Clocking and Scientific Research

the opinion of the scientific community.

Edited by:
M.Macrì, National Spokesperson of INFN researchers
S.Bellucci, Researchers co-spokesperson, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
S.Bianco, Researchers co-spokesperson, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
A.Sansoni, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati

November 13th, 1998

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

The following chapters assemble the opinions and standpoints of italian and foreign scientists with regard to the assessment of results of research work.

This collection was inspired by a manifesto signed by researchers from the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN) and associated universities, which was distributed to the international scientific community. The circumstance giving rise to this intellectual mobilization was the absence of any sign that the promised experimentation to evaluate work performed by government researchers was to start. The scientific community was prompt in giving its support as this document testify.

Research activity is assessed according to its content and results. Italian law, however, stipulates that for all government agencies, hence research institutes such as INFN, performance should be monitored using pre-defined objective procedures. For all government institutes and agencies this assessment is based on clocking in and out.

This is obviously as well as totally unsuitable for the purposes of research work. Even the present contract of employment incorporates this principle. Indeed it stipulates that proper ways of assessing research activity should be introduced, after an initial period of experimentation, as alternative to clocking. This regulation has so far been ignored and, in default of any effort by the signatories of the employment contract to resolve the issue, strict adherence to clocking has been decided. In the absence of any evidence that experimentation of alternative procedures was about to begin, INFN researchers have promoted this awareness campaign.

In the following we have collected the opinions and suggestions of all those

who replied to our appeal. The overwhelming majority clearly expressed the opinion that scientific output should not be controlled by bureaucratic means such as clocking. It is interesting to note that clocking has been proposed or even introduced in other research institutes, but it has nearly always been abandoned because the negative effects by far outweigh the advantages. Concern over the negative repercussions of clocking on INFN activities has been reported by the executive boards of the KLOE and FINUDA experiments, and expressed by the academic bodies of the Universities of Roma II, Roma III, Pavia and SISSA of Trieste.

This document has been given to the management of INFN and to members of the Italian Parliament hoping that the content will lead to a fruitful discussion and rapid solution to the problem of effectively assessing research work.

Of note is the welcome initiative taken by the new president of INFN, prof. E. Iarocci. Indeed, in a recent letter to the signatories of the employment contract (ARAN and the trade unions), he urges them to start alternative procedures to clocking, according to the contract.

Although the international reaction was strongly biased against clocking, and in favour of the appeal signed by the Infn scientists, recent facts do not make us confident in a favourable ending. Indeed, four colleagues of Infn Roma I and two in Frascati National Laboratories have been punished for having refused clocking: they were denied a salary raise uniquely for this reason. About forty colleagues in Infn Roma I and Frascati still refuse clocking, possibly facing very soon the same punishment.

For comments and opinions:
E-mail: macri@ge.infn.it

Chapter 2

The letter distributed

Dear Colleague,

It has been decided by the Management of INFN (Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, the Italian main Institute for High Energy Physics) that our researchers have to clock in/out from the 1st of July 1998. This means that we have to use a magnetic card to record and certify the time spent in our home offices and labs. We are also required to declare the exact time and activities for each day we spend outside our home institutes.

We think that this ruling is a useless bureaucratic nonsense.

Our embarrassment is added to by the fear that this ruling (which, to our knowledge, is totally absent in international research institutes) substitute a proper effort to find sensible and fair criteria for verifying both quantity and quality of the work done, and for encouraging scientific activities.

We think that it is extremely important to have the opinion of the international scientific community.

If you agree with us and have a few words to say on the matter, we should be very grateful if you would send your comments to Mario Macrì (mario.macri@ge.infn.it), National Spokesperson of INFN researchers.

2.1 Signed or supported by:

Antonella Antonelli Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Rinaldo Baldini Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Antonella Balerna Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Stefano Bellucci Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Gianni Bencivenni Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Maurizio Benfatto Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Maria Enrica Biagini Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Nicola Bianchi Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Stefano Bianco Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Halina Bilokon Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Caterina Bloise Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Federico Boscherini Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Fabio Bossi Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Sandro Calcaterra Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Pierluigi Campana Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Riccardo de Sangro Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Enzo De Sanctis Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Simone Dell'Agnello Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Franco L. Fabbri Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Alessandra Fantoni Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Giuseppe Finocchiaro Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Alberto Franceschi Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Paola Gianotti Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Andrea La Monaca Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Armando Lanaro Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Paolo Levi Sandri Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Augusto Marcelli Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Gianni Matone Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Stefano Miscetti Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Giuseppina Modestino Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Valeria Muccifora Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Calogero Natoli Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Massimo Pallotta Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Fabrizio Palumbo Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati

Piero Patteri Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Monica Pepe-Altarelli Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Marco Ricci Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Anna Rita Reolon Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Patrizia Rossi Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Andrea Sansoni Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Mario Spinetti Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Alessandro Stecchi Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Adriano Zallo Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati
Ornella Palamara INFN Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso
Gianluca Alimonti INFN Milano
Giuseppe Battistoni INFN Milano
Marco Giammarchi INFN Milano
Andrea Giuliani INFN Milano
Dario Menasce INFN Milano
Daniele Pedrini INFN Milano
Enrico Vigezzi INFN Milano
Vittorio Del Duca INFN Torino
Roberto Cirio INFN Torino
Nadia Pastrone INFN Torino
Carlo Giunti INFN Torino
Paolo Ciafaloni INFN Lecce
Margherita Primavera INFN Lecce
Antonio Surdo INFN Lecce
Egilio Lisi INFN Bari
Ambrogio Pantaleo INFN Bari
Lorenzo Bellagamba INFN Bologna
Despina Hatzifotiadou INFN Bologna
Simonetta Liuti INFN Roma III
Angela Badalà INFN Catania
Marcello Baldo INFN Catania
Roberto Fonte INFN Catania
Angelo Pagano INFN Catania
Andrea Rapisarda INFN Catania
Pia Astone INFN Roma I
Claudia Battista INFN Roma I

Alessandro Cardini INFN Roma I
Daniele De Pedis INFN Roma I
Annette Frenkel INFN Roma I
Giuseppe Martellotti INFN Roma I
Fabrizio Massa INFN Roma I
Leandro Nisati INFN Roma I
Enrico Pasqualucci INFN Roma I
Ludovico Pontecorvo INFN Roma I
Marco Rescigno INFN Roma I
Bruno Taglienti INFN Roma I
Stefano Veneziano INFN Roma I
Antonio Passeri INFN Roma III
Carlo Bosio INFN Sanità
Benigno Gobbo INFN Trieste
Massimo Lamanna INFN Trieste
Mauro Mezzetto INFN Padova
Giacomo Bressi INFN Pavia
Roberto Ferrari INFN Pavia
Valerio Vercesi INFN Pavia
Angela Gargano INFN Napoli
Franco Pezzella INFN Napoli
Piero Zucchelli INFN Ferrara
Marco Incagli INFN Pisa
Luca Lusanna INFN Firenze
Mario Macrì National Spokesperson of INFN researchers
Guido Pizzella Univ. Roma II
Giulio D'Agostini Univ. Roma I
Guido De Zorzi Univ. Roma I
Carlo Dionisi Univ. Roma I
Guido Martinelli Univ. Roma I
Mario Greco Univ Roma III
Pietro Negri Univ. Milano
Luca Serafini Univ. Milano
Tullio Bressani Univ. Torino
Pietro Frè Univ. Torino
Massimo Masera Univ. Torino

Cristiana Peroni Univ. Torino
Enrico Predazzi Univ. Torino
Gianluigi Boca Univ. Pavia
Gianluca Introzzi Univ. Pavia
Sergio Ratti Dean, National University Council, Univ. Pavia
Alberto Rimini Univ. Pavia
B. Carazza Univ. Parma
Adalberto Giazotto Univ. Pisa
Marisa Valdata Univ. Perugia
Fedele Lizzi Univ. Napoli
Laura La Rotonda Univ. Calabria
Ferruccio Balestra Univ. Torino
Giuseppe Pappalardo Univ. Calabria
Arnaldo Stefanini Univ. Pisa
Giorgio Parisi Univ. Roma I
Tullio Regge Univ. Torino
Aldo Covello Univ. Napoli
Ida Peruzzi Univ. Perugia
Tullio Weber Univ. Trieste
Ettore Gadioli Univ. Milano
Carlo De Marzo Univ. Bari
Ezio Ferrari Univ. Roma I
Roberto Catenacci Univ. Pavia
Raffaello Garfagnini Univ. Torino
GianCarlo Ghirardi ICTP Trieste
Riccardo Giachetti Univ. Firenze
Gian Carlo Bonazzola Univ. Torino
Carlo Maria Becchi Univ. Genova
Giancarlo Gialanella Univ. Napoli
Sigfrido Boffi Univ. Pavia
Maria di Corato Univ. Milano
Gianfranco Sartori Univ. Padova
Claudio Conta Univ. Pavia
Antonio Bassetto Univ. Padova
G.C. Mantovani Univ. Perugia
Gian Paolo Murtas Univ. Napoli

Emilio Chiavassa Univ. Torino
Alberta Marzari Chiesa Univ. Torino
Alfredo Molinari Univ. Torino
Giulio Auriemma Univ. Basilicata
Piero Monacelli Univ. L'Aquila
Giancarlo Susinno Univ. Calabria
Maurizio Basile Univ. Bologna
Giorgio Bellettini Univ. Pisa
Guido Fano Univ. Bologna
Fedele Lizzi Univ. Napoli
Michelangelo Mangano Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa
Paolo Checchi Univ. Padova
Yogendra Srivastava Univ. Perugia
Giancarlo Rossi Univ. Roma II
Franco Romano Politecnico Bari
Sandro Centro Univ. Padova
Cesare Rossetti Univ. Torino
G. Ciapetti Univ. Roma I
Luisa Cifarelli Univ. Salerno
Sergio Serci Univ. Cagliari
Enrico Beltrametti Univ. Genova
Pietro Menotti Univ. Pisa
Federico Palmonari Univ. Bologna
Renato Potenza Univ. Catania
Luciano Paoluzi Univ. Roma II
Giovanni De Franceschi Roma I
Guido Altarelli Univ. Roma III
Marco Napolitano Univ. Napoli
Renato Ricci Presidente Società Italiana di Fisica
Mario Calvetti Univ. Firenze
Italo Mannelli Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa
V. Flaminio Univ. Pisa
Giovanni Gallavotti Univ. Roma I
Renzo Cirelli Univ. Milano
Giovanni Borreani Univ. Torino
Franco Buccella Univ. Napoli

Sergio Petrera Univ. l'Aquila
Giorgio Giacomelli Univ. Bologna
Ettore Remiddi Univ. Bologna
Giorgio Turchetti Univ. Bologna
Gianluigi Fogli Univ. Bari
Michele Veltri Univ. Urbino
Stefano Sciuto Univ. Torino
Claudio Goletti Univ. Roma II
Vladimir Wataghin Univ. Torino
Aniello Nappi Univ. Perugia
Francesco Nicodemi Univ. Napoli
Flavio Cavanna Univ. dell'Aquila
Stefano Ragazzi Univ. Milano
Tazio Pinelli Univ. Pavia
Silvia Limentani Univ. Padova
Modesto Pusterla Univ. Padova
Giuseppe Marchesini Univ. Milano

Chapter 3

Other Documents

3.1 From KLOE Executive Board

Frascati 14 Luglio, 1998

Al Consiglio Direttivo dell'INFN

Il Comitato Esecutivo di Kloe, all'unanimità, è fortemente preoccupato per l'introduzione del "cartellino" nell'INFN.

Lo stesso Comitato è convinto che tale strumento non sia assolutamente utile al controllo della produttività nè crei le condizioni necessarie per un efficiente svolgimento delle attività di ricerca e per un positivo progredire dei nostri esperimenti.

Al contrario l'introduzione del "cartellino" rischia di mortificare il continuo e forte impegno dei ricercatori e la loro dedizione al raggiungimento di impegnativi obiettivi scientifici.

Il Comitato Esecutivo di Kloe auspica il massimo sforzo da parte della Direzione dell'INFN per uscire nei tempi più brevi possibili da questa difficile situazione.

3.2 From FINUDA Executive Board

Frascati, 24 agosto 1998

Al Consiglio Direttivo dell'INFN

Il Responsabile Nazionale, il Coordinatore Tecnico ed i Responsabili Locali di Finuda ritengono che l'introduzione del controllo dell'orario di lavoro nell'INFN rappresenti una concreta causa di danno al regolare svolgimento dell'attività scientifica dell'esperimento.

Questa nuova procedura provoca infatti disagio e frustrazione nei ricercatori dell'Istituto che si sentono discriminati rispetto ai colleghi universitari e ai colleghi di altri Paesi a fianco dei quali lavorano. Essa non solo introduce oggettivi elementi di intralcio burocratico, legati all'assenza di precise disposizioni che regolino le modalità di lavoro fuori e aldilà del normale orario, ma disconosce ed umilia la motivazione stessa che è alla base del lavoro scientifico, motivazione che si basa sulla consapevolezza che la Ricerca si valuta unicamente in base ai risultati raggiunti.

Il Responsabile Nazionale, il Coordinatore Tecnico ed i Responsabili Locali di Finuda auspicano pertanto che il Consiglio Direttivo dell'INFN si adoperi tempestivamente ed energicamente per superare l'attuale situazione.

T.Bressani F.L.Fabbri V.Filippini N.Grion V.Lucherini V.Paticchio A.Zenoni

3.3 From CCLF Roma II, Tor Vergata, Univ.

Mozione Approvata dal CCdLF

Il Consiglio del Corso di Laurea in Fisica dell'Università di Roma II "Tor Vergata", riunito in sede il 17 Settembre 1998, ha esaminato il problema posto dalla regolamentazione per il controllo dell'orario di lavoro del personale dipendente dell'INFN con funzioni di ricercatore.

Il Consiglio ricorda che l'assunzione di ricercatori presso il Dipartimento o la locale Sezione dell'INFN è stata principalmente in relazione all'apertura o meno di concorsi, presso l'una o l'altra istituzione, nel momento in cui gli aspiranti avevano maturato i titoli e la preparazione sufficiente alla vincita di un concorso. Per questo il Dipartimento di Fisica ed il Consiglio di Corso di Laurea in Fisica hanno sempre cercato di minimizzare, per quanto di loro competenza, le differenze nella assegnazione dei compiti didattici e nello

status tra i ricercatori dei due organismi. Con questo spirito sono stati assegnati ai Ricercatori della locale Sezione dell'INFN compiti didattici analoghi a quelli dei Ricercatori Universitari e parimenti a titolo gratuito. Ciò era giustificato anche dal fatto che i ricercatori dell'INFN potevano svolgere la loro limitata attività didattica liberamente non subendo da parte dell'INFN un controllo fiscale del loro orario di lavoro.

La regolamentazione, attualmente introdotta dall'INFN, modifica in modo significativo questa situazione:

1. Il controllo fiscale dell'orario di lavoro per i riceratori dell'INFN altera la sostanziale uguaglianza di status tra loro ed i ricercatori universitari che non subiscono questo tipo di controllo.

2. Questa situazione rischia di privare il nostro Corso di Laurea in Fisica di un rilevante apporto didattico che si è concretizzato in passato con la partecipazione di sei ricercatori dell'INFN alla attività didattica del Dipartimento. Apporto rilevante specialmente se confrontato con i ricercatori universitari che svolgono analoga attività.

Pertanto il Consiglio invita il proprio Presidente ed il Direttore del Dipartimento di Fisica a prendere contatti con i Presidenti di CCdL in Fisica di altre sedi e con l'INFN per poter studiare insieme forme e modi per superare le presenti difficoltà che stanno alterando i tradizionali fruttuosi rapporti di collaborazione e buon vicinato tra le Sezioni dell'INFN e le Università che le ospitano.

3.4 From CCLF Roma Tre Univ.

15 ottobre 1998

Consiglio del Corso di Laurea in Fisica dell'Università "Roma Tre"

Mozione sulla collaborazione didattica col personale ricercatore di Istituti di Ricerca

Il Consiglio del Corso di Laurea in Fisica dell'Università "Roma Tre", nella riunione del 15 ottobre 1998, ha esaminato il problema della collaborazione alla didattica dei dipendenti di Istituti di Ricerca nel contesto delle riforme di questi Istituti e della regolamentazione dell'orario di lavoro dei dipendenti con funzioni di ricercatore.

Con l'istituzione della nuova Università "Roma Tre", il Corso di Laurea in Fisica ha cercato di coinvolgere nella didattica avanzata alcuni dipen-

denti degli Istituti di Ricerca con cui i docenti hanno un rapporto di collaborazione scientifica, in accordo con lo spirito delle convenzioni stipulate dagli Istituti di Ricerca con l'Università. La collaborazione di ricercatori dell'INFN, dell'ENEA e del CNR alla didattica dei corsi specialistici e dei corsi di laboratorio di indirizzo è stata molto apprezzata e ha contribuito a consolidare i rapporti di collaborazione scientifica dei docenti del Dipartimento di Fisica con questi Istituti e a stimolare l'interesse degli studenti al mondo della ricerca.

Le riforme degli Istituti di Ricerca che sono oggi all'esame degli Organi Istituzionali e le norme previste per la regolamentazione dell'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori rischiano di produrre una grave disomogeneità tra il personale ricercatore di questi Istituti e il personale docente che fa ricerca nell'Università. Questo rischio è particolarmente avvertito nel caso dei ricercatori dell'INFN che svolgono la loro attività di ricerca nei Dipartimenti Universitari. Il Consiglio esprime viva preoccupazione per gli ostacoli che l'applicazione dei nuovi regolamenti sull'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori dell'INFN possono porre alla partecipazione alla didattica avanzata del Corso di Laurea e auspica che gli scambi tra il mondo accademico e quello della ricerca possano continuare nel tradizionale clima di collaborazione scientifica e didattica.

Il Consiglio invita il Presidente e il Direttore del Dipartimento di Fisica a prendere contatti con i Consigli di Corso di Laurea in Fisica delle altre Università e con i responsabili delle Unità Operative di Istituti di Ricerca che hanno sede nel Dipartimento di Fisica, INFM e INFN, per studiare insieme i modi per superare le attuali difficoltà che rischiano di alterare i tradizionali fruttuosi rapporti di collaborazione tra le Unità Operative di Istituti di Ricerca e le Università.

3.5 From CCLF Pavia Univ.

VERBALE DEL CONSIGLIO DI CORSO DI LAUREA IN FISICA

Seduta del 27 ottobre 1998, ore 15:00

Presidente: Claudio Conta

Segretario: Lucio Andreani

Il giorno martedi 27 ottobre 1998 alle ore 15:00 in Aula Giulotto dei Dipartimenti Fisici si e‘ riunito il Consiglio di Corso di Laurea in Fisica convocato con prot. n. 23 del 19 ottobre 1998 e n. 24 del 23 ottobre 1998

per discutere il seguente ordine del giorno:

..... OMISSIS .....

6) Mozione "cartellino ricercatori enti ricerca"

Il Presidente pone all'attenzione del CCL il problema del "cartellino" per i ricercatori degli enti di ricerca e sottopone all'approvazione del CCL una mozione. Sono suggerite ed accolte alcune modifiche che portano al seguente testo della mozione stessa:

"Controllo dell'orario di lavoro del personale dipendente degli enti di ricerca con funzioni di ricercatore ovvero il "cartellino" per i ricercatori"

I ricercatori degli enti di ricerca (universita' esclusa) sono stati equiparati, con il contratto di lavoro e con i provvedimenti generalmente noti come "Bassanini", agli impiegati dello Stato; pertanto sono stati assoggettati al controllo orario automatico della presenza sul luogo di lavoro, ovvero al "cartellino". Il provvedimento è solo apparentemente giustificato: infatti questo controllo è comprensibile per mansioni di servizio al fine di garantire il datore di lavoro contro l'assenteismo; tuttavia per il tipo ed il modo di lavoro dei ricercatori il provvedimento è inaccettabile. I ricercatori, infatti, stimolati da interesse scientifico, lavorano anche oltre ed al di fuori dell'orario di lavoro; il problema non consiste nel controllo della quantità del lavoro svolto, ma piuttosto nella verifica qualitativa e quantitativa della produttività scientifica globale su un periodo ragionevole di tempo. Inoltre, il controllo automatico dell'orario di lavoro per i ricercatori degli enti di ricerca, è, a nostra conoscenza, inesistente in tutti i laboratori internazionali e nelle Università italiane e straniere per la natura stessa dell'attività di ricerca scientifica. In conclusione, quali docenti impegnati profondamente anche nella ricerca, siamo solidali con i colleghi ricercatori degli enti di ricerca, in particolare dell'INFN con i quali buona parte di noi lavora quotidianamente in stretta collaborazione, nella loro avversione al provvedimento che riteniamo ingiustificato ed ingiusto."

La mozione è approvata all'unanimità.

..... OMISSIS .....

La seduta viene tolta alle ore 19:00.

Il Segretario Prof. Lucio Andreani

Il Presidente Prof. Claudio Conta

3.6 From SISSA Trieste

Mozione sul controllo dell'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori EPR

I sottoscritti, appartenenti al corpo docente della Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati (SISSA) con sede a Trieste, desiderano intervenire in merito alla questione della recente introduzione del controllo automatico dell'orario di lavoro del personale ricercatore dipendente degli Enti Pubblici di Ricerca (EPR), in considerazione delle ripercussioni negative di tale provvedimento sull'attività di collaborazione fra le varie componenti della Scuola e della comunità scientifica in generale.

Con il recente rinnovo del contratto di lavoro, i ricercatori degli EPR sono stati equiparati agli impiegati dello Stato, e perciò assoggettati alla verifica di presenza mediante la rilevazione automatica della presenza sul luogo di lavoro.

Se l'efficacia di questo controllo è comprensibile per molti servizi e mansioni esecutive, e garantisce il datore di lavoro contro l'assenteismo, nel caso dei ricercatori degli EPR rappresenta una vera anomalia che non ha riscontro nell'ambito dell'università italiana e negli istituti di ricerca esteri.

L'attività scientifica e di formazione della Scuola si avvale della collaborazione di diverse componenti della comunità scientifica locale, fra cui l'INFN, INFM, l'Osservatorio Astronomico, il Centro Internazionale di Fisica Teorica (ICTP) e il Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università.

Il fatto che alcune componenti di questa comunità, i dipendenti degli EPR, siano assogettate ad un controllo dell'attività lavorativa del tutto incongruo con l'attività svolta crea uno stato di disagio che non può che avere conseguenze negative sulla qualità del lavoro di ricerca e formazione che i ricercatori EPR svolgono all'interno dei dipartimenti e laboratori di fisica.

