

Guidelines for the nomination of Excellence in PhD Research Award

IDP in Climate Studies

a) All eligible PhD students as per the Institute rules can either self-nominate or be nominated by their guide or co-guide. In case of self-nomination, a support letter is needed from any one of the RPC members.

b) All nominations will be considered by an Awards (Standing) committee appointed by the IDPC. To avoid conflict of interest no guide or co-guide of any of the nominees should be part of the Awards committee and appropriate replacements be considered before starting the process.

c) All graduating PhD students will be asked to submit a video outlining their research contribution and impact (brief recorded presentation) **not more than four minutes**. The climate office will request this video at the time of final thesis submission before getting final clearances. If any help is needed for this recording, this may be provided by the Climate office. These videos will also be useful to project research been done in the IDP.

d) Each guide/ co-guide would be asked to provide a qualitative assessment of the research contribution and impact for a student they are nominating (or if self-nominated). The guide/ co-guide will also be asked to provide a statement of "X is in the top _____% of PhD students that I have guided" (It is expected that guides will only be nominating their best students – hence this line).

e) The following criteria are to be used by the Awards committee while making the decision:

1. Number of publications and quality/reputation of the journals: Differences in publishing practices in different areas under the IDPCs should be considered here. The committee members may look into the publications or seek opinion from experts to understand the quality of the journal publications. **This criteria will have 50% weightage.**
2. Thesis evaluation reports by thesis examiners (**15% weightage**): If the referee's overall recommendation is "d", then the thesis cannot be considered for award. Once the thesis has been shortlisted for consideration, the referee's overall recommendation (a, b, or c) will not matter. The committee shall consider the specific scientific comments provided by the referees on the thesis. No thesis which has an examiner marking d or e will be considered
3. Comments by the supervisor/co-supervisor supporting the nomination (**15% weightage**).

The following other criteria (4-6) together will have **20% weightage**

4. Past APS evaluation reports: If the student has at any time been asked to repeat the APS, that will not disqualify the student from consideration.
5. Four-minute video by the student summarizing his/her thesis work.
6. Awards and/or recognition the student may have received for the PhD work.

f) The weightages mentioned above are suggestive and the awards committee may change them as they find appropriate (before receiving the nominations). The committee is free to make subjective assessment after considering the criteria mentioned above, supported by the expert opinion of the committee members. If in any year the committee needs to use quantitative criteria to assess nominations, they will be free to do so

g) The committee will make a priority list of recommendations with a strong justification on why the student deserves the award. This justification along with the guide/ co-guides write up can be used by the Convener to convince the Institute to include the awardee.