

2 0 0 6 - 2 0 0 7 M I N U T E S

the  
**GIEC** *Minutes*

MAY 2006

May 3, 2:30-3:45 pm, KS 415

In attendance: Russ, Ranga, Anastasia, Jim, Dave F., Seppo, Kartik and Alberto

Absent: Bidushi, Gerard, Andrea, Carolyn

1. Upon feedback from constituents we decided that it was okay to send GIEC members to represent the science staff at the Oversight Committee. We also discussed the idea of perhaps including a postdoc in our group since they represent a large fraction of our science environment here. Current volunteers for the Oversight Cmte meeting are: Kartik, Dave F., Ranga, Bidushi + 1 postdoc?

**\*ACTION ITEM\*** Everyone - please poll people on your science staff if you have not already done so to make sure they are ok with the GIEC representing them to the Oversight Cmte. - If not, ask for volunteers.

**\*ACTION ITEM\*** - Kartik will set up a meeting for the OC meeting cmte to meet and discuss issues before we meet with the committee as a whole. I also have to get the GIEC minutes / newsletter together.

2. Performance Evaluations / Promotions / Employment (hiring and firing).

We spent much of the hour discussing this important issue.

a. In general the science staff felt that the attempt at streamlining the process to two pages was appreciated -- we should pay attention to how this goes and revisit whether the streamlining was adequate or not.

b. Non-science staff do not have a page limit on their performance evaluation and therefore the amount of effort put in by members can vary dramatically. This lack of consistency was not so much a complaint as much as a personal style issue.

c. We felt that more than one venue for feedback from supervisors would be useful. Perhaps this can take place more informally than the yearly performance review - employees could be told how they are doing, where they are performing well and where they are performing poorly.

We collated a number of questions for management that we would like them to answer in a meeting with us - they are as follows:

i) We would like to touch base again on the significance of the performance evaluations - we think the evaluations basically determine the level of the raise + allow for a record that may be used for promotions or layoffs when needed.

ii) Why are the materials used for performance evaluation not used for promotions - the latter only requires a CV and letters of recommendations. It would be great if the PEs were also formally a part of that process.

iii) What is the appropriate balance between project and science work? Are there unspoken priorities or weighting being given to such things as first author papers, or bringing in large amounts of grant money? What is implicitly being valued by the management? We think that the staff will react to whatever is being rewarded so do 1st author papers count more than others? We realize that each situation is independent and unique so we do not feel there should be a formalized breakdown of what is valued but there is some confusion in this area. So here is our main recommendation:

\* Feedback \* - We would like the management to give detailed feedback on how a person is doing. We would like to know what the positives and negatives and how we compare with our peers. It is important for us to know what to aim for. For the staff members complaining about the process of performance evaluations they should let their line managers + evaluators know this and at the meeting this time around figure out what can be streamlined in their application.

iv) If the funding profile changes what will be the process of laying off people? Recently some people have left the MSC - did they have sufficient notice? We need to get feedback from the people who have left and from management on how the whole process worked? Questions raised were: why was person X chosen over person Y? These questions are concerns of the staff in general. How does an employee know that s/he is doing well?

v) Is there bridge money when a project ramps down? What will management do to retain people?

### 3. New Business / Input from GIEC constituents

a. "The post-bcd pages are missing links and not well-maintained." We need to devote more resources to improving the web page design and overall reliability of links etc.

b. "When I ask for help or ask someone a question, I am often told that it is not my job. Is this an appropriate response for IPAC'ers?" The person suggested having a detailed flow chart of tasks and responsibilities of everyone here. This is work and may be helpful. The GIEC decided that the management should not make comments on general behavior of people - perhaps it would be better if the GIEC could encourage people to be more helpful to colleagues by referring the person to someone who could help them, and if they don't know, refer them to the supervisor.

c. Most service committees at IPAC are rotating committees (Colloq chair, Enhanced Science Legacy funds, Fellowship, Palomar TAC, etc.). The only exception is the Grad Student program. We recommend that the committee also rotate so that after serving on the cmte for a year, an experienced person can take over the leadership for a year or two. This also applies to the GIEC.

4. GIEC has chosen the following judges for the bake-off for the IPAC Picnic: Cren Frayer, Whitney Clavin, and Mark Lacy.