

LONDON MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Procedures for the award of LMS Prizes

The nomination process and eligibility

1. The aim of the nominations process is to ensure that as many eligible mathematicians of an appropriate quality are nominated as possible. There are no restrictions on who may make a nomination, including self-nomination. Nominations from professional colleagues are welcomed, including those working in the same department.
2. Nominations must include a short CV and publications list for the candidate and indicate the nominators' professional and personal relationships to the nominee. Nominations need not describe in fine detail the candidate's work, as fuller references for those shortlisted will be sought. They must also include a 'case for award' in approximately 500 words. These should be compiled into a PDF, which should in total be no more than 7 pages long, using no smaller than 11-point font.
3. A nomination form can be used for more than one prize; however, nominees should carefully consider the criteria for each prize for which a candidate is nominated and outline the candidate's suitability for each separate prize in the case for award.
4. Nominations must be made online via the LMS website.
5. Nominations remain valid for two award rounds, modulo the candidate's continuing eligibility. Nominators will be informed of when the nomination will be regarded as stale – they remain free to make a fresh case for an award.
6. Prize Committee members may make nominations themselves, but such nominations must be in the standard format and must be submitted before the deadline for nominations. Prize Committee members are encouraged to solicit nominations from across the mathematical science community.
7. Any nominations received after the deadline will not be considered until the following year's round, assuming that the nominee remains eligible.
8. Prizes Committee may add nominations at the committee meeting stage of the process only in exceptional circumstances and where there is an overriding reason. The presumption is that no nominations will be added after the deadline.
9. The Prizes Committee may move or 'roll over' a candidate to a nomination for a prize different from the one for which they were originally nominated, if deemed appropriate.
10. There is currently a disproportionately low number of women and other under-represented groups nominated for prizes each year; prize regulations replace age restrictions with the concept of 'academic age' in order to take account more fully of broken career patterns.
11. Where a prize has an age criterion then it is the nominee's 'academic' age that should be used, in order to take account more fully of broken career patterns. In addition, some allowance may be made for recent periods when the nominee was ineligible to receive an LMS prize on account of membership of Council or the Prizes Committee.
12. No current member of Council or the Prizes Committee may be awarded a prize.
13. Receipt of a Senior Anne Bennett Prize, or of an Anne Bennett Prize, should not disadvantage the prize winner from being awarded another LMS prize for which they are eligible. For example, if a person is awarded an Anne Bennett Prize and is then nominated for a Whitehead Prize in the following year, the Committee should treat the Whitehead nomination independently and should not factor into its consideration the award of the Anne Bennett Prize in the previous year.

[cont'd]

Shortlisting meeting(s)

1. The purposes of the first meeting(s) of the Committee are (a) to agree a shortlist of nominations that are deemed to be competitive and of an appropriate quality, (b) to select referees (and reserves) to be consulted on shortlisted nominations, and (c) to propose candidates for Honorary Membership.
2. Shortlisting may be undertaken over one or more meetings (e.g. one for the Whitehead nominees and one for the other prize nominees), as appropriate.
3. Committee members will be asked to declare any significant personal or professional conflicts of interest relating to the shortlisted candidates. Conflicts of interest include: being a member of the same department; close personal or family relationship; former students, close collaborators. It also includes being the formal nominator of a particular candidate.
4. The office will check factual aspects of eligibility (e.g. age, membership, previous awards) as far as it can before Committee papers are sent out, but the designated committee member should be ready to comment on both eligibility and suitability.
5. Committee members may be asked to score candidates prior to the meeting, to aid with the discussion. In this case, each nomination will be allocated to a Committee member, who should come prepared to speak to each of their allotted candidates, even though the field may not be at the centre of their own expertise. In view of the large number of nominations to be considered, it is recommended that at least two members of the committee should be assigned to each candidate and asked to score them (say in 3 categories) in advance of the meeting. Candidates should not be assigned any candidate with whom they have a conflict of interest.

Assigning referees for shortlisted candidates

6. Nominators are asked to provide potential referees on the nomination form. In addition, Prizes Committee members should consider potential referees (beyond those already suggested) for the nominees to which they are allocated. Both nominators and Prizes Committee members may consult with another more expert person to identify referees, provided they make it clear that total confidentiality is expected.
7. Referees should be chosen on the basis of their ability to offer useful and objective advice. Prizes Committee should avoid choosing referees where a conflict of interest may be perceived. This includes the following:
 - Current members of Prizes Committee;
 - Anyone personally related to the nominee;
 - Anyone based in the same department as the nominee;
 - Current or previous PhD supervisors of the nominee;
 - Anyone who has published work or undertaken major collaboration with the nominee in the past 5 years.
8. Members of Council are eligible to act as referees if appropriate, but in this case the Council Member should not take part in Council's decision of whether to award the relevant prize to that individual.
9. In advance of the meeting, Committee members should, in so far as possible, draw up an ordered list of several referees for each of their allocated nominees.
10. Committee members should send their lists of referees to the Committee secretary prior to the decision meeting.

[cont'd]

11. The Committee will agree on referees for shortlisted candidates at the decision meeting, based on the lists received. Committee members should not take part in the selection of referees for nominees with whom they have a conflict of interest. The Chair may ask a Committee member to leave the meeting while a nomination is discussed if it is felt their professional or personal relationship to the candidate could be perceived as particularly compromising.

Honorary Members

12. The Committee will also be asked to suggest one or two names as possible honorary members, providing a 50-word outline of their CV and if possible a URL giving authoritative information. These names can be agreed at the meeting or afterwards by email, as time allows. The suggestions should be forwarded by the Committee secretary to Council for their consideration.

Decision meeting

1. The purposes of the decision meeting are (a) to compose a list of recommended award winners to the LMS Council (or recommend that no award be made), (b) to select citation writers for each award recommended, and (c) to review the regulations and procedures and recommend to Council or F&GPC any changes for the successive prizes year.
2. At the beginning of the meeting, Committee members will be asked to declare any conflict of interest as above. Referees will have been asked to declare their relationship to the candidate as part of their reference.
3. As with the initial meeting(s), Committee members may be asked to score the shortlisted nominations ahead of the meeting, to aid with discussion. Committee members should come prepared to speak on each of their allotted candidates, even though the field may not be at the centre of their own expertise (see above). They should take into account the information on the nomination form, the referees' comments and any other information they may gather about the nominee (e.g. via MathSciNet). They may consult others only in strict confidence.
4. Committee members should not normally take part in discussion of a candidate with whom they have a conflict of interest. They may however, at the Chair's discretion, be invited to provide purely factual information or clarification. The Chair may ask a Committee member to leave the meeting while a nomination is discussed if it is felt their professional or personal relationship to the candidate could be perceived as particularly compromising, although consideration should also be given as to whether their absence will result in the Committee being less able to make an informed assessment. In the situation in which a final vote on several candidates is taken, to avoid distortions in the count, all Committee members should be present and vote.
5. At the meeting, citation writers should be agreed for each recommended prize winner. Citation writers are expected to provide to the secretary of the Committee within a defined timescale (a) a short (30-word) citation giving briefly the grounds for the award (to be used at the General Meeting announcing the awards), and (b) a longer (300-word) citation for publication in the LMS Newsletter.

Updated September 2024