



Scientific Staff Research & Community Service Evaluation

Period of Evaluation: October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022

Employee Identification

Name:

Employee ID:

Job Title:

Location:

Hire Date:

Department:

Manager:

The mission of the Observatory is to provide world class telescopes, instrumentation and expertise for the science community to enable forefront astronomy research at radio wavelengths, to train the next generation of scientists and engineers and to promote astronomy to foster a more scientifically literate society. Employees are encouraged to establish goals that support our mission and are encouraged to engage in activities that support the broader impact of our mission on society. Your participation and completion of the performance evaluation and goal setting process is critical to ensuring that the effort of everyone is in alignment with our mission.

Scientific Staff Review Purpose

The scientific staff has an important role beyond supporting the Observatory's functional activities, including collaboration with the larger community, pushing the boundaries of our facilities, and helping to guide the observatory into the future. The science activities of the scientific staff are therefore important and connected to performance reviews and promotions. Additionally, successful research is a very important factor in staff job satisfaction.

The goals of the Research and Community Service (RCS) PEP process include: recognize scientific achievements; identify areas of concern and provide feedback that can support corrective action; identify situations in which line management may need to take action to allow sufficient research time for the staff member; provide statistical information on staff achievements using measurable indicators so that an individual's performance can be assessed in comparison to their peers.

The RCS-PEP review is undertaken by the relevant Performance Review Committee (APRC or SPRC), which consists of scientists from all branches of the observatory and from all disciplines, including astronomy, software engineering and hardware engineering. Each committee member serves for 3 years. The resulting review is incorporated into the overall employee PEP review, and can be discussed with the line manager during the PEP meeting. Staff members also have an opportunity to make an appointment to discuss the RCS-PEP review with the AD for SSR.

Please note, it cannot be guaranteed that the PRC members will be personally familiar with each staff member's full research and community outreach activities. Staff members are therefore strongly advised to ensure that their responses to the RCS-PEP questions are thorough and clear, and include any important ancillary information that may not be known to the committee.

Background and Process

- This form is used to evaluate scientific staff on their self-directed research, Observatory service, and community service activities. The Department of Science Support and Research requests the scientific staff member complete information regarding their Research and Community Service Activities, Other Significant Achievements and establish future research goals.
- Research and Community Service Activities information is provided to review committees and SSR completes the Summary Performance Level for Research Activities.
- The AD: SSR meets and discusses the evaluation with the scientific staff member, if necessary. The employee may respond by providing written comments in Employee Comments Section.

Advice for Completing This Form

The independent research that each science staff member performs at the NRAO/GBO can be difficult to define and to quantify. Some statistical measures are possible, such as refereed publications and invited conference talks. On the other hand, there are equally valuable research efforts undertaken by staff that may not result in a measurable statistic, or, indeed, may be difficult to separate from functional duty.

Therefore, staff members are strongly encouraged to consider carefully which elements of their overall effort constitute true individual research and describe them fully here. Please do not leave it to the PRC to judge whether an effort that you record here qualifies as individual research rather than functional. If in doubt, choose to be more, rather than less, inclusive and explain as best as you can the research portion of the effort. The following criterion may be used for distinguishing your functional from your research effort:

Individual research is any effort that results in a contribution to the observatory and/or to the community that required personal and original ingenuity to create. The contribution should be considered to have advanced overall knowledge and/or technical capability and to be worthy of publication in a memo or other format. The contribution need not be limited to R&D efforts but can also include significant and creative trouble shooting and software/hardware fixes.

Key Responsibilities

Please write a paragraph describing your overall functional job responsibilities. This is requested because it is helpful to review your research activities in the context of your functional duties.

Employee



Research and Community Service Activities

The Observatory considers it important that all innovative research/development work that includes valuable advances be published as a service to NRAO/GBO and to other members of the community. It is one of the expectations of scientific staff that they report their original research and development effort in an appropriate publication format. Such publications can include internal science, computing, or technical memoranda, as well as papers submitted to professional journals. Anything published entirely as part of your functional responsibilities (e.g. documentation, web content) should not be included here.

Refereed Publications

List all refereed articles whose publication dates are within the one-year period covered. It should be made clear whether you were a first author or a co-author; and, if the latter, whether you consider your contribution major or minor. You may include conference publications if they went through a formal refereeing process.