Pertanto i sottoscritti invitano il Senato e il Direttore della Scuola a prendere contatti con gli organi competenti per poter superare le presenti difficoltà, auspicando calorosamente l'attivazione di modi di controllo dell'attività dei ricercatori EPR più congrui con la specificità della ricerca scientifica.

Trieste, 16/10/1998

Daniele Amati
Loriano Bonora
Andrew Bradbury
Alberto Bressan

Ugo Bruzzo
Paolo Caldiroli
Enrico Cherubini
Luigi Danese
Stefano Fantoni
Gregorio Falqui
Roberto Iengo
Antonio Lanza
Fabio Mammano
Amos Maritan
Antonio Masiero
Giuseppe Mussardo
Serguej Petcov
Benedetto Piccoli
Alessandro Treves
Riccardo Valdarnin

Chapter 4

Newspaper articles

4.1 L. Maiani - La Stampa 19.4.95

Ricercatori in difficoltà

ANCHE LO SCIENZIATO BOLLI LA CARTOLINA

Trend preoccupante: più burocrazia e meno finanziamenti

(...) Quanto al secondo aspetto [l'aumento della pressione burocratica sulla ricerca NdR], voglio citare due casi che mi sembrano particolarmente emblematici. Il primo è un esempio indicativo delle linee di tendenza, il secondo un fatto recente, dalle conseguenze particolarmente disastrose. (...) Ed ecco il secondo caso. Una norma generale, introdotta nella legge finanziaria per il 1995, richiede che l'osservanza dell'orario di lavoro sia controllata, per i dipendenti dello Stato, "con metodi obbiettivi ed automatici". Di nuovo, non metto in dubbio l'utilità della norma in sè, ma è la sua applicazione nel mondo della ricerca che appare, fuori ogni dubbio, inutile e anzi nociva. Non a caso il controllo dell'orario di lavoro è una pratica sconosciuta negli enti di ricerca europei (Cnrs in Francia, Max Planck Institut in Germania) e in quelli internazionali (CERN di Ginevra), dove è privilegiata la valutazione dei risultati conseguiti, *a tutti i livelli di personale.* (...)

Luciano Maiani

Presidente dell'Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare

4.2 C. Bernardini - La Repubblica 31.07.1998

IL CARTELLINO PER I RICERCATORI

C'è un effetto pernicioso e deprimente di un provvedimento apparentemente giustificato e motivato. Riguarda una minoranza, è vero, ma una minoranza importante per lo sviluppo del paese: i ricercatori degli enti di ricerca (universita' esclusa). Essendo stati equiparati, con il contratto di lavoro e con i provvedimenti generalmente noti come "Bassanini", agli impiegati dello Stato, sono stati assoggettati alla verifica di assiduità mediante "cartellino", cioè al controllo orario automatico della presenza sul luogo del lavoro. Se l'efficacia di questo controllo è comprensibile per molti servizi e mansioni esecutive, e garantisce il datore di lavoro contro l'assenteismo, nel caso dei ricercatori è una vera mostruosità. Tempo addietro, il capo di un laboratorio privato americano scrisse a "Physics Today", per spiegare che i ricercatori, stimolati da interesse scientifico e dalla prospettiva di acquistare prestigio nel loro ambiente, lavoravano anche 60 ore alla settimana; e che il controllo orario li avrebbe non solo mortificati, ma autorizzati a cercare altre attività, magari per la concorrenza.

Ministro Bassanini, è saggio tutto ciò ?

Carlo Bernardini

4.3 E. Predazzi - La Stampa 23.9.1998

Burocrazia & Ricerca
ANCHE ENRICO FERMI BOLLI LA CARTOLINA !

La cosiddetta "legge del parastato" aveva, a metà degli Anni 70, previsto un "controllo oggettivo dell'orario di lavoro" che, a priori, doveva applicarsi a tutti i dipendenti degli enti pubblici fra i quali, statutariamente, vanno inclusi anche i ricercatori. In alcuni casi (ad esempio, per l'Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, INFN) una illuminata interpretazione del termine "controllo oggettivo dell'orario di lavoro" aveva, fino a poco tempo fa, evitato di prendere misure quali la timbratura del cartellino di ingresso e di uscita che, se comprensibile per il personale addetto a mansioni esecutive, diventa un'assurdità e una vera e propria iattura se applicato a ricercatori scientifici il

cui compito istituzionale è quello di pensare e produrre ricerca fondamentale. È tanto assurdo pensare di porre dei limiti entro i quali costringere la creatività di un ricercatore scientifico (che deve essere sempre "in servizio" e per il quale, ben di altra profondità ma perfettamente definibile e individuabile deve essere il controllo della "produttività") quanto potrebbe esserlo chiedere a uno scrittore di produrre solo tra le 8 e le 14 dei giorni feriali. A prova di come sia dannosa una burocratizzazione sfrenata, questa assurdità, caso unico fra tutti i Paesi che io conosco, è stata ora estesa anche ai ricercatori dell'INFN: dal 1mo luglio anc'essi devono "timbrare il cartellino". Dovrebbe farlo anche Enrico Fermi se ci fosse ancora.

Si era sperato che una lettera aperta di Carlo Bernardini (Università di Roma) avesse riaperto la discussione, ma il perdurante silenzio delle autorità preposte alla conduzione della ricerca italiana fa temere il peggio.

La tanto decantata e ventilata "Riforma degli Enti Pubblici della Ricerca", apparentemente in dirittura di arrivo, non potrebbe far giustizia di un'assurdità che ci rende ridicoli agli occhi di tutto il mondo, distinguendo mansioni che devono essere distinte?

Signor ministro Berlinguer, signor ministro Bassanini e, prima ancora, signor Primo Ministro, è troppo chiedere un vostro fattivo e urgente interessamento a un problema che riguarda, certo, una minoranza minuscola di lavoratori, ma una minoranza non solo altamente qualificata, ma soprattutto essenziale per lo sviluppo scientifico e tecnologico del nostro Paese?

Enrico Predazzi
Università di Torino

4.4 G. Caprara - Corriere della Sera 14.10.1998

NOI RICERCATORI COSTRETTI A TIMBRARE IL CARTELLINO

"Al Nobel non si arriva timbrando il cartellino". Con questo slogan i ricercatori dell'Istituto nazionale di fisica nucleare (INFN) hanno deciso di abbandonare una silenziosa protesta che correva via Internet dal settembre scorso uscendo allo scoperto. Dal primo luglio gli scienziati nucleari italiani con il loro tesserino magnetico devono registrare l'entrata e l'uscita dal

laboratorio. Lo stabilisce il nuovo contratto di lavoro che regola il mondo della ricerca. "È un provvedimento inaccettabile", dice Mario Macrì, illustre scienziato che al CERN di Ginevra ha scoperto il primo atomo di antimateria e che ora rappresenta i suoi colleghi dell'Istituto. "Il controllo dell'orario - aggiunge - è un ostacolo all'attività di ricerca ed è incompatibile con la natura e la motivazione del lavoro scientifico". Il provvedimento riguarda tutti ma forse non è un caso che la protesta nasca in un Istituto che ha fatto parlare di sè in questi anni per i meriti conquistati e per questo è indicato come esempio di buona gestione della scienza. Forse anche per questo i toni sono accesi. "Si tratta di un limite burocratico - prosegue Macrì - imposto a chi da sempre senza limiti di tempo dedica le proprie energie intellettuali e morali alla ricerca conseguendo risultati riconosciuti dalla comunità scientifica internazionale. In nessuno dei grandi laboratori - aggiunge - dal Fermilab di Chicago a quello di Desy di Amburgo o in altre istituzioni analoghe all'INFN italiano si è mai pensato di introdurre una misura del genere". "Questo provvedimento legato alla riforma Bassanini ci fa tornare indietro negli anni ed è inattuabile in particolare nell'INFN che ha stretti rapporti con l'Università" commenta il fisico Carlo Bernardini. Ma la protesta è stata innescata in realtà da una norma aggiunta in coda al contratto e poi dimenticata. Essa permetteva di superare il controllo degli orari puntando invece su una valutazione dei lavori compiuti. Ma nessuno ha rischiato di stilare le regole per far l'esame ai colleghi e così nell'attesa prevale l'applicazione del cartellino e le 36 ore di lavoro da rispettare settimanalmente. Riusciranno gli scienziati ad accettare l'idea che gli esami non finiscono mai?

Giovanni Caprara

4.5 G. B. Palmegiano - La Stampa, 16.10.1998

Pro & Contro
BOLLARE IL CARTELLINO È L'ULTIMO PROBLEMA

Enrico Predazzi, scienziato riconosciuto e docente apprezzato, si lamentava su Tuttoscienze del 23 settembre "Anche Fermi bolli la cartolina!" dell'introduzione del controllo dell'orario di presenza per i ricercatori. Pur comprendendo che ciò possa essere vissuto da un fisico teorico quasi come

una camicia di forza, devo dissentire dal senso generale dell'articolo. Ritengo, infatti, che nel mondo della ricerca esistano problemi più urgenti (non voglio dire più importanti) di un cartellino da timbrare, sia in termini di problemi generali sia di singole questioni concrete. Credo che questo sia il tempo in cui chi si occupa di scienza deve affrontare, ad esempio, le questioni di etica poste dalla clonazione, o più propriamente del problema del limite, esemplificato dall'affermazione, mutuata dalla saggezza popolare: "Non necessariamente l'uomo deve fare tutto ciò che sa fare". Per restare, invece, nella concretezza dell'attualità va ricordato che è sul tappeto la riforma del sistema ricerca, che dovrà affrontare non pochi problemi. Ad esempio nel Cnr ci sono oltre 300 organi di ricerca, con personale numericamente variabile, che si occupano di temi anche molto lontani: dalla metrologia all'archeologia micenea. Ma per poter essere competitivi occorre avere una massa critica e di conseguenza bisognerà ridurne il numero accorpando più strutture oppure eliminando, ahimè, quelle non più di eccellenza. Di qui l'esigenza di un'attenta valutazione dell'attività di ricerca, oggi solo poco più che formale. Ecco un altro bell'argomento di discussione: quali sono i criteri per valutare la produzione scientifica di un ricercatore piuttosto che quella di un ente di ricerca o di un ateneo? Non bisogna poi dimenticare il rapporto tra ricerca pubblica e aziende; il tessuto connettivo della produzione nazionale è fatto da piccole e piccolissime aziende che non hanno possibilità nè di finanziare ricerche nè di farsele finanziare, nè semplicemente di accedere ai risultati delle ricerche. La collaborazione non può essere basata solo sulla buona volontà (o sull'interesse) del singolo ricercatore o del singolo imprenditore. Ho lasciato per ultima la questione del precariato perchè è, secondo me, scandalosa: nel solo Cnr su un totale di 7000 dipendenti ci sono quasi mille precari con un'età media che si avvicina pericolosamente ai quaranta (quella dei ricercatori di ruolo è superiore ai cinquanta). È personale ad altissima specializzazione, che gestisce anche dei laboratori, ma che non ha alcun riconoscimento se non la gloria . Pensiamo in termini concreti, come ci si dovrà comportare in una commissione concorsuale avendo da scegliere tra un giovane brillante, fresco di dottorato, e un assai meno giovane collega precario? Sanare una situazione che rischia di incancrenirsi o privilegiare l'entusiasmo del giovane? Poichè non credo che nel breve termine si possano far assunzioni, temo che il precariato sia destinato a perpetuarsi. Non ci mancano proprio gli argomenti da discutere, professor Predazzi, incluso quello della timbratura del

cartellino.

Giovanni B. Palmegiano CNR, Torino

Chapter 5

Positive Replies

5.1 References to the negative effects of clocking

5.1.1 Steven Weinberg - Nobel Laureate 1979

Dear Dr. Macri, I was surprised and saddened to learn of the plan to record and certify the time spent by researchers at INFN in their laboratories and away. This was tried once at the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and led to a collapse of morale and general rebellion, and after a few weeks this program was terminated. Scientists do their work because it interests them, not because of any bureaucratic requirements on how they spend their time. The way to tell if they are working is to look at what they produce. If this plan at INFN is not cancelled, I predict that it will become impossible for this laboratory to hold its scientists or recruit new ones of any quality. Certainly I would never work in an institute that had such requirements for record keeping, and I would not recommend working in such an institute to anyone else.

With best wishes,

Steven Weinberg

5.1.2 Sheldon Lee Glashow - Nobel Laureate 1979

Dear Dr Macri:

I have been informed of the new INFN policy regarding time reporting for research scientists. I find this policy to be absurd, insulting to researchers, and entirely unnecessary. In general, it is my experience that research scientists — especially high-energy physicists — spend a great deal more than the nominal 40 hours per week on their research activities. The new INFN policy is demeaning to Italian scientists, destructive to Italian Science, and can only result in an enormous waste of time and effort. I am unaware of any similar policy in effect in my country or anywhere else in the world,

Sincerely,

Sheldon Lee Glashow

5.1.3 Leon M. Lederman - Nobel Laureate 1988

Dear Mr. Macri, I was both surprised and amused at the new bureaucratic restrictions you have placed on the scientists at INFN. In Italy which created the modern period of scientific research, one doesn't treat scientists like production workers in a factory. Can you see Enrico Fermi punching a time clock? There are effective ways to measure scientific productivity; times clocks are not the way.

Leon M. Lederman

Physics Nobel Laureate 1988

5.1.4 Sidney Drell - SLAC

i regret to learn that the infn management has ruled that scientists at its institute must now sign in time cards. in the past similar recommendations were made for u.s. national research labs, but were, happily, opposed and withdrawn. i do not believe that slac would have been able to build so outstanding a world class scientific leadership and successful research program had a time-card punching requirement been established here. what i do reecall very clearly is the question raised by a government bureaucrat with an office at slac, when we first moved on to the slac site in 1966-67. he observed theorists playing soccer during, and somewhat after, the lunch hour on the slac lawn, and came to the director's office to question this activity during the work day. he was politely advised that he could observe much more evidence of their work were he to return to the lab after dinner and well into the late night and early morning hours. i find it most difficult to

believe that research scientists will become more productive, or the research program will benefit from a time-clock regime. if other issues are involved of which i am uninformed, i have nothing to offer.

sidney drell

5.1.5 Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky - Director Emeritus, SLAC

Dear Mr. Macri:

A group of Italian particle physicists have brought to my attention the intent of the management of INFN that research personnel should have to clock in and out as they enter their respective institutes in order for INFN to monitor their time spent at their offices and laboratories.

If correct, as retired director of SLAC which is one of the major high energy physics institutes of the United States, I would consider such a development to be unfortunate and counterproductive. During the past decade governmental authorities have attempted to apply such regulations to the conduct of American scientific workers at various institutes. Happily it has been possible to persuade the authorities to drop such requests by the argument that the scientific workers' contributions are carried out not only at their offices and laboratories but also at other locales, be it at home or visiting other institutes. Attempting to measure what are fundamentally intellectual contributions by the time spent in offices and laboratories is an exercise in futility.

Indeed it is difficult to measure quantitatively the output of scientific work. Governmental authorities are using many tools to do so: peer reviews, program reviews, survey of the literature, and the like. Time keeping is not a productive approach towards that end. I hope you will find this observation useful.

Sincerely yours,

(signed)

Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky

Director Emeritus

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center

Stanford University

5.1.6 George Trilling - LBNL. Professor Emeritus at U.C.-Berkeley, Group Leader LHC-US Collaboration

October 24, 1998

Dear Dr. Macri,

I just wish to express my surprise that scientists supported by INFN are now required to keep track of their actual working hours spent in their offices and labs as well as at their homes. I believe that if such an action were taken here, there would be very strong resistance from the scientific community. Most scientists spend far more than the 40 hours per week for which they are paid, but they expect to be judged on the basis of their accomplishments, and not from the clocking of their time. I fear that such bureaucratic actions may make a scientific career less attrative to the most talented individuals. Furthermore time clocking would be totally unacceptable for university faculty.. scientists working in national institutes are entitled to the same respect as those in universities.

With my best wishes for success in convincing the authorities that time clocking for scientists is a truly counterproductive idea.

Sincerely,

George Trilling

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Berkeley, CA 94708

5.1.7 Bruce Winstein - Univ. of Chicago

Mario Macri National Spokesperson of INFN Researchers

I have heard that INFN scientists must now punch a time clock and keep precise account of their hours away from their home offices and laboratories.

This is contrary to the customs and practice of scientific research throughout the world. I can't imagine that such burdens are very conducive to the advance of scientific knowledge or that they constitute any improvement in management's ability to keep track of the work of their scientists.

In fact, this will have just the opposite effect and I add my voice to those who are requesting that this practice be stopped. INFN science ranks at the top of the field and I would hate to see anything compromise this work or demoralize these highly talented Italian physicists.

Bruce Winstein
Professor of Physics
University of Chicago

5.1.8 Bernard Schutz - Max Planck Inst., M. Director

Dear Dr Macrì,

I was very surprised at the decision by INFN to make scientists record their time in the lab and office and their activities away from it. As the managing director of the Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics (Albert Einstein Institute), I can tell you that I believe

that timekeeping is an inappropriate way to manage scientists, and that such a policy would damage the scientific productivity of my Institute if I were to implement it.

Typically, my scientists work longer than the 37-40 hours that would be normal for people in similar civil-service or commercial positions. They do this voluntarily, because they enjoy their work and think it is important. I would be afraid that introducing timekeeping would alienate scientists. They might reduce their hours of work to the norm expected of office people. I would certainly lose their good will and cooperation on other matters.

I would also expect trouble with staffing. Timekeeping is not normal for scientists elsewhere in the world, and I would expect that my scientists would be more likely to leave for positions elsewhere if I introduced it. I would also have trouble recruiting good people to replace them.

I wish you luck with trying to get this destructive new policy changed.

Yours sincerely
Bernard Schutz
Managing Director
Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics
Potsdam, Germany

5.1.9 Kenneth W. Ford - Former Director, American Inst. of Physics

Dear Dr. Macri,

The new reporting rules that you describe at the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare have the danger of working against, not for, the goal of better science. Such rules are surely quite uncommon, if they exist at all, at other leading centers of science in the world. Good science can't be measured by the clock. I hope that your leaders will settle on other, better ways to assess the quality of the scientists' work.

Kenneth W. Ford

former director,

American Institute of Physics

5.1.10 Piermaria J. Oddone - Deputy Director LBNL

Like they say in the old country: "roba da pazzi" !! Maybe they will chain you to your desks and benches next so you do not go out after you come in, or better yet, install brain monitors to make sure you are thinking physics and not other thoughts while you are at your desks. I am sure this will do wonders for Italian physics and I look forward to an avalanche of Nobel prizes....

Mie condoglianze per la stonata de l'INFN,

Pier

Dr. Piermaria J. Oddone

Deputy Director, LBNL

5.1.11 Joel L. Lebowitz - Director of CMSR, Rutgers, The State Univ. of New Jersey

Dear Colleagues:

I agree with you wholeheartedly. It seem to me that the requirement is most foolish and counterproductive.

Good luck.

Professor Joel L. Lebowitz, Director

Center for Mathematical Sciences Research

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

5.1.12 Erwin Gabathuler - Liverpool Univ., Former Director CERN EP Division

I understand that this was tried before and did not last very long.

Due to the international nature of our field, it does not make much sense and progress in science does not proceed in time spent at the desk. I suggest that if they insist that you arrange to come in outside working hours for short periods to run jobs etc. The additional bureaucry will soon kill it .

erwin gabathuler

Liverpool University

5.1.13 Roy Weinstein - Head of TCSUH Magnet Lab, Univ. of Houston

Dear Collegues,

The most valuable possession of a Lab is the self motivation of its scientists. A scientist can spend 40 hours at a desk, as required, and produce nothing; or can spend 30 hours at a desk and win the Nobel Prize; or spend thirty hours at a desk and twenty hours at home. A management which counts productivity by the number of hours served announces to the world that they do not understand the process of discovery.

Roy Weinstein

Prof of Physics

Head of TCSUH Magnet Lab

University of Houston

5.1.14 Tom Ferbel - Rochester Univ.

Dear Mario,

It has come to my attention that the Management of INFN has decided that the way to improve the quality of Italian research is by making all researchers punch a time clock. I guess the US garment industry must be advising the INFN on how to improve productivity? Never since the time that I worked for the department store Klein's on 14th Street in New York as a teenager have I had to punch a clock. It was certainly necessary there since that was the way I was paid for sorting girdles. However, my motivation since entering physics has been sufficiently high so that I would bankrupt my

employer if I were to charge for every hour I spend working/thinking. I therefore cannot imagine a more stupid way of determining or encouraging good work habits than what the INFN has stumbled upon ! This is surely not the way to improve scholarship, science, and teaching, but simply a way to annoy serious scientists and to satisfy some misguided, but surely well-meaning, beaucrats.

You must pursuade your INFN managers that productivity cannot be measured by the number of hours spent chained to some desk or work-table, but rather by the quality of scientific output, which thrives on brilliance and superb relations among scientists and their management.

I hope this terrible nightmare will pass soon, and that you will continue working in science and teaching without annoyance, and with dedication to the excellence for which you are all known!

Best Wishes,
Tom Ferbel
(Prof of Physics)

5.1.15 Harry Lipkin - ANL

Dear Colleagues,

My immediate reaction, writing to Italy from sitting here in Chicago is: What would Enrico Fermi say about this?

Best wishes
Harry Lipkin
ANL

5.1.16 A. de Rujula - CERN

To all INFN clock-in-clock-outers:

It is our duty as scientists to try to explain all phenomena, natural or unnatural as they may happen to be.

To an outsider, the only rational explanation of the recently imposed clock obligation is that it is in fact a gift from the outgoing to the incoming INFN managers. What could be more welcome by a new director than a wonderful occasion, costing no effort or money, to satisfy an obvious and legitimate demand of its scientific employees?

A political masterpiece of Macchiavellian tradition. That is surely what it is,

Alvaro De Rujula
Theorist
CERN

5.1.17 Elliot Leader - University of London

Dear Dr. Macri,

I was frankly amazed to learn of the new INFN rules for monitoring the number of hours of work carried out by research workers.

This seems to display a fundamental misunderstanding of how research is actually carried out. Occasionally we are asked to estimate the number of hours we spend working—the result is often 100 hours per week in a period of intense development!

I can understand that there may be people who are not really contributing to the research output and that they should dealt with in some way. But the method suggested is extremely clumsy and inappropriate. Surely it would be quite simple to monitor the quality and quantity of research output.

