Interpretations on Performance Evaluation Process

D. MacFarlane

June 4th, 2009

Reasons for the change

- Establish outcome based objective-setting that complements the Lab Agenda
- Align supervisors' objectives with Departmental, Directorate and Lab goals
- Reduce subjectivity of evaluation process
- Align scientific goals with Lab priorities and establish reasonable benchmarks for performance

Near-term and ongoing HEP programs

- Facilitate ongoing exploitation of the BABAR dataset
  - Continue contributing to physics output and execute D&D project
- Operate the LAT for Fermi GST, and continue to spearhead scientific discovery with this unique observatory
  - Support the operations, software development, and instrument support functions of the LAT, as performed by the ISOC
  - Maintain a vigorous LAT-based scientific analysis program at SLAC.
- Play a significant role in ATLAS & LHC accelerator commissioning, initial science analyses, & computing
- Maintain a world-class accelerator-science program
  - World-leading programs in beam physics theory, advanced computation, and accelerator design
- Maintain a crucial, enabling role in technology development for the ILC
  - L-band rf, electron source, final focus and IR design

Near-term and ongoing HEP programs

- Lead high-gradient X-band research in the US
  - Establish the fundamental limits to acceleration gradient and the optimal design of rf structures
- Maintain world-leading theoretical programs in particle physics and particle astrophysics and cosmology

Future HEP programs

- Bring LSST into development as a joint NSF-DOE project
  - Lead the design and development of the LSST camera, participate in data management, shepherd the involvement of the HEP community
- Play a major role in the upgrade of the ATLAS detector and the LHC
  - ATLAS Phase 1 and 2 upgrades: Tracking and TDAQ upgrades
  - Enhance ATLAS computing for physics exploitation of the LHC data
  - Extend LHC contributions machine contributions to include upgrade collimators, development of PS2 design, & LLRF & feedback improvements
- Construct and operate FACET for forefront experiments in beam-driven plasma wakefield acceleration
- Participate in JDEM construction, development, and science analyses

Future HEP programs

- Develop and construct a ton-scale version of EXO for the initial suite of mid-scale experiments at DUSEL
  - Complete operation and testing of EXO-200 and purse R&D and engineering for full-EXO
- Facilitate a significant US role in SuperB in Italy
  - Provide components from PEP-II to reduce the cost of SuperB construction
- Participate in Project-X R&D with contributions to rf power systems
- Perform state of the art experiments in laser dielectric acceleration
- Develop high power X-band rf sources to optimally exploit high gradient structures
- Initiate and maintain R&D efforts to enable longer-range future programs such as SiD, GeODM, and AGIS

Steps in annual review process

- Preparation:
  - Review performance on objectives
  - Review performance against position summary & amend for the next year
  - Invite employee to write a self evaluation
  - Complete the evaluation form and have it reviewed by next managerial level: opportunity for managers to refine SLAC agenda goals to the division and department level
- During the face-to-face review
  - Discuss performance of objectives and competencies
  - Discuss of progress and future needs in any development activities
  - Many groups operate with continuous feedback during the year, but discuss how well this is working and whether adjustments are needed

Setting objectives for scientists

- Designed characteristics of objectives:
  - Connected to Lab Agenda, Directorate, Division and ultimately Department goals
  - SMART: Specific, Measurable, Aggressive, Realistic and Time-bound
  - Focused on results and not activities
- For scientists whose primary role is research stretching over years this will be challenging
  - Some tasks can be defined by milestones and intermediate goals
  - However, it will be difficult to capture all expectations in this format and we do not want to overemphasize just quantifiable tasks
  - View this year's exercise as an experiment, from which some best practices and interpretations will emerge

Which form to use?

- Available performance evaluation forms:
  - Supervisors & above (Objective setting required)
  - Staff (Objective setting optional)
  - Scientists (Objectives/Milestones required)
- For PPA:
  - Scientist is anyone in a physicist, experimental physicist, theoretical physicist or permanent physicist job classification
  - Everyone else should use the staff form unless you are a supervisor
  - Supervisor is an administrative supervisor: if you are only a functional supervisor, the scientist or staff form should be used as appropriate
  - Supervisors or line managers who are also scientists may want to use both the supervisor form for performance as a supervisor and the scientist form for performance as a scientist
  - Faculty scientific performance is being addressed separately, but faculty in line management roles should be evaluated on the supervisor form as well

What about the Job Summary?

- PPA paid significant attention this spring to development of job specific R2A2s
  - Captures some of the responsibilities also useful for the performance evaluation forms, but remains a important management tool
  - Recommend that the R2A2 be reviewed at performance review time and updated to describe an accurate job position summary for the coming year

Matrixed Employees

- Administrative Manager is responsible for conducting review
- Where employee is deployed during the review year to several other departments
  - Get feedback from those supervisors using the performance evaluation form
  - Aggregate feedback & complete
- When employee is matrixed to one department almost exclusively
  - Managers could jointly complete form & conduct review
  - No single approach