

History of Science Society

COMMITTEE ON HONORS AND PRIZES

Sarton Prize Committee 2016

Submitted by Lorraine Daston

Committee members:

Jimena Canales

Kevin Chang

Lorraine Daston (Chair)

Gregg Mitman

Lawrence Principe

1. Activities in 2016

The committee reviewed nominations of nine scholars. Because two of this year's nominees were either a co-author or a colleague of the chair, she recused herself from the ranking of the candidates. Her role was limited to collating the other committee members' rankings and coordinating communication within the committee. The committee went through two rounds of ranking, first listing five candidates in rank order and then refining the list to the three candidates submitted (unranked) to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee selected Katharine Park as the 2016 Sarton Prize laureate.

2. Results

The committee recommended that three other candidates, in addition to the two not selected, be carried over to next year.

3. Problems and Recommendations

The committee felt that it had a critical mass of strong nominations to work with, some of which had been carried over from previous years but with updated supporting letters. More nominees with comparably strong dossiers would of course have been welcome. The field of nominees was fairly well-balanced among specialties within the discipline. Two out of the nine nominees considered were women.

This year the committee tried to make its recommendations to the Executive Committee by mid-March, and thanks to the cooperation of the committee members and help from Jay Malone and Greg Macklem, we succeeded in doing so. We would recommend sticking to this tighter schedule in the future.

Report to HSS CoHP on HSS Price/Webster Prize Subcommittee 2015

Zuoyue Wang

April 25, 2016

1. Procedures followed:

The subcommittee consisted of Zuoyue Wang (chair), Anita Guerrini, and Rich Bellon. Per HSS guidelines, we covered all Isis issues from March 2012 to December 2014, and focus on the main "research" articles excluding Focus essays as in the past which were not peer-reviewed. The previous year's prize winner was of course excluded this year. Following past practice we did not include HSS distinguished lectures (none such papers were published in 2014). So on these grounds and on the basis of the list from the previous year (2012-2013) the chair compiled and attached a list of qualified papers for this year to other members, and invited revisions/suggestions in this regard.

The first step in the selection, according to the HSS guidelines, was for the members each to come up with a "top ten" un-ranked list of all the qualified papers. Then members discussed the lists and ranked those articles that got on two or more lists.

We set a deadline for the lists of top ten at July 5, came up with our top ten lists, selected those that made all three lists (3 papers did so), and then allowed each member to add one more paper from those making one or two lists, ending with five semi-finalists. Members then each assigned a numeric rank to each semi-finalists, ending up with two top finalists. In selecting the winner, members followed past practice by each writing a one-paragraph commentary on each paper summarizing its strengths and weaknesses. This writing exercise helped clarify the choice and the committee chose the winner unanimously. The chair drafted the citation for the winner based on the commentaries and with feedback from committee members. The representative from the CoHP for our subcommittee last year was Lawrence Principe and was copied on procedural discussions.

2. Results: We selected Christopher Crenner, "[Race and Laboratory Norms: The Critical Insights of Julian Herman Lewis \(1891-1989\)](#)," Isis 105, no. 3 (September 2014): 477-507, as the winner of the 2015 HSS Price/Webster Prize.

3. Problems and Recommendations: I believe that the committee following the above procedure worked well. One recommendation for future prize committee is to try the last step we undertook, i.e., each member writing a paragraph on each finalist--it not only helped clarify consensus but also paved way for the final citation.

JOSEPH H. HAZEN EDUCATION PRIZE FOR 2015

Submitted by Elizabeth Neswald on May 1, 2016

1. Describe the committee's completed, ongoing, and planned activities during the current calendar year.

The committee's main work this year has been selecting the award winner for the Hazen Prize. The committee reviewed seven short nominations (see #3) and selected five candidates (including a candidate who carried over from the previous competition) to submit full dossiers for a long nomination. We deliberated on the full nominations and chose a candidate for the award of the Hazen Prize.

2. Please describe any long-term plans, goals and potential projects for the committee, as well as any potential future concerns or issues you believe the committee could face.

This was the first year that the prize introduced a two-tier process. In the first phase, we solicited short nominations. From these nominations, we selected five candidates from whom long nominations were solicited. The aim of this change was to expand the pool of qualified candidates. Since the long nomination requires a substantial time investment on the part of the nominee, it was hoped that the two part nomination process, which informed candidates whether they were competitive before they made this investment, would encourage more nominations. This strategy was successful. We had a much larger starting pool of nominations and a much larger pool of highly qualified nominees in the long list. We recommend keeping this system.

