

## EDGE G Part II Position Evaluation Report

Employee: Meryl T. Forrest

Peer Group: Computer Science and Engineering

### Summary Scores

Factor I – Scope of Assignment	Factor II – Technical Complexity of the Assignment	Factor III – Responsibility and Authority	Factor IV – Technical and Managerial Demands
E	D	E	D

Total Score: **36**

Grade Conversion: **GS-15**

Factor I – Scope of Assignment
<p><i>The panel assigned Degree <u>E</u> for this factor because:</i> Ms. Forrest manages the overall development of the spaceNAV activity for the Agency. She has ultimate performance, cost, resource, and schedule responsibility.</p>

Factor II – Technical Complexity of the Assignment
<p><i>The panel assigned Degree <u>D</u> for this factor because:</i> The spaceNAV system must support all NASA programs that involve experimentation. These research programs are exceptionally broad, rapidly changing and have conflicting requirements. They require high levels of security and system reliability, but it must also be easy to use and provide rapid system response with maximum flexibility. A system similar to this, but providing a quarter of the functionality, was previously attempted unsuccessfully under NASA contract for a cost of \$5M. The current system was developed in-house for a fourth of the cost. It is currently the leading candidate for the 2002 Software of the Year Award. A Degree D was selected for this factor because while it involves managing development with state-of-the-art technology, the application and integration of these broad tools advances the state-of-the-art for test process support. The successful delivery and distribution of this system outside of LaRC may have broad applications in future development programs.</p>

Factor III – Responsibility and Authority
<p><i>The panel assigned Degree <u>E</u> for this factor because:</i> Ms. Forrest has been given the sole responsibility for the team’s activities. These individuals are assigned to other organizations. She must negotiate for their time with their line managers. She must advocate for resources – dollars and staff—with senior managers at the center. She is pro-active in defining and mitigating the risks within the project. She delegates work to the other team members so that she can focus on</p>

the planning efforts – strategic and tactical- for the group. She leads the group in prioritizing the requested up-dates to the *spaceNAV* system. Her responsibilities include:

- Establishes overall operating policies, priorities, procedures and long and short-range plans;
- Exercising broad authority regarding programming of effort, delegation of authority and responsibility, allocation of overall resources, insuring of functional support, approval of critical actions and changes, and continuing managerial appraisal of progress coupled with authority to require appropriate corrective actions;
- Serving as an authoritative source for decisions and guidance concerning compromises and changes in program objectives relating to management of the total project effort. Such determinations are reviewed for the purpose of keeping higher levels of management informed on the status of the project.

This is consistent with the criteria established in the guideline for a Degree E rating.

#### **Factor IV – Technical and Managerial Demands**

***The panel assigned Degree D for this factor because:*** The spaceNAV team is comprised of members from other organizations, but not from other centers or outside the agency. This is consistent with a rating of Degree C. However, since there is a cooperative agreement in the works with Arnold Engineering Development Center and the assignment met or almost met some of the factors for Degree E, the panel rated this at a Degree D.

Degree E factors met include:

- 1) A high degree of resourcefulness was demonstrated to meet time and cost factors.
- 2) Conflicting nature of requirements and objectives required outstanding leadership to achieve a productive, competent, and creative climate.

Degree E factor **not** met include:

- 1) The incumbent demonstrated the primary project direction, and coordination; however, the situation was not fragmented with external organizations.
- 2) The assignment did not involve managing activities which requirements and processes of participating other agencies or organizations; however each LaRC test facility had different processes, which were sometime conflicting, and spaceNAV had to be flexible enough to adapt to the differences.
- 3) Major advances in technology or theoretical breakthroughs were not needed to achieve the project objectives.

#### ***General comments:***

The panel had no additional comments.