

Attachment 5b cont'd. (2)

the reasons I came to the University/Research setting. It was a definite goal to sharpen this skill. In reference to the example given to substantiate the criticism, I can only say that the comments are a mystery. I do not ever remember being challenged with the assignment stated. I was asked to do a very quick rewriting of the procedures, but nothing more (a task that had to be done so quickly that there was no time for personal investigation, only to change a few words in similar procedures from another document). It is my recollection that I could never get a satisfying answer as to the extent of my involvement and that I submitted my changes with the question: "Is there anything else I can do to help?" In fact, I asked this two or three times. If I was told and understood that my involvement was to be more than the processing program and rewriting the procedures, I would not consider the Evaluation comments sufficient; I would consider myself to be a jerk and not responsible enough to be in this field.

I recommend that this criticism, not be totally dismissed, but considerably altered for the final evaluation. If I am at fault in this matter it is from a misunderstanding -- nothing more. This criticism was salt in a very deep wound.

Limitation 2: We have discussed this problem at length in the past, therefore I will not draw out this comment with facts and incidences more than necessary. I contend that my feelings are true and in reality are born out of PI's in this group being intensely paranoid about anybody trying to sneak into a position of power within their projects. I find myself caught between honoring their feelings of paranoia, since I have witnessed everybody in our group succumb to such deviousness from others in ASC, and trying to perform my QA tasks as well as getting involved with other aspects of each project besides the routine assignments.

Paranoid

Communicate

I must strongly request one of two actions be taken: 1) to place this criticism on every other professional evaluation in the ARL group, or 2) remove it from mine.

My lack of willingness to communicate with others in this group is a reaction to feeling like I'm intruding or that I'm being manipulated (a common occurrence here, and totally unacceptable to me). These are the only two feelings that I have ever had in my employment at DRI.

support for statement

In response to informal conversations, my last recollection at attempting to get involved was with local interests. I asked you if help was needed on the weekend Washoe inversion study, to which you answered yes, but never told me when the test tests would take place. I asked another five times concerning this same study as well as the more formal Washoe County proposals, to which he responded by saying first "What for?" and then on subsequent tries that I would be needed periodically to calibrate some analyzers or that I have submitted a proposal

Attachment 5b- cont'd. (3)

for audits, but nothing about aerosol characterization or meteorological modeling or pollutant transformations, as I specifically requested to be part of a team to study.

How do you classify instances when someone informally mentions to me that they had a chance to bid on QA work within Nevada and turned it down because of politics; without ever mentioning the opportunity to me until its too late?

Limitation 3: Once again, a subject we have discussed. The history behind that particular proposal (you should check the other proposals I've written here to prove to yourself that this example is not my regular style) has to do with my attempt at trying to write a proposal, report section, memo, or letter for others, knowing only part of the story. Various criticisms were: I miss the point, too detailed, not enough depth, or not exactly what was wanted. Well, I decided in this case to avoid any misunderstanding by requesting that the person asking for the proposal give me an outline of what he wanted (this is an example of my lacking communication skills) including topics (types of analyzers) and depth of discussion required for this particular document (is it for a pre-proposal, statement of capabilities, or a serious proposal?). Two days later I accidentally noticed some papers in the typing box that attempted to describe the QA task. When questioned about if the person said that it was easier just to do it himself. The 3-page attempt was wholly inadequate. This was a heavy straw on a cart already overloaded with DRI frustrations and resulted in my not getting to sleep until 4 a.m. By the time I came in to work, after deciding to go ahead and write his proposal section myself, I was still delirious from the ignorance and lack of courtesy from one of my peers, and lack of sleep that I wrote a piece which could only be taken by a sane reader as an indication that somewhere someone was horribly frustrated and filled with contempt for the way his peers treat him and was on the brink of becoming irrational. Anyone not seeing this has to have one or more of the following problems: 1) lack of sensitivity, 2) irrational enough to believe what was being read was a straight forward attempt, or 3) trying to set someone up on grounds for dismissal. Was there ever a thought to sit down with me and simply ask why?

The final point I would like to make concerning this criticism has to do with the content of my humorous brand vs. the one submitted (overlooking the technical and typing mistakes). Here is a comparison:

Attachment 5b cont'd. (4)

Brand X Audit

Challenge analyzer
report finding

Capirci Audit

Challenge analyzer
Compare primary log
Compare chart recorder
Repeat one point
(repeatability)
Field assay gas cylinder
Site calibrator vs.
audit calibrator
Flow check site calibrator
Analyzer troubleshooting
(minimal)
Calibrator troubleshooting
Technician education
Discussion of procedures
used
Report of all findings

Concluding Comments: I encourage the help that is proposed in the Evaluation. However, my interpretation of the statement, as written and in conjunction with past discussions, is that what is really needed is some inane handholding. This is exactly the attitude that can destroy a sense of usefulness in an employee. My hope is that we can share some knowledge; it is obvious that you are more knowledgeable than I when it comes to theory of this work, but that doesn't make me an idiot.

My challenge to you is: 1) take part in a Mohave or Reid Gardner audit (don't just drop in for an hour one day), and 2) try to reproduce my program for processing filter data using Lotus 123 in a short amount of time (you already have a grand headstart, since I deal with computers once every 3 years, and 123 has been installed).