

RPES PANEL VIDEO SCRIPT

[DR. LUNNEY -PANEL CHAIR] GOOD MORNING PANELIST AND GOOD MORNING AUDIENCE THIS IS OUR TRAINING PANEL AS WELL AS A REAL PANEL FOR THE RPES SYSTEM. WE ARE GOING TO START THE WAY WE NORMALLY DO, THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS THAT WE ASK THE INDEPTH REVIEWER TO DO - SOME ANONIMITY CODING FOR THE SCIENTIST INVOLVED AND FOR THE PEOPLE THAT THEY CONTACTED.

OTHERWISE THIS WILL BE RUN AS A NORMAL PANEL

I WOULD LIKE TO WELCOME EVERYBODY AND WE WILL GO AROUND THE TABLE AND INTRODUCE OURSELVES.

THERE BOTH CHRISTINE AND I WILL GO THROUGH THINGS ABOUT PANEL FUNCTIONS BEFORE WE START DISCUSSING THE PANEL CASES.

THE FIRST THING IS - THIS IS AN EVALUATION PANEL, IT'S NOT A PROMOTION PANEL YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO PROMOTE ANYBODY. WE ARE EVALUATING AND CLASSIFYING THE INDIVIDUAL CASES THAT HAS COME BEFORE THIS PANEL. EACH OF YOU HAS AN EQUAL VOICE.

WHEN WE PUT UP TH SCORES WE MAY ALL BE IN AGREEMENT, IF WE ARE IN AGREEMENT WE WILL DO A SHORTENED PANEL SUMMARY. MOST OF YOU DID ALL OF THE WORK BEFORE COMING HERE AND THAT'S THE MOST IMPORTANT THING. IF YOU'VE DONE YOUR WORK BEFORE YOU CAME HERE, YOU'VE GIVEN CHRISTINE YOUR WRITE-UPS, YOU'VE GIVEN HER THE SUMMARY OF WHO YOU HAVE CONTACTED. ALL THAT INFORMATION IS THERE TO ENSURE THAT YOU HAVE DONE YOUR JOBS AS AN INDPETH REVIEWER. AS THE PANEL GOES FORWARD WE WILL HAVE A SHORTENED DISCUSSION IF THE PANEL IS IN AGREEMENT AND DO A SHORT SUMMARY OF THE INDEPT REVIEWER'S REPORT AND GO THROUGH WITH EACH OF THE FACTORS AND EVALUATIONS. THAT WAY WE HAVE TIME TO GO THROUGHT THE DIFFICULT CASES. WE CAN SPEND 2 HOURS ON A CASE IF WE HAVE TO.

AS MUCH AS YOU MAY DO YOUR EFFORT AS INDEPTH REVIEW AND I TALKED TO EACH IF I HAD A QUESTION ON THE CASE SO THAT WE COULD HAVE A HEADS UP BEFORE TIME

WE DO OUR WORK IN ADVANCE OF THESE PANELS AND BRING IT TO THE DISCUSSION HERE. IF THERE ARE QUESTIONS THAT YOU HAVE PLEASE ASK THE INDPETH REVIEWER SO THAT WE KNOW IF THERE ARE ANY ISSUES THAT HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESSED.

THIS IS A CONFIDENTIAL DISCUSSION. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT DOES NOT GO ANYFURTHER THAN DISCUSSION OF THESE CASES AND IT'S A VERY IMPORTANT THING ABOUT RPES IS THAT THIS IS A CONFIDENTIAL DISCUSSION THAT ISSUES ABOUT SOME BODY'S CAREER CAN BE DISCUSSED FULLY BUT CONFIDENTIALLY. IF ANYBODY EVER WANTS TO BE RELIEVED AS A PANELIST, BREAKING CONFIDENTIALLY IS THE FIRST THING – YOU BREAK THAT YOU WONT BE INVITED BACK TO DO PANELS. IF SOMEBODY AFTER THIS PANEL SAYS, I KNOW YOU WERE IN BELTSVILLE ON A PANEL CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT HAPPENED, REFER THEM TO CHRISTINE. YOU DON'T TALK TO ME OR SOMEONE ELSE, YOU PASS EVERYBODY BACK TO CHRISTINE. SHE'S THE PERSONNEL REP, SHE'S THE ONLY CONTACT ABOUT THIS CASE.

