

Reference Document for Awards Committees that Review PES Award Nominations

Table of Contents

	Page
Purpose of This Reference Document	2
Listing of Awards covered by this Reference Document:	2
PES Governing Board Member Listing	2
Policies and Practices for the PES Governing Board	3
Code of Ethics and Review Committee Member Conflict of Interest	4
Process When only One Nomination is Received	4
Additional Nominee Eligibility Requirement	5
Requirements for Review Committee Membership Participation	5
“Review Committee” Membership Participation:	6
Transparent Ranking	6
Delay in Submitting Review Reports	7
Candidate Scoring	8
Scoring Guideline to Receive an Award	8
Outstanding Large & Small Chapter Awards	9
Appendixes	11
I. Additional Information Related to Ranking Structure by Evaluators:	11

Purpose of This Reference Document

This reference is a supplement to the IEEE Policy 4.4.H and is intended to provide a consistent and equitable governance for the various Awards Technical Committees that receive and review nominations. Topics covered are the questions presented by PES Awards review committee members, to achieve uniform evaluations across all society and chapter Awards. The information contained in this Guide is based on collective sets of information that IEEE has been practicing. Source of information, outside of Policy 4.4H, is provided where available. Where a common knowledge, or commonly practiced process is described, the process has been vetted by the technical committees, both electronically and in person at Power and Energy Society (PES) Awards Committee and PES Technical Committee Awards Meetings. Efforts are made to prevent any duplications with IEEE Policy 4.4H to the extent possible. In case of conflict, IEEE 4.4H prevails.

This Guide maybe updated from time to time with the intent to clarify, to include responses to additional questions, or in case roles within the approval process require name changes.

Listing of Awards covered by this Reference Document:

PES Awards are created through a clear process. Once a proposal is prepared and has been discussed amongst the active Governing Board (GB) members, then, the proposal is submitted to IEEE TABARC (Technical Activity Board Review Committee) for approval. Updates to Society and Chapter level Awards require a formal process to receive approval from IEEE TABARC.

The IEEE PES maintains a complete list of Society and Chapter Awards on the Awards Web Site. From the link below, select Society Level Awards for a complete listing of Awards, Eligibility requirements and list of active committee members that review the nominations for the respective Award. The IEEE PES reference manual for preparing effective nominations is also available at the same site.

<https://www.ieee-pes.org/pes-communities/awards>

PES Governing Board Member Listing

Active GB member listing is available on the PES Web site, at <https://www.ieee-pes.org/about-pes> . Under, "Related Links", the respective year's GB members names, e-mail addresses are available. Note that the GB members each have a term limit. Therefore, listing is associated with the year present members are serving. When reviewing nominations, it may be necessary to have access to members from previous year depending on review season.

The PES Staff will be able to assist with listing of GB members for one year earlier when needed.

Policies and Practices for the PES Governing Board

IEEE Policy 4.4H governs PES policies and practices for the PES Governing Board members. The Policy describes where the GB members may not be involved in the process. As a reminder, each society level Award is approved by IEEE (TABARC).

IEEE Policy 4.4H

Eligibility and Process Limitations. Individuals serving on any board or committee involved at any stage of the recipient selection or approval process for an award shall be ineligible to receive, or act as a nominator or reference for that award. This conflict of interest limitation shall apply to all awards given by the IEEE or any of its organizational units.

1. PES GB members cannot be nominated to receive an Award.
2. PES GB Members cannot submit nominations.
3. PES GB Members cannot submit references or endorsement in support of a nomination.
4. PES GB members cannot participate in Award evaluation for any society level award.

Awards Review Committee members are expected to be familiar with the Eligibility for the respective Award, covered in earlier section, Listing of Awards. The PES Vice President (VP) of Membership and Image (VP M&I) is the director of PES awards activities. The Chair of the PES Awards and Recognition (also referred to as the PES Awards Chair) reports to the VP of Membership and Image. The PES Awards Chair is responsible to review each Award Review committee's (or award committees) recommendation, and also coordinate with each committee when questions arise requiring clarifications about the process. Citations are proposed by the nominator, however, as described within each society Award the final decision for Citation for a recommended nominee is determined by the individual IEEE PES Awards and Recognition Committee. When, the Awards Chair identifies a need for a revision to a specific citation, the Awards Chair will coordinate with the respective award committee the proposed update with a brief reason and ask the respective award committee to consider and determine if acceptable or if the committee has an alternate citation proposal.