The committee experienced some irregularities in this year. One committee member was unresponsive to repeated contact attempts over several months using a variety of media, and by a number of different people, including myself, the other committee member, Jay Malone and Greg Macklem. After consultation with Jay Malone, the diminished committee selected candidates for long nominations. The third member remained unresponsive, and the committee requested an alternative committee member to advise in the final selection. This was provided.

3. List names of committee members, if applicable. Indicate members whose terms expire in 2015. Also, indicate any preferences for appointments (or reappointments) to the committee. The Executive Committee makes committee assignments at its mid-year meeting and will take any recommendations under consideration.

The committee members for 2015 are:

Elizabeth Neswald (term expires 2015)

Nancy Slack

Melanie Keene (replaced by John Rudolph)

THE LEVINSON PRIZE SUBCOMMITTEE for 2016

Submitted by Gregory Radick

(1) Procedures followed

Following invitations from Jay Malone at the end of March 2016 to Elena Aronova, Vanessa Heggie and me, we began our work in mid-April by agreeing to a longlist of 22 books (= the full list minus three obviously non-historical scientific books) and a three-way division of labor for thinning that out to a shortlist. We're currently collecting and reading through the longlisted books, aiming to discuss them and arrive at a shortlist of 3-5 books in early July. Vanessa and I are both serving for a second year, with me acting as chair.

(2) results;

None so far.

(3) any problems encountered or recommendations for future committees.

None so far.

The Reingold Prize Committee 2015

Submitted by Rachel Dentiger

As the chair of the Reingold Committee in 2015, I received the 8 candidate papers on 30 June. The committee (myself, Helen Curry, and Alexander Jones) agreed that we would read and score the papers by the end of August, in order to make a decision by the beginning of September. We scored the papers using the standard scale (3=Prize-worthy; 2=Adequate; 1=Unsuitable). Only one paper received a 3 from all of us and we concurred that we were all happy to proceed with that paper as the winner (Evan Hepler-Smith), and we informed the HSS office of our decision on 3 September. Then I drafted the prize citation and circulated it to the other two committee members for their comment, submitting it to HSS on 8 October. The whole process went quite smoothly and I can't think of any problems.

The Margaret W. Rossiter History of Women in Science Prize for 2015

Submitted by Donald Opitz on April 19, 2016

- 1. Describe the committee's completed, ongoing, and planned activities during the current calendar year.**

The subcommittee's completed activity for the calendar year was the selection of the winner of The Margaret W. Rossiter History of Women in Science Prize. The competition for 2015, being an odd year, was for recognizing an outstanding book (as opposed to article, in even-numbered years). The subcommittee consisted of voting members Ruth Schwartz Cowan, Gwen Kay, and Donald Opitz (chair), and non-voting, ex-officio member Lorraine Daston. Among 15 nominations received, only 14 were eligible based on year of publication (in 2011, 2012, 2013 or 2014). The selection proceeded in two rounds. The subcommittee unanimously named Amy Sue Bix's *Girls Coming to Tech: A History of American Engineering Education for Women* (MIT Press, 2013) as the winner.

- 2. Please describe any long-term plans, goals and potential projects for the committee, as well as any potential future concerns or issues you believe the committee could face.**

In the 2016 calendar year, the selection will be for recognizing an outstanding article or book chapter.

- 3. List names of committee members, if applicable. Indicate members whose terms expire in 2015. Also, indicate any preferences for appointments (or reappointments) to the committee. The Executive Committee makes committee assignments at its mid-year meeting and will take any recommendations under consideration.**

The subcommittee members for the current year are:

Ruth Schwartz Cowan

Lorraine Daston (non-voting, ex-officio)

Gwen Kay (incoming chair)

Donald Opitz (outgoing chair, term expires)

History of Science Society 2016 Awards Ceremony Program
Saturday, November 5, 2016 6:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Peachtree C

Welcome

Robert J. Malone, Executive Director

Recognition

Program Co-Chairs • Committee on Meetings and Programs Chair
Local Arrangements Committee Co-Chairs • Former Presidents of the Society

In Memoriam

(please stand, if you are able)

