Science program dates and news

- Comparative reviews:
  - Detector R&D programs [July 24-26]
  - Energy frontier (proton) research [July 30-Aug 1]
- LSST All Hands meeting in Tucson [Aug 13-17]
- KIPAC Advisory Committee [Aug 22-23]
- Energy Frontier retreat Sept 27-28 [Charlie & Eric Colby organizers]
- LDRD status
- Early Career Award status
Detector R&D presentations: July 25

- PPA program and detector R&D [10]: David MacFarlane
- Overview of detector R&D program [20]: Gunther Haller
- Sensor R&D [20]: Chris Kenney
- Integrated electronics [10]: Angelo Dragone
- Detector systems development [15]: Marty Breidenbach
- FDIRC and TOF [15]: Jerry Va’vra
- DAQ development [20]: Matt Weaver
- Programmatic issues and summary [15]: David MacFarlane
Detector R&D: Initial reviewer comments

- From (private) short close-out session
  - Suggest including external advice in the process of setting priorities
  - Find Core, ASIC and DAQ efforts excellent
  - Encourage wider dissemination of capabilities
  - Encourage more coordination in 3-d sensor development
  - Suggest completing ILC related R&D, but at lower priority
  - Find FDIRC work excellent, but also should be brought to a timely conclusion
  - Encourage more coordination with Fermilab on DAQ development
  - Underground low-background electronics effort very interesting

- Reviewer written input due 2 weeks after review; goal for report was 2 weeks after that
Energy Frontier presentations: July 31

- Introduction [10]: David MacFarlane
- Pixel detector [20]: Charlie Young
- Trigger and data acquisition [20]: Rainer Bartoldus
- Simulation and computing [15]: Richard Mount
- Physics tools and analysis [40]: Ariel Schwartzman
- Upgrade and Summary [30]: Su Dong
Energy frontier closeout comments

- Several activities are characterized as 'extremely competent'
- Experimental activities utilize very well the resources and expertise at SLAC. Strongly encourage further developments.
- Not yet top level management roles, perhaps consequence of relatively new group.
- Very active and competitive physics analysis effort with identifiable key strengths, such as jets.
  » Good connection with SLAC theory group
  » Some concern of maybe over concentration on SUSY
  » Reviewers were unclear about direct connection between jet physics effort and various analyses
- Upgrade activities have noteworthy strengths such as the high bandwidth DAQ. Cost effective, but not 'unique'
Energy frontier closeout comments

- Commended for collaboration and support for university groups.
- Small increase in senior physicist level manpower is appropriate.
Administrative news

- Enumerating success rate for goal setting in FY2012
  - PPA goal to achieve 80% completion rate for individual performance goals
  - Accumulated information from Dept Heads indicates about 70% completion so far
  - Will work with small number of supervisors to improve this completion rate
- Timeline for FY2012 performance evaluation process
- Update on new conference rules
- Reorganization status
  - Most changes implemented, including SCA and follow-the-money strategy for faculty
- Next steps on Conduct of Engineering
Administrative news

- Machine shop policy development
- Lab-level risk assessment
- Financial scenario planning exercises underway
  » Largely will involve Division Heads on up
Managing software packages

- Management of software packages and procurements will be done centrally through the OCIO.
  - Requisitions for software require a specific GL code to ensure they are routed to OCIO, similar to computers, sources, etc.
- Software content decisions are managed as follows:
  - IT administrative, business, database software (CIO responsibility)
  - IT engineering software (CAD, FEA, etc.) (Chief Engineer responsibility)
  - Scientific software (MathCad, etc.) (TBD, status quo for now)
- Software choices in these lab-wide categories are considered the standard, unless there is a specific business requirement for another software choice.
  - Exceptions are approved via the specific ALD and COO.
Performance evaluation timeline

- **August 15:**
  - Access given to supervisors to begin writing evaluations and seek employee and matrixed supervisor / functional lead input

- **September 28:**
  - Directorates complete their normalization process and communicate to supervisors

- **October 31:**
  - All performance evaluations are finalized including higher level review

- **November 1:**
  - Evaluations are released to employees; supervisors begin meeting with employees
Training sessions