IF THERE'S A QUESTION AS YOU GO ALONG, WE'LL GO BACK TO IT. WE DON'T WANT YOU TO LEAVE HERE IF YOU HAVE A QUESTION.

CHRISTINE WILL GO THROUGH ALL OF THE DETAILS OF THE DECISIONS AND WE'LL BE GOING OVER THE SCORES AND WRITING UP A PANEL REPORT IF WE NEED TO. THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR ALL THE WORK THAT YOU'VE DONE. CHRISTINE.

[CHRISTINE – PERSONNEL REPRESENTATIVE] THANK YOU DR. LUNNEY. WHAT IM GOING TO GO OVER TODAY ARE PANEL DECISIONS, WHICH I WILL PUT UP ON THE OVERHEAD IN JUST A SECOND, THE METHOD OF RECORDING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SCORES FOR EACH CASE, THE PROCEDURES FOR EDITING THE REPORTS, AND SURRENDERING PAPERWORK AT THE END OF THE REVIEW.

PANEL DECISION OPTIONS: (REFER TO OVERHEAD TRANSPARENCY)

FOR UPGRADE –UPG: THE SCIENTIST IS PERFORMING SUFFICIENT HIGH QUALITY RESEARCH THAT IS POSTIVELY IMPACTING RESEARCH GRADE LEVEL OR RESEARCH LEADERSHIP COMPONENT OF A MIXED GRADE POSITION. PROMOTION RESULTS FROM THE UPGRADE, THE PROMOTION ACTION IS AFFECTED ASAP OR WITHIN 2 PAY PERIODS. NO REPORT IS NEEDED FOR UPGRADES, BUT THE IDR'S ARS-516 AND NOTES AND TRANSPENCY THAT I WILL RECORD THE SCORES ON WILL GO TO RPE STAFF.

REMAIN-IN-GRADE OR RIG: SCIENTIST IS PERFORMING AT A LEVEL OF QUALITY AND QUANTITY SUFFICIENT TO MAINTAIN CURRENT POSITION GRADE LEVEL. A REPORT IS NEEDED. AGAIN THE IDR SUBMITS HIS NOTES AND THE 516 AND TRANSPANEKY THAT SCORES ARE RECORDING ON TO RPE STAFF.

GRADE/CATEGORY PROBLEM OR GCP: PANEL IS UNABLE TO EVALUATE THE POSITION AT OR ABOVE its CURRENT GRADE LEVEL, AND CONCLUDES THAT A SIGNIFICANT POSITION MANAGEMENT OR PERFORMANCE PROBLEM MAY EXIST. A REPORT IS NEEDED.

INSUFFICIENT FACTUAL BASES (IFB): PANEL DOES NOT HAVE SUFFICIENT FACTUAL INFORMATION TO RENDER A FAIR EVALUATION APPLYING RGEG OR THE RESEARCH GRADE EVALUATION GUIDE CRITERIA. THE CASE MAYBE OVERWRITTEN OR UNDERWRITTEN OR THERE MAY BE MAJOR UNRESOLVED DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN CASE WRITE-UP CONTACT AND IDR FACT FINDING REPORT. RPE STAFF WILL ISSUE A FORMAL RESUBMISSION NOTICE.

REFER TO SUPERGRADE OR REF: WHEN A REGULAR PANEL ASSIGNS A TOTAL OF 56 OR MORE POINTS TO A GM/GS-15 POSITION, THE POSITION IS AUTOMATICALLY SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY THE NEXT SUPERGRADE PANEL. ALL OF THE FACTOR 4 LEVEL "F" CRITERIA MUST BE MET.

SPLIT DECISION OR SPL: THIS IS THE ONLY NON-CONSENSUS DECISION OPTION. PANEL CANNOT UNANNOUSILY AGREE ON PROPER EVALUATION OF ALL FACTORS OR WHETHER RGEG IS APPLICABLE AND/OR CONTENTS OF FINAL PANEL REPORT. MAJORITY-MINORITY REPORTS ARE PREPARED DURING THE PANEL MEETING AND ARE SUBSEQUENTLY FILED BY THE PERSONNEL REP THROUGHT THE RPE STAFF FOR RESOLUTION BY THE ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR. WE WILL RETAIN THE CASE MATERIALS UNTIL NOTIFIED BY THE RPE STAFF TO DISPOSE OF THEM.