In summary, the PES GB Members may not be involved in writing nomination, cannot submit nominations, nor can they submit references or endorsement in support of a nomination. In addition, the GB members cannot be nominated to receive an Award and they cannot participate in Award evaluation for any society level award.

Code of Ethics and Review Committee Member Conflict of Interest

In addition to the Eligibility requirements described within each PES Award, IEEE Policy Statement 9.8 of the Fellows Handbook, defines conflict of interest. A short summary is included for reference.

“Conflict of interest is any situation in which a member’s decisions or votes could substantially and directly affect the member’s professional, personal, financial or business interests.” A conflict of interest also exists if one cannot consider themselves impartial. For example, a relative, a partner, a close associate or direct report, If a potential conflict of interest is perceived by a Society/Technical Council Evaluating Committee, this matter must be reported immediately to the IEEE Staff for review and recommended action. IEEE Fellows policy statement further mentions that all nominations and evaluation data should be treated as “IEEE Confidential Controlled Distribution”.

Similar rules apply to the IEEE PES Awards review committees. The committee members with perceived or implied conflicts of interest should report to PES Awards office and the respective review Committee Chair. In addition, the PES Awards on-line evaluation system has provisions for committee members with conflict of interest to recuse themselves from evaluating a nominee.

In case of updates to the IEEE Policy Statements on conflict of interest, at some point in the future, the IEEE policy will prevail.

Process When only One Nomination is Received

In a given year, it is possible that a limited number of Awards may only receive one nomination. As a general rule, each Award requires two or more nominations for a committee to engage and review the nominations. For some Awards, this requirement, of multiple nominations, may in some years lead to forfeiting a deserving person. It is possible that a particular nomination is truly worthy of receiving Award and the single one nomination truly deserves the respective Award. In other words, even with multiple nominations for a given Award, the nomination for the single nominee would stand out in ranking for the respective award over a life cycle.

In other words, even when multiple nominations are submitted, the single nomination would stand out amongst multiple nominations. The review committee chairs and members in the

past have favored to allow the respective review committee to evaluate whether a single nomination merits receiving Award for the respective year. As a reminder, the Awards Chair and Vice-Chair are part of oversight committee that remain engaged following individual technical committees and maintain equity for the PES Society and Chapter Awards across the spectrum. In particular, the PES Awards Office and PES Membership and Image request assistance from the respective committees to review of the single nomination, and let the PES Awards Office know of the committee's recommendation for consideration, while following a similar on-line evaluation process as if there are multiple nominations.

The respective committee's recommendation, provided favorable outcome, will be considered by the PES Awards Chair / vice-Chair and the PES Membership and Image for a final determination. Each committee has sufficient membership with knowledge of past Award recipients, eligibility and qualifications, and each have specific criteria for evaluation of the nominee(s).

The overall process can be summarized in the following steps:

1. Provided that the Respective Review Committee has considered a favorable vote, the PES will forward the entire nomination package for the single nominations (one for each committee, not as a bundle) to the PES Awards Chair.
2. The Awards Chair will coordinate or provide an independent review and will let the respective committee know of the final decision.

Additional Nominee Eligibility Requirement

IEEE Policy 4.4.H and the Awards Board Operations Manual, Eligibility criteria Section 5.5C (Technical Field Awards Council), define eligibility requirements in more details. A couple of the most commonly asked questions are summarized in this section for reference.

- A TFA recipient may not receive two Technical Field Awards for the same work
- Self-nominations are not eligible, with the exception of employees of the company Nominated for the IEEE Corporate Innovation Award (applicable to IEEE TFA)

Requirements for Review Committee Membership Participation

In order to guarantee the rigor and the impartiality of the evaluation process, it is recommended to limit membership of the review committee, from the same organization, to be

less than 20% of the total members, ensuring a proper balance representation, and to avoid polarization to a particular geographic area or a particular institution or organization. Committees with less than 10 members should only have one member from any institution, or corporation, in the evaluating Committee. Committees with 10-20 members may have than two individuals from same institution as members of the review committee. In addition, the review committee and vice-chair cannot be from same organization or affiliated institutions. Furthermore, for committees with larger than 10 membership, when there is more than one representative from the same institution, the respective review committee chair can only appoint a person that is not from the same institution to represent the committee, for example during a hearing or a GB meeting.

