

EAG Meeting

Thursday, April 26, 2012

9:30 AM

Subject	EAG Meeting
Date and Location	Thursday, April 26, 2012 9:30 AM - 12:30 PM, One East
Attendees	James N Blowers, Teri, Curtis, Denise, Carol, Eileen, Sandra, Cons, Kay
Message	Suggestions/Recommendations Discussion: process for suggestions made to the EAG and for those made by the EAG. Also go over the suggestions that others have made to the EAG so far. And a small permissions discussion – who should have access. Get brief Yay or Nay on removal of upcoming topics from the web site Go over suggested process for action items from meetings. Discussion on feedback from Bruce's column on alternate work days. Content for supervisor/manager all-hands meeting Any Other Business

Notes

Eileen: would like to converge on a process for handling suggestions made to the EAG.

- Web submissions:
 - Go to the Steering Committee, who reviews it and "scrubs" as necessary (e.g. removing names, if necessary) and adds it to the Sharepoint list
 - Acknowledgement of receipt is sent to originator
 - It is responded to appropriately; e.g. EAG responds, it is passed to another organization for response
 - New items and status is monitored at each meeting to make sure that it's not forgotten about (at least for too long)

We had some discussions regarding whether or not complete web submissions (i.e. not "scrubbed") should be reviewed by the full EAG (and not just the Steering Committee). Sandra pointed out that HR-related issues, which may come via the EAG, may not be part of our purview, and so showing it to the full EAG may not even be appropriate in the first place. Eileen pointed out that every web submission does indeed come to the full EAG, but in sensitive cases the Steering Committee is simply removing personally-identifiable information when the submission is of a sensitive nature.

Action: Jamie and Eileen to publish the list of responsibilities of the Steering Committee in Sharepoint (Eileen suggested that it not be a document, but be a SP web page that people can easily get to).

We recognized that we were trying to approve the process, but folks who have not seen the actual content (the submissions) were struggling to be able to contribute to a discussion about process without knowing more about the content. Eileen brought up on the screen the list of items (she currently has in a spreadsheet). She mentioned that the name of the submitter will not be on the Sharepoint list. We had some discussion on this topic, and there was general agreement that submitters may not have signed up to have their names publicized lab-wide, which this Sharepoint list would be. Eileen thought it may be possible to have a column visible only to a limited number of people, but she'll have to check with the SP expert.

Action: Eileen will check with the Sharepoint expert regarding limited access to specific columns in Sharepoint lists.

One of the items led us to a discussion about how content on bulletin boards around the Lab is "approved" to be put up. Carol suggested that the Wilson Hall boards by the elevators and anything that goes through the mail to be hung should be approved by the Office of Communications. Teri pointed out that since we are a federal facility, everyone and every group is allowed to have access. Are there any formal guidelines? Sandra suggested that this item be forwarded to Diane Ingram and Katie from Communications.

Action: Eileen will forward the item to Diane and Katie.

We agreed that the item which was questioning the useful vs useless (in the eyes of the submitter) training should be brought up at a full EAG meeting so we can get folks thought's/perspective's on required training.

There was general agreement that the process Eileen outlined was a good place to start and so we should proceed on it. The items in the spreadsheet she showed will be put into a Sharepoint list. It was agreed that we should review this list at every meeting. We also agreed there should be a unique identifier assigned to each item.

Upcoming items on our web site:

- Eileen proposed that we remove the "Upcoming Items" from the site because we're not maintaining them and have no plans to do so. We all agreed.

We also agreed that it would be good to be able to get agendas at least a week in advance of our meetings. It would also be good to get the meeting minutes posted sooner. We can always update the minutes if/when we find that something needs to be corrected after they are posted.

Action items:

- Eileen said that Sharepoint can be used to keep track of action items. This way they would not remain buried in our minutes (and so potentially forgotten about).
- Eileen would extract the action items from the minutes when she posts the minutes.
- There was general agreement on this approach.

Carol brought up an issue regarding communication and the changeover to Exchange/Outlook.

- The new procedure for reserving/approving meeting rooms is unclear at this point.
- There was training given to some (small) group of people, but others (e.g. the entire Education Department) don't know anything about the new system, especially with regards to the changes in reserving meeting rooms.
- There seemed to be two issues at play:
 - The communication (or lack thereof) regarding the migration to Exchange.
 - The "politics" of using meeting rooms that are managed by persons in different organizations than the person asking about the room.
- **We agreed it would be good to provide feedback to the CD project manager(s) about where the gaps were in the communication plan.**
 - The Education Office (Marge) was not informed about the change in meeting room reservation process.