Certainly Italy is the only country in the world, I guess, where such a system is contemplated. A most surprising and disturbing fact.

Professor Elliot Leader,
Professor of Theoretical Physics,
University of London.

5.1.18 Kellogg S. Stelle - Imperial College

Dear Dr. Macri, I am writing concerning the status of INFN researchers at Italian institutes. I understand from my Italian colleagues that the INFN has adopted what I would characterize as something of a low-level manufacturing attitude towards researchers and their professional responsabilities, requiring them to actually clock on and off every day. I find this rather distressing and quite counterproductive. Italy has been blessed by a high level of scientific talent and inventiveness, but the objective conditions for work in Italian institutes are not really much better than they are here in Britain. Maintaining an active scientific community in such conditions requires that one trust professional researchers to pursue their work simply for the reason

that they are devoted to it. Impugning the dignity of scientific researchers by requiring time clocking is not a helpful step in this direction. Despite less than favorable working conditions, Italian physics has a strong reputation internationally. Actions that lead to a demoralisation of the Italian scientific community are detrimental to the country's standing in world research, and should be strongly resisted. Yours sincerely,

Kellogg S. Stelle
Professor of Physics
Imperial College, London

5.1.19 Henry Frisch - Univ. of Chicago

Sept. 29, 1998

Dear Professor Macri,

I have recently learned about a new policy requiring INFN scientists to punch in with time cards. I find it hard to believe that the country that brought us Da Vinci, Galileo, and Fermi, to name just a few of the great creative Italian scientists, would even dream of treating them this way.

I have worked for many years with the group from INFN, Pisa, that works on the CDF experiment at Fermilab. They are an exceptional group, one of the strongest of the almost 40 groups on CDF. In particular, the top quark discovery rested on the the Silicon Vertex Detector, conceived, proposed, and built (largely) by this group.

This is an exceptional group of dedicated scientists. I know from long personal experience that they work for the love of it, and work exceptionally hard for that reason. Good administration would give them the resources to do what they want and need to do, and not burden them with demeaning requirements.

I presume this is some temporary aberration much of the kind that occasionally comes down from above in this country. I hope you can help in sheilding our colleagues.

Sincerely yours,
Henry Frisch
Prof. of Physics
Enrico Fermi Institute, the Physics Department, and the College
University of Chicago

5.1.20 Tom LeCompte - ANL

Argonne, 23-SEP-1998

Dear Prof. Macri:

I was recently informed that INFN is requiring its reserachers to clock in and out of their home institutes and to submit detailed records for time spent outside of them.

If there is any way for you to reconsider this decision, I would urge you to do so. I have been collaborating with Italian researchers for my entire professional career (presently including co-leading the CDF muon upgrade) and my experience tells me that such record-keeping is not only absent in the rest of the research community, but totally unncessary. As a group, Italian researchers are among the hardest working, often putting in many, many more hours than the minimum required by their employers, all in an attempt to do the best possible physics research.

Strict adherance to a time clock is unnecessary. It is also demoralizing, and therefore may even have a negative impact on the amount of work done. This would be tragic, especially since it's unnecessary and avoidable.

Thank your for taking the time to read this.

My best wishes,

Tom LeCompte

Argonne National Laboratory

5.1.21 Myron Campbell - Univ. of Michigan

"There is only one proved way of assisting the advancement of pure science that of picking men of genius, backing them heavily, and leaving them to direct themselves."

James B. Conant (1893-1978)

Dear Mr. Macri,

I was invited to comment on the plan to have INFN researchers keep track of their time by clocking in and out.

I am a Professor in the Physics Department at the University of Michigan. My group works on CDF has 4 faculty, 6 post-docs, and 8 graduate students. All of us, including graduate students, are on salary that simply requires us to do our job. Our hours are not tracked, and I am sure that to try to do so

would only result in a counter-productive backlash, and probably a reduction in the number of hours that are actually spent. I know many people who work at INFN, I know that they share the same work ethic, and would expect the same result.

Professor Myron Campbell

P.S. The lead-in quote above was made in 1945. I would certainly be amended today to 'men and women of genius'.

5.1.22 John E. Elias - Fermilab

For the past thirty years I have had the pleasure and stimulation of working in collaborations with Italian high energy physicists from INFN institutes. Given my long involvement and a personal friendship with a past director, I am at a loss in trying to understand the recent onerous and offensive (and embarassing) time-clock ruling by the INFN management. I can discern no useful purpose in such tactics. I suggest that the ruling be reassessed in terms of a clearly enunciated purpose or goal, and that alternate, well respected criteria be established if a need exists. The time-clock ruling does nothing to encourage scientific endeavors nor inform on the excellence of research activities. Public embarassment of its scientists is not a useful activity for INFN.

John E. Elias

Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF)

Compact Muon Solenoid (CMS)

5.1.23 Brian Meadows Professor and Head of Physics - Univ. of Cincinnati

I am writing on behalf of my INFN collaborators in the Babar experiment at SLAC, Stanford, California, USA. I do hope you will forgive my interest in the workings of INFN, and also my lack of knowledge of the Italian language demonstrated by writing in English. However, I am concerned for their dignity and I feel I must comment on the recent ruling by the INFN management that their researchers, including my physicist colleagues, have to clock in/out.

Perhaps INFN has a good reason for the necessity to monitor research productivity, but I urge them to consider the consequences of this way of

doing it. I know many INFN high energy physicists in a variety of World class enterprises - both theoretical and experimental - who contribute in a major and innovative way to their success. Surely there is no problem which can be addressed in this undignified way.

In our own experiment (Babar at SLAC) INFN and its scientists are heros. They have provided much of the reason that the experiment will be ready on time by bringing on the magnet, the flux return and much of the vertex detector. It is hard to stand by and work side by side with these fine people and watch them having to clock in! (I am an Englishman from an American University, and I do not have to do this!) To be truthful, I do not see how this can work - most of my INFN friends are clocked in almost all the time anyway. Does INFN want to pay by the hour? It will surely cost dearly if they do!

In the opinion of most scientists, clocking in/out is an extremely undignified thing to do. Doctors, lawyers, most other professionals too, work for the sheer pleasure of what they do and because they are working on something which is self fulfilling. INFN physicists clearly fall into this category, none of whom should be expected to work by the clock.

Speaking as a member of the International community of scientists, I do hope INFN will decide it does not wish to be the only organisation in the World to require its physicists to clock in, but will try instead to measure productivity in a more meaningful and thoughtful way.

Brian Meadows

Professor and Head of Physics,

University of Cincinnati, OH, USA.

5.1.24 Scott Menary - York Univ.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have worked closely with INFN Research personnel both while I was an associate of CERN as well as at SLAC and Fermilab in the United States. I do not know what motivated this decision to have INFN researchers "clock in/out" but if it based on a belief that INFN personnel are not working hard enough or efficiently then I can assure you from personal experience that this is severely misguided. In all of the projects with which I have been associated with INFN personnel I always been impressed by how hard working, moti-

vated, efficient, and competent they have been. Doing physics research is not equivalent to manufacturing widgets. I don't believe the Italian or, more importantly from my perspective, the world physics community will be well served by the introduction of such a "time management" system at INFN. I greatly look forward to working with INFN personnel on physics research in the future.

Yours sincerely,
Professor Scott Menary
234 Petrie Science Building
York University
4700 Keele St.
Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3

5.1.25 Allan Widom - Northeastern Univ. Boston

Dear Dr. Mario Macri,

I have had the pleasure on several occasions to visit and collaborate with Italian physicists at the Physics Department & INFN of the University of Perugia, and at the INFN Nuclear Physics Laboratory in Frascati. I have been very thankful for the INFN support which made such visits and collaborations with Italian physicists possible. I was therefore quite dismayed upon hearing of the recent policy of the management at INFN that these researchers have to "clock in and out" with magnetic cards and write new kinds reports accounting for their times and activities. I find it difficult to believe that such a policy could have made by any group who has even the slightest idea of how productive research is practiced, nor any management who has any knowledge of how to set up centers of excellent research. Quite often the very best ideas of creative research occur in the conscious mind when you wake up at 3:00 A.M. (because you have been unable to sleep) and a solution to a problem that you have been thinking about for weeks finally occurs to you. If I understand the new policy. then at this exciting point in your thinking, you need need play with magnetic cards and/or accountant reports, and maybe then play with a computer and perhaps some spreadsheets to make sure you get "credit" for the time (say 3:00 AM to 7:00 AM) when the idea should have been is further developed. This policy is of course quite absurd for productive researchers. I am in great dismay

at the destructive effect such a policy will have on a group of researchers at INFN presently with highly respected international reputations, and younger research workers with great promise.

Sincerely,
Professor Allan Widom
Physics Department
Northeastern University
Boston MA 02115

5.1.26 Elias Kiritsis - Theory Division, CERN

To whom it might concern,

I have learned from several Italian colleagues about the new rules at INFN concerning using magnetic cards to monitor entry and exit of (among others) researchers to work. If the INFN directorate is trying to make administrators be more productive, then this may be a good way. If they are trying to make researchers productive, then this is a bad way of doing so. The directorate could be more efficient by evaluating the scientific or administrative output of any researcher over some period of time instead of trying to check if a given reseacher came one hour late. This is the only country in the world I have seen that happening so INFN scored a world first I think the INFN would be much better off scoring a world first in some more relevant direction.

Elias Kiritsis, staff member
CERN - Theory Division

5.1.27 David Mermin - Cornell Univ.

Yes, of course I agree with you. It is stupid and insulting. But what is worse is that it completely misses the way research is done. (Is one supposed to clock in when one goes to bed at night? I get some of my best ideas while I'm asleep — at least they're there in the morning and weren't there when I went to bed.)

I think if this persists it will make Italy (which I love and where I have close friends) the laughing stock of the scientific world. I say this comfortably because I am a citizen of a country that is now the laughing stock of the world for other reasons. I don't recommend the position.

Please feel free to forwad this letter to whomever you wish if you think it will do any good. I append titles because you seem to be dealing with the type of mentality that takes them seriously.

David Mermin

Horace White Professor of Physics. Cornell University

Member, U.S. National Academy of Sciences

5.1.28 W.D. Walker - Duke Univ. Physics Dept.

This requirement of punching a clock to indicate research activity is nonsense! The usual way to measure activity is by means of the number and quality of publications in physics. Iin other disciplines it might be measured in numbers of patents.

W.D. Walker

Former Chairman Duke Physics Dept.

5.1.29 Louis Fayard - Orsay, group-leader esp. NA48

Dear Mario ,

I have learned that the management of INFN was forcing physicists to clock-in/clock-out . It is clear to me that this method (which is not at all used in France and seems to come from other times) will have a negative impact on the quality andthe diversity of the work done by the physicists

Regards,

Louis Fayard

(Orsay group-leader in the NA48 experiment)

5.1.30 P.C.Gugelot - Univ. of Virginia

Dear Sign. Macri

I like to support the action of the physicist who signed the forgoing letter. Since I have been often in contact with Italian physicists e.g. E.Amaldi, G.Salvini, Quercia and many others. I feel that I should express the following. Physics research is not a 9 to 5 job. One should compare it more to the work of an artist, an author or painter. There are periods that one is completely involved- e.g. Yukawa, who had a note pad next to his bed to

scribble during the night any ideas which may come up- I am convinced that the measures proposed in the letter will degrade physics research to a bureaucratic endeavour. Italy has contributed much to our knowledge of modern physics and many famous Italian names are in our students textbooks. I am convinced that Italian physicist will continue to contribute when they are able to continue their work in the same way as all physicist in the democratic world. With the measures described Italian research will descend to the level of a third world country !

P.C.Gugelot,
Prof.Em University of Virginia,
Charlottesville, VA. 22903. USA

5.1.31 Steven Carlip - Univ. of California, Davis

Dear Dr. Macri,

I have just learned of the INFN's proposal to require that researchers use time clocks to record their hours. This is an appalling idea, which seems to reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of how physicists actually do research.

I am a fairly productive theoretical physicist; I publish about four papers a year, have just written a book, and have won several prestigious grants. Last week, I spent about 70 hours in the office, most of it working. Three weeks ago, on the other hand, I spent only about 20 hours at work. This kind of fluctuation is inevitable—there are times when ideas are coming together productively and times when one is stuck—and merely requiring a physical presence at an office will do nothing to change this. Nor can such a policy really measure intensity of effort. (I woke up in the middle of the night last night with a new idea about my current project. Would the INFN management expect me to jump out of bed and record the time?)

People who go into theoretical physics do so because they love the work. There is no need to insult them by pretending that their effort can be measured by hours at a desk. If the administration at my university tried to impose such a rule, I can safely say that there would be a universal refusal to cooperate, and that the only effect would be to divert energy away from research.

I hope very much that the INFN administration can be persuaded to drop

this folloish and insulting plan.

Sincerely yours,
Steven Carlip
Professor of Physics
University of California at Davis

5.1.32 R. N. Mohapatra - Univ. of Maryland

I am very disturbed to learn that the INFN management has adopted the system of time cards to monitor the "research" hours of scientists at various labs in Italy. As is very well known to all active researchers, a true scientist continues to think of research on a 24 hour basis. It therefore does not make any sense at all to use the time card system to monitor the times when the scientists come in and leave presumably with the goal of keeping track of when the scientist is working. All that this kind of monitoring can do is to erode the trust between the management and the scientists leading to low moral and stifling of creativity. This also has great potential to be misused by management to punish people that they do not "like" for nonscientific reasons.

Needless to say that it does not exist in any university in USA that I know of nor in any laboratory. I hope the management of INFN will see the futility of this new procedure and eliminate it as soon as possible.

R. N. Mohapatra,
Professor of Physics,
University of Maryland,
USA

5.1.33 Claus Grupen - Siegen Univ.

Dear Mario,

in my country it is unconceivable to check the presence of researchers in the institutes or universities by magnetic cards. Generally researchers spent more time at work compared to what they are supposed to. In my opinion the recording of the presence of researchers in their office could take a bad influence on the creativity and the engagement of physicists. The recording of the working hours would also contradict the freedom of research.

Unnecessary regulations have always presented a substantial disadvantage in achieving progress.

Claus Grupen
Professor of Physics at
Siegen University, Germany

5.1.34 Michael Gold - Univ. of New Mexico

This is an absurd request. First of all, it is demeaning to treat professional physicists as if they were assembly line workers. Second, it is a waste of time. Third, and most important, it is meaningless as a measure of the quality and quantity of an individual's research.

I suggest that any managers who are so out of touch with the real world of research as to dream up this nonsense be promptly replaced.

Michael Gold,
Associate Professor of Physics
Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of New Mexico

5.1.35 Jean-Marc Richard - Universite Joseph Fourier

Dear Mario,

I got the message from the CERN theory mailing list about the new rules at INFN.

I completely agree with your statements. Without hesitation, everybody accepts that the research work is evaluated: this can lead to constructive improvements. On the other hand, the system you describe is likely to generate an atmosphere of suspicion which will hardly benefit to the quality of the research. So far, the reserach done at INFN is really of first class, and one should maintain this exceptional quality.

With my best regards
Jean-Marc Richard
Professeur,
Universite Joseph Fourier, Grenoble, France
et physicien theoricien,

Institut des Sciences Nucleaires
F-38026 Grenoble Cedex, France

5.1.36 Giorgio Gratta - Stanford Univ.

Caro Dr. Macri,

ho ricevuto il vostro messaggio riguardo l'introduzione di controlli del tempo che i ricercatori INFN spendono "in ufficio" e sono piu' che contento di scrivere questa lettera sull'argomento. Come studente a Roma, borsista INFN e poi ricercatore e professore negli Stati Uniti credo di avere un particolare dovere e diritto a dire qualcosa.

Trovo assolutamente ridicolo che si possa fare ricerca scientifica regolando il numero di ore che i ricercatori passano in ufficio ! Questo non succede in nessun posto reputabile al mondo, e' semplicemente sciocco, semplicistico e sbagliato. Se fosse così semplice fare ricerca non servirebbero i ricercatori ! Chiunque pensi di risolvere i problemi in questo modo non si rende conto che la ricerca scientifica e' un processo estremamente imprevedibile e paradossalmente "irrazionale". Ricerca scientifica ha a che fare con creativita', non con regole. Importanti idee nuove scaturiscono da modi di pensare non convenzionali e spesso sono originate in modo fortuito. Discussioni informali con colleghi, seminari o semplicemente una passeggiata al parco sono occasioni per fare la fisica migliore. In questo contesto anche la semplice nozione di avere un ufficio e' irrilevante.

Si puo' sostenere che la fisica delle particelle, per lo meno in campo sperimentale, sta diventando sempre piu' simile ad un processo industriale. Questo e' sicuramente vero ma non mi sembra certo il caso di accelerare la transizione facendo timbrare il cartellino alla gente. Semmai l'INFN dovrebbe cercare di selezionare solo i migliori ricercatori e circondarli di personale tecnico in grado di coprire le attivita non scientifiche lasciando ai ricercatori il tempo per sviluppare nuove idee. In ogni caso, anche in un ambiente industriale avanzato non ci sono cartellini, la maggior parte delle imprese hi-tech in America sbandiera il "telecommuting" come l'ultima trovata per aumentare il rendimento. In altre parole non solo non c'e' in cartellino, ma non si deve nemmeno andare in ufficio. Certamente sia in un ambiente industriale che in uno scientifico ci deve essere un modo di distinguere "chi fa" da "chi non fa", non so come facciano questo diciamo a Hewlett Packard

(ma lo fanno molto bene !), posso pero dire come tengo il mio gruppo a Stanford competitivo: semplicemente dico a tutti (studenti e ricercatori) che sono supposti produrre risultati. Dico chiaramente che non mi importa quando, dove e come lavorano, basta che in tempi ragionevoli ci siano risultati. In un ambiente scientifico non sempre e' facile giudicare, occorre lasciare molto tempo ed essere flessibili, ma in genere dopo uno, due o tre anni si vede chi funziona (o almeno promette bene) e chi no. Quelli che non funzionano se ne vanno...

Ovviamente nessun sistema e' perfetto, il sistema dell'INFN, almeno come lo ricordo io 10 anni fa, puo' considerasi un gran successo, certo ben al di sopra della maggior parte degli altri enti in Italia. Uno degli aspetti dell'INFN che ho sempre considerato rimarchevole e' la flessibilita', che in genere permetteva di operare l'ente in modo molto efficiente. Credo non ci sia dubbio che qualsiasi collega straniero in fisica delle alte energie consideri l'Italia come un'incredibile "success story" nel campo. E' possibile che l'efficienza del sistema, pesata con il denaro speso sia meno ideale ed e' certo che c'e' gente che approfitta dell'elasticita' del sistema. Questa e' una valutazione molto piu' complessa che sicuramente l'INFN dovrebbe fare, ma sono certo che la situazione non si migliora contando il numero di ore la gente passa in ufficio !

Spero vivamente che l'INFN riconsideri questo punto e non si appresti a fare un gigantesco passo indietro.

Cordiali saluti

Giorgio Gratta

Associate Professor

Stanford University

5.1.37 Fabrizio Pinto - California Inst. of Technology

Dear Italian Colleagues,

I am somewhat embarassed as I attempt to write concerning this new regulation you may be asked to follow, as some of the signers of the letter I received are those who taught me a good deal of what I know. Please realize that these few words are written by one who knows his place well.

What I would like to say in support of the Italian physics community is

that its creativity and level of activity is hardly paralleled not only in Italy, but in the world. Having attended "la Sapienza" during years of turmoil, I was impressed by the stability and quality everyone in the faculty was able to offer, sometimes to the students' surprise (or desires).

This is evidently an example of a dog barking at the wrong tree, as the names I see listed in the letter I recieved are among the most original and productive in the their fields that physics at the international level has to offer. Here in the United States, even in government laboratories, the direction taken to increase productivity has been the opposite – that is, to accommodate the realities of modern life by taking advantage of the Internet, for instance. I know by experience that a scientist keeping his or her rear end on a chair is not necessarily a more productive one. In fact, it is a common anectodical joke that we get much more done at home, on vacation, or in a plane than here on lab.

I am sure that the Italian government will want to take another look at a rule that threatens the lifestyle of a community that has made Italy proud worldwide. We have a proverb here that says "If it's not broken, don't fix it." Of course, some bad apples will take advantange of freedom to rob the taxpayers – but those cases should be dealt with on an individual basis.

I wish you all the best and hope to see more wonderful physics and astronomy made in Italy worldwide, the kind you have produced without someone spoonfeeding you and keeping you in the playpen. Physicists, just as artists, lawyers, dancers, and writers, are engaged in creative work that cannot be enhanced by chaining them at the helm of a trireme.

Sincerely Yours,

Fabrizio Pinto, PhD

Dr. Fabrizio Pinto

Jet Propulsion Laboratory

M/S 301-150

California Institute of Technology

4800 Oak Grove Dr.

Pasadena, CA 91109-8099

5.1.38 Jim Norem - ANL

I have always had a very high respect for the work done at INFN. I am sorry to hear that someone has decided to doubt the quality of the work done there and try to improve it by having the staff clock in and out. This seems unprofessional and useless as a measure of productivity. The added bookkeeping is probably counterproductive.

I hope you are able to avoid this sort of interference.

Jim Norem
HEP Division
Argonne National Laboratory
Argonne IL 60439

5.1.39 Marvin L. Marshak - Univ. of Minnesota

I have been asked as an experienced scientist and university administrator to express my opinion about the new INFN regulations requiring scientists to record the times at which they enter and leave their offices. I believe that such a requirement is counterproductive. Scientists should be judged on the merits of their contributions. Laboratory directors and department heads should be required to make these judgments with adequate peer review by scientists both inside and outside INFN. Administrators who judge scientists by the amount of time they spend in their office are shirking their own responsibilities to make hard decisions. INFN has been a major contributor to excellent science in the world. I would regret seeing such a great institute as INFN lose its ability to contribute as a result of administrative nonsense.

Marvin L. Marshak
University of Minnesota
Morse Alumni Distinguished Teaching
311 Tate Laboratory of Physics
Professor of Physics
116 Church Street S.E.
Director of Residential College Programs
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Legislative Liaison for the Faculty
Consultative Committee

5.1.40 Pedro Waloschek - DESY

I find it difficult to believe that INFN is really going to perform such an incredible step. It contradicts the initial spirit of INFN, which was to encourage research and avoid burocracy. INFN was the unique example in Europe on how to combine successfully research with university teaching. The position and success in the university was coulped to the possible position in INFN and so there was no problem in "checking" the quality of the work done. And this really does not depend at all on the number of hours spent in the Institute.