Interest Group Prizes and HSS Lecturers

Forum for History of Human Science
Forum for the History of Science in America

History of Science Society Prizes

Read by Janet Browne, HSS President

Adam Richter (University of Toronto)

Nathan Reingold Prize for best essay by a graduate student

Joan L. Richards (Brown University)

Joseph H. Hazen Education Prize for excellence in education

Megan Raby (University of Texas at Austin)

Derek Price/Rod Webster Prize for best article in Isis

Nick Hopwood (University of Cambridge)

*Suzanne J. Levinson Prize for best book in the history of the life sciences
and natural history*

Paola Bertucci (Yale University)

*Margaret W. Rossiter History of Women in Science Prize for best article
on the role of women in science*

Jacob Darwin Hamblin (Oregon State University)

Watson Davis and Helen Miles Davis Prize for best book for a general audience

Omar W. Nasim (University of Regensburg)

Pfizer Award for best scholarly book

Katharine Park (Harvard University, emerita)

Sarton Medal for lifetime scholarly achievement

Conclusion

Robert J. Malone

Proposals for the Phil Pauly Prize and the Ron Rainger Prize

Dear Council,

The following exchanges (apologies for the length) are intended to give you information to help you in your deliberations. The overarching questions are:

1. Do you agree with COHP's recommendation that we accept these two new prizes (see descriptions)?
2. Should new prizes be accepted on the condition that they equal the monetary amount of extant prizes? (Our practice has been that endowed prizes provide awards that are equal in value.)
3. Should we draw on the prize funds to help defray the travel costs of prize winners so that they can attend the ceremony?

On 10/10/2016 1:51 PM, Jay Malone wrote:

Dear Adam and Gwen,

Before I send the Pauly and Rainger prize proposals to the Comm on Honors and Prizes, I want to be sure that I understand what you need from them. The Treasurer determines what amount is considered sufficient for an endowed prize and you want to find out from CoHP if they believe that all prizes should be the same (e.g. \$1000, which would require a \$25K minimum gift) or if they are okay with prizes that are less than that amount. Remember, even a minimum amount does not account for the extra administrative costs in administering the prizes, e.g. staffing the committees, ordering the books, corresponding with the prize committees, more expensive prize booklets (time required and length), etc. Determining the admin costs can be tricky. Selecting the prize committee members is done by our officer volunteers, but it's up to me to get people on board and the time involved can be considerable. Our student workers handle many of the details, such as ordering the books, but that can derail, as it did earlier this year when our student had to take an emergency medical leave and we spent a lot of time trying to follow through on things.

Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2016 3:33 PM, Adam Apt wrote

To: Jay Malone <jay@hsonline.org>; 'HSS Treasurer' <hss.treasurer3@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: New prizes

Dear Jay and Gwen,

It seems to me that there are costs associated with a prize that can be expected to rise with the rate of inflation, while the prize itself remains a fixed amount unless and until the Society decides, perhaps because of inflation, to raise the amount. So, the administrative costs and the cost of books (if not complimentary) will rise with inflation, but a \$1000 prize will not. Further, we may or may not add administration monotonically with rising costs. A staff person (say, a graduate student assistant) may have hours added, which is almost a smooth adjustment in adding to our administration, but laying on additional Greg's [Society Coordinator] would be more like a step function. Also, if the prize is small (and \$1000 is small), then even a 20% overhead charge (in this case, \$200) wouldn't amount to much as a way of covering the administrative costs--though it would cover a few hours of a graduate assistant--but it would

require a significantly larger endowment. So, it may or may not be reasonable to charge an administrative fee as a percentage of the fixed annual draw. I think this requires further discussion.

Furthermore, if they were to raise \$25,000 to fund a \$1000 prize (and I'm neglecting the overhead charge), and the market were promptly to decline, the prize would be underfunded. It would then be necessary to reduce the size of the prize, or to raise additional funds for the endowment. That's a choice that the committee would have to make. They should understand that they may have to make it. One way of dealing with that is to raise additional money from the outset, as a cushion for underperformance.

On October 14, 2016 Jay Malone wrote:

Dear Raine,

The promised information about the new prizes is attached and appears below. I would like CoHP to discuss these proposed prizes (see attached) and make a recommendation to Council, which will meet on 3 Nov. [Larry is a member of Council and can elaborate on CoHP's statement.] I know that Nov 3 is only 3 weeks away and will be grateful for some guidelines prior that date. I have invited Sally Kohlstedt (Pauly Prize) and Alistair Sponsel (Rainger Prize) to speak to Council on behalf of the prizes. There are several issues here to sort out – I'll begin with the financial part of it. (Please note that this is a condensation of dozens of emails, hours on the phone, and consultation with our lawyer.)