THE NEXT THING I WILL COVER IS METHOD OF RECORDING BEST ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND INITIAL SCORES. THE INITIAL SCORES ARE CALLED OUT BY PANELISTS AND RECORDED BY THE PERSONNEL REP ON A SCORE SHEET TRANSPERANCY OR ARS-517. EACH PANELIST WILL IDENTIFY BY NUMBERS 1 THROUGH 3 THE MOST SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENT, AND PROVIDE NUMERIC SCORES FROM THE RGEG FACTORS AND TOTAL POINTS ASSIGNED TO THE CASE. AFTER INITIAL SCORES ARE RECORDED THE IDR WILL DISTRIBUTE HIS/HER COPIES OF THE ARS-516 TO US, PRESENT A BRIEF ORAL REPORT SUMMARIZING RESULTS OF THE FACT-FINDING INTERVIEWS AND STATE WHO WAS CONTACTED. A GENERAL DISCUSSION OF THE CASE INVOLVING ALL PANELISTS WILL FOLLOWS. THE CHAIR THEN LEADS A FACTOR-BY-FACTOR DISCUSSION OF THE CASE BEGINNING WITH FACTOR 4 AND LEADING TO FACTORS 1 THROUGH 3. THE DISCUSSION FIRST, DEALS ONLY WITH THE FACTS OF THE FACTORS. FOR EXAMPLE, WHAT WHERE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE ENTIRE PANELS OPINON AND WHAT ARE THE CURRENT OBJECTIVES BEING PURSUED AS VERIFIED BY THE IDR. AFTER THE FACT FOR EACH FACTOR ARE AGREED UPON THE PANEL DETERMINES THE APPROPRIATE RGEG LEVEL. PANELISTS AGREEMENT ON ALL FACTOR SCORES MUST BE REACHED OR A SPLIT DECISION OCCURS.

PROCEDURES FOR EDITING REPORTS WHEN REQUIRED. FOR REMAIN IN GRADE OR RIG DECISIONS, THE PANEL MUST EDIT THE IDR'S ARS-516 TO GENERATE A NARRATIVE REPORT WHEN THE RATIONAL STATEMENT INCLUDING SUMMARY SENTENCES FOR EACH FACTOR HAS BEEN EDITED THE PANEL DECIDES WHETHER GENERAL COMMENTS ARE WARRENTED. GENERAL COMMENTS SHOULD NOT BE ROUTINELY MADE BUT ARE APPROPRIATE WHEN THE PANEL NEEDS TO CITE EMERGING DEFICIENCIES OR PROVIDE CONSTRUCTIVE CRITISM TO ENHANCE PREPARATION FOR SUBSEQUENT PANEL REVIEWS.

NOTE IF A POSITION IS SCORED REMAIN IN GRADE – RIG AT BOTTOM OF THE GRADE A CAUTIONARY MESSAGE IS PROBABLY APPROPRIATE.

NARRATIVE PANEL REPORTS ARE NOT REQUIRED FOR UPGRADE OR UPG DECISIONS AND THE PANEL NEED NOT EDIT THE ARS-516.

FOR IFB, INSUFFICIENT FACTUAL BASIS AND GRADE-CATEGORY PROBLEM, GCPDECISIONS ONLY A BRIEF NARRATIVE STATEMENT NEED BE PREPARED. FOR IFB, SPECIFY DEFICIENCIES THAT MUST BE CORRECTED BEFORE THE CASE IS RESUBMITTED. FOR GCP USE ONLY A STANDARD SUMMARY STATEMENT.

NO REPORT ISREQUIRED FOR REFER TO SUPERGRADE.

PANELISTS ARE NOT AUTHORIZED TO KEEP COPIES OF ANY CASE MATERIALS EXCEPT EXHIBITS ON SPLITS DECISIONS ON POSITIONS THEY REVIEW.