- **Action item: Carol agreed to write down a list enumerating the assumptions that she had which resulted in unmet expectations regarding the conference room calendar migration and communication/training.**
- There is an Admin email list.
- WDRS still has at least one meeting room which is managed with a paper book, but some thought that that room was now available in Outlook. This will need to be checked on so that there are no double-bookings.
- People shared that they have had their properly-reserved rooms unreserved, but they were not told about it; they have shown up only to find out they no longer have the room.
 - **Action item: draft a recommendation regarding communication of when meeting room assignments change, and that the original person needs to know there has been a change (before they get to the room); it would also be helpful if the Admin who made the change could help to find a replacement room. To whom should this be addressed?**

Content for supervisors/managers "all-hands" meeting:

- Performance review process
- It would be good to have the Directorate tell supervisors/managers what is important to do. Explain what the Directorate's expectations of supervisors/managers are.
- It would be good to ask the attendees of the all-hands meeting about what they need, e.g. communication that is lacking in certain areas - what are those areas?
- Explain what support/help is available for supervisors/managers to help them effectively do their jobs.
- Should ask attendees what they need to be able to do their jobs as supervisors and managers. What are they presently lacking?
 - Recognize that there are presently shortcomings ("own it"). Then could pose the question to folks about what they think is lacking.
- It has been stated that some feel that asking for help is a sign of weakness, and so folks are very reluctant to do so.
- It would be good for a notice to be sent to attendees ahead of the meeting(s) of things to think about so that they can have an informed discussion at the meeting.
- We need to be very careful to include everyone in this communication and meetings. It seemed reasonable to ask the divisions/sections/centers to come up with the list of names of folks that are supervisors. We should provide some guidance to D/S/C on what is meant by supervisor/manager (e.g. someone who is responsible for directing the work of others, even if they are not doing performance reviews).
- It was mentioned that those planning the meetings should consider what people will be willing to talk about if their immediate supervisor is present at the same meeting. It was stated that trying to manage and plan for different meetings of different levels of management at the same meeting is quite complicated. If that is going to be part of the planning, it should be managed locally in the D/S/C to decide who should be going to which meeting.
- Should a message go to all-hands and open it up to anyone who considers themselves a supervisor?
- Kay has the impression that YKK is planning to have three meetings.
- It will be interesting to see who comes (this implies that it will be optional). What fraction of supervisors/managers will willingly come? The invitation should be worded such that these meetings are important to the Directorate for such-and-such reasons.
- It would be very good to make sure that these meetings are more about discussions and seeking feedback, and less so about a presentation (not to exclude the presentation part).

Feedback on Bruce's column regarding alternative work schedules (AWS):

- It was great that Bruce put a column together in response to two inquiries regarding this topic (that we think came via the EAG).
- Kay: her understanding is that the Directorate has decided that additional AWS's is "off the table" (recognizing that the couple of groups presently doing it will continue to do it).
 - Bruce's remarks at our July 2011 meeting seemed to indicate a willingness to discuss the topic and see if there are ways we can do it and address the concerns that Sr. Management has.
 - **Action item: the Steering Committee will ask Bruce at our next meeting whether or not the AWS issue is up for discussion, or is it closed.**
- There is a DOE Order on sustainability, with a requirement to reduce our carbon footprint.
- It was mentioned that the Fermi Site Office uses an AWS (9-80, so every other week there is a day off), and it works.
- Kay mentioned there are some technical issues:
 - Non-exempt work-weeks would need to be changed so that they don't get OT for "extra" hours worked one week in a 9-80 schedule.
- There is also the issue that some managers are receptive to AWS and flex-time, but others are not, which leads to inconsistency and the feeling of unfairness.
 - How do we address the belief that some managers will not allow employees to do "flex time", but others do? Does the Lab need a policy on this topic which would provide guidance and a framework for everyone to use?
 - Kay said there is a policy on flex-time, but the use of it is left up to the discretion of the supervisor.
 - **Action item: Kay said she would have WDRS revisit the flex-time policy and explore the possibilities of expanding it. Timing for being able to provide an update would be perhaps three months from now.**

Any other business:

- Following up on a suggestion by another EAG member, Eileen suggested that we **include links to the other known electronic suggestion boxes on the EAG web submission page**. The group agreed this was a good idea.
- An incoming EAG member told Eileen that they received an initial message letting them know they were selected to be members of the EAG, and that a follow-up message from Pier would soon follow. No such message has followed, and the individual was wondering if they were still going to be on the EAG. **It was suggested that we pass this along to Katie so that she can follow up with the new members.**