Will physicists be payed by INFN based on the "hour of thinking"? Is it postulated by the burocrats that you can not think at home or while you are driving, but only in your Institute? Will INFN check the time spent in the Internet too?

Horrified
Pedro Waloschek
DESY
PS: I was a member of INFN from 1957(!) until 1968.

5.1.41 Mark Gross - California State Univ.

I agree 100%. It sounds like what needs to be done is to put someone in charge who has the ability and courage to judge scientific activities on their own merit rather than by the time spent carrying them out which is irrelevent. Was one hour of Einstein's work worth the same as one hour of the average physicist's work?

Rediculous!
Mark Gross
Professor, California State University
California, U.S.A.

5.1.42 Manfried Faber - Technische Universitaet Wien

Dear Colleague,

With astonishment I became aware of the fact that researchers of INFN have to clock in/out since 1st of July 1998. Thats an attitude which is not

at all common in the international community of scientists.

Scientific work can not be counted in hours. What counts is the number of ideas which somebody has and his strength in pushing through these new ideas. This needs of course also strong personal efforts.

Such rules which are now introduced at INFN are completely contraproductive.

At university institutes of Austria we have the rule that we have to work 40 hours per week. We have to be present at the institute if necessary for our duties, like teaching and administrative work. We can do our scientific work where we can do it best, e.g. at home, in other institutes, in libraries. It leads to the attitude that the colleagues work much more than 40 hours. We are interested in science, Physics is not only our work but our hobby.

There should be more intelligent rules to measure the scientific productivity.

A rule for the choice of managment is for shure their ability to introduce appropriate rules in cooperation with the scientific staff. Your managment has shown that they are not able to rule your institutes in an appropriate manner.

I advice you to make any efforts to change your managment.

With best regards,

Univ. Prof. Manfried Faber

Institut fuer Kernphysik

Technische Universitaet Wien

5.1.43 Carlos Naon - Universidad Nacional de La Plata

Dear Mr. Mario Macri,

My name is Carlos Naon. I am Doctor in Physics and Professor in the Physics Department at Facultad de Ciencias Exactas, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina. I am really surprised and annoyed by the crazy idea of the management of INFN that the researchers have to clock in/out with a magnetic card. I have received this bad news from a group of italian colleagues that asked me to give you my opinion about it. All I want to say is that I am sure that "the father of this creature" is not a scientist. It is evident that he/she or they do not have the slightest idea about the

real nature of scientific research. This is the first time I hear something like that! (Let me tell you that I have worked many years in USA and also know some centers in Europe). Only a highly bureaucratized, kafkian mind could conceive such a thing. I hope this will not be taken seriously,

Best regards,

Carlos Naon

5.1.44 Michel Van Hove - LBNL

Dear Sir, I have received the appended paragraph extracted from an e-mail complaining about the indicated procedure. Without knowing the broader picture, I in principle fully support the opposition to such practices, which to my knowledge are applied in no other public research facility in the world. Time keeping is not a useful measure of research productivity, and is a wasteful occupation itself. Quality and quantity of output are useful measures, even if they are more difficult to quantify.

Yours sincerely,

Michel Van Hove

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

5.1.45 Donald S. Gemmell - ANL

Dear Mr. Macri,

I have just learned from several of your scientific colleagues at Frascati that the INFN management is instituting a system of clocking in and clocking out for research staff.

As a scientist who spent about 10 years as director of the Physics Division here at Argonne National Laboratory, please allow me to urge the reversal of that decision.

It is my experience that scientists perform at their best (and that is presumably what Frascati desires) when they are left "uncontrolled". Unsubtle attemps to force them to be "efficient", as defined by administrators, are doomed to failure. Such attempts are bad for morale and also encourage the feeling that when a scientist clocks out, he/she has finished work for the day and that, of course, is far from the ethic of most good researchers.

I am reminded of a story stemming from the early days of this laboratory when a similar effort was made to have our staff clock in and out. One of

our staff members of some note responded that it was OK with him provided that a clock machine was installed at his home too. That scientist was Enrico Fermi. The idea of clocking in/out was abandonned.

Yours sincerely,
Donald S. Gemmell
Physics Division,
Argonne National Laboratory.

5.1.46 Norman K. Glendenning - LBNL

To the Management Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Italia

I am appaled to hear of the misuse of science and technology for the purpose of monitoring the working hours of Italian Scientists. Anyone who has the least idea of how original thought comes out of the mind knows that it is percolating there at all times. The proposed use of card keys to monitor the presence and movement in a country that produced Galilei, Fermi, Segre, Regge, Majorana .... the list is interminable, is unthinkable. It is a shame on the heads of the administration and will earn the contempt of scholars everywhere. It will turn Italian Science Administrators into the laughing stock of the world.

I urge the Science Administrators in Italy desist in this abhorant behavior and allow respect to return to the Italian Scientific Comunity.

Norman K. Glendenning
Nuclear Science Division & Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California, 94720

5.1.47 Richard Friedberg - Barnard College

Dear Dr. Macri:

In response to the letter about a new ruling concerning time cards for INFN researchers, I can only say that if I were required to account for the amount of time I spend in each place, I think I would have to resign from the institution. I don't think I could do it, and remain creative.

Yours truly,

Richard Friedberg
Chairman, Dept of Physics and Astronomy
Barnard College
New York City

5.1.48 Robert Gardner - Indiana Univ.

Dear Dr. Macri,

I've recently heard of a new policy INFN is adopting which requires physicists to punch a clock, as if they were factory workers on an assembly line.

I believe this would be a serious mistake and would deal a blow to the morale of what has been a very successful scientific program.

Most scientific researchers working at government laboratories or universities are already undercompensated. This is true for the United States as well as Italy. In the U.S., this poses a serious problem for recruiting young people into high energy physics. Postdocs often make a factor of 2 more salary leaving high energy physics for private industry. I could not imagine trying to attract graduate students into a field where in addition to low pay their productivity will be measured by minutes clocked rather than scientific results.

INFN must have the notion that bright, serious, young people will flock into physics no matter what rules are made for the work environment or the compensation offered.

Regards,
Robert Gardner
Assistant Professor of Physics
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

5.1.49 Thomas K. Gaisser - Univ. of Delaware

Dear Professor Macri,

I am distressed to learn of the time-card system that has been introduced recently for INFN researchers. I find this very surprising for two reasons:

1. It is likely to produce the opposite of what I assume is its purpose, which would be to insure that Italian researchers continue to produce

outstanding work as they have done for hundreds of years and are doing now. Work of this kind should be judged by the results, i.e. discoveries, publications and (where appropriate) teaching and training of students. A regulation like this will tend instead to encourage "working to rule" rather than being productive.

2. It is completely against the international norm for research workers who often spend essentially all waking hours on their work and need to fit in personal obligations whenever possible.

I hope you and your colleagues are able to reverse these counterproductive regulations.

Sincerely yours,
Thomas K. Gaisser
Professor of Physics
Bartol Research Institute
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716 USA

5.1.50 Giancarlo Moneti - Syracuse Univ.

Caro Macrì,

La notizia che la direzione dell'INFN ha intenzione di istallare il sistema del cartellino per contare le ore lavorative dei ricercatori mi ha veramente addolorato.

Nel campo della ricerca, quello che conta e' quanto il ricercatore produce, e la sua carriera, attraverso pubblicazioni, presentazioni a congressi o pura fama, e' legata alla sua produzione, giudicata dai suoi pari all'interno dell'istituto nel quale lavora ed all'esterno di esso. Quasi tutti i ricercatori dedicano molte ore notturne (o la mattina presto) al loro lavoro. Sono le uniche ore, per molti, nelle quali potersi concentrare, apprendere e produrre idee. Oggi poi, con computers ed internet, e' molto efficiente lavorare a case, a parte la necessita' di interagire con altri: colleghi, superiori ed inferiori. Il sistema del cartellino non ha senso per questo tipo di lavoro.

Negli Stati Uniti, dove vivo da trent'anni, il "management" di qualunque azienda, grande o piccola, pubblica o privata, commerciale, industriale o accademica ha una meritata fama di grande severita' ed attenzione a spremere

il massimo possibile dai dipendenti. Quanto ad orari funziona come ora descrivo.

Gli inservienti, operai, commessi, sgretari/ie di basso rango sono "non exempt", cioe' devono marcare l'orario e sono "wage earner" cioe' vengono pagati settimanalmente in base alla paga oraria ed alle ore di lavoro effettuate e registrate. Gli impiegati con responsabilita' professionali o dirigenti sono "exempt", cioe' non hanno orario rigido ne' hanno il dovere di registare le loro ore di lavoro e sono "salaried" cioe' sono pagati in base ad uno stipendio ("salary") annuale pagato mensilmente o quindicinalmente (come nello stato di NY). Ovviamente tutti i ricercatori scientifici, qui negli Stati Uniti, sono "exempt employees". La contropartita di non avere orario rigido e' che dovono svolgere i compiti dei quali sono responsabili indipendentemen te da quanto tempo occorre e quando. Puo' essere necessario per loro lavorare di notte, nei weekends, nelle feste se necessario. La contropartita e' anche l'assenza di aumenti di stipendio per anzianita': gli aumenti sono legati al merito, come anche le promozioni.

Vi auguro e mi auguro che questa assurda proposta della direzione dell'INFN rientri prontamente, come gia' e' avvenuto nel lontano passato.

Giancarlo Moneti
Professore Emerito e Professore di Ricerca
201 Physics Bldg
Syracuse University
Syracuse NY 13244-1130

5.1.51 John F. Martin - Univ. of Toronto

23 Sept 98

Dear Mario,

I find it astonishing that INFN has set up a bureaucratic system to have researchers account for their time by clocking in and out and reporting detailed time/activity for periods spent away from their institutes.

I have never heard of such a system in any country. It is certainly not practiced in any Canadian academic science institute or university.

This will be quite an imposition, especially as high energy physicists travel quite a lot to accomplish their research.

A researcher has been highly selected and is motivated strongly to do

research, and normally puts in hours in excess of a "regular" job in industry. It seems a little insulting to force such a clocking system on these people.

I cannot imagine what the reason is, unless it is to expose a few researchers not doing their job. But this must be a small percentage. A much better way to accomplish this is a yearly activity report submitted by the researchers and reviewed by lab directors or high level committees of researchers. This is common practice, at least in Canada.

I hope that INFN will reconsider and eventually withdraw the ill-considered system they have put in place.

Yours sincerely,

John F. Martin

Professor, University of Toronto

5.1.52 Niall MacKay - Pembroke College, Cambridge

I am appalled to hear of the introduction of timed working hours for academic research physicists in Italy. This shows an utter lack of appreciation of how scientific research is done.

When a physicist is deeply involved in, and making progress on, a research problem, (s)he becomes obsessed; the problem takes over his waking hours, and frequently interrupts his sleep as well. Is this time to be measured? Will time outside the research institute be counted? I think not. The need for a scientist to spend fixed numbers of hours in the workplace can only adversely affect his research.

It might be argued that such hard-working scientists will not be affected by the rules, that it will only affect those whose effort is minimal. But such people rarely survive into a research career anyway: being a professional researcher demands enthusiasm and commitment, and is not merely a 9-to-5 job. A scheme which suggests that it is only shows how little its administrators understand about science.

Niall MacKay,

Stokes Fellow,

Pembroke College,

Cambridge

5.1.53 Julian Lewis - CERN

I regard the unfortunate decision taken by the Italian bureaucrats managing the INFN to be unimaginative, short sighted, and demotivating to the staff. It is completely ridiculous to assume that the quality, creativity or imagination of scientists can be improved by forcing them into a rigid time structure, in fact quite the reverse is true. This stupidity is a direct attack on your liberty to think and exchange ideas freely with your fellow scientists, and hence a serious blow to international high energy physics, in which the Italians have been a major motivating force. It is a cause for regret that attitudes today towards fundamental research tend to focus more and more on short term goals and profit.

Julian Lewis
Senior Engineer CERN

5.1.54 William Murray - RAL

Dear Sir, I have heard that INFN researchers are now required to 'clock in' their hours at work. I must protest that this procedure can only lead to more beaurocratic efforts,as the nature of research is that people do not file in and out of one office for 5 days a week. The discussion with a colleague over a coffee in the evening may produce more results than spending all day at a desk. In my experience people work in this field because it interests them, and far more people work 80 hours a week than too few. In the UK we rejected this procedure as a waste of time, and I can see no reason for it to be different in Italy.

Yours sincerely,
William Murray
Rutherford Appleton Laboratory

5.1.55 Gerard Watts - King's College London

I first heard of this from an INFN researcher in July, and I could not believe what I was told. The shows that the INFN clearly does not understand, or chooses not to understand, the true nature of research.

This decision will make the INFN the laughing stock of other nations.

I hope very much that you are able to get this decision changed,

Dr Gerard Watts,
King's College London

5.1.56 Domenico Campi - CERN

Dear Mario and Stefano, my point of view on the subject is that the enthousiasm that I have experienced by the large majority of the INFN researchers and scientists with whom I got in contact, goes largely beyond the official worktime.

Most of them have never cared about evening, saturday or sunday to reach their goals with the highest dedication.

Freedom and personal responsability are at the base of scientific creativity, and the quality of the results is not, in my view, directly proportional to the time spent behind the desk.

I think that the effort spent to this kind of administartive controls is greater than the gains one gets,(especially if the salary is not linked with the number of hours spent at work!) and sometime the risk is to frustrate people rather than motivating them

In my expeierence at CERN the best scientific and economical results have been reached when the sense of personal responsibility and the one of identification with his own Institution have been encouraged .

I sincerely hope that this measure is only temporay, at least for confirmed reserchers.

Best regards.
Domenico CAMPI /EP
CMS Coil Coordinator

5.1.57 Nick van Eijndhoven - Utrecht Univ. / NIKHEF

Dear Andrea, Mario and others, I fully agree with you that the above regulations are absolute nonsense and may even work contra-productive. I know quite a few Italian colleagues and like all other physicists they spend a lot of time working at home or at international institutes (e.g. CERN) in what actually should be their spare time (i.e. late evenings and weekends) without any financial compensation. Imposing the above regulations would to

my opinion not increase the productivity, but more effect in a 'resistance' to offer one's spare time for work. In addition I would like to raise the question whether the same regulations will be imposed on people working for the European parliament?

Cheers,
Dr. Nick van Eijndhoven
Department of Subatomic Physics
Utrecht University / NIKHEF
CERN PPE Division / ALICE exp.

5.1.58 Muzaffer Atac - Fermilab and UCLA

Dear Dr. Mario Macri:

As I understand Italian Scientists are being asked to carry magnetic cards to have their activity-time recorded in some location. As an American scientist I found this a very shocking news. The science in the United State has been flourished mainly because of the scientific freedom. When they are watched like factory workers it may backfire in their productivity. Thinking about myself; I may have found some of my best ideas or solutions to my problems while driving, before going to sleep or walking around. One of our prominent physicists found the solution to his physics equation while taking a bath (this is a fact).

I do High Energy Particle Research at Fermi National Laboratory. Some of my physicist friends from Italy heve been Italian scientists. They have been very successful in our field. They have all the freedom they need to produce results. Sometime they work until midnight or weekends. They may come to the laboratory around 10 o'clock in the morning. It realy does not matter. We cannot predict when the mind will spark.

I hope that you reconsider the action taken about Italian Scientists. Italy would be the first in the world in restricting the scientific freedom. Directors or laboratory leaders in your country must have some means of monitoring activities of their scientists. This should be left to them.

Respectfully,
Dr.Muzaffer Atac
Senior Physicist at Fermilab
and Prof. of Physics at UCLA

5.1.59 Peter Apell - Chalmers Univ. of Technology Goteborg, Sweden

In response to your letter:

In modern science as elsewhere in society it is the result which is important not the way it was done, who did it or WHEN it was done!!

Having spent many long term stays in Italy (Trieste, Pisa and Napoli) I am surprised you take such a backward step in organizing modern research activities

best wishes
peter apell
professor
applied physics
chalmers university of technology
goteborg, sweden

5.1.60 Bjarne Stugu - Bergen

I agree with you all that the requirement of clocking in/out is "useless bureaucratic nonsense". I know Italian physicists as extremely hard working, usually working many hours more per day than a normal working day would require. If INFN should have to pay you for these additional hours, I guess that it would add significantly to the income of most of you !

I am surprised that INFN management shows such a lack of understanding of how scientific results are achieved. Best regards,

Bjarne Stugu

5.1.61 Howard Matis - LBNL

I just received an e-mail which says that Italian Physicists must clock in and out and account for every minute of their time.

I assume the e-mail is a practical joke. For any reasonable person who knows creative people realizes that work in physics simply cannot be compartmentalized. For instance, I often get ideas in the early morning. If I were an Italian physicist would have to jump out of bed and punch my time clock. I do not think my wife would understand. Also, if I am working on two problems at once, should I double charge.

I have know very many Italian physicists. They all have been hard working and made important contributions to my experiments. They all worked very long days.

As someone who worked with many of Enrico Fermi's colleagues and heard many tales of him, I know that Fermi must be turning in his grave because of this timekeeping plan.

Please tell me that this plan have researchers clock in/out is a hoax.

Howard Matis
Staff Physicist
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
Berkeley, CA 94720 USA

5.1.62 Robert V. Kowalewski - Univ. of Victoria

I'm concerned about the policy proposed by the INFN management that would have INFN researchers keep a detailed log of the time spent in and out of their laboratories and research centers. I can only guess that such a system is aimed at either

1. punishing those researchers who take advantage of their positions (these, if they exist, must be a small minority) or

2. evaluating the quality of their scientific work based on the hours they spend "clocked-in" in their institutes - a rather superficial means of evaluating scientific research.

This surveillance strikes me as unnecessary and counter-productive. The laboratories in Canada and in the United States, who can rightly be proud of their history of scientific achievement, do not subject their researchers to such a system, but rather use peer review to evaluate the quality of the research done by each institute and each individual.

Based on the experience I've had working with INFN researchers at CERN and SLAC over the last 10 years I would rate them as second to none. They deserve to be treated with a respect corresponding to their international stature as scientists; the proposed policy does not acheive this.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Robert V. Kowalewski
University of Victoria

CANADA

5.1.63 Andrew Sandorfi - BNL

I was saddened to hear of the insulting bureaucracy that is evidently being forced upon you. I have enjoyed working with colleagues from Frascati for many years and I have the highest esteem for their work.

I have one suggestion for you: suggest that the time records of the scientific staff and of those in the INFN administration divisions be compared. Propose that the staff of the division which works the most hours be paid overtime, and let the funds for this be taken from the staff of the division that puts in the fewest hours. (Since no bureaucrat has the courage to put in the hours of a physicist, it won't take long to starve out the opposition.)

I sincerely hope that the INFN will soon realize the treasures with which they are entrusted and treat them accordingly.

Andrew Sandorfi
Senior Physicist
Brookhaven National Laboratory

5.1.64 Pete E.C. Markowitz - Florida Int. Univ.

Having been involved in experiments with physicists from INFN/Roma, Bari and Lecce, I am happy to write to you in support of the hard work and incredible quality of the INFN physicists.

I agree with the letter I received, stating that asking the physicists to "punch a time clock" would be counter-productive. Not only is it demeaning to their personal dignity and an insult to their integrity, but it somehow conveys the impression that:

i) the INFN does not believe the physicists work enough hours, and ii) that all work can be judged solely by the number of hours involved.

Both are patently false. I do support the INFN reseachers and associates who are challenging this conception. If I can be of more service, please let me know.

Dr. Pete E.C. Markowitz
Asst. Professor, Physics Department
Florida International University

5.1.65 Murman Margvelashvili - Tbilisi State Univ.

Recently I have recieved a message from Italian collegues working in INFN about new regulation of their worktime.

It is not a secret that Italian Physicists are ranked the highest among the world scientific community and I think this is because they have some other motivations for good work than strict control of their working hours. I have spent some time in Italy and in INFN as well and I found only hard working people dedicated to their job, who were working long hours even on weekends. I honestly don't think that increased time control could add anything to their performace except stress and discomfort. We have an experience of Soviet system and know how much time and effort is spent in order to maintain such an arrangement which is totally unnatural for science. As you very well know there are well known criteria and incentives which help to motivate scientists and to judge their performance.

I wish a great success and further development to Italian Science and scientists of which I have a true and deep respect and hope that this will be a short episode without any serious impact on the scientific process.

Sincerely Yours

Dr. Murman Margvelashvili

Tbilisi State University

5.1.66 Konstantin Zioutas - Univ. Of Thessaloniki

Dear professor Macri,

I was really chocked hearing that italian researchers in INFN have to clock in/out. Their worldwide reputation certainly doesnot deserve such a treatment. This rule will be an obstacle for the creative researchers. Therefore, I ask you herewith with emphasis to reconsider this unacceptable rule for the 21st century.

Sincerely Yours,

Konstantin Zioutas

University Of Thessaloniki Greece

5.1.67 Peter Landshoff - DAMTP Cambridge

Dear Professor Macri Theoretical research is good research only if it contains new ideas. The generation of new ideas is a mysterious process, but one cannot simply sit down and say now I am going to have an idea. It requires periods of intense concentration and also of relaxation. It is certainly counter-productive to have to sit at one's desk for a fixed 8-hour period each day. Therefore I am extremely alarmed to hear what INFN proposes. It has an excellent reputation for its research, but it seems to me that it is about to kill it.

With regards
Professor Peter Landshoff
DAMTP
Silver Street
Cambridge CB3 9EW

5.1.68 Yasushi Watanabe - Tokyo Inst. of Technology

Dear friends in Italy:

I received your email on the "crazy" regulation at INFN. Without hearing the exact intension from the management, I cannot make a strong comment on this issue. Nevertheless, I am certainly against the measure by the management. The activities of scientists cannot be measured by the time spent. But a question is how they use the data. Is a scientist working long hours paid more or rather criticized instead? As long as it gives little effect on scientific activities, we would just live with it, if we were you.

We need more information. We probably can give you a more official statement from the Japanese society of HE physicists, if it will help you further.

Incidentally, HE physicists in Japan have admired your system of INFN, where laboratories of High energy physics and universities are united in an ideal fashion. In Japan, KEK had been strengthened, overweighing high energy physicists in universities. This measure was successful in bringing the HE physics in Japan to the world level, but at the same time created two serious problems. One is that it has become really difficult for HE physicists once hired by KEK to move out of KEK and thus to have opportunities

to teach young students. Another is the less visibility of HE physicists in Japanese universities, who promote Japanese big projects; this will result in a reduction of staff of HE physicists from universities. Both facts work against attracting young fresh people into this field.

