HARRY H. HESS

DEFINITION OF MEDAL:

Established in 1984, the Hess Medal is named in honor of Harry H. Hess, who made many contributions to geology, mineralogy, and geophysics. Hess served multiple terms as an AGU section president — for the Geodesy section (1950–1953) as well as the Tectonophysics section (1956–1959). The Hess Medal is awarded not more than once annually to an individual “for outstanding achievements in research of the constitution and evolution of Earth and other planets.” Gerald J. Wasserburg was the first recipient of the Hess Medal.

For more than 30 years, Harry H. Hess was a geology professor at Princeton University. He made major contributions to the study of the oceanic lithosphere, including the concept that convection cells in the mantle were the driving force for seafloor spreading. Hess discovered and explained the formation of flat-topped seamounts (guyots), performed seafloor gravity studies while submerged aboard U.S. Navy submarines, conducted detailed mineralogic and petrologic studies of peridotites, and was an originator of scientific ocean drilling by the Mohole Project.

FREQUENCY:
Presented to one medalist annually.

CITATION/SCOPE STATEMENT:

For outstanding achievements in research on the constitution and evolution of the Earth and other planets.

PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE MEDAL:

- Presentation piece description: engrave and gold-plate; mount on gray stone; cherry case
NOMINATION PROCESS

Eligibility:

Eligible Nominees:
- Nominee must be an active AGU member.

Ineligible Nominees, Nominators and Supporters:
- President and President-Elect
- Council Leadership Team
- Honors and Recognition Committee members
- Hess Medal committee members
- Self-nominations are not accepted.

Eligible Nominators and Supporters:
- Open to public.
- Multiple nominators for a candidate are allowed; however it is often suggested that they collaborate so as to submit a more robust package for the nominee.

Requirements:

All documents included in a nomination package should be no more than two (2) pages in length.

1. Nomination and Supporting Letters

   - **Three letters of support must be submitted (total number does not include the nomination letter).** At least two supporting letters should be from individuals not currently or recently associated with the candidate’s institution of graduate education or employment.
   - Nomination and supporting letters should be concise, clear, and preferably on letterhead.
   - Nomination and supporting letters must clearly articulate how the candidate(s) research over a sustained period of time has made significant impact on his/her field. The letters must explain the contributions and their importance so that they can be understood by their peers and those outside their research.
   - The first paragraph of each nomination and supporting letter should include the name of the candidate and a few sentences giving the overall reasons for nominating or supporting the candidate. The body of the nominating letter, which could be a few paragraphs, should give a brief and concise history of the candidate’s work and publications that have resulted. Both the nomination and supporting letters should state how the work has contributed to the field overall and/or to the growth of the field, as well as what insights have been gained and what impacts the work will have on current and future research.
The last paragraph of the nomination and supporting letters should summarize the work, state who has benefitted, and highlight some of the candidate's recognitions and notable service to his/her field.

- If possible, the nominator might want to provide his/her nomination letter and other nomination materials to the persons asked to write supporting letters to help ensure the best possible coverage of the nominee's accomplishments and contributions. It is important that supporting letters augment the letter of nomination through substantive material, establishing the nominee's international reputation in his/her field as important.

- **Both nomination and supporting letters should contain the author’s signature, full name, title, and institution affiliation. Electronic or official signatures are acceptable.**

---

2. **Curriculum Vitae**

The curriculum vitae should list the candidate's (1) name, (2) address, (3) history of employment, (4) degrees, (5) research experience, (6) honors, (7) memberships, and (8) service to the community through committee work, advisory boards, etc. It is important to explain the reasons for the honors which have been received by the candidate. All incomplete or incorrect CVs will be returned to the nominator for revising.

3. **Bibliography**

Each selected bibliography should begin by briefly stating the candidate's total number and types of publications and specifying the number published in AGU journals. For example:

*Jane Doe is the author of 92 publications, 86 in peer-reviewed scientific journals, 14 of which have been published in AGU journals and books. The following selected list best supports Jane's nomination for the Smith Medal.*

4. **Holdover Nominations**

Holdover nominations are strong contenders/candidates who were not selected but were recommended by the committee for consideration for the following nomination cycle. Nominations can be held over for no more than 2 years after the original date of submission, unless the committee recommends otherwise.

Nominations made or received (holdovers) for member volunteers before assuming their term of office will be considered except for AGU President and President-Elect, Council Leadership Team (CLT), Honors and Recognition Committee, and the specific members of that particular medal/award committee.
Nominators are encouraged to update documentation in held-over packages (i.e. nomination letter, curriculum vitae, bibliography, and supporting letters). Held-over candidates who were not selected and can no longer be held over for the following year will require a new nomination submission.