1. The Treasurer is charged with determining whether or not a prize is sufficiently endowed. But you can see from the exchange above that our Treasurer would like to see a policy on prize amounts. The HSS prizes have been the same amount for decades (\$500 then raised to \$1000 by CoHP in the late 1990s, with the exceptions of the Pfizer (\$2,500 paid by Pfizer) and the Sarton (reimburse travel expenses). The doubling created some stress on the restricted prize funds, especially with the market downturn of 2001, but they are all doing well now. Here's a list, with audited FY15 values (the permanently restricted amount followed by temporarily restricted):
 - a. Rossiter – yearly, restricted fund (\$45,606; \$14,341)
 - b. Levinson – biennial, restricted fund (\$10,000; \$5,235)
 - c. Reingold – yearly (\$500 prize up to \$500 in reimbursement), restricted fund (\$29,443; \$10,963)
 - d. Price/Webster – yearly, restricted fund (\$20,000; \$5,906)
 - e. Davis – yearly, paid by Miles Davis (I've spoken with Miles about endowing the prize and there are plans to do so upon his death –this

was when we thought \$20K at a 5% draw would be sufficient. Adam Apt believes that a 4% draw is more realistic)

- f. I should note that our invited lectures: Hazen (biennial), Distinguished (yearly), and AAAS (yearly) all carry a \$500 honorarium, with some reimbursement)

If the stock market falls dramatically (we use a 3-year average for our draws to cushion sudden drops), then we risk losing the temporarily restricted amounts. If I were an idealist, I would like to see prize amounts that include reimbursement for travel for prize winners to come to the meeting and some administrative overhead (we currently only charge the Hazen Education fund (which funds the Hazen lecture) for overhead, at 13.5%).

2. Funding for the prizes: The Forum for the History of Science in America is disbanding and would like to transfer approx. \$11K, with \$2K in pledges to HSS. They would like the Forum to live on in the form of a prize honoring Phil Pauly. Much of the transfer would be dues income but some of it was pledged to the prize and we would need to clarify with the prize donors how we will use the money. When the prize was first raised with Council last year, the objection was that we do not need a prize to support American science (the field is doing well) and it was suggested that we make it a first book prize. I suspect that Sally will speak to this. The Earth and Environment Forum (EEF) wishes to honor long-time member Ron Rainger, who died earlier this year. Keith Bengtsson is leading efforts to solicit donations in Ron's memory and reports he has been promised \$15K. The reason the EEF wants HSS to take on the prize is that donors would receive a tax deduction because we are a non profit. It is important that HSS maintain control over how such donated funds are spent, e.g. assigning the members of the prize committee, deciding the endowment minimum, etc. and this has been communicated to these folks. Sally has said that if \$25K is the minimum and the Forum can't raise that amount, then we could impose a limited timeline and exhaust the fund (she suggested \$500/year).
3. Strategic plan. The Society spent a lot of effort on our strategic plan, and I would not want to take on any activities that do not fit into the plan. I believe both of these prizes (intended for scholars early in their careers) help us support emerging scholars (Goal 3) and the desire for more emphasis on digital prizes (Rainger Prize) (Goal 2), as are outlined in the strategic plan (which can be found here: http://hssonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Strategic_Plan_Public_2014_12_02.pdf)

Email from Raine Daston dated 10/21/2016

Dear Jay,

The CoHP has had an email exchange on the question you raised, and here is my summary of the sense of the committee (I'd be glad to forward our polygonal exchanges in raw form if you'd like more detail, but I thought a short summary would be more convenient).

1. Monetary amount of prizes: Insofar as HSS does have latitude with respect to finances (who can fathom the mysterious ways of the stock market?), we strongly endorse your proposal that any extra money be spent on travel and accommodation costs of the prize-winners, so that they can attend HSS and receive their awards in person. Should funds be too limited to do this in all cases, we recommend that the prizes aimed at early career scholars at least be given priority. We also would be willing to award monetary prizes on a biennial basis if this would make it possible to subsidize the travel and accommodation costs of prize-winners by allowing money to accumulate over two years rather than one.