LASTLY, NECESSITY TO SURRENDER ALL WRITE-UP PRINTOUTS AND EVALUATION NOTES FOR EACH CASE THAT HAS BEEN DECIDED - CASE MATERIALS, ALL INITIAL SCORING DATA AND RELATED NOTES EXCEPT THE IDR NOTES WHICH WILL BE HANDED OVER TO THE PERSONNEL REP ALONG WIT THE ARS ARS-516 WILL BE DISPOSED OF AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE PANEL. CASES WILL NORNALLY BE REVIEWED IN ASSENDING, GRADE-LEVEL , ALPHA ORDER. WITH THAT WE WILL BEGIN OUR FIRST CASE.

[DR. LUNNEY] DOES ANY ONE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS BEFORE WE BEGIN?

FOR CONFIDENTIALLY OF THE PEOPLE BEING REVIEWED, THE FIRST SCIENTIST WILL BE REFERRED TO AS DR. A. BRYAN IS THE INDEPTH REVIEWER, BUT LET'S FIRST DO RECORD THE SCORES.

[CHRISTINE] DR. LAWRENCE

[DR LAWRENCE - PANELIST] ACCOMPLISHMENTS 3, 6 AND 8

[CHRISTINE] GIVE ME YOUR SCORES STARTING WITH FACTOR 1, 2, 3, and 4

[DR. LAWRENCE] 6, 8, 6 and 16

[CHRISTINE] 6, 8, 6, and 16

[DR. LAWRENCE] AND IT'S 36

[CHRISTINE] DR. MEGNSTU, YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS FIRST

[DR. MENGISTU - PANELIST] 4, 6, AND 8

[CHRISTINE] YOUR SCORES STARTING WITH FACTOR 1, 2, 3, 4

[DR. MENGISTU] 8, 8, 8, and 12

[CHRISTINE] 8, 8, 8, and 12 FOR TOTAL OF WHAT

[DR. MENGISTU] 36

[CHRISTINE] DR. BAILEY

[DR. BAILEY - IDR] ACCOMPLISHMENTS ARE 5, 6, and 8 AND SCORES 6,, 8, 8, and 16 FOR A TOTAL OF 38

[CHRISTINE] 6, 8, 8, and 16 FOR A TOTAL OF 38

[DR. BAILEY] YES

[CHRISTINE] DR. POGUE

[DR. POGUE - PANELIST] ACCOMPLISHMENTS 5, 6 AND 8 SCORE IS 8, 10, 8, 16, 42

[CHRISTINE] DR. REHNER

[DR. REHNER - PANELIST] ACCOMPLISHMENTS 5, 7, and 8 SCORES ARE 8, 8, 8 and 16, FOR 40

[CHRISTINE] DR. LUNNEY

[DR. LUNNEY] 5, 6 AND 8. Scores are 8, 8, 8, 16 FOR 40

[CHRISTINE] MY SCORES 8, 8, 8, 16 , and 40

[DR LUNNEY] PUT THE SCORES UP PLEASE

[CHRISTINE] OK

[DR. LUNNEY] AS WE LOOK AT THE SCORING YOU WILL SEE THAT EVERYONE SCORED BETWEEN 36 AND 40 AND THAT WOULD MEAN A PROMOTE DECISION. GOOD CONSENSUS AMONG THE PANELISTS SO IM ASKING OUR INDEPTH REVIEWER TO DO AN ABBREVIATED INDEPTH REVIEW REPORT AND THEN WE WILL HAVE AN ABBREVIATED DISCUSSION OF THIS CASE.

