



SAC weekly meeting

Frank Chlebana, Anne Schukraft, Bo Jayatilaka
January 11, 2021

Meeting ground rules

Continuing from last term:

- Please mute when you are not speaking
- Please use the “raise hand” feature and the moderators will try to recognize people in order
- If we are moving on to another topic and your follow-up comment was on the current issue, please speak up. It is important to have timely and efficient conversations

Winter break

A survey was sent out via a Fermilab News announcement about the Pilot Winter Break program
Look for an email with subject: [“Please complete a survey on the Voluntary Winter Break Pilot”](#)

Please fill it out with special attention to the following questions

- *What services / facilities do you rely on*
- *Has the winter break impacted your work*
- *Should the winter break be made mandatory*

The input will be used to shape the future of the program

We have representation on the Winter Break Working group and would like to collect any additional input to present at the WG.

Please consider reaching out to your Dept/group to encourage them to fill out the survey and to get any additional input we can bring to the Winter Break working group

Snowmass update

- New Snowmass Timeline announced by Young-Kee Kim on Dec 22
 - The process is delayed by one year
 - Preliminary Topical Group Reports – Spring 2022*
 - Preliminary Frontier Reports – late Spring 2022*
 - Snowmass Community Summer Study – Summer 2022 in University of Washington, Seattle*
 - Snowmass Book – October 2022*
- This removes urgency to schedule All-Hands Meetings in January/February
- Will dedicate a future meeting to discussion the next steps
 - Discuss the format of the meeting (dedicated talk, reports from WGs...)
 - Schedule of next All-Hands Meetings
 - Charge for SAC and Scientific Working Groups going forward

The snowmass report will contain a collection of physics topics

The P5 report will use the Snowmass report as input to develop a strategic plan

Discussion

- Hiring / Promotion

- Diversity

- Concerns and suggestions on the hiring and promotion process have been collected by the SAC (and other lab groups) in the summer ([report](#))
 - A task force charged with reviewing the lab's hiring process wrt diversity is being formed
 - How should the SAC interface with these efforts?

- Concerns on the intransparency of the promotion process from senior to distinguished scientist have been raised

- Concerns have been raised on lack of external promotion of lab scientists for community awards, fellowships, etc by the lab.

- Should there be a more centralized approach?

- Performance Evaluation / Compensation

- We want to discuss some issues that were raised during the climate survey and feedback received during performance evaluations

- Discuss whether we want to pursue this topic

- Write up our findings and ask that lab management address the issues

Discussion: Performance Evaluation / Compensation

The performance grade is coupled to the available funds for salary raises

This essentially imposes a quota on the number of “outstanding” ratings we can give and can lead to a situation where a person’s rating has to be reduced in order to meet the quota.

The current approach is not being uniformly applied to RAs and Scientists

Discussion: Performance Evaluation / Compensation

We have only have three levels of scientist positions, of which the third will not normally not reached, and there is no mechanism for career advancement = salary increase within a level

For example, a “senior scientist” could remain in this category for the remainder of their career.

Discussion: Performance Evaluation / Compensation

The current approach for compensation leads to “Salary Compression”

Annual salary increase budgets have been modest while candidates changing jobs or companies expect raises of more than the annual salary increase, and thus the salaries of new hires can exceed that of incumbents.

Annual pay increase does not match the market rate.

Employee A earns \$50k a year for Job B and gets a 3% raise for 5 years, landing them just under \$58k a year. Meanwhile, Employee X joins the company after that 5-year period, and because the market rate for Job B has changed over time, they are hired at \$65k.

Discussion: Performance Evaluation / Compensation

Procedure to request equity adjustment