

*This material is part of a collection that documents the harassment, discrimination, and retaliation perpetrated against Alaska's women research scientists by their supervisor, with full knowledge (and arguably, "tacit approval") of their federal employer, the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS)*

Interviewer Initials \_\_\_\_\_

Scribe Initials \_\_\_\_\_

## **Consolidated Assistance, Review and Evaluation (CARE) Location Questionnaire**

Location Being Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Person Being Interviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Please review the following questions to help you prepare for your confidential personal interview with the CARE Team during your Location Review. Comments concerning your expectations and satisfaction with the delivery of administrative support services will enhance the ability of the CARE Team to evaluate the efficiency and delivery of service you are receiving at the Location.

NOTE: Not all questions may apply to your particular situation.

---

### **How is information disseminated at your Location? What are your suggestions for improvement?**

Information is generally provided through email. Staff meetings are often hastily convened to issue tentative, sometimes contradictory information, (but there is no written record, as provided by email, to contest incorrect assertions later). I'd like a set meeting schedule (if possible), with a pre-meeting agenda and a post-meeting summary emailed out.

### **Do you feel the Location works as a team? What improvements would you suggest?**

We are NOT a team! For example, in my project I have no collaborations with other SYs in the Unit, (which was not my expectation and certainly not my choice when I accepted this job). The Research Leader sets the tone for the Unit, and I am trying hard to avoid isolation. The RL has misused his power to prevent several legitimate collaborations. He discourages communication within the unit, (he refers to it as "gossip"). He also specifically "counseled" me on which scientists I should (and should not!) associate with in the unit. Improvements? We really can't move forward until we have new leadership.

### **What are your comments on the delivery of procurement support and services (supplies, services, equipment, construction, and repair & maintenance)?**

It's good. I always go through the AO, Janis Contento, and the job always gets done.

### **What are your comments on the delivery of facilities management including physical security, your workspace, safety, health and environmental management?**

It's probably okay. (It's not a big issue.)

**What are your comments on the delivery of human resources support and services (benefits, time & attendance, awards, recruitment, etc.)?**

It certainly takes a lot of paperwork...

Appraisal awards are not equitably distributed among the SYs. It seems to depend entirely on securing friendship with the RL, not on a scientist's annual performance.

Last year I was denied the ability to reward outstanding technician performance. The reason (according to the RL and Lead Scientist): it is better to recognize employees only once a year at their performance appraisal. This excluded the possibility of a spot award for successfully handling a difficult component of the research earlier in the year, so I strongly disagreed. However, I had no power to change the situation.

**Are your major duties and responsibilities described in your position description? If you are a supervisor, how often do you review subordinates' position descriptions?**

I have just re-written my original (grossly inaccurate) position description (PD) for my recent RPES case. The RL did not understand the person-in-the-job concept, and my PD became a source of contention between us, (due to major administrative misconduct issues during my initial hiring in 2004, when an officially classified GS 13/14 position description was inaccurately assigned GS 12 ratings by an ad hoc RPES panel). Based on those experiences, my understanding of the PD is that it is just another piece of administrative paperwork, and its accuracy is of little concern to the ARS.

As for reviewing my technician's position description, that is not an issue for me. Although the male scientists in Fairbanks all have permanent technicians, the two female scientists were only given temporary techs, so I generally review the PD every time I hire a new tech. I've been through two techs since I arrived in Oct 2004. (Just in case it isn't obvious, technician-turnover is extremely disruptive to building a research program.)

**Are your training needs reflected on your individual development plan? Are they being met? If not, why not?**

The workplace is currently too stressful and the demands on my time are too high to engage in outside training. However, that is not to imply that I have allowed a lapse in my continuing education. I have just spent the last five months (on my own time) educating myself on the ARS grievance process, Civil Rights polices, EEO, and Code of Federal Regulations. These became my (unforeseen) development needs, and I addressed them. It would be truly helpful to have the ARS-administrative attacks on my career stopped, so that I could devote more energy to my research.

**Comment on your work hours and your ability to take leave.**

Please check out Section 3 (Leave) in our (somewhat Draconian) location policy manual. As a professional, I bristle at the micromanagement that asks me to notify my supervisor whenever I leave my office. They already get considerably more than 40 hrs/wk from me. I believe I deserve the flexibility in my work schedule (e.g. telecommuting, flex-time, etc...) as described in ARS policy manuals, but it's just too time-consuming to fight for it.

**In what ways are you being recognized for the work you do?**

I am isolated and generally ignored (which is preferable to being verbally and administratively attacked, as the other women scientists often are). Before I started filing grievances I received an annual bonus, but apparently that part of my life is now over.

**What are your comments on the delivery of information technology products, support and services (hardware, software, telephone systems, Internet access, etc.)?**

Things are great. However, it's mostly done through the UAF School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences, not ARS.

**What is your opinion on Agency issued policies and procedures? Have you come across any that need clarification?**

I've downloaded and pored over a lot of them. Specific ARS policies are sometimes difficult to find, unclear, or seemingly contradictory. When in doubt, I track the policy back to the US Code of Regulations for clarification.

**ARS has a policy on acceptable use of Information Technology resources. Based on this policy, how would you recognize and report misuse of Information Technology resources?**

I am familiar with the ARS policy, (and also aware of documentation protocols for employee misconduct). However, I've never witnessed misuse of IT resources by the people I supervise.

**What are your comments on the delivery of accounting and financial management support and services (Status of Funds Reports, ARMP, etc.)?**

The RL does not allow us to see the final version of the accepted ARMPs. This is a source of contention. Presumably the financial management aspects of the document are handled appropriately by the support staff.

**What are your comments on the delivery of travel support and services?**

The (phone-based) system just changed over to an internet service, so it's going to be a learning curve.

**What are your comments on the delivery of extramural agreements support and services (Specific Cooperative Agreements, CRADAs, Grants, etc.)?**

I was ADODR of one SCA. I guess the system was okay. (I have nothing to compare it to.)

**Besides the things we have already discussed, is there anything that impairs your ability to do your job?**

I know that the CARE team is not here to handle EEO violations, but the Research Leader discriminates against women! The Pacific West Area is aware of the problem and has done nothing to improve the situation, thereby facilitating (if not actively supporting) further abuses of RL power. Program interference and workplace stress are what impair my ability to do my job, not administrative paperwork.

---