[DR. BAILEY] OK, FIRST I'LL TELL YOU THE CONTACTS I MADE. I CONTACTED THE AREA DIRECTOR WHICH WAS EDGAR KING. OF COURSE I CONTACTED THE RESEARCH LEADER, LAWRENCE YOUNG; I CONTACTED GLEN HARTMAN A PLANT PATHOLOGIST IN URBANA; BEN MATTHEWS HERE IN BELTSVILLE A PLANT PHYSIOLOGIST, ALL WORKING WITH SOYBEAN; THEN I WENT ON AND CONTACTED DR. HEATHERLY WHO IS WITH THE MISSISSIPPI SOYBEAN PROMOTION BOARD; AND A DR. (I CAN'T PRONOUNCE HIS NAME) MUNCH, THE DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AT THE UNITED SOYBEAN BOARD. NOW, IN MAKING THESE CONTACTS IT BECAME VERY CLEAR AND ON OUR CONSENSUS ON THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS SO I THOUGHT I'D POINT THAT OUT. DR. A IS WORKING WITH AND HAS WORKED WITH 3 PRIMARY DISEASES OF SOYBEAN AND HAS MADE SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITH ALL 3. THE FIRST ONE BEING SUDDEN DEATH SYNDROME. THAT WAS CARRIED OUT WHEN SHE WAS AT URBANA AND ACTUALLY COLLABORATED WITH DR. HARTMAN. AND WITH THAT WHAT SHE WAS FINDING WAS SHE LOOKED AT IS DIVERSITY ARE VERY IMPORTANT. YOU NEED TO HAVE A DIVERSE PANEL TO SCREEN FOR RESISTANCE. SHE ALSO DID SOME OTHER WORK LOOKING AT TOXINS PRODUCED BY THAT ORGANISM. QUITE INTERESTING WORK. WHEN SHE WENT INTO STONEVILLE EVERYONE PROBABLY REMEMBERS WHEN SOYBEAN RUST WAS A REALLY HOT TOPIC. SOYBEAN RUST WAS COMING INTO THE UNITED STATES AND ARS BEGAN A SIGNIFICANT EFFORT LOOKING AT SOYBEAN RUST. AND SO THERE SHE WAS INVOLVED IN SCREENING FOR RESISTANCE TO SOYBEAN RUST AND DID SOME OF THE EARLY WORK WITH THAT. SO THAT WAS SOME GOOD ACCOMPLISHMENTS. I GOT THAT FROM HER RESEARCH LEADER. AND THEN SHE ALSO COLLABORATOR WITH BEN MATTHEWS AND THAT WAS A COLLABORATION WHERE SHE PRODUCED INFECTED MATERIAL. SHE HAS A QUARANTINE LAB WHERE SHE CAN PRODUCE INFECTED MATERIAL AND SHE PRODUCED THAT MATERIAL AND SENT IT BEN MATTHEWS HERE IN BELTSVILLE, AND THEY'VE BEEN DOING SOME TRANSCRIPT ANALYSIS, SOME FAIRLY ADVANCED WORK. BUT REALLY DR. A'S STRONG SUIT RIGHT NOW IS WORKING WITH PHOMOPSIS SEED DECAY IN SOYBEANS. AND THIS IS WHERE TALKING WITH DR. HEATHERLY WAS IMPORTANT. DR. HEATHERLY, WITH THE MISSISSIPPI SOYBEAN PROMOTION BOARD, ACTUALLY WORKED WITH ARS IN DEVELOPING WHAT WAS AN EARLY SOYBEAN PLANTING PROGRAM. THE WHOLE GOAL OF THIS EARLY SOYBEAN PLANTING WAS TO AVOID DROUGHT. THE PROBLEM WITH THAT PROCESS IS THAT WHEN YOU PLANT THE SOYBEANS EARLY YOU CAN GET HEAVY RAINS IN LATE SUMMER AND THOSE HEAVY RAINS CAN CAUSE PHOMOPSIS SEED DECAY, AND DR. A. HAS BEEN VERY IMPORTANT IN SCREENING FOR RESISTANCE TO THAT SEED DECAY. SO THAT IS A VERY IMPORTANT DISEASE IN THE SOUTH, SPECIFICALLY IN THE SOUTH, WHEREAS THE SUDDEN DEATH SYNDROME IS MORE IN THE MIDWEST. PHOMOPSIS SEED DECAY IS VERY IMPORTANT IN THE REGION WHERE DR. A. IS WORKING. EVERYONE WAS QUITE HAPPY WITH DR. A.'S EFFORTS. SHE HAS ACCOMPLISHED WELL, HAS PUBLISHED WELL, HER

WORK IS RECEIVED BY THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY QUITE WELL. AND ALWAYS OUTGOING, EVERYBODY SAYS OUTGOING, HARD WORKER AND TRIES TO DO THE JOB.

[DR. LUNNEY] AND HER PUBLICATIONS?