- **August 6 [11am-noon] & August 9 [9-10am]**
  - Venue: Panofsky Auditorium
  - Supervisor’s All Hands – performance evaluation timeline and revised process for normalizing evaluations

- **August 21 [1-2pm], August 28 & 29 [10-11am], August 30 & 31 [9-10am]:**
  - Voluntary performance evaluation training session for supervisors
Normalization process

- Step 1: Department Head self-evaluation: Due August 3 COB [extended now to August 17]
  - Your analysis based on FY2012 PPA research plan & department goals
  - Accomplishments beyond formal goals may be included
  - Division Head and PPA management assessment conducted in parallel
  - In cases where significant discrepancies exist, will meet with relevant department heads over the next 2 weeks
  - Intent is to calibrate performance evaluation scale, which should also be reflected in individual performance evaluations

- Step 2: Discussion with SLAC Director and EC
  - Will use dollar-weighted distribution of department ratings to propose PPA overall rating
Grading scale

- 7 = Consistently exceeds all expectations
- 6 = Frequently exceeds expectations
- 5 = Sometimes exceeds expectations
- 4 = Consistently meets all expectations
- 3 = Meets most expectations
- 2 = Needs improvement
- 1 = Does not meet expectations
- 0 = Not applicable

- You need to make the case why the department rating should be above 4
FY2011 experience with normalization

- HR rounds all evaluations to half integer
- Means are all 4.5 except AD (forced to 4.0)
- Standard deviations are all between 0.7 and 0.9

![Graph showing mean and standard deviation for different departments]
PPA approach in FY2011

Starting point:
Department Head self-evaluation

Ending point:
PPA management evaluation and feedback to Dept Heads

Actual bottoms-up distribution:
Mean = 4.75 (vs 4.53)
SD = 0.87 (vs 0.79)
Flow-down implementation under discussion

- Provide upper management feedback to department heads (and/or supervisors) to normalize supervisor grading standards
  - Allows discrimination between Departments, rather than imposing an aggregate PPA level
- Incorporate a fraction, e.g., 30%, of aggregate department level performance against Dept goals into individual performance goals
  - Couples department overall performance to individual contributions in a natural way
- Continue to emphasize performance evaluations as a management tool
  - Important to communicate performance problems
Merit and bonus program timeline

- **November 30:**
  » Directorates finalize salary increase and bonus recommendations

- **December 12:**
  » Executive Council completes approval process for bonuses and salary increases

- **January 21, 2013:**
  » Supervisors complete meetings with employees

- **January 22, 2013:**
  » Salary increases in paycheck; FY bonuses paid out in paycheck
Definition of a Conference

- A conference is defined as a meeting, retreat, seminar, symposium, training or event that involves attendee travel
  - Includes FACA meetings since they are advisory
- Not considered conferences:
  - Operational meetings such as peer review, program reviews, & construction project reviews
- Unfortunately, collaboration meetings do not meet the definition of an operational meeting and are therefore considered conferences
  - We attempted to make the case, but did not succeed with the Conference Management Office
- More guidance at:
Recent OMB Requirements – Conferences costing DOE >$100K

- If DOE expects to spend more than $100K on a conference, pre-approval must be sought from Deputy Secretary.
- DOE must aggregate DOE-wide costs to know if the conference will be >$100K.
  » SLAC must submit to DOE Office of Management (MA) when any one of the following conditions are met:
    • Hosting a conference for 30 or more at which more than half will be on travel status.
    • Sending 15 or more individuals to a conference; or
    • Spending on a conference is expected to exceed $100K.
  » Method for aggregating information in the case of collaboration meetings under discussion:
    • May be simpler for host lab for meeting or host lab for collaboration to collect and submit conference approval.
Working to minimize impact, but we need your cooperation

- **Political reality**
  - High visibility attached to this issue right now, extending up to OMB and the White House

- **Working with Business Manager Forum**
  - Attempt to identify common simplified approach to dealing with Foreign Travel Authorization (FTA) requirements

- Need to identify (with other HEP labs) a simple process for collaboration meeting submissions

- Need you to be pro-active in identifying meetings and conferences where we could trip over the $100K limit
  - Remember this is the aggregate over the DOE complex

- Need you to be patient as we work through this storm