2. New prizes: Everyone basically endorses both proposed new prizes. Since the Forum for History of Science in America is already awarding a prize in Phil Pauly's memory, it would make sense to diversify the HSS prize in the suggested direction of a first book prize in American history. We very much welcomed the initiative of the proposers of the Ron Rainger prize in widening the genres to include non-print media and would encourage the proposers of both prizes to widen the scope of genres to include public history and more digitally oriented projects (films, blogs, websites).

3. Number of prizes — too many? too few? just right? We're all acutely aware of how much work is involved for members of the individual prize committees and don't want to add to the burdens of the good citizens who so stalwartly discharge these duties on behalf of HSS (another reason to think about biennial awards in at least some cases). But none of us could bring herself/himself to call for a ban on new prizes: we appreciate the heartfelt impulse to honor a colleague in a fitting manner. However, we would suggest that HSS develop a set of guidelines and requirements for new prizes.

That sums up the main points of our email discussion. Please do let me know if there are any questions.

With best wishes,

Raine

May 26, 2016

TO: HSS Council

FROM: Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (for the Forum on the History of Science in America

RE: Philip Pauly Prize

For over two decades, the Forum on the History of Science in America has been awarding an annual prize to junior scholars, offering it, in alternating years, for a first article or first book. This prize has been funded by the annual dues of members and the prize amount varied in the early years from \$300 to \$500 depending on the state of the treasury and occasional supplements from officers. Over those years, the description of the prize was clarified by members at the annual meeting as issues arose and, when Philip Pauly died, the group voted to award the prize in his name.

At the annual meeting in 2015, the members agreed that the first article prize was complicated to administer and that at this point in time there were sufficient new books to warrant simply awarding a book prize every year. After a fund raising effort in the fall of 2015 and with the residual money left from membership dues, which many paid even after the production and mailing of a newsletter was dropped, there is now \$10,580 with some additional contributions promised. Assuming that we can get the fund to \$12,500, we could be able to offer a \$500 prize every year or \$1,000 every other year.

PRIZE DESCRIPTION

The Philip Pauly Prize (formerly the Forum for the History of Science in America Prize) is awarded for the best first book on the history of science in the Americas (broadly defined to include North American science including Canada, Mexico, the Caribbean, and the United States) and written in English. To be eligible, the book must have been published in the previous three years; i.e., the 2017 prize will be awarded will be awarded for a book published in 2014, 2015, or 2016. Eligible candidates may self-nominate.

From: Sally Kohlstedt [<mailto:sgk@umn.edu>]

Sent: Friday, September 30, 2016 12:12 PM

To: Jay Malone <jay@hssonline.org>

Subject: Pauly Prize

Hi, Jay.

Thanks for following up on the Pauly Prize with Council.

Some additional thoughts after talking with local colleagues that can be discussed if necessary: While the Forum, as I understand it, currently has about \$11,000 with \$2,000 more in pledges, I think that more can be raised from colleagues at Rutgers, Princeton, and from Pauly family members (an idea that came up in discussion with Angela Creager a couple of years ago). However, if that effort did not reach \$25,000 or more, then the prize (at \$500) could be offered

for at least two decades. Some organizations (including our university and the AAAS) do take on awards with a limited timeline so that the funds donated are expended as intended. That also seems to me a reasonable practice to encourage contributions (after all, HSS often takes in money for just the year) that enhance our membership activity.

I did not want to raise that additional point yet, but it could be part of an agreement if the Council is willing to accept the Pauly Prize but worries about the endowment.

Just trying to keep you up on our thinking.

Best,

Sally

The Ronald Rainger Early Career Award in History of the Earth and Environmental Sciences

This prize will be awarded annually by the History of Science Society (HSS). The Rainger Prize was conceived in the Earth and Environment Forum (EEF), a lively group of scholars interested in histories of knowledge about the land, sea, and sky, and in all manner of physical, human and life sciences as they have been practiced outdoors, in transit, or on a global scale. Ronald Rainger (1949-2016) was a historian of geology, paleontology, biology, and oceanography who distinguished himself equally for his scholarly work and his generosity to colleagues in the field. The Rainger Early Career Award commemorates Ron's contributions in both respects. His contributions and his personality are reflected in EEF's long tradition of welcoming students into the discipline, and EEF warmly encourages any interested parties to join the Forum for its annual get-together at the HSS meeting. The Rainger Prize reflects HSS's commitment to support emerging scholars and their work, especially digital works.