Comments:



 [Attach Feedback](#)

Submitted Publications

Please list papers submitted during the one-year period covered and which are still in the refereeing process.

Comments:



 [Attach Feedback](#)

Unrefereed Publications

List all unrefereed publications, internal or external, including technical memos, conference proceedings, meeting abstracts, web publications, etc. whose publication dates are within the one-year period covered. It should be made clear whether you were a first author or a co-author, and, if the latter, whether you consider your contribution major or minor.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Observing Proposals

List submitted observing proposals you were part of within the one-year period covered. Include PI name, proposal title, telescope, and time allocated. It should be made clear whether you were the Principle Investigator or a Co-Investigator.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Instrumentation or Software

List significant hardware or software efforts that you worked on within the one-year period covered that were not necessarily part of your assigned functional responsibilities. List patents you have filed. Memos or other publications should not be listed here but in the appropriate publication section above.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Funding Grants

List and number outside sources of funding that you received within the one-year period covered. Include title, amount and granting organization. Please indicate if you are the PI of the project, or if you are a major contributor to the study (i.e. you have an anticipated contribution of 20% or greater).

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Professional Meetings

List and number conferences, schools or workshops that you have attended or made significant contribution to in the one-year period covered and in what capacity: e.g. SOC, LOC, Chair, plenary speaker, invited speaker, contributing speaker, invited lecturer, tutor, or attendee. Please indicate the location of the meeting.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Colloquia

List any scientific colloquia you have given in the one-year period covered, and provide the date, place and title of your talk. Note: Conference presentations should be included in the previous question (Professional Meetings), not here.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Other Presentations

List any other, more informal, presentations you have given during the one-year period covered that are not part of meetings or workshops, such as lunch talks.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Mentoring

List and number the names, affiliations and career status (undergrad, co-op, PhD candidate, postdoc, etc.) of the people you have mentored in the one-year period covered. Please indicate your mentoring role, e.g. sole mentor, primary mentor, co-mentor, etc., and note the time period covered by the mentoring of each person, e.g. continuous, summer student, etc. Also please indicate any significant achievement made by the student/postdoc under your mentorship, e.g. successfully defending a thesis.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Committees and Society Support

List outside committees that you have served on, and formal roles in professional societies that you have held, in the one-year period covered. Indicate the nature of the committee (e.g., management board, advisory committee, editorial board), your specific role (such as chair, member, editor), and/or your role in the professional society (e.g. Chair of Commission X). Do not list membership of professional societies such as the IAU or AAS. Note: Participation in formal review committees and panels should be included in the response to the next question (Review Panels and Refereeing), not this one.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Review Panels and Refereeing

List review and refereeing activities you have undertaken in the one-year period covered. This may include refereeing scientific papers, thesis examiner roles, time allocation committees, NSF or NASA grant reviews, etc.

Comments: [Attach Feedback](#)

Education and Public Outreach

Outreach activities are those targeted at the general public (rather than the science community). List EPO, BI, and SC activities you have contributed to during the one-year period covered. This includes support of observatory events, science fairs, lectures and press interviews, press releases, etc.

Comments:



 [Attach Feedback](#)

Awards and other Significant Recognition

List awards and other significant recognition you have received in the one-year period covered (e.g. patents received, being named to a significant post in a professional society, achievement awards, etc.).

Comments:



 [Attach Feedback](#)

On average, what fraction of the total time you dedicate to NRAO/GB0 activities do you estimate you spent on research related activities?

This may be more or less than the fraction that you were allocated.

Comments:



 [Attach Feedback](#)

Other Significant Achievements:

List any other science-related activities or achievements that have not been noted above.

Employee



Summary Performance Evaluation: Research Activities (provided by Science & Academic Affairs)



Future Research and Community Activities Goals

Instructions: Use the box below to describe major research goals and any community activities the employee is striving to achieve or is expected to achieve during the next review period.

Use this section to document Future Research and Community Activities Goals.



Employee Summary Comments

Use this section to document additional comments not captured elsewhere on this review form.

Employee



Electronic Signature Notification

By electronically signing this document, I hereby acknowledge that I have read and understood this review and have met with my manager to discuss it.