

Most Significant Futures Works 2018 Program Plan

Introduction

The Association of Professional Futurists (APF) Board of Directors approved a program in which APF would select and recognize the most important futures works. In 2012, it became known as the Most Significant Futures Works program. The three purposes of this program are:

- To promote the futures field to clients and the general public
- To recognize the work of professional futurists and of others whose work illuminates one or more aspects of the future
- To promote APF

A Core Committee consisting of Andy Hines (Chair), Jennifer Jarratt, Rowena Morrow, and Sam Miller administer the program. They may add others as needed. This program plan sets forth:

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| • Eligible works | • Suggested judging criteria |
| • Nominating procedure | • Schedule |
| • Judges | • Awards |
| • Judging procedure | • Budget |

Eligible Works

Eligible works will be in three categories: Those that: (1) advance the methodology and practice of foresight and futures studies; (2) analyze a significant future issue; and (3) illuminate the future through literary or artistic works. They must be publicly accessible, but they do not have to be formally published. The works may be in the form of books, articles, theses, policy papers, reports, dissertations and speeches in print and online; movies and videos; television and radio programs; works of art; electronic or other games and simulations; websites; software or multimedia presentations. **Please note:** we need to have sufficient description of the nomination for the judges to be able to judge it. Some sort of documentation, particularly with category 3, is essential, or the judges may report back that they are unable to render a decision.

Works that have been published or otherwise made publicly accessible at any time from January 1, 2016—2018 will be eligible. Works which have previously won a most-significant-futures-works award are not eligible.

If there are not enough volunteer judges to form two-judge teams to review each nominated work, the Core Committee will prioritize nominees for consideration by the available judges. The Core Committee may add members and establish a screening subcommittee for prioritizing the nominees. Nominees for whom judges cannot be found will be eligible for future awards, as long as the multi-year window remains in effect.

Nominating procedure

Any APF member who is not currently serving as a judge, including Core Committee members, may nominate a work he or she has written or produced in whole or in part or read, seen, or heard in part or entirety for consideration as a most important futures work by sending an email to the Core Committee members. The nomination shall include a brief statement of why the nominating member thinks the work is significant and in which of the three categories he or she thinks it should be considered:

- (1) advances the methodology and practice of foresight and futures studies;
- (2) analyzes a significant future issue; and
- (3) illuminates the future through literary or artistic works

Judges

A volunteer panel of APF members will serve as judges. The panel's decision rendered in the ballot shall not be subject to appeal to the APF Board of Directors or membership.

The Core Committee will agree on a list of APF members, who it feels would be good judges, and solicit those members individually. If necessary, the Core Committee will make a general call to the membership for volunteers. The Core Committee will make every effort to assure a diverse panel of judges to avoid cultural or other biases in making awards.

The call for nominations for judges will be posted at the same time as the call for MSFW nominations. Judges can serve from the time the Core Committee declares nominations to be open until the panel's ballot is cast (See schedule below). Judges who have made a most-significant-futures-work nomination cannot judge that nomination and must declare any conflict of interest for any nomination.

In the event of a vacancy on the panel of judges, a member of the Core Committee or another APF member, will serve for the remainder of the vacancy. (If this situation arises, the Core Committee may find it necessary to appoint a replacement judge who has nominated a work, but the replacement judge shall not review any work he or she has nominated.) A resigning judge will fully brief his or her replacement on the work he or she has done up to the time of his or her resignation. If a judge is unable to meet review dates, he or she should notify the Core Committee within reasonable time for replacement or can be asked to step aside.

Judging procedure

The Core Committee will assure eligibility of and prioritize nominated works for judging, considering the availability of judges, date of initial public availability of the nominated works, potential benefit to APF and the foresight profession of awards for the nominated works, and, for works nominated previously, the judges' opinions on those works. Following prioritization, the Core Committee will pass on works to the two-judge teams in order of priority from highest to lowest.

Teams of two judges will review each nominated work. Each judge will read, listen to, view or watch the entirety of each nominated work. If a judge's work is a nominee, that judge shall not serve on the two-person team reviewing that work.

Each team member may then use the criterion and scoring section (see below) to evaluate the works using a jury tab sheet provided by the Core Committee, or provide a written evaluation explaining the criteria they used. On the jury tab sheet each judging team member will also record whether he or she thinks the work deserves an award in the space provided. They are also encouraged to enter qualitative

comments in the spaces provided. **Both team members must agree that the work deserves an award for the nominee to be eligible.**

Judges will consider nominations as they are made to avoid excessive workload at the end of the judging period and not reveal any decisions until the announcement of awards. If both judging team members do not complete their review of a nominated work, that work shall be a nominee for the next year's awards, as long as the multi-year window remains in effect.

After all judging teams have entered their decisions, there will be a period for discussion among the judges during which time judges will be free to alter their initial judgments. At the conclusion of the discussion period, all qualitative and numerical judgments will be considered final, and the Core Committee will rank the nominees within each of the three categories according to the averages of their numerical scores. The top two works in each category will receive an award.