We sincerely hope that your system is kept as efficient as ever, so that some day, we can succeed in persuading the Japanese government to adopt a system like yours in Japan.

One of your true friends.

Yasushi Watanabe,

Professor of physics

Tokyo Institute of Technology

5.1.69 Duccio Abbaneo - CERN

Buongiorno. Invio queste righe in seguito all'invito ricevuto ad esprimere la propria opinione riguardo all'introduzione del "cartellino" nell'INFN.

E' preoccupante questa svolta burocratica di quello che e' stato fino ad oggi uno degli enti di ricerca piu' importanti ed efficaci d'Europa. La peculiarita' del lavoro di ricerca deve essere salvaguardata, e l'INFN non puo' e non deve uniformarsi agli altri enti statali. In un laboratorio la politica deve essere quella di fornire ai ricercatori tutte le facilitazioni possibili e di sollevarli di ogni impedimento burocratico con lo scopo di ottenere da loro la piu' alta efficienza sul lavoro. E la qualita' dei risultati ottenuti e' il solo possibile metro di giudizio per il lavoro di ricerca. Il piu' bell'esempio di questa politica e' il CERN, grazie al quale l'Europa ha colmato l'abisso con gli USA e guadagnato la leadership nella fisica delle alte energie. E' demoralizzante vedere che l'Italia si muove in direzione opposta.

Cordiali saluti.

Duccio Abbaneo - CERN EP Division

5.1.70 Gerald P. Thomas - Fermilab

I agree with those complaining about the policies concerning "checking in and checking out" when spending time both "inside" and "outside" their institutions. Checking in/out amounts to a "non-professional" treatment of the scientists involved. The authorities should take the time to investigate any occasional "bad guy". They should not "persecute" ALL the scientists

due to the behavior of just a "few"! This reminds me of the behavior of Nazis who killed innocent people from the "general" population in a town when any Nazi soldier was killed by ONLY a couple of people of that town.

Respectfully yours,
Dr. Gerald P. Thomas
Fermilab

5.1.71 Zagel - Fermilab

It is always astonishing to me when the lack of good management produces more useless bureaucratic nonsense.

The only effective way to assure that a scientists time is well spent is a close interaction with immediate supervision on the current project.

It sounds as though one, or a few, individuals have gone beyond the bounds of good practice and the typical (poor) management response is to "punish" everyone. For some reason (poor) managers like to come up with policies that make no sense instead of dealing with the individuals who violate common sense.

Good luck in your quest to stop this rediculous policy before it spreads.
There must be a good "Dilbert" cartoon in here somewhere.
Zagel
Fermilab

5.1.72 Edward Hart - Univ. of Tennessee

Dear Dr. Macri,

In 1964-65, I spent over a year as a visiting scientist, under Professor Lucciano Bertanza of the University of Pisa, Physics Dept. I was on a sabbatical leave from Brookhaven National Laboratory. Had the current policy been then in effect, I doubt very much if I would have accepted a position at Pisa. I think the idea of "punching a time clock" will have a disastrous effect on basic research in Italy.

Sincerely,
Edward Hart
Professor, Physics
University of Tennessee.

5.1.73 Angelos Angelopoulos - Univ. of Athens

Concerning your message I find the introduction of a card to control the working time of scientists as an extreme unscientific measure. If such a card will be introduced you will stop thinking and working before and after the official working times? Do the people who proposed the measure will pay the extra work you will offer outside the schedule? I do not think that scientists can effectively work under such restrictions and I absolutely disagree with this kind of measures.

Best regards

Angelos Angelopoulos

University of Athens

PS: Why you do not contact the physics societies of the European and other countries to support you on this problem?

5.1.74 Abel Camacho Quintana - Univ. Aut. Met.-Iztapalapa

To whom it may concern:

Recently I have read the rules that INFN has set to its researchers. As far as I know, this is the only situation in which members of a scientific institution must abide by these kind of burocratic rules.

If scientific research and work involve one of mankind's most precious gifts, namely creativity, I might wonder if a predominatly burocratic atmosphere (and I do not need to comment that burocracry has usually no common point with creativity) could render better scientific results.

Maybe you could answer a question: would artists (musicians, painters, etc.) accept these rules?

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Abel Camacho Quintana,

Physics Department,

Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, Mexico

5.1.75 Caren Marzban - Univ. of Oklahoma

Although I have heard of an increasing number of industry-related entities relying more on the card check-in/out system, I have never heard of any sci-

entitifc/research entity relying on such a system for any purpose; my opinion is based on 10's of research entities that I have participated in personally. If the check-in/out system is ever implemented in your establishment, it will be a step back-ward to the dark ages. Good luck to you, in this supposed age of enlightenment.

Caren Marzban
Dept. of Physics, University of Oklahoma, and
National Severe Storms Laboratory.
Norman, Oklahoma, USA

5.1.76 Peter Marzlin - Macquarie Univ. Sydney

You seem to have a really poor management. If they think that this kind of time-check would boost scientific productivity they probably never have done research for themselves. On the other hand, according to my experience the vast majority of researchers spends a lot more time in their office/laboratory than they have to. If this is the case at your institute, too, then ask your management to be paid according to the hours of presence. If they agree, this would mean a salary increase for most of your colleagues. If they don't they admit that there is really no reason to introduce the time-check.

Yours sincerely,
Peter Marzlin
Dr. Karl-Peter Marzlin
School of MPCE
Macquarie University
Sydney, NSW 2109
Australia

5.1.77 Iris Abt - MPI fuer Physik

I have received the attached letter.

My comment.

Such nonsense has been tried in other institutes. It has always resulted in a drop of efficiency and creativity. Science per definition cannot be performed at regulated hours. Such regulations always result in frustrated scientists killing time and not doing their job as well as they want to and could.

Iris Abt

MPI fuer Physik,

Munich

5.1.78 Stefano Fantoni - SISSA Trieste

Sono assolutamente daccordo che il cartellino non puo' essere considerato come un quantificatore del "lavoro" di un ricercatore.

L'unico quantificatore serio e' la sua produzione scientifica. Mi sembra talmente ovvio che non ci dovrebbe essere neppure il bisogno di dirlo, e, francamente non credo che ci siano all'interno dell'INFN "scienziati" che non la pensino cosi'.

Anzi, il cartellino e' e sara' sempre piu' dannoso all'efficienza vera dell'INFN, sia perche' favorira' proprio coloro che non vedono nella ricerca ad alto livello l'obbiettivo primario dell'ente, sia perche' costituisce un elemento di disturbo a che dipendenti dell'INFN si trovino presso Universita' o altre istituzioni scientifiche.

Tuttavia, ribadire questo concetto non mi pare che serva a molto, soprattutto adesso che la pantomima del cartellino e' gia' in atto.

Tra l'altro il problema del cartellino non c'e' soltanto per i dipendenti INFN, ma anche per dipendenti di altri enti scientifici, come CNR etc.

In realta', l'istituzione del cartellino e' solo una deresponsabilizzazzione della dirigenza. Un buona dirigenza deve poter sapere chi fa e chi non fa nel suo ente (questo, secondo me vale anche per il personale tecnico-amministrativo). E purtruppo questo e' un fatto generalizzato nel nostro paese, e, non vedo come una battaglia contro il cartellino fatta solo all'interno dell'INFN possa avere esito positivo.

Mi spiace di essere pessimista, ma, non ho buoni suggerimenti da dare, tranne che tentare di convincere la dirigenza INFN ad avere coraggio, essere innovativi (come e' successo nel passato), e di proporre a ministeri e sindacati una valutazione seria dei suoi dipendenti, che potrebbe servire come prototipo di altri enti scientifici nazionali.

Cordiali saluti,

stefano fantoni

5.1.79 A. Rodriguez -

I totally agree that the requests of your present administration are completely nonsense. But even more nonsense is having an odd administrator who is in the least able to understand and evaluate the kind of work which is developed under his care, so you should organize your community with conscience and conviction that only an own physics expert is the right person for such key positions in the administration, and not somebody else taken just from some top position in the goverment.

with my best Regards,

A. Rodriguez

5.1.80 King Y Ng - Fermilab

Concerning clocking in and out:

A factory worker clocks in and out. But a factory worker does work for the factory only when he is in the factory and nothing when he is away from the factory.

A research worker works in the home office or lab. But when he goes home he works on his reseach for the lab also. For example, some take books and papers home to read. Some do computation and derivation at home. Some even buy computers so that they can continue to work in the evenings and/or weekends after they leave the office. There is no way to clock all those extra hours a reseacher works.

So far as I know, for many top reseach workers, the time they spend in their offices has very often been for discussions with colleagues, for meetings, and for gathering research materials. Most of the important research work and significant progress of a work have been performed at home, early in the morning and late in the evening when there is nobody to disturb them.

For the above reason, it is impossible to measure the amount of contribution of a reseach worker by the amount of time he spends in his office.

King Y Ng

Applied Scientist

Fermilab

5.1.81 Yannick Meurice - Univ. of Iowa

Dear Mario Macri,

Everybody I talked to at the University of Iowa, thinks that measuring the time spent in an office is a very poor way to measure the scientific quality of a researcher. I have never heard about any good research institute or department which would rely on such inappropriate method.

Best regards.

Yannick Meurice

Physics Professor

University of Iowa

Iowa City, USA

5.1.82 Jean-Louis Masnou - Paris Obs., Meudon

Dear Colleague,

According to my knowledge, there are no rule of this type you describe for INFN elsewhere in Europe.

It seems amazing that, in order to check the activity of the researchers, the INFN Administration has found no other choice than to install a clock on each individual.

This rule will be inoperant for the following reasons:

1. If a researcher knows he is spied, he will be less motivated for active research. He will perform only standard routine such as running indefinitetly the same experimental procedure. It is the best way to get the Nobel Prize in Thermodynamics: "Discovery of the indefinite motion".

2. It would be interested to know with what accuracy the work duration will be measured. The best timing techniques go down as low as the femtosecond. If the Administration is unable to be as accurate as this limit, what is the interest of the measurement?

3. In the promoting Commisssions, a statistician will be appointed and will become the real boss. It will be easy to make a decision.

For example:

Albert Einstein has been in his Office only 2 hours this week. Instead of working, he has been seen driving with his bicycle around a Princeton building. He is fired.

Jean-Louis Masnou

5.1.83 Howard Nicholson - Mount Holyoke College

I think it is a waste of time for researchers to be asked to account for their time and I do not know of any reputable organization in the United States which operates on this principle. The result of this will certainly reduce productivity since some time which could be spent on research will be used in verifying the time spent on research.

It is a bad idea and should be eliminated.

Howard Nicholson

Mount Holyoke College

DOE Principle Investigator

5.1.84 Federico Carminati - CERN

Caro Mario, e cari ricercatori e ricercatrici INFN, ovviamente avete tutta la mia solidarieta' contro questa misura ridicola che e' un'insulto per coloro che spendono ben piu' di otto ore al giorno a lavorare, e che lo fanno solo per passione. Spero che una soluzione possa essere trovata che rispetti la dignita' dei ricercatori e della ricerca scientifica italiana.

Federico Carminati

Senior Physicist

CERN-EP

5.1.85 Nikita Nekrassov - Harvard Univ.

As a physicist coming from the former Soviet union and familiar very well with both uselesness and harmfulness of bureacratic power I'd like to support the fear of my Italian colleagues that any kind of formal justification of quality and quantity of scientific work is a complete nonsense. The research, especially the research in theoretical physics is a creative phenomenon and cannot and shouldn't be regulated, nor judged on the basis of amount of time spent. THe best work done in theoretical physics was done by people

who didn't have to report on every minute they spent while thinking on this or that problem. Examples are obvious and there is no need for providing them.

Nikita Nekrassov,
Lyman Lab for Physics,
Harvard University

5.1.86 Robert Mills - Ohio State Univ.

I agree wholeheartedly that the kind of breaucratic restrictions described in a recent email from Stefano Bianco represent a terrible violation of intellectual freedom and an insult to the integrity of the scientific community. Please add my name to those listed.

Robert Mills
Professor Emeritus
Department of Physics
Ohio State University

5.1.87 Ann Nelson - Univ. of Washington

To whom it may concern I recently got a note informing me that italian researchers may soon have to record their office hours. This seems a completely innappropriate way to evaluate scientists, and is completely contrary to the international norm of using peer review of research output as the main criteria. I believe the new proposed system would be harmful to itialian science and morale.

Sincerely
Prof Ann Nelson
University of Washington
USA

5.1.88 Hartmut Machner - Juelich

Dear Colleagues, in my opinion is a scientist in some way like an artist. One needs a lot of phantasie and imagination to be a creative researcher. Leonardo da Vinci is a good example of a person having both talents. No one would expect from an artist to have regularly working hours which are

even controlled. The next step would be to have the ideas in a fixed time, say from 10.30 to 11.30. This may enlighten the stupidity of such a method.

I wish you success in the fight against such burocratism.

Yours sincerely

Hartmut Machner
Dr. Hartmut Machner
Institut fuer Kernphysik
Forschungszentrum Juelich
D-52425 JUELICH

5.1.89 Ian McNulty - ANL

Dear Dr. Macri,

I too am appalled at this new ruling by the INFN which requires researchers to clock in/out and to declare one's exact activities while at work, at outside institutes, and at home. It truly constitutes needless beaurocracy, and is extremely counterproductive in the context of a research institute where the creativity and ability to think and act freely (within societally appropriate limits) is *essential* to the conduct of the scientific enterprise. I cannot imagine the severity of the consequences on our productivity and morale if such a ruling were imposed on the research personnal of my own institution. I sincerely hope that this police-state condition recently imposed on Italian scientists is abolished soon by the INFN.

Dr. Ian McNulty,
Physicist and Sector Coordinator
Advanced Photon Source,
Argonne National Laboratory

5.1.90 Katherine Freese - Univ. of Michigan

I think it is a very bad idea to ask scientists to clock in and out. As scientists are hard working people who often work on weekends, at home, on the road, in the evening, this clocking procedure will not mean anything. It will create a lot of bureaucracy without testing the real scientific product. I am against this suggested procedure.

Yours,

Professor Katherine Freese

Physics Dept.
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

5.1.91 Marco Delmastro - CERN

Ciao Mario.

Mi chiamo Marco, mi sono laureato a Marzo lavorando con uno dei gruppi INFN di Torino, e questa storia del "cartellino" era gia' discussa con disappunto da un po'...

Adesso sono a lavorare al CERN, la vostra lettera e' arrivata anche qui e ovviamente se ne parla. L'impressione, condivisa da molti, e' che nel mondo della ricerca, nonostante la pretesa liberta di orario e di "non-controllo", e' molto piu' facile e comune e probabile che si lavori di piu' delle ore per cui si e' pagati (certo non di meno, almeno nella media delle persone), vuoi perche' quelle sono le esigenze del lavoro, esperimento, attivita' che stai portando avanti, vuoi perche' hai delle scadenze da rispettare, vuoi perche' fai un lavoro creativo che ti piace e interessa, e ci tieni a ottenere dei risultati.

Non so, mi sembra veramente fuori luogo la decisione. Qui qualcuno mi ha detto di temere che, se parte una esperienza simile in Italia, facilemente potrebbe essere adottata altrove (tipo CERN). La domanda che sorge spontanea e': se - come mi sembra probabile - il conteggio burocratico segnalera' che si e' lavorato di piu' di quanto prevede il contratto, si verra' pagati di piu'?

Buona fortuna
Marco DELMASTRO
CERN - EP/MIC Division

5.1.92 Dave Casper - Univ. of California, Irvine

I received the request for comments about the new INFN policy for monitoring the time of physics researchers.

I sympathize with your outrage at this policy. It is unheard-of anyplace in the world (USA, France, Switzerland, Japan) where I have worked. It is demeaning and insulting to treat researchers like factory workers or coal miners. The performance of a researcher cannot be judged by the number of hours spent in the office, but rather by the quality of his/her ideas. Moreover

the money spent to administer the recordkeeping of this policy could be better spent on doing real physics or hiring more physicists.

If this policy were imposed on me, I would refuse to cooperate, or demand that I be paid overtime when I worked more hours than a standard work week (which would be almost always). I think you are completely justified in your opposition to this policy and I wish you success.

Dave Casper, PhD

University of California, Irvine

5.1.93 Serguei Moukhine - DESY

Dear Colleagues,

for me it is quite obvious that this type of administration effort will never lead to good scientific results. The way in which scientists get their ideas is rather unpredictable. For example, the best ideas came to me when I made love with my wife. Another physicist, professor Zhigunov, told me that the most interesting ideas he got when he was in sauna.

On the other hand, I am 100% sure that even if the Management of INFN will force researchers to make sex in their offices (using plastic cards to mesure the time for this activity) in order to obtain some new scientific ideas, these ideas will never come anyway.

Because freedom is the most important thing for successful scientific work!

With my best wishes,

Dr. Serguei Moukhine

DESY / HERA-B

5.1.94 Omer F. Dayi - Feza Gursey Inst.

Dear Italian Colleagues,

doing research has no relation with being in the office for a certain time. In labs when needed the whole group may even stay for days, but this is not achived by force, it is a part of the research programm. Hence, obviously I protest the decision of the Management of INFN that the researchers have to clock in/out.

I hope that they will see their mistake.

Best regards.

Omer F. Dayi

Feza Gursey Institute
P.O. Box 6
81220-Cengelkoy/Istanbul
Turkey

5.1.95 Juan Jose Gomez-Cadenas - IFIC Valencia

Dear Prof. Macri, I am writing you in response to a note from a wide group of researchers INFN researchers. The note explains their concern about the new INFN rules of using a magnetic card to time their work hours.

I would like to point out that this rule could have very negative effects in the researchers of the INFN. The nature of the research work tends to be in open conflict with a rigid schedule. It is very common in our profession that people work many more hours and in a much more intense way than in other ocupations. However, it is also common that schedules are adapted to the needs of projects and even personal mood of the researcher. Often, an apparently iddle period is nothing but an incubation process of new and fertile ideas, which is followed by a long burst of intense work. I think that a rigid schedule does not help (on the contrary. It hinders) this process.

It is also a fact that the researchers of the INFN as their colleagues of many research institutions are highly educated, extremely motivated and only very moderately payed professionals. The drive for research does not reside, certainly, in a high salary or social status, but instead in the pleasure which produces the challenging nature of our work. I believe that one fundamental element of the self-esteem of a scientist is the conviction than his profession gives him or her an intelectual freedom which could not be found in more profitable jobs (from the economical point of view). I cannot see the use of a measure such as the use of magnetic cards (which can only account for the time expent in an office or laboratory, which in my opinion is not at all connected with scientific results) but I strongly believe it hurts unnecesarily the self-esteem feeling of the researchers of the INFN.

Finally I would like to point out that the evaluation of the scientific merit is only possible measuring the productivity via a combination of evaluation of published work, contributions to experiments, letters from other colleagues, etc. One fears that a rule that imposes a fix schedule for a researcher ends up by a) demoralizing the research comunity of the INFN, b) hurting some

of the most creative people, c) creating a bureocratic actitude towards the research work which will ultimately hurt sorely the scientific output of one of the most prestigious research institutions in Europe.

Thanks very much for your attention,
Juan Jose Gomez-Cadenas,
Prof. of physics,
IFIC, Valencia. Spain.

5.1.96 Paul Watts - Inst. for Advanced Studies, Dublin

I do not know why I was included in this mailing; maybe because two years ago, I was offered an INFN fellowship to study at Bologna. In any case, I am glad that I received this, because I agree whole-heartedly with you and your fellows. The concept of having to check in and out is disgusting to me. As a formal theorist, I can do my work anywhere, and will often go to my home, a park, a pub, or somewhere other than my workplace (the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, in Ireland) to do some calculations. Under the system being proposed, this work would not be accounted for.

Furthermore, one of the main things which I enjoy about research is that I can work when and where I like. I find that the feeling of freedom which this gives me helps my work, rather than hinders it, because the lack of pressure or time restrictions gives my workplace a much more pleasant atmosphere, so that I look forward to coming to my office each day. If I was *forced* to work a certain number of hours at my institute each day, as this new system seems to demand, I think that doing research would be far less pleasant, and that my work would suffer for it.

I hope that you will pass along my comments to whoever is in charge of instituting this misguided (in my opinion) policy change, and I wish you good luck in stopping its implementation.

Sincerely,
Dr Paul Watts

5.1.97 Jacobus Verbaarschot - SUNY Stony Brook

To whom it may concern,

I believe that it is an absolute outrage to keep a detailed check on the schedule of scientist and on their time spend inside the office. Itialian physics has a great tradition, and no scientist is served by this type of burocracy. It send the clearest signal possible that one should not work at home. Our motivation to work is based on our urge to solve a problem, to understand things better than anyone else, and to push your ideas by publishing as many papers as possible. I have been several times in Italy, and it is not different in Italy than it is in the US. Certainly, such rule will make it almost impossible to attract foreign talent. Certainly, I would not want to work under such conditions.

Sincerely,
Jacobus Verbaarschot,
Associate Professor of Physics
SUNY Stony Brook

5.1.98 Steven R. White - Univ. of California, Irvine

I would like to express my opinion that the use of time clocks for physicists is foolish. A good physicist spends many hours thinking about his research when he is not in the office, and often home is quieter and free from disturbing phone calls, so one can be more productive there. It is much better to use peer review to assess the quality and quantity of the work produced.

Sincerely,
Steven R. White
Professor of Physics
Univ. of California, Irvine

5.1.99 Taku Yamanaka - Osaka Univ.

Dear Dr. Mario Marcri,

I was very fascinated to hear that you have started clocking the time in/out of researchers of your institute.

We, the physicist, are motivated to work not by our salary (if so, we will be working at somewhere else), but by the strong desire to find the truth. It is very common for us to spend long hours, and work over weekends. During experiments, we take shifts and work odd hours.

I think this is the same with the physicists in your institute, also.

By adopting the clocking system, I am afraid some scientists in the world might speculate that scientists in your institute will not work unless you use such a system. I hope this is not true.

Taku Yamanaka
Physics Dept.,
Osaka Univ., Japan

5.1.100 Francesca Di Lodovico - ETH

Salve, volevo esprimere solidarieta' nei confronti dei colleghi italiani. Penso infatti che il lavoro di un fisico si debba esprimere nei tempi= che vuole e non si possa controllare attraverso cartellini e soprattutto in questo modo certo non si controlla la qualita' del lavoro.