Eligibility for the Rainger Award:

- The prize will be awarded for a single, specific work such as an article, exhibition, or interactive resource whose primary topic is the history of the earth and environmental sciences broadly construed.
- Published and unpublished articles are equally eligible, as are any digital or other projects that represent the outcome of original scholarly research in the history of the earth and environmental sciences.
- The prospective winner(s) must be enrolled in a graduate program or no more than three years past the completion of a relevant doctoral degree. For the purposes of this award, that means that, as of the prize-nomination deadline, no more than three full years have elapsed since *the end of the year* in which the candidate received the doctoral degree. Works that have been published/exhibited remain eligible (regardless of publication date) for as long as the author/creator remains eligible.
- Multi-authored works are eligible for consideration as long as the prize committee receives a brief statement describing the role(s) of the eligible author(s). In the event that more than one co-author of the winning submission is eligible for the Rainger Prize, the authors will be considered joint winners and the prize will be split between them according to the discretion of the committee. In any event, the prize will only be awarded to those authors who meet the eligibility requirements above.

Works in languages other than English will be eligible if they are accompanied by an English translation.

Nominations

- Works may be nominated by their authors or by third parties. The committee also has the discretion to consider published works that have not otherwise been nominated, provided that the author(s) are eligible for the prize.

Prize money

- **The prize consists of \$X and a certificate.**

On 29 Sept 16, Alistair wrote:

Hi Jay,

Thanks for this. It looks pretty good, I think. I reattach with just a couple of further tracked-changes and comments. On the main points:

1. Could we please add something about the EEF having the right to nominate one (or more) Rainger Prize committee members to the Committee on Honors and Prizes? It would be nice if the forum could maintain some modicum of formal connection to the selection process, however loose/flexible it might be.
2. The forum discussed the annual vs. biennial issue at length and in the end it was unanimous that we preferred to award annually (even at the cost of a reducing the monetary prize, if any) so that more young scholars would receive this recognition and so that the prize would become a more regular and predictable part of the field so that graduate advisers (for example) could get in the habit each year of recommending students and postdocs to submit.
3. One logistical consideration. If it is an HSS prize, does that mean it would be awarded at the main HSS prize ceremony? If so, it defeats one modest purpose of the award as originally conceived, namely to compel the winner's attendance at the forum gathering. Do you see a way around this? Our meetings are Fridays at lunchtime so it would preempt the ceremony if we announce the winner there (but that might be what we'd prefer to do--I'd have to canvass the EEF steering committee).

HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY CAUCUS REPORT

COMMITTEE ON MEETINGS AND PROGRAMS

Submitted by Rachel A. Ankeny on 28 September 2016

1. *Describe the committee's completed, ongoing, and planned activities during the current calendar year.*

The Committee met in person in San Francisco at the annual meeting; otherwise, the Committee has performed its activities via email correspondence and will meet in person at the annual meeting in Atlanta. It has considered the following issues:

- Program co-chair selection for 2017 meeting
- Adjudication of panel proposals for co-sponsorship at AHA
- Continued feedback on program format including roundtables and poster session
- Feedback on calls for papers and posters

The Chair of CoMP also has provided ongoing advice to the ED regarding a range of issues, particularly implementation of the strategic plan and program planning.

2. *What funds were allocated and how were they used or will be used?*

Not applicable.

3. *Please describe any long-term plans, goals and potential projects for the Committee, as well as any potential future concerns or issues you believe the Committee could face.*

The outcomes of the strategic planning processes have had considerable implications for CoMP particularly with regard to how meetings are conducted, etc. and we will continue to work closely with the ED on implementing the recommendations.

Ongoing issues on which we anticipate ongoing discussion and activity include:

- Co-hosting of an annual meeting outside of North America (and outside of usual time period) in Utrecht
- Use of various technologies to enhance or augment our annual meetings
- Review of models for policies on meetings (e.g., AAHM bluebook)
- Continued monitoring of the prize ceremony/reception format
- Fostering more and higher quality interactions with PSA during their co-located biennial meetings

4. *List names of committee members. Indicate members whose terms expire in 2016.*

*Rachel A. Ankeny, 2013-2017, Chair

+Brian Dolan, 2015 LAC (ex officio)

James Elwick, 2017 LAC (ex officio)

