

# **American Meteorological Society Scientific and Technological Activities Commission**

## **Terms of Reference for Reviewing Nominations**

### **Lecturer Awards (Revised June 1, 2016)**

This Terms of Reference (TOR) describes the process to be used by the American Meteorological Society (AMS) Scientific and Technological Activities Commission (STAC) to review nominations for the Robert E. Horton Lecturer in Hydrology, the Bernhard Haurwitz Memorial Lecturer, and the Walter Orr Roberts Lecturer in Interdisciplinary Sciences. All award review committees will follow the AMS conflict of interest policy (shown below).

The Robert E. Horton Lecturer in Hydrology is selected in recognition of eminence as a scientist for outstanding research on topics of interest to both hydrologists and meteorologists. The purpose of the lectureship is to encourage and foster an interchange of ideas between meteorologists and hydrologists. It is named for Robert E. Horton (1875–1945), whose career was distinguished by important assignments involving intricate hydrometeorological problems and by contributions to the sciences of meteorology and hydrology embracing all phases of the hydrologic cycle. The lecture may be either a general overview or a summary of recent work conducted in an area of particularly current interest.

The Bernhard Haurwitz Memorial Lecturer is selected in recognition of significant contributions to the understanding of atmospheric and oceanic fluid dynamics, the circulation of the middle atmosphere, or the dynamics of climate.

The Walter Orr Roberts Lecturer in Interdisciplinary Sciences is selected in recognition of significant contributions to the understanding of atmospheric processes through the effective interchange of knowledge between atmospheric science subdisciplines or between atmospheric scientists and scientists of other disciplines.

All three lectures are presented at an AMS Annual Meeting or an appropriate specialty conference.

Nominations for the Robert E. Horton Lecturer are considered by the STAC Committee on Hydrology. The Chair of the Hydrology Committee is responsible for assembling a committee of at least 3 individuals to review the nominations and conducting the review.

Nominations for the Bernhard Haurwitz Memorial Lecturer are considered by a committee assembled by the STAC Commissioner. The team is typically composed of five individuals including the Commissioner as chair (or an individual he/she designates), two members from the Atmospheric and Oceanic Fluid Dynamics Committee, one member from the Middle

Atmosphere Committee, and one member from the Committee on Climate Variability and Change.

Nominations for the Walter Orr Roberts Lecturer are considered by a committee of at least 3 individuals assembled by the STAC Commissioner. Committee members are selected based on disciplines of the nominees.

In April, the STAC Commissioner will contact the Chair of the Hydrology Committee about chairing the Robert E. Horton Lecturer review committee and assembling a review team, and the Commissioner will identify a Bernhard Haurwitz Memorial Lecturer review team. On May 2<sup>nd</sup> the Commissioner will assemble a committee to review nominations for the Walter Orr Roberts Lecturer award after all the nominees are known, as the expertise of the nominees can vary greatly from year to year making it difficult to know a priori who would have the background to evaluate the nominations.

The review team members participating in these reviews should be at least mid-career AMS members. Where possible, review teams should represent all three AMS sectors (academia, private, and government). The Commissioner will provide team member names to the AMS Office of the Director of Executive Programs<sup>1</sup> so they can be given access to the nomination packages on or about May 2<sup>nd</sup>.

The STAC Commissioner will provide members of the selection committees a schedule for completing the reviews, and the date STAC nomination recommendations are due to the Awards Oversight Committee (AOC). To ensure an objective award selection process, team members must review the AMS Conflict of Interest Policy and Policy Regarding Involvement in the Nomination Process (shown below). If they feel they have a relationship with one or more of the nominees, they must not participate in the reviews and replacement members will be identified.

Each team member of the review committees shall review the nomination packages ( $n$ ), rank them on a scale of 1 to  $n$  with 1 being the best, and provide them to the chair of the committee with a brief statement or reason for their top two ranked nominations. In the case of only one nomination, review team members can indicate their support or non-support for the nomination.

The chair of each committee will compile the rankings for scoring purposes and determine if there is a significant separation in scores for the top nominee. The chair will share with the review team the compiled scores and the statements of support for the top two or three nominees and either recommend an awardee (based on the separation of the scores), OR propose a second round of scoring for just the top two or three nominees. The chair will share the scores with the team members and the supporting statements for the top two or three nominees *without* attribution as to whom voted for whom. This process will be conducted by e-mail but at any

---

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Melissa Weston is the current contact; mweston@ametsoc.org

time the chair or any member of the team can request a conference call to discuss the nominees, the rankings, and/or the proposed award selection.

When agreement on the selection is reached, the chair will complete the award report (see below) and forward through the STAC Commissioner to the AOC. For item 5 of the report, the chair will indicate that the STAC TOR for reviewing Lecturer awards was followed.

**AMS CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY:** It is recognized that award committee members will often have had relationships of one form or another with at least some of those nominated for awards over the course of their career. It is important for the entire committee to be aware of the nature of those relationships so that it can address any real or perceived conflicts of interest or biases with respect to committee members and award nominees. On the first conference call or meeting at which the award committee reviews nominations, each member of the committee will describe for fellow committee members their current or past relationship to any award nominee. This should include any financial, personal, or professional relationship that might be perceived as representing a conflict of interest or bias on the part of the committee member. The committee as a whole will decide if any of these relationships are strong enough to warrant the committee member recusing him or herself from discussions on a particular nominee. In most cases, the open discussion of relationships will allow the entire committee to move forward with the review and discussion of nominations without anyone needing to recuse themselves.

#### **POLICY REGARDING INVOLVEMENT IN THE NOMINATION PROCESS**

- o Committee members will not be involved in the nomination process.(see <http://www.ametsoc.org/awards/awardsnominationprocedure.html>), BUT
- o Committee members can urge colleagues to make nominations for specific prizes (but not specific individuals)
- o Committee Chairs can formally notify the Nominations Committee about the need for nominations for a given prize.
- o In the past, specific names have been forwarded to the Awards Nomination Committee to see if they could secure nominations. Though this seems inconsistent with the stated policy if the committee is also judging that nomination, the Nominating Committee can filter these.
- o Committee members can make nominations for awards they are not involved in. Thus, a member of the Atmospheric Research Awards Committee could nominate for the Simpson Award, but the Chair of that committee could not.

# Awards Report

Return report to STAC Commissioner

To:

From:

CC: Melissa Weston

Date:

Award: (title of award)

---

1. Number of nominations for this award: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Review committee's recommendation (name of individual):
3. Was a clear justification for this award: \_\_\_\_\_ yes, \_\_\_\_\_no  
(Provide a brief reason why the recognition is justified. Cite key points from the nomination letters and/or comments by the review committee. If there is insufficient justification in the nomination letters or nomination packages are incomplete, please explain.)
4. Proposed award citation (25 words or less):
5. How did the committee select the nominees:  
(Briefly describe the process used (e.g. by e-mail, conference call etc.) and the degree of consensus (e.g. number of first place votes.)
6. Did the committee have any difficulties, concerns about the process? Recommendations for improvement
7. Names of members of the review team (name and Board/Committee affiliation):
8. Did any of the review team members have conflicts of interest with the nominees?
9. Should any of the nomination packages be move to another award for consideration next year? (Provide the name of the individual and the appropriate award.)