Distinti saluti,
Francesca Di Lodovico
(dottoranda al politecnico di Zurigo, ETH-Z)

5.1.101 Paul Langacker - Univ. of Pennsylvania

Dear Dr. Macrì, I have never heard of a proposal similar to that of the INFN management for clocking scientists anywhere in the world. I think it is a completely inappropriate way to judge the productivity of a scientist. Most scientists work far more than a standard number of working hours, and put in much thought and effort days, evenings, and weekends. The only measure of the results is the quality, quantity, importance, and impact of their research, as determined by peer review.

Sincerely,
Paul Langacker
Chair, Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6396

5.1.102 Jim MacLachlan - Fermilab

Dear Mario, I have been a little slow to respond to your letter because, besides the usual excuses, I have to say I have been a little uncertain what I should say as an outsider about how other institutions run their business.

You know from your time here that we have no comparable requirement at any professional level. I have been told that your technicians have been punching a clock for some time. I suppose that there is a superficial aspect of fairness to treating all employees alike, but it is such empty symbolism for the way most physicists work, that it doesn't seem useful to me for real democratization and it is certainly, at best, an annoyance and, most likely, a depressant for a productive scientist. We have so-called effort reporting here at Fermilab, but it consists basically of some secretary or the like asking one at the end of the month to say what fraction of time he spent in each category of activity where he has assigned responsibility. For me, this has usually been a statement of 100 be judged by the comparison of your product to that of others engaged in comparable activities. How are we to report our time? Should I record when I wake in the middle of the night to chew over a recalcitrant problem? How about when I am peacefully in my bath (like Archimedies) and suddenly am struck by something that saves me hours of routine work? Do I record the time in the bath or the time saved? I'm not trying to be silly, but the situation would be funny if it were not for the aggravation that it doubtless causes most of the INFN physicists. Maybe there are a few among you who are so focused that their time in the office actually relates to their accomplishment, but I suspect that most, like me, are very irregular in their productivity, sometimes accomplihing in a few hours more than they can do in an equal number of dogged days. I hope you can establish some more satisfactory way for your non-scientific overseers to evaluate prodctivity in physics research. If you do, I would be interested to hear about it, because the U. S. Congress is pushing our DOE to setup cross-disciplinary criteria for judging the return on research funding. - Good luck, Jim MacLachlan

5.1.103 Rajan Gupta - LANL

I think that to judge the effectiveness of scientists based on time recorded in their office (via punched cards) is to ignore the basic notion of how research in physical sciences is carried out.

Progress in science is achieved through highly motivated and committed individuals who spend most of their conscience hours thinking, calculating, doing experiments, learning from others, and discussing their ideas with oth-

ers. The efforts of any individual (or group) in their offices are supplemented by equally important interactions with other scientists around the world. An inspiration while attending an opera, or a casual remark by a colleague can lead to a breakthrough that years of sitting in one's office may not.

Experimental facilities are typically located at a few centers distributed globally. It is necessary for scientists to spend a significant fraction of their time at these, and it is obvious that building and monitoring the experiments, and the subsequent analysis of data cannot be done by just sitting at their offices in their home institutions. A time card that can really measure the full time spent doing the various aspects essential to the success of their job would have to be a very elaborate – and in my opinion such a system has not yet been designed ! So why install a system that is just a wasteful but expensive token.

If the purpose of this time record is to weed out those who are not doing their job properly, then let me assure you that you will not succeed. They will be very diligent in recording their time, while those working hard will have another frustrating and wasteful detail to worry about.

Hope INFN does not take such a – I hate to say – stupid step

Yours concerned

Rajan Gupta

5.1.104 Parthasarathi Mitra - Saha Inst.

Dear Colleague,

This is to express my shock at the recent decision of your authorities to record times of arrival and departure at work. I believe that such strictness should not be necessary as scientists are generally honest and sincere. If some people do keep away from work, it will show up in their research papers/reports. I hope that better sense will soon prevail.

With best wishes,

Parthasarathi Mitra

5.1.105 W.L. van Neerven - Univ. of Leiden

Dear Mr. M. Macri

¿From what I have heard from the researchers of INFN, the management of this institution wants to have a tighter control on the whereabouts of

their scientific personel. In the past these measures were also proposed in Holland but after some deliberation they have been never implemented. The reason is clear. Scientific results never depend on the time spent in offices or laboratories. A good idea can occur during midnight and not necessarily between 9.00 and 17.00. I understand the problem that some researchers abuse the freedom they get to be idle. However global measures cannot cure this. On the contrary, it is very well possible that these people now get the chance to show that they are useful by appearing in their offices during the requested hours. Therefore I will dissuade everybody to support this type of global rules as proposed in the messages I received from my collegues.

Sincerely Yours
Dr. W.L. van Neerven
Instituut-Lorentz
University of Leiden
Leiden
The Netherlands

5.1.106 Paul Frampton - UNC-Chapel Hill

Creative research requires a great deal of unencumbered time and the opportunity to avoid time constraints except where otherwise unavoidable e.g. teaching classes , faculty meetings, etc. Imposition of severe time constraints by INFN on its researchers is bureaucracy out of control and such a decision about clocking in and out of research institutes should be reversed as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Paul Frampton
Rubin Professor
UNC-Chapel Hill

5.1.107 Fabian Zomer - LAL

Dear Mr Macri,

I am working since years with Italian Groups in High Energy Physics. I do agree with them that the administrative constraint that you are now imposing is completly 'Ubuesque' and out of date. It is, most of all in complete opposition to the point of view of the research field.

Fabian Zomer
Laboratoire de l'Accelerateur Lineaire
Universite Paris 11 / Centre d'Orsay - Building 208.
91405 cedex Orsay

5.1.108 Cheuk-Yin Wong - Oak Ridge Nat. Laboratory

Dear Dr. Macrì,

I strongly support your position that the recent rulings by the Management of INFN, which requires detailed account of the exact time and record of all the activities of the researchers, is restrictive and unproductive.

Scientists at INFN have been making great contributions to the world of science. The spirit of freedom and the proper use of time rest with the INFN researchers, and there should be no restriction like those imposed by the INFN management. For an experimentalist, some of the experiments need to be done sometimes in very odd hours when the accelerator and the detector are running. For a theorist, some of the inspirations come when he or she has time to reflect at a quiet moment at all possible places during all possible time of the day.

I salute your group for your effort to stand up and speak for the scientists. It will have an effect not only for those at INFN, but also for similar institutions in the world.

With best regards!

Cheuk-Yin Wong
Senior Scientist
Physics Division
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

5.1.109 Gary Grim - Univ. of California, Davis

Dear Mr. Macrì

I wish to strongly oppose the decision of INFN to burden the Italian scientific community with the totally unnecessary act of "clocking" in and out of their laboratories, and keeping accurate records of their presence at foreign laboratories.

Mandating this requirement can only be taken as an insult by the academic community. Will INFN then pay these scientists for the many hours spent at home, thinking about their experiments and theories? I suspect it will not. This is a humiliating and degrading yolk for these members of the world's intelligentsia to bear. I urge you to revoke this mandate as soon as is possible.

Best regards,
Dr. Gary Grim
University of California, Davis

5.1.110 Michael J. Longo - Univ. of Michigan

I agree that it is demeaning and counterproductive to require INFN research workers to punch a time clock. I'm sure most research workers work longer hours than the nominal 40 hours a week or whatever it is in Italy. Punching a time clock might result in their actually working less hours on average. In the US at least much work is done nowadays "at home" possibly thru a modem connection. There are much better ways to measure productivity.

Michael J. Longo,
University of Michigan

5.1.111 Don Lichtenberg - Indiana Univ.

Dear Mario Macri, It has come to my attention that the management of INFN is requiring its research workers to clock in and out at their labs. To my knowledge, no other developed country in the world has this requirement. Certainly, research workers in the United Stetes are treated with respect and never made to deal with a time card. My own view is that Italian research workers, like research workers everywhere, put in more time on the average than is required. They are a valuable resource to the nation, and treating them well is the best way to insure their hard work and productivity. I hope that you can prevail upon INFN to stop requiring time cards so that Italian research workers will once again be treated like those of the other nations of the world.

Sincerely yours,
Don Lichtenberg
Physics Department

Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405, USA

5.1.112 John G. Learned - Univ. of Hawaii

Dear Physics Colleague:

In response to the letter below, please allow me to say that we have similar foolish attempts by management (and politicians) in the US. While the motivation for such hourly accounting is clear, and is employed by many businesses, it makes no real sense for a research institution.

Of course there must be accounting for where the public funds are spent, and there should be some long term review of performance of individuals (in my view), but this sort of thoughtless solution of employing a timeclock achieves nothing but wasted time. I would hope that your management would reconsider, such as perhaps asking for an annual or rough monthly accounting for effort and objective indications of results.

Best wishes,
John G. Learned
[NdR: Spokesperson of SuperKamiokande Collaboration]
Professor of Physics and Astronomy
University of Hawaii

5.1.113 Markus Luty - Univ. of Maryland

Dear Sir:

It has recently come to my attention that there is a proposal that INFN researchers be required to clock in and out to document their research activities. As a physics professor at the University of Maryland and member of the physics community, I feel strongly that this is an unecessary bureacratic burden. It is hard to see how this can be anything other than a waste of time. It is especially worrisome that records based on this might substutute in some way for peer evaluation based on scientific accomplishment.

Italy has a proud record of scientific accomplishment. However, I am sure that I am not alone in feeling strongly that implimenting this proposal would be a significant step backward for Italian science.

Respectfully yours,
Markus Luty

Department of Physics
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

5.1.114 Steve Giddings - Univ. of California, Santa Barbara

Dear Dr. Macri:

Measuring productivity of a physicist by amount of time spent is clearly a ludicrous notion. Far more important are actual accomplishments in terms of research, teaching, service to community, etc., and there certainly exist reasonable measures of these. I hope your institute staff sees the wisdom of dropping this plan as one that is likely to be scientifically counter-productive.

Steve Giddings
Professor, Department of Physics,
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

5.1.115 Vic Viola - Indiana Univ.

I agree that this rule is nonsensical (did it originate in the U.S Congress?). The only people who will have time to do time reports religiously are those who aren't doing anything. When I'm working 80-100 hours in a week, the last thing I'm going to worry about is keeping track of the hours.

Vic Viola
Distinguished Professor
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN USA

5.1.116 Kurt Weiss - CERN

I think that you intended to sent your mail to Dr. Mario WEISS, senior physichist at CERN, instead of myself, vacuum engineer in LEP/SPS. I nevertheless agree completely with your point of view. This is NOT a way to motivate people, this only invites them to be present during a certain number of hours... It will only become a waste of paper and time. It's well known that the "freedom" we have at CERN is appreciated by the personel. We

normally should work 40 hours a week (which is already exeptional in Europe), but appart of some abuse by a minority, most of the people do much more, are always ready to help. Everytime we had an incident on one of the accelerators, CERN coud start them up with a minimum of lost time. A lot of people do shifts for free or stay in stand-by for free. Many of them even pass some time during week-end in the office to be able to think and work quitly. When do those burocrats understand that our motivation is ON the job, is the subject we're working on, is the results of our tests,...? And not 5.30 PM and a payslip at the end of the month!!!

Kurt WEISS
LHC/VAC

5.1.117 Steve Wimpenny - UC Riverside

Andrea,

I already received the INFN letter via our group at Fermilab and will send off a reply shortly. This is pure beaurocratic nonsense and is completely inappropriate to doing first rate research where fixed schedules make no sense whatsoever.

Regards,
Steve Wimpenny
UC Riverside

5.1.118 Donald G. Fleming - Univ. of British Columbia

Dear Dr. Macrì

I received an e-mail from a group of Italian scientists lamenting the reasons for an apparent change recently instituted requiring Italian scientists to "sign and sign out". I would STRONGLY URGE you to abandon this tactic, regardeless of its motivation, which may well be sound (eg. to establish more meritorious individuals). There is NOTHING more detrimental to the spirit of inquiry that constitutes scientific research than to have your time monitored, as if government funding agencies begrudge the very activites they are supporting. Such a "big brother" attitude can only be detrimental to the unfettered flow of ideas so necessary to the success of a strong

research program,particulary in the regime of "curiosity oriented" research which characterizes the nation's universities and government research labs. Much of the intelllectual activity that drives this kind of research, and from which Nobel prizes are derived, occurs away from the office or laboratory, at home, in cars, and maybe even while making love (but only in Italy!). It is patently ludicrous to try and monitior thought!!!

Sincerely yours,
Donald G. Fleming
Prof. of Nuclear Chemistry
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T1Z1

5.1.119 Shi-Lin Zhu - Academia Sinica

Dear Italian Colleague,

All I can say is that such an absurd ruling does not exist in the national institutes of China. Anyway, scientists are not farmers or factory workers.

Respectfully yours,
Dr. Shi-Lin Zhu
Institute of Theoretical Physics
Academia Sinica
P.O.Box 2735
Beijing 100080
P.R.China

5.1.120 Piotr Zalewski - Soltan's Inst. for Nuclear Studies Warsaw

Dear Sir,

I would like to express my astonishment by the letter you could find enclosed below. I totaly agree with italian coleagues and I hope that described decision will be canceled.

My best regards
Piotr Zalewski
Soltan's Institute for Nuclear Studies Warsaw

5.1.121 Prof. Flyagin - JINR

I am in absolute agreement with the INFN scientists opinion: the time spent scientist on job show nothing of his or her scientific activity.

Regards.

Prof.of HEP Flyagin.

JINR Dubna Russia.

5.1.122 Juan Fuster - Univ. of Valencia

Dear Professor Mario Macri,

I am Juan Fuster from the IFIC Institute from the Uniersity of Valencia and CSIC.

My opinion about controling working time to physicists is quite meaningless. Due to the nature of our work (we are not an industry), motivation and vocation we not only work in our offices but also at home, not only during day but also during night and not only during the week but also during the week-end. I dont think that you can control all this and on the other hand by puting controls I believe you break on the various manners each physicists feels confortable to make research (by the way the quality of research unfortunateley doesnt correspond and it is not proportional to the time we spend in our offices).

If you want to control and avoid situations in which some people take advantage of this way of working (in every community there is always certain type of people which dont behave as expected), I believe you can do in other ways than just punishing the entire community.

I hope this will help or give you some more arguments to consider in your decision,

Sincerely, Juan Fuster

5.1.123 Alberto Reis - CBPF Rio de Janeiro

I am writing to share with you the surprise with the institution of the magnetic card. This is not a sensible way to measure the quantity and quality of a researcher work. I hope this won't last for very long.

Alberto Reis

CBPF - Brazil

5.1.124 John Cumalat - Univ. Colorado at Boulder

[...] As you indicate it is not a question of how much time is spent at the lab, but rather how the information will be used. Some people can spend hours on a project and accomplish little, while others with better ideas or insight might solve the problem directly. In our field people are promoted for their accomplishments, not for their time spent on the job.

How will the management keep track of when scientists are logged into the computer from home? How will the management know how much time is spent when scientists are away at other national labs? Is the intent to reward people who work more hours? I have never heard of a research institution that depends heavily on creativity and new ideas that requires a time clock.

John Cumalat
Professor of Physics
Univ. Colorado at Boulder
FOCUS (E831 at Fermilab)Spokesperson

5.1.125 Lukas A. Schaller - Univ. of Fribourg

I agree completely with the above letter. If we cannot trust anymore our colleagues when and how they do their work we should stop doing research. There is unfortunately a strong tendency nowadays to centralize and to increase administration which goes contrary to the interests of science.

Prof. Lukas A. Schaller
Director
Physics Department
University of Fribourg
P=E9rolles
CH-1700 Fribourg
SWITZERLAND

5.1.126 Benny Lautrup - The Niels Bohr Inst.

Dear friends at the INFN,

Here at the Niels Bohr Institute we have also been given a card instead of keys. However, even if the administration can use it to control our whereabouts, we have been promised that it will not be used for that purpose.

Unfortunately, even if I trust this administration, I don't trust coming administrations implicitly. It would be better with a law against such use.

Scientists as I know them are hardworking people that put in many more hours on their science than they are paid for. Evenings, weekends, holidays are

spent in calculations and reading, which is necessary for keeping abreast of modern science, and because our competitors (alias our friends) do it. So it seems a terrible waste of effort to institute a control scheme in order to secure full working hours for scientists. It can only have an adverse effect and should be met by demands for paid overtime.

Alternatively, one can make a case for civil disobedience. The system can be frustrated in numerous ways. One can for example overload the system by clocking in and out lots of times or underloading it by waiting for a group to enter simultaneously. I am sure our experimentalists friends are capable of inventing much more practical ways of interfering with such a system

Big Brother is here, just 13 years later than Orwell thought. . Since this is a European (and perhaps world-wide) problem, why not set up a service on the internet for exchange of points of view and perhaps as a base for political lobbying.

Best regards and good luck to us all!

Benny Lautrup
The Niels Bohr Institute
Copenhagen
Denmark

5.1.127 Konstantinos Anagnostopoulos - Niels Bohr Inst.

I have been informed from several of my Italian colleagues that INFN has recently asked its researchers to submit to a humiliating electronic checking of their presence in their workplace.

As one of the important research organizations INFN should realize that good research is produced in a free and trusting environment. Such a test, which is appropriate only in production environments where the "product" is the direct result of the amount of hours worked by the employee, is bount to have disastrous effects on research. The "amount of research" performed

by a researcher, is by no means countable by the exact hours spent by the reseacher in his/her office.

There are many ways to judge good research which is usually measured by its end result and peer evaluation. This is the international standard which seems to work very well. The above measure is totally unnecessary and it could only have a negative impact on research and the moral of the researchers.

It will also be a major negative factor for attracting good researchers from abroad.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at any address included below. This message has been signed electronically using the encryption program PGP and my public PGP key contained in this message which can be used to verify it. Any alteration of its content will invalidate the signature.

Sincerely,

Konstantinos Anagnostopoulos

5.1.128 Michael Albrow - Fermilab

I agree that the move of the INFN management towards "clocking in and out" of work is extraordinary and certainly not in line with the way physicists actually work, at least not when they are at a research center like Fermilab or CERN. We are moving around between offices and labs, different buildings all the time. One could check in and out at the main gates but our work does not stop outside the site, we have computers at home with links to the labs and we take other work home, at least some of us do. Progress in one's career should be linked to performance and results and not to "the number of minutes spent in the office".

Michael Albrow

5.1.129 Jean-Pierre Egger - Universite' de Neuchatel

The clocking idea with a magnetic card is totally stupid, especially now when people can do a lot of work with their home computer. Quality should be decided by publications, lectures, beamtime, setup and testing of equipment etc. etc. I prefer a physicist who is analyzing some data at home, hooked up

with his home computer to a physicist who is reading the newspaper at his office.

Best regards,

Jean-Pierre Egger.

5.1.130 Shavkat Singatulin - BINP

I think that this ruling is a useless bureaucratic nonsense. It seams to me , that the science not depend from working time, while anybody never find method , that control spend time in my head. We hadn't this clocking even in Soviet Union in socialist times, when bureaucratic machine has been powerfull.

researcher from BINP , Shavkat Singatulin.

5.1.131 Gisela Anton - Bonn University

concerning your new "rules" let me give you the following comment:

controlling the time people are in the lab does not garanty good work. (i personally do a lot of work in the evening at home).

If there seems to be the problem that people do not work enough, i would propose to control the projects (something like a program advisory commitee: what are the plans and what are the results) and would eventually reduce the number of permanent jobs.

best regards,

Gisela Anton

5.1.132 Bruno Autin - CERN

Dear Mario, I fully support your concern about the new regulations at INFN and you can join this message to a letter of protest you may have to send to the management of INFN. Sincerely with you. Bruno.

Bruno AUTIN

CERN

5.1.133 David Miller - Univ. College London

The suggestion that research scientists should clock in and out of their laboratories stirkes me as most inappropriate. It is hard to see what good it would do - what incentive to work in any better way - what more efficient collection of useful statistics. It is quite unprecedented in any fundamental research laboratory I have encountered, anywhere in the world. Even the Thatcher Government did not suggest it in the UK.

I hope those suggesting it will think again.

Yours ever

David Miller
Professor of Physics, Dept of Physics and Astronomy
University College London, Gower St., London WC1E 6BT, UK.

5.1.134 Joseph F. Muratore - BNL

I agree with the objections of the INFN physicists against the monitoring of their activities, especially those outside the workplace. This type of control and time monitoring on the job is not conducive to scientific research, which requires a certain amount of freedom to be effective. Indeed, this type of monitoring and control is also against the basic human ideals of personal freedom and civil rights and, im my opinion, is a form of fascism.

In the US, such restrictions would raise a great outcry. Such regulated activity exists only with respect to top secret, high security work, and, even in that case, a scientist's (or any citizen's) personal life must still be his or her own affair.

I would strongly recommend to the Italian government and/or the directorship of the laboratory (whoever is imposing these regulations) that these restrictions be eased and my Italian colleagues be allowed to perform their research activities unhampered.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Dr. Joseph F. Muratore
Physicist
Brookhaven National Laboratory
Upton, NY 11973
USA

5.1.135 John Ralston - Univ. of Kansas

I learn that INFN has proposed the institution of silly time-clock rules for Italian physicists.

You have my support in protesting this. When a bureaucracy imposes rules for no purpose, it usually represents an agenda.

To make an analogy, here in the US we have a trivial indescretion on the part of our President being exploited to serve a political agenda. In Italy, if someone wants to keep a time-card on Physics, there might as well be a time-card on Sex.

Good luck
John Ralston
Professor of Physics
University of Kansas

5.1.136 Benjamin Grinstein - Univ. of California, San Diego

I was appalled to find out the Management of the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare intends to have scientific researchers "punch time cards" to keep track of their working hours. As is universally known, researchers spent a great deal of time working in and out of the lab, often at home or even getting inspiration to solve a problem during a walk in the park. The proper measure of scientific productivity is not in the number of clocked hours in the lab (leave that for office and factory workers), but rather in the number and relevance of scientific contributions. I hope the Management will rectify this ill-directed policy change.

Best regards,
Benjamin Grinstein
Profesor of Physics
University of California, San Diego

5.1.137 Stephen Adler - BNL

My name is Dr. Stephen Adler. I do physics research at Brookhaven National Laboratory on Rare Kaon decays. This issue of having your scientist log their time spent in such detail is frankly stupid. I would think that Italy, home of

the renaissance, would have a better mind that to resort to such bureaucratic means to quantify their scientific achievement.