Jim Fleming, 2015-17, Representative from Council

+John Krige, 2016 LAC (ex officio)

Susan Lederer OR Florence Hsia, 2015 Program Chairs

Brian Oglivie OR Sigrid Schmalzer, 2016 Program Chairs

Joel Shackelford, 2016 Three-Society Meeting Co-Chair

*Karen-Beth G. Scholthof, 2014-2016

Frans Van Lunteren, 2016-2018

Helen Rozwadoski and Michael Robinson, 2017 Program Chairs

** Indicates individuals rotating off at end of 2016*

+Indicates individuals rotating off at end of 2016 for whom reappointment/replacement is not required

The Executive Committee appointed Projit Mukharji for 2017-2019 to fill the place vacated due to the expiry of Scholthof's term.

5. *If minutes were recorded at your last meeting, please include them.*

Agenda was attached to the mid-year report.

HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Submitted by Dawn Digrius on 5/12/2016

Please list here action items that require Executive Committee and/or Council Approval (these include motions that affect policy, budget, and/or practices).

Note: If necessary, please provide details on an attached page.

1. *Describe the committee's completed, ongoing, and planned activities during the current calendar year (January 2016 – December 2016)*

The committee has agreed to reach out to STEM K-12 educators and STEM Higher Ed faculty, particularly those who are connected with HBCUs. One way we have chosen to do this is to solicit syllabi from individuals teaching in the HoS, particularly those faculty who have developed courses for MAT programs and integrate digital methods. This relates to Goal 2.1.B and 2.3.B, as well as Objective 4.1 of our Strategic Plan.

The committee has decided to organize a workshop for skill-building for new and established historians of science at the upcoming HSS meeting, to develop competencies inside and beyond academe. Meets Goal 4.3.B.

The committee plans to host a panel session for the 2016 program of the annual meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, entitled "Engaging STEM Educators: The History of Science as a Tool for URM Student Success in STEM." Our goal is to collaborate with educators at all levels, provide resources and curricular tools for the inclusion of history of science STEM classrooms, and support a "cradle to career" initiative for STEM Education that engages, inspires, and supports under-represented students pursuing and attaining degrees in STEM or in the History of Science (two fields of study that are severely lacking in diversity. This meets Objective 4.2.C, 4.2.D.

The Committee will host a public film event at the 2016 annual meeting of the HSS that will show film clips of various films that highlight or utilize the history of science. This will be coordinated jointly with JCSEPHS. This meets objectives 4.3.B and 4.4 of our strategic plan.

2. *For CoP and CoE, please provide details concerning any budget allocations and expenditures during the current academic fiscal year, July 2015 to June 2016 (outside of the annual meeting). What funds were allocated and how were they used or will be used?*

\$5,000 will be allocated to sponsor an oral history workshop and public event at the 2016 annual meeting of the HSS in Atlanta, Georgia, that will bring educators from all sectors together in conversation and collaboration, making the work done by historians of science more available and accessible.

The Hazen Lecture for 2016 costs are:

Honorarium: \$500

Registration: \$480

Catering: 872.50

TOTAL: \$1852.50

3. *Please describe any long-term plans, goals and potential projects for the committee, as well as any potential future concerns or issues you believe the committee could face.*

The committee's long term plans include more active communications and collaborations with STEM educators in the K-12 and Higher Education spheres, not limited to but may include outreach, syllabi databanks, workshops, and talks geared to engage non-historians of science in ways that benefit STEM fields.

One potential project is to investigate the number of MAT programs in the US that have a History of Science component in their curriculum, invite collaboration with those programs, and bring those educators to the next annual meeting of the HSS. The committee sees real value in weaving the history of science into STEM teaching programs and STEM classrooms.

Goals of the committee include further attempts to align the Strategic Plan of the HSS with its work, make the field of History of Science more diverse, more available, and more accessible to more individuals.

4. *Committee Members:*

Dawn M. Digrius, Chair (term expires in 2017)

Muriel Blaisdel, Secretary (Chair 2017)

Lloyd Ackert (Chair 2018)

Erik Peterson (Chair 2019)

Amy Fisher (Chair 2020)

History of Science Society Committee Report

Annual Report of the Technology and Communication Committee
2 October 2016

Prepared by Stephen Weldon, Chair, Technology and Communication Committee

Committee members: Stephen Weldon, Alex Wellerstein, Desiree Capel, Carla Nappi, Fred Gibbs, Jessica Baron, and Matt Jones. In addition, I have asked to appoint Michelle DiMeo (Chemical Heritage Foundation) to this committee.

