

Martha T Muse Prize Committee Meeting

1st and 2nd June 2011, KOPRI, Incheon.

Attendees: Diane McKnight (Chair and Committee Member), Alexander Klepikov (Committee Member), Daniela Liggett (Committee Member), M Y Choe (Committee Member), John Turner (Committee Member), Renuka Badhe (Administrator, SCAR)

Opening Formalities (June 1st 2011)

Renuka Badhe (Executive Officer, SCAR), on behalf of SCAR, opened the meeting and conveyed thanks to all the Committee members for their effort and time for the selection of the Martha T Muse Prize winner. Renuka also conveyed greetings and best wishes from Renate Rennie (Chair, Tinker Foundation) who could not be present.

Diane McKnight, the Committee Chair, welcomed the meeting attendees and thanked the committee members and SCAR for organizing the meeting. Diane also thanked KOPRI for hosting the 3rd Selection Committee meeting, and for their hospitality. Diane pointed out that this would be the third such meeting, and the selection process was still evolving, and invited especially the new Committee members to put forward their suggestions and improvements.

Discussion of Nominations

Initial Short-listing of Nominations

Since the guide age limit had come into force since 2010, the Committee first looked at applications which were above the age limit, and Diane presented each such case to the Committee. The Committee then discussed each nomination in turn, and whether it would be within the scope of the Prize. Of a total 17 nominations received, 13 were considered further by the Committee.

The overall approach taken in reaching a short list of three nominees at the end of the first day of the meeting was similar to the approach taken for the last two selection committee meetings. Each Nominee was assigned a Principal Reviewer and a Secondary Reviewer from within the Committee. In order to shortlist the Nominations, each Committee Member gave a short oral presentations (~5-10 minutes) on the Nominees for which they were assigned Principal Reviewer. The Nominee Secondary Reviewer was then given the opportunity to make any additional comments.

All Committee Members (excluding those who declared a conflict of interest –

see below) then rated the nomination (using the Evaluation forms – Appendix), based both on the presentation and the complete Nomination package. A further opportunity to reconsider scores was given after all the Nominees had been discussed. These scores were then used to create the first shortlist of the Nominees.

Disclosures of conflicts of interest had been made prior to the meeting and taken into account in assigning Principal and Secondary Reviewers. The Committee decided that any Committee Member that had declared a conflict of interest would not evaluate that particular Nominee nor voice an opinion. However they would not need to leave the room and could share additional information when a specific question was directed to them.

After the Committee Members had finalized their evaluations, Renuka and Diane presented the results to the Committee. Those Nominees with scores above 80/100 (a total of seven) were considered further. Diane checked if any Committee Member thought any Nominee not in these top seven should be considered further, which was not the case.

The Committee discussed the seven nominees further. Each member then voted by secret ballot to choose two Nominations to **not** consider further. The results of this ballot yielded five names. A second ballot was then held where each member was asked to choose one nomination to **not** consider further, leaving a final selection shortlist of three.

The meeting then adjourned for the day to give Committee Members time to study the final three Nominations in depth.

Final Selection (June 2nd 2011)

Diane provided the Committee with a short review of the previous day's discussions and decisions. The Committee took a short break to have a detailed look at the final three nominations.

The first vote of the day was held to obtain the final shortlist of two Nominees. Diane then reminded the Committee Members of the Prize Winner Attributes and the main aims of the Prize.

Two new reviewers were randomly appointed for the final two Nominees. The strong points of the final two nominees were presented again to the Committee, and discussed in detail by the Committee.

The last ballot was then made for the winner, and Dr Jose Xavier was unanimously chosen as the recipient of the 2011 Martha T Muse Prize.

Post-meeting activities

Action: Diane and Renuka to work on a short citation and press release for Jose Xavier and to pass it by the Committee and Tinker for approval. The Press Release would have an embargo date.

Action: After letters have been sent out to unsuccessful Nominators, Renuka to email selected Nominators to ask them to update their nominations for next year in early 2012 (Please note the suggestion on age limits below, this is important as re-nominations allowed if the Nominee is below 55 at closure of nominations)

Location of the Prize Award Ceremony and Schedule of Future Prizes

The Committee discussed possible locations for the Award Ceremony/ Prize winner lecture, noting that it should be at a high profile event with a connection to Antarctic Science and/or Policy. The Committee decided upon the World Conference on Marine Biodiversity as a possible venue.

Action: Renuka to check about further arrangements for the Prize Ceremony at the WCMB, Aberdeen, and a Plenary lecture by the Prize Winner.

Future of the Prize Committee

Diane McKnight and Angelika Brandt rotate off the Prize Committee after three years to allow for the yearly rotation of the Committee and were thanked for their contribution by Renuka.

Action: Committee members suggested potential new Committee. They also suggested putting out an open call for potential Committee members.

Procedural improvements to the format of the Nomination package:

As an ongoing effort to improve the Prize Selection process, the Committee members suggested following updates/changes to the Nominators instructions and for the Nominations:

- Importance of supporting letters was reiterated, and the Committee asked that “optional” be removed from the Supporting letters part of the online submission
- To name the template CV as a “Nomination form” to be downloaded, filled and sent in. The Committee further suggested addition of the following wording to the website:
“The nominator is strongly encouraged to follow the given format as it facilitates the consideration of the nomination by the committee.”

- Include on the website, as well as ask for information on the Nomination form about the citizenship / country of residence of all nominationees. To add on the website “Nominations from South America, Asia, Russia, etc., are encouraged”)

Action: Renuka to follow up on the rest of the points for the procedural improvements.