SEEKING STAFF INPUT

• One Review Panel recommendation was to encourage greater staff involvement in organizational decisions

• We held a “players-only” meeting to gather staff input
  – Department heads and above not invited

• Staff met in three groups:
  – Scientists
  – Technicians
  – Administration

• Charge: Name five things you would do differently if you were SCCWRP Director
FIVE KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Refine the annual performance review process
2. Enhance staff involvement in research planning
3. Revise the grievance process
4. Expand the number of full-time technicians
5. Restructure the bonus program
6. Increase mentorship of scientists
REFINE THE REVIEW PROCESS

• **Customize the review process by employee class**
  – Separate process for scientists, technicians and administration

• **Conduct a 360-type review**
  – Feedback from all sides, rather than just from supervisor

• **Both suggestions will be implemented this year**
  – Appointed committees to provide detailed input about how we implement these suggestions
  – They will be reporting out at Monday’s staff meeting
RESEARCH PLANNING INVOLVEMENT

• Actions on this one were more about informing than adjusting
  – It’s already a bottom-up process
  – Need to make it clearer to new scientists how they initiate ideas

• However, we did identify a few actions
  – We will distribute more interim planning products to staff
  – Will also present plan highlights and new initiatives at the March staff meeting

• The new CTAG research planning process also provides a great opportunity for staff involvement
MORE TECHNICIANS

• The numbers are inconsistent with the request
  – Next year’s budget indicates we are overstaffed with technicians by 20%

• Further conversations suggested the problem is less about the number of technicians and more about how they are allocated
  – Do more cross-training and have the technicians less strongly attached to specific departments
  – Has the potential advantage of making the job more interesting

• More structured training program for part-timers
  – They provide numbers for large short-term projects
RESTRUCTURE THE BONUS SYSTEM

• Three underlying concerns
  – The amount changes from year to year
  – Therefore the rules of what is rewarded changes midyear
  – Intangibles are the first thing to be cut if we don’t meet goals

• Those are all true critiques
  – About 40% goes to people who bring in funds
  – Next 40% goes to publication
  – Remaining 20% goes to intangibles
  – Bonuses were cut last year because we did not meet financial goals
  – First category was preserved, second was reduced, third was eliminated

• The present structure is what we want to reward and there are no changes planned
  – However, we will revisit this with Personnel and Finance Committee
REVISE THE GRIEVANCE PROCESS

• Three critiques
  – Better inform people of the process
  – Provide an alternative to me for lodging complaints
  – Create assurances that the process works

• We will enhance this section of the employee handbook
  – Also make it a larger part of the new employee orientation

• Marisol Gonzalez will be an alternative for initiating the process
  – She is going for training next month

• Inclusion of a second person (Marisol) will provide feedback mechanism that the process works
  – Bridges a delicate balance among transparency, accountability, and confidentiality
MENTORING ACTIVITIES

• Create an orientation package for new scientists
  – Expectations
  – Growth opportunities

• Management training
  – Financial management
  – Personnel management
  – Videotape the training so it is available for review at any time

• Personal mentoring
  – Spur the Department heads to do more in this area
  – Revise the annual review process to ensure this discussion
  – I will go to lunch with each of the scientists annually
SUCCESSFUL EXERCISE?

• Absolutely!!!
  – Creates dialog and partnership
  – Even for changes we won’t make, there is better staff understanding of the rationale behind management actions

• Do I anticipate the changes will be successful?
  – Yes, but ask me again in December
  – Biggest changes will be to the review process

• Will we do this kind of staff input annually?
  – We will ask the staff that question in a year
  – Let’s see how whether implementation took place and whether the changes were helpful