

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**UCAR Management Committee (UMC)**  
**Working Group #4 - Administrative Efficiency & Agility**

**LADDER TRACK ISSUES**

Item	Staff Raised Issues/Concerns <sup>1</sup>	Staff Identified Impact(s)	Staff Proposed Solution(s) <sup>2</sup>	WG#4 Recommendations, Comments, and/or Actions Based on SME Discussion	NCAR Director's Office Response	Status
1	<p><b>LT Annual Performance Evaluations &amp; Forms:</b> The annual evaluation process has become more cumbersome and drawn out, with extensive (and often confusing) instructions that have led to the need for multiple meetings at the Division and Lab levels to discuss how the form is to be interpreted. The LT Performance Matrix (Sec. III) is one aspect that adds significantly to the complication and confusion. The required matrix data is highly subjective and must be arbitrarily normalized so each Lab has about the same percentage of top performers. In addition, the current form includes 4 (redundant) tables related to estimating the effort across four subjective categories e.g., (science, contributions, service, and supervision). Another concern expressed by staff is that the subjective information is being used to assess performance trends and equity (for each criterion) across NCAR using data that are interpreted differently across NCAR.</p>	<p>Confusing and time consuming for scientists, supervisors and administration with little demonstrated benefit to the organization and more importantly the employee.</p>	<p>- Eliminate the LT Performance Matrix that is currently part of the LT performance review materials (see Sec. III of form) since it is highly subjective requiring performance to be assessed separately for each criteria with varying activity percentage amounts.</p> <p>- Delete redundant 'percent of effort tables'</p>	<p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p><b>1) The LT performance appraisal form and instructions should be simplified and streamlined before the 2013-2014 performance appraisal season. The NCAR Directorate and Executive Committee should identify a process to review and revise the current form that includes input and feedback from key ladder track scientists across NCAR. In addition, UCAR F&amp;A should ensure that any new proposed electronic form is consistent with other form modernization efforts across UCAR.</b></p> <p><b>WG4 recommends the following specific form revisions:</b></p> <p><b>1a) Develop a new (more modern) electronic form and organize it in a more intuitive manner that guides the employee and supervisor through the document with appropriate fill-in sections. The form should include features that allow staff to link to and input data from OpenSky and other internal metrics databases.</b></p> <p><b>1b) Consolidate the 4 level-of-effort-per-criteria tables into a single table that captures past and next year level-of-effort estimates.</b></p> <p><b>1c) Clarify when a performance improvement plan is required when performance "does not meet expectations". Currently, the form provides conflicting information on this matter in Section III.</b></p> <p><b>1d) Replace the subjective LT Performance Matrix (in Section III) with rating indicators that better capture the employees overall performance as determined by the lab/entity. Establish a process to revisit the forms and requirements for capturing metrics that</b></p>		

<sup>1</sup> This column list the issues and concerns raised by staff that was collected during the feedback solicitation process and clarified during the subject matter expert (SME) meeting(s).

<sup>2</sup> This column lists proposed solutions from the staff feedback process and, where applicable, refined during the SME meeting(s).

**CONFIDENTIAL**

				<p><b>measure performance assessment equity across NCAR.</b></p> <p><b>1e) Reduce the amount of paper generated when printing each performance review by separating the instructions and guidance materials from the review form.</b></p> <p><b>Note:</b> Per the recommendations, the WG developed, with scientific staff input, a draft streamlined LT appraisal form and separate instructions and provided them along with rationale for the refinements to the NCAR Directorate (ND) for its consideration. The ND did concur with some of the WG#4's suggestion about streamlining the instructions including organizing and consolidation and everyone agreed that the forms need to be modernized into electronically friendly forms. This draft form could be used as an example of the type of changes WG4 recommends. <b>Summary SME meeting notes are provided in a separate document.</b></p>		
2	<p>The <b>Post-ARG Review (PAR)</b> process is cumbersome for scientists and administrators. Since it has been clearly stated by the BOT and NCAR management that NCAR Ladder-Track scientists do not have tenure, there is no need for an additional (redundant) formal review process beyond the annual evaluations that are conducted for all staff.</p>	<p>Unnecessary effort; annual evaluations are sufficient. Cynicism produced among LTS in consequence of an inconsistent PAR justification.</p> <p>Some scientists feel inhibited in discussions with the NCAR Director since the Director, who is removed from the scientist's research, is formally reviewing the scientist as part of the process.</p>	<p>1) Eliminate formal PAR evaluation process, but keep occasional (informal and perhaps volunteer) one-on-one conversations between Scientists and NCAR Director.</p> <p>Any significant performance issues should be addressed as part of the annual review process.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>2) Eliminate the formal PAR evaluation process, but keep occasional (informal and perhaps volunteer) one-on-one conversations between Scientists and NCAR Director.</b></p>		
3	<p>The <b>ARG process</b> spans too much of the year and requires additional work that's "not worth the extra effort". The decision to submit a final nomination is strongly influenced by the first round of referee letters, which may not be representative of the complete set. The need for 2 rounds of (seeking) letters does not appear necessary anymore nor does the need for 10 referee letters since the positions are not officially tenured.</p>	<p>ARG considerations are at least 4 months longer with little perceived benefit. Final nomination decisions are sometimes made with only partial referee input.</p>	<p>1) Return to previous cycle, except with nomination deadline in mid-December, and AICs formed prior to January ARG meeting.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p><b>3) The ARG, ARG Bylaws Committee, and the NCAR Directorate should review the current processes and schedule and identify opportunities for streamlining them. In addition, current overlapping and competing authorities between the ARG and NCAR Directorate should be reviewed and resolved.</b></p> <p>Note: We understand that discussions have begun between the ND and ARG on this issue.</p>		