[DR. BAILEY] WELL, PUBLICATIONS, IF YOU LOOKED AT THE LIST, IT IS QUITE AN EXTENSIVE LIST OF PUBLICATIONS FOR A GS-13. NOW I DID HAVE ONE CONCERN WITH THE PUBLICATION LIST. AND THAT WAS THE FIRST AUTHOR WAS ALMOST ALWAYS ITALICIZED IF IT WASN'T DR. A. AND THAT USUALLY MEANS DIRECT SUPERVISION AND IN THIS CASE, THAT'S NOT NECESSARILY THE CASE. A LOT OF THESE ARE INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIONS WHERE DR. A MAYBE ON A COMMITTEE OR A STUDENT THAT SORT OF THING. BUT MAINLY, IT'S NOT DIRECTLY SUPERVISING. IN FACT, I ASKED THE RESEARCH LEADER IF ANY OF THESE PEOPLE WERE ACTUALLY IN STONEVILLE AND NONE OF THEM WERE IN STONEVILLE FROM WHAT I WAS TOLD. BUT THAT I REALLY DIDN'T THINK WAS IMPORTANT SIMPLY BECAUSE THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OUTSIDE OF THAT WERE EXTENSIVE SO I DIDN'T SEE THAT AS A REAL ISSUE.

YEAH, THAT WOULD BE THE ONLY ISSUE.

[DR. LUNNEY] SO SHE SHOULDN'T HAVE USED ITALICS FOR SOMETHING SHE DIDN'T DIRECTLY SUPERVISE, SHE WAS ON A COMMITTEE FOR THEM?

[DR BAILEY] RIGHT, AND THERE'S SOME DISCREPANCY ABOUT HOW THAT'S HANDLED BUT I'M JUST SURPRISED THAT NONE OF THEM WERE IN STONEVILLE. BEYOND THAT IT WAS QUITE A GOOD CASE.

[DR. LUNNEY] SUSAN ANY COMMENTS ON THE CASE?

[DR. LAWRENCE] NO, I DON'T THINK SO.

[DR. LUNNEY] ALEMU ANY COMMENTS?

[DR. MENGISTU] YES A COUPLE OF COMMENTS THAT I HAVE IN THE LIST OF PUBLICATIONS SOME OF THE PUBLICATIONS SHE HAS IN LIME DISEASE MANAGEMENT REPORT IS NOT CONSIDERED A PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION. THERE ARE ABOUT 8 OR 9 OF THOSE LISTED IN THE PUBLICATIONS.

[DR. LUNNEY] SO THEY SHOULD BE IN THE ADDITIONAL PUBLICATIONS RATHER THAN IN PUBLICATIONS

[DR. MENGISTU] YES THEY SHOULD BE LISTED IN ADDITIONAL PUBLICATIONS. AND THAT HAS ACTUALLY ELIMINATED A NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS

THE SECOND POINT I HAVE IS THAT I AM IN THE SAME UNIT AS DR. A AND IF YOU LOOK AT THE REFERENCES LISTED THE SCIENTIST WORKS WITH ABOUT 9 DIFFERENT SCIENTISTS CLOSELY ON THE SAME PROJECTS AND NONE OF THEM HAVE BEEN LISTED AS CONTACTS. OF THE PEOPLE EXCEPT FOR THE AREA DIRECTOR AND THE RL NONE OF THE SCIENTIST IN STONEVILLE WAS CONTACTED AND THAT FOR ME HAS SOME CONCERN.

[DR. LUNNEY] NONE OF THEM WERE LISTED AS A CONTACT AND TYPICALLY YOU WOULD EXPECT THAT SOME WOULD ON THAT LIST.

[DR. MEGNISTU] THE LEAD SCIENTIST SHOULD HAVE BEEN AT LEAST ONE OF THEM. SO THERE ARE CERTAIN ISSUES THAT THEY PROBABLY HAVE.