The TCC has accomplished the following this past year:

- (1) We have sponsored a roundtable at the 2016 HSS meeting: Roundtable Session 38: The Library and the Discipline in the 21st Century, which includes short presentations followed a discussion among the following people: Toby Appel (Manuscript Cataloging, Cushing/Whitney Medical Library); Esther Chen (Head of the Library, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science); Daniel Goldstein (UC Davis, University Libraries); Benjamin Gross (Linda Hall Library); Kerry Magruder (History of Science Collections, University of Oklahoma Libraries); Birute Railiene (Wroblewski Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Information); Stephen Weldon (University of Oklahoma).
- (2) We are sponsoring our third annual THATCamp at the meeting.
- (3) Under the mandate that we help the Society develop statements regarding Digital Scholarship and respectful behavior on Social Media, we developing plans to create an HSS Digital page for the website, that will provide not just a statement, but links and short comments regarding existing digital activities in the history of science. We aim to provide support for new initiatives (perhaps by encouraging an award for exceptional projects); information about critical issues for scholars, academic departments, and other groups; and visibility to important projects in the field.
- (4) The TCC is holding its annual meeting on Saturday morning at the conference where we will discuss the above issues and any new business.

HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY COMMITTEE REPORT

ADVOCACY COMMITTEE

Submitted by Marc Rothenberg, October 5, 2016

Please list here action items that require Executive Committee and/or Council Approval (these include motions that affect policy, budget, and/or practices). NONE

Note: If necessary, please provide details on an attached page.

1. Describe the committee's completed, ongoing, and planned activities during the current calendar year.

The committee is only a few months old and still needs to establish a focus and priorities. It will meet at the Annual Meeting to do so. One preliminary activity is identifying all military and civilian US government agencies that include science in their mission and further identifying which ones have historians on staff.

2. For CoP and CoE, please provide details concerning any budget allocations and expenditures during the current academic fiscal year, July 2016 to June 2017 (outside of the annual meeting). What funds were allocated and how were they used or will be used?

3. Please describe any long-term plans, goals and potential projects for the committee, as well as any potential future concerns or issues you believe the committee could face.

It is still too early to say much about this, except to say that the long-term goal is to increase employment for historians of science and research funding by a variety of means.

4. List names of committee members, if applicable. Indicate members whose terms expire in 2016. Also, indicate any preferences for appointments (or reappointments) to the committee. The Executive Committee makes committee assignments at its mid-year meeting and will take any recommendations under consideration.

Marc Rothenberg, Chair; Kathryn Olesko; Evan Hepler-Smith, Victoria Harden; Matt Shindell

5. If minutes were recorded at your last meeting, please include them.

(Thank you for your work on behalf of the Society!)

HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY COMMITTEE REPORT

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Submitted by Erika Milam on 18 September 2016

Please list here action items that require Executive Committee and/or Council Approval (these include motions that affect policy, budget, and/or practices).

Note: If necessary, please provide details on an attached page.

1. Describe the committee's completed, ongoing, and planned activities during the current calendar year.

We are meeting for the first time next month (remotely) and then in person for the first time at the annual History of Science meeting in November. Our first order of business will be to clarify our priorities for the coming year and develop a concrete plan forward for those items at the top of the list.

2. For CoP and CoE, please provide details concerning any budget allocations and expenditures during the current academic fiscal year, July 2016 to June 2017 (outside of the annual meeting). What funds were allocated and how were they used or will be used?

N/A

3. Please describe any long-term plans, goals and potential projects for the committee, as well as any potential future concerns or issues you believe the committee could face.

TBD

4. List names of committee members, if applicable. Indicate members whose terms expire in 2016. Also, indicate any preferences for appointments (or reappointments) to the committee. The Executive Committee makes committee assignments at its mid-year meeting and will take any recommendations under consideration.

Erika Milam (chair), Soma Banerjee, Edward Morris, Babak Ashrafi, Tania Munz, Zuoyue Wang, and Neeraja Sankaran. The HSS Treasurer will also serve ex-officio. My understanding is that everyone has agreed to a three-year term, expiring in 2019.

5. If minutes were recorded at your last meeting, please include them.

N/A

Please return this form by Monday, September 26, to:
greg@hssonline.org