

OPIRG Peggy McKay Awards

Nomination Form, Year _____

Qualification Checklist:

- ❖ The party being nominated should consist of OPIRG members (i.e. individual or individuals who support OPIRG via their student fees or who have purchased a community membership).
- ❖ The project must address a contemporary and timely environmental issue.
- ❖ The project was associated in some way with OPIRG (i.e. hosted, sponsored, organized, published).
- ❖ The project occurred within the previous year (i.e. between March 1st of last year and April 30th of this year).

Submitted By:

OPIRG: _____ Telephone: _____

Address: _____ Email: _____

Staff Contact: _____

Party Being Nominated:

Name: _____ Telephone: _____

Address: _____ Email: _____

On a separate sheet, provide clear (typewritten is nice) and concise answers to the following questions. But don't be shy – emphasize your project's uniqueness. As well, be sure to submit all relevant supporting documentation related to the project including brochures, posters, workshop outlines, media coverage, etc.

1. Briefly describe the project being nominated.
2. Outline your project's:
 - A. Goals – What were you trying to accomplish?
 - B. Methodology – How were you trying to reach your goals?
 - C. Effectiveness – Were you successful in reaching your goals? If not, why not?

SUBMISSION DEADLINE TO YOUR LOCAL OPIRG CHAPTER IS MARCH 1ST.

ALL SUBMISSIONS MUST BE RECEIVED BY MARCH 8TH. SEND TO:

OPIRG McMaster,

Box 1013, McMaster University,

1280 Main Street West,

Hamilton, ON., L8S 1C0.

Ph. (905)525-9140, ext. 27289; Email: opirg@mcmaster.ca

AWARD RECIPIENTS WILL BE NOTIFIED IN APRIL.

Peggy McKay Awards

Background

This award was established by Paul McKay (journalist, environmental activist, and former OPIRG-Peterborough staff member) in 1988, in memory of his mother, Peggy, who died of cancer in 1987. By encouraging environmental action, the awards will hopefully lead to a decrease in the cause of her death.

From Paul McKay (1988)

“My mother died in November 1987, at the age of 62, six months after being diagnosed with pancreatic cancer. During those six months, she was transformed from a radiantly healthy, self-reliant person into an emaciated, helpless ghost.

The sudden change was devastating to those who loved her. We all assumed she would live another two decades. Her skiing, golf, and walking had kept her in apparent top physical condition. She had keen interests in her family and friends, was immersed in painting as a hobby, continued extensive charity work, and was interested in larger issues like the environment and peace. She didn't smoke, ate generally healthy foods, and spent much of her time gardening or outdoors.

In short, she had a full, healthy lifestyle. The cancer that killed her invaded her life – she did little to encourage it. Her doctors had no explanation as to why she would contract cancer.

But Statistics Canada does. One in three Canadians now contracts some form of cancer during their lifetime. One in four die from it. Cancer is at epidemic levels, and many scientists have warned that much of the cancer is caused by our environment – by man-made poisons in our food, water, air and soils.

In a small way, I hope the Peggy McKay Awards can help in the fight against cancer – by focusing on the root cause, our polluted environment. Winning the battle will require the ingenuity and dedication of young people, and the Awards are meant to encourage values, ideas, skills, which serve the public interest rather than private gain.”

The Awards

Two prizes of \$250 each will be awarded in April of each year. Once awarded, the money may be spent by the recipients in any way they choose.

Selection Criteria for Peggy McKay

In order to facilitate the selection process for Peggy McKay:

- 1) The nomination form has been re-vamped in order to more clearly emphasize submission requirements. Specifically, the need for submitters to highlight their particular project's: a) goals, b) methodology and c) effectiveness.

PIRGS are quite erratic about sending supporting documentation with project submissions. Such documentation gives a breadth and depth to a project, which no nomination form can adequately convey. Please make sure to submit any relevant materials including posters, workshop outlines, media coverage and so on. This request will also be emphasized in the nomination form.

- 2) We evaluate projects from a number of PIRGS (sometimes our own) and the process must be seen to be legitimate and unbiased. To ensure objectivity, the following criteria will be utilized in evaluating project goals, methodology and effectiveness:

Using a scale from 1 – 5 (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, very good, excellent), projects will be rated on the following criteria:

- a) Novelty – Is the project something that isn't necessarily tried and true – something a little different within the context of PIRG projects?
- b) Effectiveness – Did the project meet its goals? If not, why not? Failures, so-called, can also be usefully evaluated.
- c) Timeliness – Does the project contribute to an understanding of current environmental issues? Does it bring to light some new environmental issues for us to worry about? Please note that we're de-emphasizing the "best project for preserving the environment" angle of previous awards. We felt it could be potentially limiting in terms of what is perceived as "preservation." In the broadest sense, "preserving the environment" is a given. In its most narrow sense, however, it's a pretty specific type of activism. As far as we can recall, the interpretation of what constitutes "preserving the environment" has been interpreted fairly broadly. Hopefully, our de-emphasizing this aspect in no way conflicts with the request of our benefactor, Paul McKay.
- d) Creativity – Does the project utilize new and imaginative methodology to reach project goals?
- e) Networking – Does the project attempt to utilize and integrate existing community and/or campus resources relevant to it? In this context, resources are broadly defined and include people, organizations, libraries and so on.

Members of the Selection Committee (selected at the Fall Provincial Annual General Meeting) will independently evaluate each application and then discuss their choices. Reaching consensus, using the aforementioned criteria, should not be overly problematic. Upon reaching a decision as to the two prizewinners,* OPIRG McMaster contacts OPIRG Provincial's accountant with the recipients' names. As well, copies of the recipients' nomination forms and project documentation should also be forwarded. OPIRG Provincial then contacts Paul McKay, submits the recipients' forms and documentation to him and, finally, issues the cheques. Please note all submission deadlines on the Nomination Form.

*There might be exceptions, probably atypical, to this condition. For example, if only one submission is received within any given year, the submitter would be awarded the entire sum, unless their project is deemed unacceptable, in which case the money is not given out. In the event of a “three way tie” in which there seems to be an impasse in the Selection Committee, the money will be equally divided among the recipients. However, this situation should be avoided if possible. Anything greater than a “three way tie” will greatly reduce the award per recipient and should not be considered a feasible option.