Cheers.

Steve.

5.1.138 Daniel Karner - Univ. of California, Berkeley

I understand the desire of the administration to want to see exactly where and when their scientists are working, and so understand the implementation of a magnetic time card system at the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare. I would like to state, however, that it has been my experience that scientists who work at such a high level of expertise do so because they are interested in science, not because of the money involved. If they were interested in money only, they would work for industry, or an international company, both of which would probably pay much more than the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare. Because they have decided to work for the government, they are probably doing what they love, and so are probably working far more than will show up on a magnetic time card. From my experience working at a national lab in the United States, scientists are always thinking about their work to some degree- and much of this time does not register on a time clock. It is my suggestion that you allow your brilliant scientists to work how and when they wish, and that you should judge the QUALITY of their work, not the QUANTITY of time they spend in the office. If you only judge a scientist by the amount of time they spend in the office, you will undoubtedly reward many below-average scientists who can sit at their desks all day long without producing any results, whereas you will punish great minds who might solve some of the world's greatest problems while taking a walk with their daughter along the beach.

Sincerely,

Dr. Daniel Karner

Department of Physics

University of California,

Berkeley, CA 94720

5.1.139 Gerson Godhaber - Univ. of California, Berkeley

I heard that your organization plans to clock ther time researchers spend. Let me say that creativity cannot be legislated, it either comes or does not. I think it is a bigg mistake to have scientists punch a clock!

Respectfully, Gerson Godhaber

Prof in the graduate school Univ. of California, Berkeley

5.1.140 Tetsuro Mizutani - Virginia Tech. Blacksburg

I have read an e-mail note informing that the INFN management has decided to introduce a method of controlling the researchers by too closely watching their activities in and out of their home laboratories.

The management's concern may be, I guess, the finalcial one in that the researcher should be paid for their work, hence their activities must be closely monitored. This is exactly the attitude of a private profit-making firm, and constrains the free thinking which is essential for a quality work in research. When everything is controlled by the authority for whatever reason (this tie it may be the budgetal one behind), our intellectual actitities will be completely subordinate to the power, a system virtually inder the totaliterian regime. I am very much worried about such a trend: already our current society is too much controlled by economy: a very unhealthy direction.

I have heard that at some US research/manamement firms, the obligatory office hours have been eliminated: due to the progress of the computer network communications, the employees may work either at their offices ot at their home, etc. They may even take short vacations occasionally. The important point is that they accompolish their works which they can show to the management. Such is the trend in some most advanced management even at the private sectors. So the INFN decision appears totally anachronic to us.

I strongly hope that such a decision be lifted up for long term health and benefit of the INFN organisation.

Tetsuro Mizutani

Physics Dept.

Virginia Tech

Blacksburg, VA 24060, USA

5.1.141 Ian Adam - Slac

I agree completely with your assessment of this proposal. Please feel free to add my name to your petition.

Regards, Ian Adam
SLAC research associate
Stanford, CA
USA

5.1.142 A.C.Melissinos - Univ. of Rochester

I read with dismay the suggestion that the INFN scientists should punch in time cards. I can not believe that this is the intention of the INFN directors and I am sure there is a misunderstanding somewhere.

A.C.Melissinos
Professor of Physics
University of Rochester

5.1.143 Dennis Silverman - Univ. of California, Irvine

When the clockers find out that physicists put in much longer hours than a 40 hour week, the physicists will have a strong argument for increased pay.

Also, when the pay is divided by the hours, physics will appear to be a lower paying job, thus discouraging students from going into the field. This might cost Italy the excellent international reputation it has earned over the ages in physics. Does anyone remember what hours Galileo put in?

Dennis Silverman
Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of California, Irvine

5.1.144 Douglas McKay - Univ. of Kansas

I agree with the statement of the INFN researchers who have protested that the recently adopted sign-in sign-out procedures at Frascati are counter pro-

ductive and nonsensical in an open research environment. All of the high energy/nuclear physics facilities that I have worked at or visited have an open atmosphere with essentially unlimited flexibility that results in extremely high productivity.

Sincerely,
Douglas McKay
Professor
University of Kansas
USA

5.1.145 Delfino Ladino Luna - Univ. Aut. Met.-Azc.

Yes, I agree with you about your problem. Reseach working is so different to other activities so I think it is not possible to enclosed in an exact routine. Researchers need freedom to make that activity.

Sincerely
M. Sc. Delfino Ladino Luna
Area de Fisica, Dpto. Ciencias Basicas
Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Azc.
Mexico

5.1.146 Olivier de Mirleau - Amsterdam Univ.

I herewith declare that:

1. In no scientific institute have I ever seen clocking being required of researchers

2. Quality of scientific thinking in Italy will go down by introducing this policy

3. In Genova everybody is afraid of [NdR: an italian physicist] Would that be the reason that nobody but you from Genova signed up on the list?

Ciao,
Olivier de Mirleau

5.1.147 Jorge G. Hirsch G. - Inst. de Ciencias Nucleares

I found the regulation of reaserchers cheking in and out an absolute nonsense.

Being not a well developed country, we have anyway clear rules for evaluation of research work, which consist mainly in annual reports were the articles published, the invited conferences given, curses lectured and the thesis avised are the criteria to judge the individual work.

I wish you that a more clever way of qualifying your work will be found by the manager of the INFN, which is of course a very respected research institution.

Receive my best regards

Dr. Jorge G. Hirsch G.

Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, UNAM

Mexico

5.1.148 Peter Arnold - Univ. of Virginia

It has recently come to my attention that the management of INFN will soon require researchers to clock in/out of their work. I would like to say that, while I am sympathetic to the desire to somehow measure workers' productivity, this is a miserably bad way to do so. It is misguided because, unlike the case for many proffessions, scientists typically become scientists because they *enjoy* working on science – you don't have to hit them with a stick to get them to do it. One consequence is that they think *productively* about science at odd times – while in the shower, while laying in bed trying to sleep at night, and so forth. Now one could in principle place a time clock in each scientists shower, and one near each scientists bed, in addition to the one in each scientists home office, but that seems a rather silly proposition. To try to measure something you just can't measure – how much time of each day a scientist spends thinking about science – is both impossible and offensive. If they didn't love their work, the majority of scientists would be capable of making a whole lot more money doing something else. Trying to pretend that scientists are hourly employees who are no different from the scores of unskilled workers in the world who hate their jobs is counterproductive and insulting. It is certainly necessary to have some way to measure a scientist's productivity, because there will always be a very small handful of scientists

who will lose the will to work productively. But you should handle this by more sensible and effective measures of productivity such as examining scientific output and in peer review. To think that "number of hours worked according to a time clock" is a useful measure of anything is a dangerous illusion. I do not know offhand of a single, reputable scientific instituation that follows a time clock policy.

Regards,
Peter Arnold
Professor of Physics
University of Virginia

5.1.149 Adrian L. Melott - Univ. of Kansas

This time clock procedure is demeaning, unprofessional, and fails to recognize that scientists do not stop thinking when they are outside their labs and offices.

Adrian L. Melott
Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Kansas

5.1.150 Gordon Aubrecht - Ohio State

I am responding to an email appeal from physicists at INFN about the looming possibility of requiring scientists to punch time clocks to verify their working hours.

I think this is inimical to free scientific inquiry. Most scientists I know are seldom "off"; many work in the supposedly "off" hours. It looks to me as if the measure will *discourage* scientific activities if it should come to pass.

The tme clock is a bureaucratic response to challenges about the work the scientist is doing ... but scientists do so much work, so much of it unrecorded time, so many hours a day. This approach is insulting. The bureaucrats need to educate those pointing the fingers.

I have been involved with the Contemporary Physics Education Project (CPEP) and have observed so many hours of selfless dedicated work done by so many committed physicists on their own time to work on our beautiful charts and web-based materials because of their commitment to physics as a

field and the need to educate generations to come about the burning issues of physics research, to communicate the excitement we all feel about our work.

I very much hope that the people who are pushing the bureaucratic response will leave well enough alone. If people must punch a clock, they may resent it so that they will work only during "clock time." Physics and the individual scientists (and Italian science) will be the poorer for it.

Sincerely,

Gordon Aubrecht

Ohio State

5.1.151 Dien A. Rice - Macquarie Univ.

I agree, this is ridiculous for research scientists. Scientific research is not like any standard job, since it is exploring into the unknown, whereas in other jobs it is clear what needs to be done. Because science is a form of exploration, it is much less predictable what will be found, and it is inherently creative. This creativity needs freedom in order for it to be at the highest level of productivity.

Kind regards,

Dr. Dien A. Rice

Department of Physics

Macquarie University

Sydney, New South Wales 2109

Australia

5.1.152 German A. Lobov - DESY/ITEP

Dear Mario Macri, I agree with scientists of INFN that ruling clock in/out is useless nonsense. Surely it should be remove.

Sincerely yours

Professor , Dr. German A.Lobov

DESY(Hamburg)

ITEP(Moscow)

5.1.153 Sandra Faber - UCO/Lick Observatory

Dear Colleagues: I am happy to provide you with ammunition in your fight against your unfriendly bureaucracy. The kinds of rules and regulations you describe are unheard of in productive academic research laboratories in the US. Goverment labs to have timeclocks, but they are (interestingly) LESS productive than completely unregulated labs. Good people don't want to work under strict regulations and will move elsewhere to freer places.

Sandra Faber
University Professor
UCO/Lick Observatory

5.1.154 David Gross - UCSB

I completely agree with your reaction to this absurd bureaucratic requirement, which is unique in the world of research and makes no sense. Clearly it will anger and upset the researchers and provide no real measure of their scientific productivity.

Sincerely Yours,
David Gross
Director-Institute For Theoretical Physics
Kohn Hall/ UCSB
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4030

5.1.155 Yitzhak Frishman - Weizmann Inst. of Science

I was informed that there is a new ruling at INFN, which is to clock in/out for Scientists, and was also asked if I can write to you regarding my views about it. Now, as we all know, good research is not done by a nine to five way. In fact, most scientists work more hours than required by the bureaucracy, sometimes late at night etc. On the other hand, coming in at definite hours but not necessarilly doing something, certainly does not contribute to good science. If the aim is to have the best research possible, one should get the best people available, and not to introduce methods like the clock in/out, which will make things only worse.

Sincerely,

Yitzhak Frishman
The Amos de-Shalit Professor of Theoretical Physics
Head, Department of Particle Physics
Weizmann Institute of Science
76-100 Rehovot, ISRAEL

5.1.156 Rufus Neal - Sr. Comm. Editor, Cambridge Univ. Press

Dear Professor Macri

I am senior commissioning editor in Physics at Cambridge University Press.

It really does seem totally bizzarre to me that physicists at the INFN have been ask to clock in and out (see message appended from S Bianco). This is totally contrary to the whole philosophy of physics, and is hostile to the sort of environment in which physics research has always thrived.

I find this particularly disturbing because physicists are among the most valuable wealth creators in a high technology society. The spending on physics research over the years has been absolutely miniscule compared with the amount of wealth created as a result. Virtually every high technology product that is made today owes its existence to something a physicist has done. And it is simply a fact that the most original work is often done away from the laboratory or office - as exemplified by Einstein, or by Archimedes. Even when they are not directly trying to do physics, physicists are instigating technologies that will provide massive wealth - the emergence of the internet owes much to what physicists at CERN were up to in their "non-physics" time.

Physicists just produce a fantastic financial return on average just by being physicists. Their value comes from the way they approach problems in their work, as consultants, or just by thinking and mulling over things. It is patently obvious that how many research papers a physicist manages, or how many hours they spend in an office are uselessly crude indications of a physicist's real value. Physicists are physicists 24 hours of the day. Making them clock on and off and keep track of their time is just totally absurd, a total waste of time and effort, and it also must be insulting to boot.

I can't imagine highly creative and valuable people in any professional

industry being treated in the way it seems physicists are being treated at the moment at INFN (and elsewhere). In industry they have realised that money comes from maximally enabling highly creative and valuable people to be creative, not by weighing them down with distractions, time wasting bureacracy and total irrelevencies.

Yours sincerely
Rufus Neal
Senior Commissioning Editor
Cambridge University Press

5.1.157 H. Abramowicz and A. Levy - Tel Aviv Univ.

Dear Dr Macri,

We have been made aware of an attempt to regulate the working hours of research scientists in academia and basic research in Italy. We find it highly absurd for many reasons, listed below.

1. Creative work, the main characteristics of researchers cannot be timed. Ideas come and go and require prompt action from the authors.

2. Ideas cannot be planned. Goals can. Funding agencies around the world know it and accept it.

3. Researchers are known to spend a large fraction of their time on their work. Very often quiet hours at home, on a plane or on a walk produce the most brilliant ideas.

4. Senior researchers are loaded with teaching and administrative work. Teaching is treated as holy by the community and there doesn't seem to be a problem with missing lectures, tutorials or seminars. In fact many universities around the world appreciate the fact that one teaching hour is worth many hours of preparation and introduce appropriate scaling factors.

5. The activity of researchers is easily timed by their achievements, there is no need to introduce any other measure.

6. Last but not least, the academic community has very few privileges and very low remuneration level for the quality of their work. Taking away the only remaining privilege, that of intellectual and personal freedom will be disastrous for the future of science.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Halina Abramowicz and Prof. Aharon Levy
Tel Aviv University

5.1.158 Jacob Grunhaus - Tel Aviv Univ.

Dear Gentlemen;

I do not know of any academic research institution in Israel that requires the staff to clock in/out. The work that we do requires strong personal motivation, imagination and ambition and therefore demanding the physicists to clock in/out will most probably be counter productive.

I earnestly hope that the INFN will not convert its research labs into factories !

Best Wishes, Jacob Grunhaus

5.1.159 Michael Gronau - Technion, Haifa

Dear INFN physicists;

I heard with great sorrow about the bad news of July 1, 1998. The decision of the Management of INFN that researchers have to clock in and out when arriving and departing from office or laboratory is unheard of in scientific institutes worldwide. If it becomes real, it would have an extremely bad influence on the freedom of scientific ideas and on creative thinking which are at the heart of fundamental science. Clearly, this decision will not improve the quality of scientific work.

I hope very much that this unusual decision, which would have a bad effect on future science in Italy, can be turned around.

Sincerely,
Michael Gronau
Professor of Physics
Technion, Haifa, Israel

5.1.160 Gilbert Guignard - CERN

I may do a few remarks: - It is difficult to find criteria to judge the quality and quantity of scientific work, in particular in research fields. - Novel ideas and inventive contributions don't come on request but result of a lot of thinking and discussing, impossible to control, qualify and quantify. - Many

of us, working on some challenging problems, carry them back home, where they still think and 'work' about them outside the working hours spent in their labs/offices. - More and more people work at home on a PC, either in a stand-alone mode or in connection with a lab. central computer via a modem. All these indicate that it is desirable to leave a reasonable freedom to scientific researchers and to avoid the demotivating clock in/out system with a magnetic card.

In addition, - Reporting about exact time and activities can be useful but, if details are requested, this takes time again and efficiency drops contrary to the goal that is pursued.

Gilbert Guignard,
SL division, CERN

5.1.161 David C. Walker - Univ. of British Columbia

Dear Sir, Please add my name to the list of research Scientists who oppose the new bureauocracy by Management at INFN. Any 'clock in/ clock out' process shows a complete lack of understanding of how science is done – particularly at the high levels.

Yours sincerely,
David C. Walker,
Professor of Chemistry,
University of BC,
Vancouver, Canada.

5.1.162 Jong Hyuk Yoon - Kon-Kuk Univ. Seul

Dear Prof. Mario Macrì,

I heard from my Italian colleagues about the decision made by INFN which forces the researchers to clock in/out to measure the research activity done in the home office. I am sure that this unusual idea will not help improve the scientific activities in Italy.

Best wishes,
Prof. Jong Hyuk YOON
Department of Physics

Kon-Kuk University,
Seoul 143-701, S. KOREA

5.1.163 George Lafferty - The Univ. of Manchester

Dear Mario Macri,

It has come to my attention that INFN scientists will soon be required to record their hours of work by "clocking" in and out of laboratories. I do not consider this to be at all appropriate for professional scientists working on fundamental research in the public sector. The scientific output of the Italian community is bound to decrease if this proposal is implemented, as scientists become much less likely to work outside of official hours. The nature of modern research, particularly in the fields of nuclear and particle physics, requires great flexibilty, and time allocated to work and to leisure are often intermingled. If INFN considers a person to be suitable for appointment as a professional scientist, then they should consider him fit to manage his own time, for the greater benefit of their science.

Best regards, George Lafferty
Dr George Lafferty
Dept of Physics and Astronomy
The University of Manchester
Manchester, GB - M13 9PL

5.1.164 Serge Winitzki - DAMTP Cambridge

Dear Colleagues,

I tried sending this email to the address you provided, but the letter bounced back as undeliverable. So I am sending it to you again.

I wholeheartedly agree that the requirement of measured working hours is ridiculous in a basic research institution such as the INFN. The job contracts in research institutes all around the world are not based on a fixed number of work hours per week. This seems to be a universally accepted practice, for good reasons. Creativity is never boosted by monitoring and formal requirements of attendance. Judgments based on the duration of presence at the office are entirely inappropriate for evaluation of research.

I hope that the authorities realize that their decision to monitor scientists' working hours is counterproductive and the decision is retracted.

Best regards,
Dr. Serge Winitzki
DAMTP
Cambridge, CB3 9EW
Great Britain

5.1.165 Daniel Froidevaux - CERN

Dear all ...

I do not know enough to have an informed opinion, but if the reality is going to be as you say, then I fully support your cause !!

Physicists work very often long hours (nights, week-ends etc) and have never (in my experience) requested compensation for this ! One should be maybe rather simplistic here :

1) I clock in and out and I get paid extra for extra hours (this is impossible for us of course !)

2) I do not clock in and out (and even am not forced to submit to any strict control about time off from work) and then I happily accept to work long hours for most of my life because I feel responsible ...

Bocca al lupo ! Daniel Froidevaux
CERN

5.1.166 Alberto S. Cattaneo - Universitaet Zuerich-Irchel

Egregio Prof. Macri,

da una lettera di Stefano Bellucci (Frascati) ho saputo dell'introduzione dell'obbligo di timbrare il cartellino per i ricercatori INFN.

Mi associo senz'altro alla vostra protesta.

Probabilmente sarebbe utile far rilevare, anche attraverso i media, che il cartellino oltre a non essere presente, che io sappia, in nessuna istituzione scientifica pubblica, e' ormai considerato uno strumento superato anche da buona parte delle aziende private straniere, salvo che per gli impiegati di basso livello o per chi svolge un lavoro di sportello.

Alberto S. Cattaneo
Institut fuer Mathematik

Universitaet Zuerich-Irchel
Winterthurerstrasse 190
CH-8057 Zuerich

5.1.167 N. Wermes - Physikalisches Institut

Dear Dr. Macri,

I find the clock out regulation introduced at INFN an unacceptable and unappropriate way to try to enhance scientific productivity. I support you in your attempt to reverse this regulation. Scientific progress cannot be confined to working hours. I am happy that in Germany such regulations do not exist. The result is that the diploma, PhD and Postdoc researchers in my institute work far more than the 8 hrs/day required by law.

Sincerely
N. Wermes
(Professor of Physics)
Director of Physikalisches Institut,
Nussallee 12, 53115 Bonn, Germany

5.1.168 Colin Christopher,Robin Horan,Martin Lavelle,David McMullan - Univ. of Plymouth

Dear Dr. Macri,

We would like to say that the new policy of clocking in and out which the INFN bureaucrats have introduced does not seem to be in any way conducive to furthering high quality research in Italy. We all know that dedicated researchers work many hours at home or outside of their usual office hours. Many scientists feel at their most creative in the early morning or late in the evening. Presumably the INFN would have severely reprimanded the Nobel prize winner Schwinger, who worked mostly at night. Informal discussions while taking a coffee or walking are often very beneficial to research. This is a nonsense which should be stopped now.

No-one is against some monitoring of research, but this is a very complicated issue (5 dull papers every year are worth less than one great one; 20 citations in one area are worth less than 2 in another) and introducing Ford's conveyor belt is not worthy of a country with Italy's scientific tradition.

Best regards,

Dr. Colin Christopher, Dr. Robin Horan, Dr. Martin Lavelle, Dr. David McMullan

School of Mathematics and Statistics

University of Plymouth

Plymouth

PL4 8AA

5.1.169 J.-M. Frere - FNRS

I totally agree with the fact that there is no way to control the fact that you think or not at a given time, and as a consequence that putting tight schedule constraints on individuals is both stupid and ineffective in the field of research. I assume your authorities have foreseen a magnetic card reader in every scientist bedroom to count the time where you cannot sleep because a specific problem is nagging you !

J.-M. Frere,

Director of Research, FNRS,

Professor, ULB

5.1.170 Francois Gieres - Universite de Lyon 1

Dear colleagues of the INFN,

Scientific research is a creative activity relying on a large amount of technical mastery and hard work. It does not make sense to decide to be creative during a fixed time of the day while spending the remaining hours of the day with other matters. You need freedom and flexibility.

Moreover, almost all researchers do some (or a lot of) work outside of the usual working hours (in particular during the week-end), either at home or in their lab or otherwise. They do it, because they are interested by what they do, they have a lot to do and because they won't produce many interesting results if they only work the 38 (or 35) hours of the week they are supposed to work. It would be senseless to count exactly this time just as it is senseless to count exactly the hours of presence in a lab.

A more reasonable approach would be to create good working conditions in the labs which encourage the researchers to do their work there.

A final comment: There are always some persons who don't work: they can be isolated and specific measures can be applied to them, but general measures intended to solve such singular problems generally don't solve them, but rather deteriorate the working conditions for all the others.

With kind regards,

Francois Gieres

Universite de Lyon 1

5.1.171 Belen Gavela - Univ. Aut. de Madrid

Dear Sir,

I do agree with the contents of the letter below. It seems simply ridiculous, as regards favoring scientific research and productivity.

Sincerely yours,

Belen Gavela

Professor of Theoretical Physics

Universidad Autonoma de Madrid

5.1.172 Ian D. Lawrie - Univ. of Leeds

Dear Dr Macri,

The ruling described in your message seems to me to be an excellent way of REDUCING the effectiveness of Italian physics research. As anyone who actually does research must know, the essential factor which determines both the quality and quantity of useful research output is the flow of creative ideas, and this is certainly not proportional to the number of hours spent in one's own office or laboratory. Most importantly, one need periods of uninterrupted time that can be spent concentrating on the problem in hand, and the opportunity of discussing this problem with knowledgeable colleagues, who may well work at other institutions.