[DR. BAILEY] I DID NOTE THE PLANT DISEASE MANAGEMENT AND I ACTUALLY ASKED THE RESEARCH LEADER AND ONE OF THE OTHER SCIENTISTS, I FORGET WHICH ONE, ABOUT THAT AND WHAT THEY SAID, WHICH I ACTUALLY DISAGREE WITH, IT IS PEER REVIEWED, EDITED BY THE EDITOR, BY THE EDITOR, AND SO THE RESEARCH LEADER SHOULD HAVE DEALT WITH THAT ISSUE, BUT AGAIN, BUT TAKING THOSE OFF THE PUBLICATION LIST IS STILL SUBSTANTIAL. I ALSO DID NOTE THAT DR. A IS NOT PUBLISHING WITH OTHER SCIENTISTS ON THE PROJECT THAT SHE IS ON. AND IN TALKING WITH PEOPLE, IT SEEMS LIKE THAT IS AN ISSUE, BUT DR. A GETS AROUND THAT BY COLLABORATING WITH SCIENTISTS IN OTHER AREAS. FOR EXAMPLE, IN ILLINOIS, MISSOURI, ARKANSAS, AND ELSEWHERE. TO THE POINT THAT IT ISN'T PREVENTING HER FROM ACCOMPLISHING RESEARCH. PERSONALITY ISSUES WITHIN UNITS ARE NOT UNCOMMON. AND ACTUALLY I WAS TOLD THAT BY OTHER PEOPLE THAT I'VE TALKED WITH. WHETHER THAT IS SOMETHING THAT WE NEED TO BE CONCERNED ABOUT, I THINK IT WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT THE RESEARCH LEADER SHOULD BE CONCERNED WITH.

[DR. LUNNEY] THAT'S A LINE MANAGEMENT ISSUE.

[DR. BAILEY] SO HAVING ACCOMPLISHED UNDER THOSE CONDITIONS WHAT SHE HAS ACCOMPLISHED, I THINK STILL SUPPORTS THE WAY WE'RE LOOKING AT THE PROJECTS. MY ONLY, MY ACTUAL REAL CONCERN WAS THAT DR. A'S INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATIONS, WHICH IS REALLY THE NEXT STEP, SEEM TO BE TIED TO ONE COUNTRY. AND A LOT OF PUBLICATIONS COME THROUGH THAT WITH STUDENTS AND THAT SORT OF THING, SO I DON'T PUT A LOT OF WEIGHT ON THAT ESPECIALLY BECAUSE IT'S NOT NECESSARILY THAT THERE IS A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF IMPACT EVEN IN THAT COUNTRY SO I THINK THAT IS BUT THAT IS SOMETHING FOR THE NEXT.

[DR. LUNNEY] BECAUSE IN CHINA SOYBEANS ARE NOT A MAJOR CROP OR?

[DR. BAILEY] NO, THEY ARE A MAJOR CROP, THE IMPACT WILL PROBABLY BECOME MORE IMPORTANT , BUT WHAT'S BEING DONE WITH THE WORK IT'S JUST NOT THAT BIG OF AN IMPACT NOW.

[DR. LUNNEY] DID YOU CONTACT ANY OF THE OTHER SCIENTISTS IN THE UNIT BESIDES THE RL?

[DR. BAILEY] I DID NOT. IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT I DO, BUT I ACTUALLY TALKED TO DR. HEATHERLY WHO WAS FROM THAT UNIT DOWN THERE AND HE GAVE ME THE WHOLE STORY, BUT HE WAS IN THAT UNIT.

[DR. LUNNEY] SO HE'S AT THE SOYBEAN BOARD NOW AND HE WAS IN THAT UNIT.

[DR. BAILEY] YES AND HE WAS IN THAT UNIT. AND ACTUALLY HE WAS HOPING THAT I HADN'T ASKED THAT QUESTION. BUT I DID ASK HIM THAT QUESTION AND HE GAVE ME A PRETTY GOOD AND HE'S OVER THERE ALL THE TIME AND HE GAVE ME A GOOD DESCRIPTION OF WHAT WAS GOING ON.

[DR. LUNNEY] OK, AND SO, WERE JUDGING THE SCIENCE AND THE OUT PUT OF HER CAREER. IS THERE ANY OTHER QUESTIONS YOU HAVE ALEMU?

[DR. MENGISTU] NO, I WAS JUST RAISING THOSE QUESTIONS BECAUSE IF YOU LOOK AT HEATHERLY HIMSELF HE RETIRED BEFORE SHE STARTED THE JOB, SO HIS JUDGEMENT IS QUESTIONABLE. HE'S FAR AWAY, HE'S IN TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE WHICH IS ABOUT 8 HOURS AWAY. BUT HE IS WORKING FOR MISSISSIPPI SOYBEAN PROMOTION BOARD BECAUE HE WAS HIRED TO CARRY OUT SOME PROJECTS FOR THEM BUT HE DOESN'T HAVE THE LEVEL OF CONTACTS AS I KNOW.

