

# A. J. GUTTMANN PRIZE GUIDELINES

## AUSTRALIAN & NEW ZEALAND ASSOCIATION OF MATHEMATICAL PHYSICS

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The A. J. Guttman Prize is awarded for the most outstanding talk presented by a student at the Annual ANZAMP Meeting. This document outlines the procedure by which the winning talk shall be selected.

### 2. ELIGIBILITY

To be eligible for the the A. J. Guttman Prize, a person should:

- (1) Present a talk at the Annual ANZAMP Meeting.
- (2) Be currently enrolled as a student (honours, masters, or PhD), or have graduated no more than 12 months prior to the ANZAMP Meeting.
- (3) Be members of ANZAMP.

### 3. NUMBER OF WINNERS

The Prize is to be awarded to a single individual. The committee is able to designate any number of *Honourable Mentions*. If, in the opinion of the Prize Committee, there are no candidates of sufficient merit, then no Prize will be awarded.

### 4. THE VALUE OF THE PRIZE

The value of the Prize is AUD \$500. The value of the Prize may be amended in future, as decided by the ANZAMP Executive Committee. The Prize shall be paid to the winner by bank transfer after the Meeting has concluded. The winner shall also receive a certificate suitable for framing.

### 5. TALK SCHEDULING

The Prize will be awarded at the conference dinner and the Meeting Organizers must ensure that all student talks are scheduled prior to the conference dinner. As far as possible, the allocation of committee members to student talks should be made in advance of the ANZAMP Meeting. To expedite this, the ANZAMP programmer should send the Chair of the Prize Committee the programme as soon as it is available.

### 6. THE GUTTMANN PRIZE COMMITTEE

Each student talk should be judged by at least two judges appointed by the Prize Committee's Chair. These judges may also seek additional advice from the Session Chair of the speaker. These judges will comprise the Guttman Prize Committee. The Chair of the Committee will be appointed by the ANZAMP Executive. The Committee Chair determines the composition of the Committee. It is recommended that:

- (1) The Chair has previously served on the Committee as a judge;
- (2) There be some continuity in membership of the Committee from year-to-year.

The Committee should meet after the last student talk, prior to the conference dinner, to decide on the winner and honourable mention(s).

### 7. CRITERIA FOR JUDGING TALKS

The specific criteria that are used to assess talks, and the method of using them to select the winning talk and honourable mention(s), will be at the discretion of the Chair. This may involve assigning numerical scores and/or recording comments relating to a number of specified criteria. Whatever criteria/methods are used, consideration should be given to both the quality of the **presentation** (degree of organization, effectiveness of communication) and the quality of the **content** (substance and originality of the results discussed). While the relative weighting between presentation and content will be at the discretion of the Chair, the weight given to content should be at least commensurate to that given to presentation. Some examples of possible criteria to be used in judging the presentation and content of the talks are given below.

In assessing student talks (whatever the criteria/method), the talk should be judged against what you expect from a PhD student, regardless of the actual level of the speaker (undergraduate, honours, masters, PhD).

**7.1. Presentation.** Qualities<sup>1</sup> to look for:

- Could you see and read what was written?
- Was attention given to introducing/motivating the topic?
- Was there too much (or too little) detail?
- Was the introduction appropriate for a general audience?
  - Was the aim of the talk made clear early on?
  - Was the speaker able to compliment/substitute formal definitions by/with understandable informal descriptions?
  - Were examples given that illustrate the main points?
- Did the speaker have a rapport with the audience?
- Was the pace of the talk appropriate?
- Did the talk finish on time?

**7.2. Content.** Qualities to look for:

- Originality
- Substance of the work (e.g., level of technical ability required)
- Explanation of the motivation and broader context of the work

---

<sup>1</sup>Source: “How to give a good colloquium”, by J. E. MacCarthy