

IUPAP YSP PROCEDURE 2018

Here is a suggestion as a starting point for discussions in Bologna on September 7 2018.

The refereeing should be done by the members of C12. Last time external referees were called in. I don't think that is necessary. We are 14 members in C12 covering most fields of nuclear physics and we should be able to do the job ourselves.

Three members of C12 will be assigned to assess each nominee. If we assume we will have 20 nominees each C12 member will have to review 4 or 5 nominees. Each of us should then provide a ranking of those 4 to 5 nominees based on the following criteria:

- a) Quality and impact of the research project: 1-5 points.
- b) Publication record, primary authorship, impact factor of journal, etc.: 1-5 points.
- c) Identifiable individual contribution of the nominee: 1-5 points.
- d) Record of invited talks and visibility of the nominee at nuclear physics conferences: 1-5 points.
- e) Future prospects of the nominee: 1-5 points.

(1 = ok, 2 = good, 3= very good, 4 = excellent, 5 = outstanding)

Maybe also write a short text to motivate our ranking.

This initial process will then converge into a preliminary shortlist of say 10 candidates.

From the shortlist of 10 nominees, each member of C12 will be asked to select three and rank them with 1 for the top candidate, followed by 2 and 3. We will then have 14 different rankings, and based on them we may narrow the number down to lets say 6 top candidates, out of which we shall select three winners.

Now comes the difficult part. We must have a reasonable gender balance, which means that both genders must be represented amongst the three winners. Also, we need a regional spread and a spread of the different subfields of nuclear physics. If we are lucky this spread exists already within the top 6 candidates and there should be no big problem to select the three. If not we may have to look at candidates further down in the list. That means that we may have to build in some non-scientific considerations, and we need to do that from the beginning because it will be difficult to start such discussions when we already are a bit into the evaluation process. How do we do that? How do we build in non-scientific considerations into the process?