[DR. BAILEY] THE IMPRESSIVE THING IS THAT DR. A HAS GOTTEN FUNDING FROM BOTH THE MISSISSIPPI SOYBEAN BOARD AND THE UNITED SOYBEAN BOARD AND HAS HAD IT REPEATEDLY RE-FUNDED, SO THAT'S A GOOD RECOMMENDATION.

[DR. LUNNEY] AND SHE'S A PI ON SOME OF THAT FUNDING.

[DR. BAILEY] Yeah, SHE IS PI on the funding.

[DR. BAILEY] THE END USERS ARE QUITE HAPPY WITH WHAT SHE IS DOING BECAUSE THEY ARE CONTINUING TO FUND HER WORK. AND THAT GOES ALL THE WAY BACK TO ACCOMPLISHMENT 2. SO THAT'S A BIG OVER TIME. RIGHT NOW THE BIG EFFORT WITH THE UNITED SOYBEAN BOARD IS PHOMOPSIS SEED DECAY, SO THEY OBVIOUSLY THINK SHE'S GOING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION WITH THIS.

[DR. LUNNEY] STEVE ANY COMMENTS

[DR. REHNER] OTHER THAN THE MISCLASSIFICATION OF THE PUBLICATIONS, I REALLY HAD NO OBJECTIONS. SEEMS SHE HAS A DIVERSE AND STRONG RESEARCH PROGRAM WITH LOTS OF EXTERNAL COLLABORATIONS.

[DR. LUNNEY] MIKE?

[DR. POGUE] YES, I AGREE I THOUGHT THE PUBLICATION RECORD WAS PRETTY GOOD FOR THAT LEVEL

[DR. LUNNEY] CHRISTINE?

[CHRISTINE] NO, I THINK SHE'S DONE GREAT WORK

[DR. LUNNEY] AND KNOW IF WE LOOK AT THE SCORES. FIRST IF WE LOOK AT THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS, IT APPEARS TO BE 5, 6, AND 8 WOULD BE THE CONSENSUS. ON FACTOR 1 THE INDEPTH REVIEWER SCORE AT 6 MANY PEOPLE SCORED AT 8. BRYAN DO YOU WANT TO

[DR. BAILEY] IM FINE WITH 8 MY CONCERN WITH 8 IS THAT I DIDN'T THINK DR. A WAS BEING GIVEN ENOUGH RESPONSIBILITY, NOT THAT SHE WASN'T CAPABLE.

[DR. LUNNEY] THAT'S INTERESTING

[DR. BAILEY] I WILL GO TO 8

[DR. LUNNEY] AND SUSAN

[DR. LAWRENCE] YES, SURE

[DR. LUNNEY] SO THE CONSENSUS WOULD BE 8. AND FACTOR 2, MIKE YOU SCORED AT 10

[DR. POGUE] IN HER CASE WRITE-UP IT SAID NO TECHNICAL SUPERVISION IS GIVEN BY A SUPERVISOR AND IF YOU LOOK AT THE EVALUATION CRITERIA AT LEVEL E WHICH IS 10 POINTS THERE'S NO SUPERVISION SO THAT'S WHY I SCORED IT THAT WAY.

[DR. LUNNEY] OK, BUT COULD YOU COME TO CONSENSUS AT 8

[DR. POGUE] I COULD COME TO CONSENSUS AT 8 YES

[DR. LUNNEY] AND FACTOR 3 SUSAN

[DR. LAWRENCE] YES IM THE OUTLIER. OK, SURE.

[DR. LUNNEY] THAT IS ORIGINALTY.

[DR. LAWRENCE] OK

[DR. LUNNEY] AND THEN FACTOR 4, ALEMU COULD YOU COME UPTO 16 FOR CONSENSUS

[DR. MENGISTU] YES

[DR. LUNNEY] SO THE CONSENSUS SCORE IS 8 8 8 16 FOR 40. SO THE DECISION IS TO UPGRADE IF ANYONE HAS PAPER WORK FOR THIS CASE PLEASE GIVE IT TO CHRISTINE. THIS IS FINISHED.