Upon request, nominators are provided with feedback from the Union Medal committee to which their package was submitted. All requests for feedback should be sent to the Executive Office: unionmedals@agu.org.

SUBMISSION PROCESS

Timeline
- The Hess Medal nomination opens 15 January and closes on 15 March each year.

Methods of Submission:

Nomination packages can be submitted by using one of the following methods:

1) **Nominate online**: [http://medals.agu.org/cgi-bin/main.plex?form_type=home](http://medals.agu.org/cgi-bin/main.plex?form_type=home)
   The nomination package must be complete at the time of submission. Once the nomination is submitted, no additional information can be submitted online thereafter. If a nomination package requires revising, please send us the revised document(s) electronically, in either .pdf or .doc format to the Executive Office: Union Medals at unionmedals@agu.org. You do not need to send a print version if you submit the package using this form.

2) **E-mail requirements to**: unionmedals@agu.org

3) **Mail to**: American Geophysical Union
   2000 Florida Avenue, NW
   Washington, DC 209
   Attn: Executive Office

- All online, electronic, fax and post submissions must be date stamped and received by the submission deadline (15 March). Please note that only complete packages will be forwarded to Union medal committee for review.

- The Executive Office will contact any nominator regarding incomplete or incorrect packages. Only complete packages will move forward to the Union medal committees for review. Revised documents must be received by AGU headquarters by the appropriate deadline date.
EVALUATION PROCESS

Timeline

- **15 March to 30 April:**
  Nomination packages are reviewed for completion and accuracy by the AGU Executive office. Within this timeframe, nominators are informed of additional requirements needed to complete the packages.

- **1 May to 15 June:**
  Once the reviews are completed, the nomination packages, in pdf formats, are uploaded to the Leadership Resource Center (LRC). Committees are sent reminders about LRC site access and instructions to begin the nomination review process. Committees may utilize the List-serve or E-mail for discussion, ranking, and selection of awardees. Teleconferences and Webex support are also provided to facilitate their committee work.

- **30 June:**
  Committees forward their final recommendations to the Council Leadership Team for approval.

Evaluation Criteria/Guidelines

1. Union wide criteria: Scientific body of work in Earth and space sciences

2. Defining characteristics: Focused on excellence and impact and aligns with the Vision/Mission of the organization (not intended to be prescriptive)
   - Lifetime achievement
   - Significant body of work
   - Contribution across the Union
Evaluation Process/Balloting Procedure

1. All committee chairs should discuss with their members (either through mail or conference call) prior to the review process the following:
   - Criteria for the medal
   - Recusal policy due to conflict of interest
   - Deliberation process

2. Voting Procedure:
   - Committee members will review all nomination packages, rank the candidates, and send list to committee chair. The committee chair will then sum up the points for each candidate and share with the committee via e-mail.
   - The committee chair will divide the top few nominees among the committee members by area of expertise. During the conference call, each of the committee members who were designated leader present information as to why the candidate(s) should be chose for the Medal.
   - At the end of the discussion, a new ranking vote is taken either on conference call or via separate e-mail. The candidate with the most votes is selected. If a clear candidate is not decided, or if the points are close for first place, the committee will discuss either by e-mail or conference call the top candidates and make a decision.

3. Council Leadership Team approval:
   - The role of the Council Leadership Team is to accept the recommendation of the committee on the basis of its evaluation of the process and its knowledge of the candidates. Whereas the Council Leadership Team may not substitute for the choice, it can ask for further clarification or additional deliberation.
   - The committee’s report to the Council Leadership Team must state the number of candidates considered, how many these were holdovers, new submissions, and whether the new candidates were nominations from the general call or were actively encouraged by the committee. The report should also describe the process used for reaching the decision and the degree of unanimity on the decision.
ANNOUNCEMENT OF HONOREES

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 July</td>
<td>Approval of awardees and medalists by the Council Leadership Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July</td>
<td>Union awardees and medalists notified by Union President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July</td>
<td>Headquarters notifies all nominators regarding the status of their nominations (i.e., selected, held over, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July</td>
<td>AGU staff notifies Board of Directors and Council of Union awardees and medalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July</td>
<td>AGU releases information to membership and general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 December</td>
<td>AGU Honors presentations held during the Fall Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECIPIENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Given</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>David Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Frank M. Richter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>H. Jay Melosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Michael John O'Hara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Alexandra Navrotsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Sean C. Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Adolphe Nicolas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>David L. Kohlstedt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Gerald Schubert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Albrecht W. Hofmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Ikuo Kushiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>David J. Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Stanley Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Thomas J. Ahrens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Edward Anders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Alfred E. Ringwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>George W. Wetherill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>A.G.W. Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Julian R. Goldsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Gerald J. Wasserburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>