Nominations:

Chair Waterton discussed criteria that have been identified for good Council membership. The six criteria included: ability to do a good job on the work required for Council, years of involvement/attendance of 4S/knowledge of 4S, previous good work in similar organizational/management role, good leadership in STS, scholarly excellence, and willingness to attend next three meetings of 4S (and scheduled spring meetings either in person or by Skype).

Council discussed these criteria and added "being effective at collaboration" to the list.

Waterton also reviewed criteria for diverse representation within Council including: gender, geographical distribution, and area of intellectual focus. Waterton also suggested Council take into consideration characteristics of the current membership as background to decision-making about future nominees.

Council received a list of nominees that emerged from membership and Council recommendations, both in response to *Technoscience Update* requests and informal communications via email. There was discussion of each nominee.

The ten voting members of Council (nine members and the President) were then asked to vote in a closed ballot for six Council candidates without rank order. Aggregated results identified 10 candidates with three or more votes. These 10 candidates were then rank-ordered by voting Council members in a closed ballot. The Secretary reported the aggregated results

Council asked Waterton to produce a decision tree following both this rank order and the criteria identified. Waterton will then contact nominees to inform them of Council's desire that they stand for election.

Council then discussed the nine nominations for 4S President. Council voted on the candidates in a closed ballot. The results were aggregated, producing a slate of four candidates. Council decided not to rank order these candidates, instead asking President Downey to produce a decision tree of nominees. Downey indicated an interest in seeking confidential reactions from Council members to a draft decision tree.

Downey raised the issue of whether potential candidates should be informed of fellow candidates. Council felt that the traditional practice of not informing candidates of their competitors should be maintained.

Downey raised the issue of the practice of not releasing number of votes in an election. Council agreed to maintain this practice.

Council Nominations Committee – report from 2013-2014

Claire Waterton, Lancaster University (Chair)

12th August 2014

Process followed in 2014

The process of nominating people who would potentially stand for council changed subtly this year from previous years. This choice of potential nominees, in the past, was made by the nominations committee but it was made by Council for the first time this year.

As usual an advertisement asking people to self-nominate for Council was posted in Technoscience. Nominations for potential candidates from all Council members were also sought. Altogether 23 potential nominees were identified through these two methods. Council discussed all potential nominees at the San Francisco meeting (4s Council Spring Meeting, 17th March 2014) with a view to deciding who to ask to stand according to the following agreed criteria
- Ability to do a good job on the work required for Council
- Years of involvement/attendance of 4S/knowledge of 4S
- Previous good work in similar organisational/management role
- Good leadership in STS
- Scholarly excellence
- Willingness to attend next three meetings of 4S (and scheduled spring meetings either in person or by skype)
- Being good at collaboration
- Gender balance (across whole council)
- Diversity of areas of scholarly expertise (across whole council)
- Mixture of people from different part of the world (across whole council)

Present Council characteristics in Spring 2014 were noted:
- gender balance = 4 women to 5 men (6 including Gary D)
- global provenance =   USA (3, 4 including Gary D), UK (1), Norway (1), Mexico (1), Singapore (1), Tokyo (1), Taiwan (1)
- Area of expertise = pretty varied.

Noted also were those that Council will lose this fall (2014): Kenji Ito, Leandro Rodriguez Medina and Kaushik Sunder-Rajan. So we acknowledged we would lose representation from Japan, Mexico, and USA. All men. We also acknowledged that we do have some representation on the EU fronts until next year (summer 2015)

Our final Council selection needed to be limited to 6 people and so 6 votes each were made and ranked, 1-6 by all Council members at San Francisco. Scores were counted up and a list of the top 10 were made.
1. name

2. name
3. name
4. name
5. name
6. name
7. name
8. name
9. name
10. name

Claire Waterton created a decision tree and contacted by e-mail those on the list in order, asking them if they would be willing to stand for council. 5 people agreed to stand (names). Steve Zehr collected individual statements from that final selection of people. Steve Coffee then created the survey monkey for members to vote for the new Council members.

Claire Waterton wrote to those who had been nominated in the first round but who did not make it to the final selection to let them know that they had been put forward and that their work and contribution to 4S was valued. Many replies indicated they were grateful to have been let know of this and some suggested they would be happy to stand again.

Those newly elected to Council in the summer 2014 elections are:

Daniel Breslau (Virginia Tech)
Shobita Parthasarathy (U Michigan)
Tania Pérez-Bustos (Pontificia U Javeriana de Colombia)

Gary Downey wrote to thank those who had stood for Council but not been elected this year (name, name).

CW 12 August 2014.