“Review Committee” Membership Participation:

Each review committee is expected to have a chair person and a vice-chair (deputy). The term for chairing a review committee is three years, with chair transition period to occur sometimes between August – October of the year the PES Awards on-line nominations are in progress. Committee membership selects the new chair, which may or may not be the deputy. Likewise, membership to a particular Awards Review Committee shall not exceed 5 years. The chair / vice-chair of each review committee shall maintain an active roster membership and provide a copy to the PES Awards office by October of the year the PES Awards on-line nominations are in progress.

Furthermore, it is anticipated that PES volunteer participation in the review committees will not exceed two committees. The limit is intended to allow a member be participant in one committee while possibly volunteering to Chair / vice-Chair another. The limit also helps promote new volunteers to each awards review committee and also increase membership within the PES pool of volunteers participating in the Awards.

Transparent Ranking

A documented way to know ranking is very helpful with transparency, and also clearly identifies the committee members discussions as they are reviewing each candidate. A documented ranking also helps the respective review committee be prepared with questions that may come up from some of the nominators, may help them to prepare future nominations, or to prepare references for future nominees. Often times, the questions come up long after a committee has completed their review service and a documented ranking helps with quick

reference. Furthermore, it is important to have a ranking documentation in the hands of PES Office staff in case there is a need to refer to it to identify committees decision on a runner up. For example, if a selected nominee is disqualified for being a GB member that may not have been identified earlier. There are many other examples beyond intent of this Guide.

The practice of transparent ranking is common across the industry, and closer to us is IEEE Technical Fields Awards (TFA). Ranking is not a public information. In the example of TFA, the ranking is Available to the IEEE Office as well as to the respective TFA Chair. See Appendix for further discussions. For PES related Awards, the information will be available to the PES Awards office, the PES Awards Committee Chair, and the PES VP of M&I.

Delay in Submitting Review Reports

The on-line Awards process does not allow for late submission of review committee evaluations. Delays in submission of final evaluations by the respective committee chairs will result in forfeiting an Award, for the respective award, for the respective year. The PES Award Chair / vice-chair and the PES Awards office will send multiple reminders, throughout the review open period, to help minimize meeting the deadline. The overall objective is to reach to the specific member with offering a date by which their votes are needed, preferably allowing 2-3 days prior to the final deadline in order for the Committee Chair to finalize the ranking to be submitted to the PES Awards Office. To this aim, the Committee Chair is invited to set aside a conference call to get some of the committee members to start or to discuss outcome of their review. The call will help Chair narrow down the nominations, and to receive some general consensus.

Although it is ideal to get all members to participate, it could happen that some of the review committee members, after several reminders, do not completed their evaluations in due time. IEEE PES depends on its volunteer review committee members to meet the review deadlines. When a committee member cannot meet the dates, the member should immediately notify the respective committee Chair / vice-chair and also inform the Awards Committee Chair. The respective Committee Chair can then reassign the review or remove the member from the voting membership. When not possible, due to circumstances outside of the committee member and Chair control, the IEEE guidelines for "Standards" and "Guides" under PAR (Project Authorization Request) may be applied. The IEEE PAR requires that 70% of formed balloting body. The insight is that a possibly great nominee should not be disqualified if a Committee has sufficient level of information to move forward without reaching 100% membership vote. It is Reference for Society and Chapter Awards Nominations Review

the discretion of the respective review committee Chair to decide how best to manage all the votes prior to cutoff date. The on-line review does not provide provisions to extend the cutoff date for submission of the evaluation. Therefore, it is important that each committee Chair attempts to have their review completed timely.

The same approach should be followed also in the case of a single nominee, since, also in this case, an official score is expected to properly assess the qualifications of the nominee. The scoring also assists the PES Office and the Awards Committee Chair as to whether the respective review committee thinks the single nomination has sufficient merits to pursue a second / independent review.

The Awards web site will remain as the main location for notification of successful recipients for Awards. The on-line process further minimizes contacts between the nominators and the respective review committees. Therefore, only successful nominees will be announced. The on-line nomination templates have a note indicating that announcements are made only of successful nominees and via public PES announcements.