The Core Committee will then send to the judges the rankings of, and proposed awards for, each of the nominees within the 3 categories. If the Core Committee receives no significant objection from the judges, it will submit the results to the APF Board of Directors for final action. If there is an objection to any nomination, the original judging team shall serve as advocate and provide reasons for the nomination, and the Core Committee shall make the final decision. The Board may not overrule the panel's decision, but it may limit the number and value of awards for budgetary reasons.

Suggested judging criteria

The following statements are to be used as guidelines, not literal rules for judging. These types of considerations should direct the jury members' reviews but not limit them to only consider these descriptions. The criteria are described with suggested scoring descriptions. If a criterion or description does not suit a particular work, the jury members should clarify what criteria he or she used instead, and work through that with the other jury team member.

Criteria and scores

1. Impact on the foresight profession: Is the work likely to advance the foresight profession? Does the author have foresight professional credentials? Does it use scenarios or some other recognized analytical tool of the profession? Has it been reviewed in peer-reviewed journal? Is its time perspective at least 10 years into the future?

1= The author is not a recognized foresight professional. He or she is not a member of APF, WFS or WFSF and/or has not published in a foresight publication. The work does not make use of recognized foresight analytical tools. It does not look 10 or more years ahead or its time perspective is not clearly stated.

3= The author is not a recognized foresight professional but, in the work, in some way builds on the work of one or more recognized foresight professionals. The time perspective of the work is limited to the current decade.

5= The author is a recognized foresight professional. The work uses one or more recognized analytical tools of the profession. Time perspective is more than 10 years ahead.

2. General impact. Is the work likely to have a discernible impact on how the public views the future? Is the media likely to pay attention to and/or debate the work? Might there be calls for or actual legislative

or regulatory action as a result of the work? Might business practices change as a result of the work? Might the work lead to invention or construction?

1= The public is likely to be unaware of either the work or some of the original ideas that the work proposed

3= It is likely to be a popular work and some of the ideas are out there

5= A lot of folks are likely to hear of the work and the ideas are likely to become social memes - they are out there even if people don't know where they originated from

3. Originality. To what extent does the work break new ground either because it is based on primary source material or because it presents secondary material in a new light?

1= Not very original, ideas exist in many sources,

3= A synthesis of ideas that exist elsewhere but put together in a new way

5= Very original, haven't seen either the idea or the reframing is a very radical new approach to the information

4. Strength of content. How much evidence does the author provide for his or her ideas and how strong is the evidence? For works nominated because they advance the study of the future, does the author present real world examples of approaches he or she is proposing? For works on the future of a subject area, how significant does the work appear to be for that area and for the future in general?

1= No real content strength,

3= Content strength is average for futures and similar books,

5= Powerful evidence, how can anyone read this and not be convinced?

5. Reproducibility. Could another APF member use the methodology in further study of the same or a different problem or issue?

For Category 1 works only:

1= It works for this work and the specific cases discussed, but would be difficult to use in too many places

3= Has some applicability to doing other work and will plan on using it as appropriate in the future

5= Approach or methodology is very useful and I already have plans to use or I've already used it

6a Effective communication (textual works). Is the work well edited? Does it use clear concise language? Does it recap or clearly state the main points?

1= Work has acceptable communication,

3= Fairly effective communication, definitely gets message across,

5= Impressive communication either the way it's presented or new approach to presentation

6b Effective communication (visual and sound works). Are the graphics compelling? Is the sound clear? Are colors bright and/or appearance appealing to the eye or convey the message well? If a presentation, do speakers use varied tones, gestures and expressions and speak with enthusiasm on their work? Do

speakers speak at an ordinary conversational pace and in “digestible” sentences? Or do they illustrate their points with stories?

1= Acceptable communication

3= Fairly effective communication, definitely gets message across,

5= Impressive communication either the way it's presented or new approaches to graphics, sound, or other features (you are going to use the presentation approach and not just the ideas)

Schedule

- January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018: Nominations accepted for MSFW and judging roles.
- February 28: Judges chosen (at least two for each nominated and screened work)
- March 31: Nominations shared with Core Committee for screening.
- April 13: Core Committee completes screening nominated works
- April 16: Judges asked for their review preferences
- April 30: Review assignments completed
- May 1 - May 31: Judges make initial reviews
- June 1-15: Two-judge teams discuss their reviews and enter their judgments.
- June 18-20: Rankings of and proposed awards for nominees prepared and emailed to judges.
- June 21-30: Group discussion of proposed awards if required
- June 29-July 3: Submission of proposed awards to APF Board of Directors
- July 20: Final Board decision on awards
- July 20-August 7: Preparation of award certificates
- August-September??: Awards announced and presented to awardees

Awards

- A two-year free membership in APF.

Budget

The annual budget for the MSFW shall include provisions for the awards and distribution of publications to judges as needed. The budget shall be a reasonable allowance based on approximate numbers of nominations and awards in prior years. The budget is submitted to the Board at the end of each year and costs are reimbursed as needed.