Candidate Scoring

For each Award, the PES Awards office and the PES Awards Committee Chair should receive a documented scoring chart detailing each member's vote and the overall scoring plus other details the Committee Chair determines appropriate for completeness of the decision. IEEE PES is required to have a transparent process, for each nominee for a given Award, to respond to inquiries as needed. Even with one nominee, the score will help the independent reviewers to know the overall opinion of the Committee assigned to review. To this aim, the Committee Chair may use a numerical indicator ranging in the interval [0,100], or terms such as "Strongly Recommends" or "Highly Recommends" or "nominee is Exceptionally qualified", or "moderately meets requirements", "marginally meets requirements", which are acceptable, as IEEE Fellows also allows the tier terminologies when ranking nominees.

Scoring Guideline to Receive an Award

Although there is no official cutoff score to qualify a nominee for an Award, it is important to determine merits of the accomplishment, the quality of the nomination and supporting documents prepared by the nominator. A score of 30 vs. a score of 90, on a 0-100 scale with 100 indicating highly qualified, reflects the strength of the nomination and supporting documentations for a particular nominee. This scoring system is practiced both in the Reference for Society and Chapter Awards Nominations Review

Academic fields and also by some IEEE evaluation process such as the Fellows. As a general rule, any score is acceptable. General business and industry practice are to consider a Grade of “C” or higher, which translates to score of 70 indicating that a Candidate has met sufficient requirements for an award. Likewise, score of 80-90 indicates a nominee moderately meets requirements. Terms used within IEEE for elevation to grade of Fellow are, Extraordinarily Qualified, Highly Qualified, Qualified, Marginally Qualified, Not Qualified. For PES Awards, each Awards Committee may use a numerical scoring or ranking as see appropriate. In some instances when there is a large number of nominations for example, it may be more practical to use a numerical scoring of 0-100 scale. The respective committee will notify the PES Awards office and the Awards Chair of the method used (ranking or scoring) when the evaluation is completed for the respective year and summary evaluation is submitted to PES Awards office.

Self-nominations

The PES awards policy does not allow for self-nomination. Self-nomination also reduces the objectivity of the nomination. Refer to earlier section related to the IEEE Technical Fields Awards (TFA) for additional information.

Outstanding Large & Small Chapter Awards

It is recommended that the Chapter Chairs send to the IEEE PES Awards the following information:

- The selected Large & Small Chapters
- Selected Chapter officer names and contact info. & region rep. name and contact info.
- Listing of Runner-up Chapters in both Large & Small categories in a sequential way based on ranking and associated score
- Runner-up Chapter officer names and contact info. & region rep. name and contact info.
- Write ups for both the large and small selected chapters - limited to approximately 300 words each.

Jointly with a report summarizing the key information for the selection for the award, such as the membership growth trend, the list of technical meetings and educational workshops held, etc.

For single nominations, it is required a documentation that backs the summary, i.e. information related to membership growth numbers, or whether information demonstrated meetings were actually conducted, the Agenda for the meeting (some of the meetings), etc.

IEEE PES Awards will coordinate official notifications to both large and small Chapters.

Appendixes

I. Additional Information Related to Ranking Structure by Evaluators:

The approach adopted by some committees, which prefers to only identify the winning candidate (100) for the award and to keep all remaining candidates equal (1) appears not practicable. The application of this approach was motivated by the fact that not all candidates could be qualified for the award, so the committee members would prefer to not perpetuate any false hopes with further rankings beyond the winning candidate. Anyway this approach is considered not coherent, since if the committee members scored a candidate with a 1 that would translate to the candidate not being qualified for the award. Hence, it is suggested to rank all the candidates as a 1, if they are all not qualified and the committee would not present the award that year.

Moreover, it is required to have, in the system, a way to identify the second, third, and so on candidates, and a simple 100 for the top candidate, 90 for the second, 80 for the third and so on would work for that. The ranking allows in the off chance the top candidate has been declared unfit to receive the award (if there is some conflict of interest or other reasons for disqualification is identified). Of course, the committee would be involved in the process if some problem was identified, but the committee members wouldn't have to go back and re-vote because the second-place person would already have been scored that way. Broader perspective, one can look at Nobel Prize, the MacArthur Fellowship Award, some of the competitive Sports, and other examples with monetary rewards, where the runner up is identified in case of disqualification of the primary.