All of the research physicists that I know are paid much less for doing their research than they could obtain from applying their skills in other ways. It follows that their motivation is mainly to do good research, and the time that they devote to this is usually much greater than the standard business hours, even though this time is not necessarily all spent on their employer's premises. Creative thought simply cannot be switched on and off by the clock, and individuals will perform best if they are trusted to organise

their time in the way that they find most effective. Artificial time-keeping constraints and record-keeping requirements will surely be a distraction from doing good research and not an incentive.

It is understandable that those who fund research will want some way of assessing whether their money is put to good use. But it is important for them to realise that the performance indicator they use should measure properly the result that they want to achieve. If your management measures the success of its institute according to the number of hours people spend on the premises, then their strategy seems to be a good one. On the other hand, if their goal is a high quality of scientific output, which is far from being the same thing, then this is what needs to be measured. Of course, it is extremely difficult to find a reliable quantitative measure of the quality of research, but that is no reason to adopt an unreliable one.

I think your managers would do well to consider that creative and highly motivated researchers are driven by their own internal pressures to achieve good work, and that inappropriate pressures from the outside are unlikely to produce the desired result.

I hope these remarks may be of some help.

With best regards,

Dr Ian D Lawrie

Reader in Theoretical Physics,

University of Leeds, UK

5.1.173 Tony Weidberg - Nuclear Physics Lab, Oxford

Dear Sir, I have receieved the following email about the proposal to introduce a clocking in system for Italian Physicists. If this is true then I would like to say that in my opinion this is a completely ridiculous suggestion which shows a complete lack of understanding of the nature of scientific work. Science works well when bright and enthusiastic people are allowed to work hard in a positive atmosphere and not when scientists are treated like production line workers. Italian Physics has enjoyed a very high reputation throughout the world but if this stupid proposal is accepted it will make Italy look very silly indeed.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Tony Weidberg
Nuclear Physics Lab
Oxford

5.1.174 Alfred Scharff Goldhaber - State Univ. of New York at Stony Brook

In my opinion, time clocks do not belong in research laboratories. Evaluation of contributions should be based on meeting specific substantive requirements, and most of all on the reaction of the research community to one's work.

Sincerely,
Professor Alfred Scharff Goldhaber
Institute for Theoretical Physics
State University of New York
Stony Brook,NY 11794-3840

5.1.175 Christian Gottfried - HTL1 Wien

Here come some thoughts about the regulations about checking in and out, which are imposed on scientists in the INFN since July 1st 98. These regulations come obviously from the understandable need to make sure, that people working in scientific institutes dont waste the money which is spent for them by the public. Of course the way this need is met with the mentioned regulations about checking in and out etc. is nonsense but scientist should take the wish to survey the seriosity and reliability of scientific work very serious. If every scientist would be in stead of checking in and out be obliged to present regularly the results or the state of his scientific work to competent people and to popularize his findings also in a way that the grand public can get a faint idea about what he is doing and what it is good for, then I think that the need of justification would be met.

Best regards
Christian GOTTFRIED
OStR Prof. DI Dr.
HTL1 Wien I

5.1.176 Andrew Gould - Ohio State Univ.

Dear Mr Macri, I have just learned that the management of the INFN has ordered researchers at the institute to clock in and out when they enter and leave the facilities and to record the details of their activities for review. Certainly you are aware that the productivity of researchers cannot possibly be judged in this fashion, that the best way to judge their work is the esteem in which it is held by the international community. Moreover, recording the details of their activity can only interefere with this work and moreover would make them the laughing stock of the international scientific community.

Sincerely,
Andrew Gould
Professor of Astronomy
Ohio State University

5.1.177 H. T. Williams - Washington and Lee Univ.

The kind of time reporting policy you describe in your e-mail of September 24 is unlike anything I have experienced in 35 years of work in (US) government laboratories, research in industry, and academic teaching and research in the US and Germany. The nature of scientific research, and of scientific researchers, clearly indicates that a clock is not a measure of productivity or efficiency. The problems discussed, pondered, and solved in places away from office and laboratory, and times outside of "working hours" are numerous. Should an employer wish to truly pay by the hour, they should be billed for 24 hours a day, since the best scientists are solving research problems in their waking and sleeping hours. Bureaucratic attempts to put scientists to work by a clock will be a most efficient way to reduce scientific output to a crawl.

H. T. Williams
Department of Physics
Washington and Lee University
Lexington, VA 24450 USA

5.1.178 Olaf Lechtenfeld - Univ. of Hannover

Dear Dr. Macrì:

I have heard about the decision of the Management of INFN to force Italian researchers to clock in/out from the 1st of July 1998.

I find this a useless and counterproductive measure which will not only alienate scientists world-wide but also backfire for the Italian scientific community. Science management must serve to improve the conditions and effectiveness of research. This is done best by an approach using trust and incentive, which will be destroyed by distrust and stupid regulations like this one. It shows that, unfortunately, the management of INFN has little idea about the reality of research and the workstyle of scientists.

I strongly urge to roll back this decision.

Olaf Lechtenfeld

Professor of Physics

University of Hannover, Germany

5.1.179 Richard M. Weiner - University of Marburg

Dear Dr. Macri, I have learnt with surprise about a recent decision of the INFN according to which the reseachers associated with INFN have to clock in/out in order to prove their activity. Besides the fact that the presence or absence of a researcher at the institute is no criterion for the efficiency of his work*), it is in my view not compatible with the dignity of a scientist. I hope this decision will be taken back as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours

Richard M. Weiner

*) As a matter of fact, with the development of internet, even commercial enterprises encourage now their employees to work at home and avoid coming to the office. This spares office space and reduces traffic and pollution.

Prof. R. M. Weiner

University of Marburg and

Laboratoire de Physique Theorique Hautes Energies, Orsay.

5.1.180 Richard Gustafson - Univ. of Michigan

Dear Italian Science Managers,

I am informed of an inititive to institute time and effort studies and control of the Italian INFN scientists;

While right meaning the is surely wrong headed... counter productive..

I myself and the Italian scientists I have worked with in the US and at CERN generally work 10-12 hour days 6 or 7 days a week AND go home and do "homework"; physics and astrophysics as I know it are extremely competitive and demanding to keep up; a substantial part of what we do is not just work, but struggle, and study.

Paper puffery is easy but empty with out content and encourages or requires a bureaucracy consuming resources ie money. It empowers a new class of bureaucrats, either wasting a good scientist or giving power to a resented not respected manager.

Better some kind of of occasional review of effectiveness, and reward system for outstanding accomplishment or discovery

Richard Gustafson
Research Scientist
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

5.1.181 Paul M. Goldbart - Univ. of Illinois

Dear Dr. Macri,

The newly instituted working constraints on the working conditions of scientists at INFN appear to represent the worst possible strategy for fostering efficient, productive and creative scientific research. No informed and constructive bureaucrat would think of instituting such a policy, presuming he/she has the best interests of science in mind. Such a policy is bad for Italian science, and therefore bad for Italy. I do not know of any other scientificlly advanced nation that forces its scientists to work under such conditions. If this policy is a subsitute for the vital task of evaluating scientific perfomance then it will do nothing but harm, promoting individuals on the basis of criteria that have nothing to do with what is important for Italy, namely having a thriving culture of scientific research.

Sincerely,
Paul M. Goldbart
Professor of Physics
Department of Physics
University of Illinois
September 26, 1998

5.1.182 Francis Farley - F.R.S.

A professional researcher thinks about his problem day and night, whether he is at home, travelling or in the office and lab. Therefore it is useless to try to keep track of his hours at work.

Norman Ramsey told me recently that he is paid by Harvard so that for 10 minutes once every two years he might have a good idea.

The only way to evaluate physicists is by their output, which is often independent of the time spent.

best wishes,

Professor Francis J.M. Farley,

F.R.S

Le Masage, 8 Chemin de Saint Pierre, 06620 Le Bar-sur-Loup, France

5.1.183 M.I. Wanas - Cairo Univ.

Dear Colleague,

I have received the e-mail concerning the decision by the management of INFN that some of the Italian resarchers have to clock in/out at their institute. I am very sorry to hear that this type of bureaucracy still exists in a developed country, a memember of EU, such as Italy. Actually, in our developing countries, we have overcome this obstacle by evaluating the scientific activities (publications, seminars, conferences,....) for each resarcher in a certain period of time, rather than counting his office hours.

I hpoe that this situation will be resolved soon.

Sincerely Yours,

M.I. Wanas

Professor of Cosmology,

Cairo University,

EGYPT

5.1.184 Antoine Van Proeyen - K.U. Leuven, Belgium

To whom it concerns,

I heard about the plans to install machines to measure the time which researchers spend in their laboratory in Italy. This sort of attitude is counter-

prductive. Original research can not be done in such strict time schedules. Research will not advance faster when people are forced to spend an amount of time in their institute.

It is necessary that there is a check on the performance of researchers. This can be done by experienced researchers who should take responsability. They can judge whether researchers in their group make a reasonable or good contribution. This can not be judged by the time spend at an institute, but should be measured by the scientific output. I thus agree that there should be the possibility for measures against those who do not perform sufficiently. However, this performance can not be measured in time. Everyone can have its personal life style from which he knows that it is most productive.

I hope therefore that the installment of such machines can still be stopped.

Antoine Van Proeyen,

K.U. Leuven, Belgium

Coordinator of the EC-TMR network 'Quantum Aspects of Gauge Theories, Supersymmetry and Unification'.

5.1.185 H. Fritzsch - Munich Univ.

Dear Dr. Macri,

I was informed recently that the management of INFN has decided to check out in detail the working time of the research personnel. I find this a completely useless bureaucratic measure, which will have a very negative impact on the outcome of research in Italy. It is well–known that anybody carrying out scientific research cannot do so by limiting himself to the usual working hours per week. On the other hand it is well–known that successful research can only be done if the corresponding researcher is not much constrained by bureaucratic measures. Imposing such measures will no doubt lead to a reduction of the research output since in particular it would encourage anybody doing scientific research to limit himself to the working hours described in his contract. Similar bureaucratic measures have been discussed in various stages some time ago in Germany with respect to the personnel in the big research laboratories. However it has always been decided not to impose strict time constraints on the research personnel, for reasons described above. I would be very glad if the management of the INFN would do the same.

Sincerely, Prof. H. Fritzsch

5.1.186 Oleg Zaslavskii - Kharkov State Univ.

Dear Prof. Macri,

I received a letter from my italian colleagues with information about surprise their burocrats are prepering for them. I mean the very strange conditions for evaluating the contribution of scientists - marking time spent inside institutes. It does not any sense and, in fact, prevents personal contancts, free thinkings, etc. which are necessary for successfull work. It reminds me of something from the communistic regime and even in the time of this regime I had (as I have now) the possiblility to work at home (I am theoritician). The conditions of work and methods to evaluate it must correspopnd to the character of work. It seems obvious that only final result is important but not where it was obtained (in institute, at home, etc.) and I wonder why burocrats from the INFN do not realize this. I share perplexity and support protest of my Italian colleagues and hope that common sense will triumph.

Sincerely,
Oleg Zaslavskii,
Doctor of sciences,
Department of Physics,
Kharkov State University, Kharkov, Ukraine

5.1.187 Piotr Zenczykowski - Inst. of Nuclear Physics Krakow

I totally agree that requiring scientific researchers to use magnetic cards to record and certify the time spent for work is a complete bureaucratic nonsense. It will neither encourage nor improve scientific activities and should be relinquished as soon as possible.

Piotr Zenczykowski
Associate Professor
Dept. of Theor. Physics
Institute of Nuclear Physics
Radzikowskiego 152
31-342 Krakow, Poland

5.1.188 Tom O'Neill - ANL

Dear Dr. Macri,

Please add me to the list of foreign physicists who strongly object to the proposal to track the time Italian researchers spend "at work". Such an accounting is absurd since there is often no clear separation between a physicist's work and personal time: a lot of progress is made thinking about problems while "off duty" and also talking with colleagues over dinner.

Furthermore a physicist's productivity is not as closely related to time spent in the office as one might expect. Pressures to work longer hours often result in an inefficient use of one's efforts, either on inefficient or wrong methods to solve a problem or on issues that aren't very important. It is absolutely critical that the researcher have time to clear his/her head, so he/she can direct his/her efforts most productively.

Over long experience the field has determined that peer review, while not perfect, is the best way to judge a researcher's productivity. Attempts to objectively quantify output (time spent, papers published, etc.) are ill-founded, since they do not take into account the quality of the output. I strongly encourage such attempts to be abandoned!

Tom O'Neill
Staff Physicist
Argonne National Lab

5.1.189 Gay E. Canough - State Univ. of New York

Dear Mr. Macrì,

I am curious as to what the proposed purpose of this rule is. Creativity in scientific research is not correlated to time spent at an office or lab. Infact, it might be anti-correlated. While I was at CERN, the most creative times of day, the most fertile moments of thought among us physicists was at lunch and during coffee break. Some of the greatest ideas in physics (an oft cited favorite being the invention of the bubble chamber) came in the most unlikely moments and settings (at the bar, having a beer). In fact, a better rule for the lab than time clocks would be official "think time". Think time could be used any time and any place. The researchers should be encouraged to go for a walk or bike ride, take a coffee break, or go to a beautiful place and think. My most creative moments come when I'm not stressed by schedules or when

I'm doing a physical activity. These days, scientists are overwhelmed by all kinds of details and tasks and it is putting a serious crimp on new ideas. We have to write grant proposals, go to meetings, hassle with purchasing departments for hardware, mess with cantankerous computers, answer phone calls...Not to mention taking care of a family, getting the car fixed, getting the deck fixed...

You want more science? Increase flex-time and decrease administrivia.

Measuring a researcher's perfomance is perhaps not trivial, but measuring their output is more accurate than measuring hours spent. You have only to listen to your body to know that you have only so many peak hours in a day. After those hours are done, you might be at your lab, but nothing more is getting accomplished. For most people, 6 to 8 peak hours is all they can hope for. Sometimes, one can gain another hour or two by taking a long break. That is, knocking off work at 4 PM may give you a couple more good hours in the evening. Some of the really great scientists were great, not so much because they had such great neurons, but because they had more peak hours, more mental energy. Richard Feynman seemed to be this type. The rest of us have to make the most of our high mental energy time periods when and where we can.

Gay

Dr. Gay E. Canough

State University of New York, The Watson School

5.1.190 Saroj Kumar Sahu - Univ. of Hawaii

For : INFN Management

Dear Sir or Madam :

I received the following disheartening letter from my Italian colleagues, and I wish to appeal in a few words my opinion. I understand that the INFN management is going to card its members' scientific activities.

Researchers, at least in this field, do what they do because they have a natural curiosity and respect for science, and implicitly are the messengers of human race to the frontiers of knowledge. I have worked with researchers all over the world, and have found all of them working beyond their regular work expectations. Working at least 60 hours a week is a normal thing to do in our field.

Doing research is an intellectual job, and needs inspiration. Mental inspiration and creativity do not necessarily synchronize with the biological clock. Most of us jump to work whenever there is an idea flashing in our brain - may it be midnight or noon. That's why researchers seem to work erratic hours. But in no case do they work less hours than what they are supposed to do. Carding their activities would not only be embarrassing, but counter productive.

Researchers are people of dignity, and they wish to be treated with respect, having sacrificed a lot of luxuries in life, for the sake of human knowledge. Such embarrassing acts will not only dissuade and repel them from their normal research, but eventually replace them with people with very little heart in science, carding in and out 40 hours a week.

I hope you will reconsider this decision for the sake of Italian High Energy Physics community and in turn for the rest of us, their colleagues like me all over the world.

Thank you. With sincere regards,

Saroj Kumar Sahu,

Dept. of Physics & Astronomy,

Univ. of Hawaii

5.1.191 Eckhard Hitzer - Univ. of Fukui

Dear M. Macri,

I agree with the opinion expressed in this letter. I think a research institute is not a bank, where every person must be checked. Research is not factory work, it requires a freedom of mind to search an inspiring atmosphere and to freely divide the day so as to be able to use the most creative periods.

Also this regulation puts much extrawork and psychological pressure on the individual so that it may prove very counterproductive. A very important part of research is meeting people and discussing ideas, that can be over a glass of vine and a pizza, it can be more likely when hiking somewhere in the mountains, then allways in the limiting conforming atmosphere of one's workplace. Heisenberg found the uncertainty relationship whilst taking a vacation on a small island in the North Sea. I think there is a countless sequence of such special times where new ideas were born. Such opportunities should not be constrained.

Yours sincerely,
Eckhard Hitzer
University of Fukui, Japan

5.1.192 Suresh Govindarja - Indian Inst. of Technology, Madras

Hello,

Research is *not* done on a 9-5 basis and cannot be measured by the "physical amount of time" one spends in a particular room. A much better measure is the "scientific output" of a particular person/organisation. It is ridiculous (to me) that the management of INFN can propose to use magnetic cards to monitor the amount of time spent in one's office. The number obtained from this monitoring clearly need not be correlated with the scientific output.

I support the Italian physicists in their attempt to counter this proposed measure.

With best wishes,
Suresh Govindarjan
Assistant Professor
Department of Physics
Indian Institute of Technology, Madras
Chennai 600 036
INDIA

5.1.193 Charanjit S. Aulakh - Panjab Univ.

Dear Dr. Macri,

I am writing in response to the appeal sent out by researchers of INFN. I am dismayed and saddened to note that the insidious tendency of bureaucratic machines to regiment and thus throttle scientific creativity is not just a consequence of underdevelopment and lack of a scientific culture (as in India) but seems an intrinsic urge ! It is clear that bureaucrats and administrators with their fixed working hours and narrow reward bound committment to their professions can never comprehend the free form dedication and late (if unpredictable !) working hours of creative scientists. There is a strong need

for International cooperation and solidarity to preserve independence and academic freedom of researchers not only as regards content but also with respect to the form i.e the the freedom to structure their time according to the exigencies of their creativity rather than by the authoritarian norms pushed by soulless bureaucrats. I am with you !

Charan Aulakh
Panjab University
Chandigarh
India

5.1.194 Christian Lang - Karl-Franzens-Universitaet Graz

Dear colleagues,

I too find the introduction of magnetic check-in check-out cards not appropriate for scientific work. After all, I can hardly ask my wife to check me in/out when I sit down on weekends and evenings doing scientific work at home. (Or maybe the authorities have this in mind?) I support your suggestions to attempt to find more qualified ways (than chair occupancy) to establish the scietific quality of academic employees.

Good wishes,

Christian Lang
(Univ. Prof.)
Inst. f. Theoret. Physik
Karl-Franzens-Universitaet Graz , AUSTRIA

5.1.195 Klaus Goeke - Ruhr Universitaet Bochum

Dear Mr. Mario Macri

I fully support your activities against the described regulations of your management to use magnetic card in order to record your working schedule.

Prof. Dr. Klaus Goeke
Ruhr Universitaet Bochum
Institut fuer Theoretische Physik II
D-44780 Bochum, Germany

5.1.196 Marcel Wellner - SUNY Health Science Center

Dear Dr. Macrì,

Please transmit to the management of INFN my astonishment at the unusual time keeping rules they are imposing on the researchers at INFN, as explained to me in a letter signed by many of the latter.

I have had a long career as a physicist, and am still doing research as a biophysicist. In my experience, scientific researchers work, of their own accord, much longer hours than officially required to justify their salary. We also bring our work home and on the road. Therefore a time keeping constraint would seem not only useless, but actually counterproductive. It would naturally be interpreted as an expression of mistrust. It tends to downgrade the prestige of a scientific career, and to cause demoralization and increased difficulty in recruiting qualified persons. The net result would likely be a loss in scientific productivity.

Sincerely yours,

Marcel Wellner

Prof. Emeritus, Syracuse University

Senior Research Scientist, SUNY Health Science Center

Syracuse, N.Y. 13210

5.1.197 Hartwig Freiesleben - Dresden Univ. of Technology

Dear Colleague,

I strongly support your protest against the clock in/out procedure recently forced upon you by the Management of INFN.

Indeed, this ruling is a useless bureaucratic nonsense. It is not applied in Germany to physicists working in national research laboratories.

It is common understanding of scientists that such a regulation is contraproductive. Science can only prosper in an atmosphere free of senseless obstacles and bureaucratic bossing around.

I hope you get rid of this stupidity!

Dr. Hartwig Freiesleben

Professor of Nuclear Physics

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics

Dresden University of Technology
D-01062 Dresen

5.1.198 Jeeva S. Anandan - Faculteit Natuur- en Sterrenkunde, Utrecht

Dear Dr. Macri, I agree completely with the sentiments expressed in the message below from Stefano Bianco. I think that the restrictions on INFN researchers infringes on academic freedom and impairs creativity. I hope that they will remove these restrictions.

Sincerely,
Prof. Jeeva S. Anandan
Foundations of Science
Faculteit Natuur- en Sterrenkunde
Utrecht, The Netherlands

5.1.199 Ruprecht Machleidt - Univ. of Idaho

Dear Dr. Mario Macrì:

From my colleagues in Italy I learned that, recently, the INFN introduced the new rule that INFN researchers have to use mangnetic cards to record and certify the time they spend in their office. This is to let you know that I am absolutely shocked and disgusted by this news.

The Italian bureaucracy has obviously no respect for some of the brightest and most creative poeple in Italy.

This regulation makes Italy the joke of the International world.

If you want to prevent that more demage is done to the reputaion of the Italian Nation in this world, you better take this regulation back as soon as possible.

Sicerely,
Ruprecht Machleidt
Professor of Physics
University of Idaho
U. S. A.

PS: Maybe, this example can make my point more clear: If EINSTEIN was alive today and lived in Italy, he would leave the country immediately

(he would have never put up with this!) in deep disgust, almost as disgusted as he was when he left Germany in 1932.

5.1.200 Steven Gottlieb - Indiana Univ.

Dear Dr. Macri,

I recently received an email stating that the management of INFN is now requiring that researchers must clock in and out with magnetic cards to certify time spent working at home or office. I have heard that Italian bureacracy is second to none in its ability to frustrate citizens and visitors to Italy with foolish requirements. These new requirements certainly confirm that. If the true goal of the INFN was to become the laughingstock of the international scientific community, they have been able to achieve that in short order. If, on the other hand, the goal of INFN is to support and enhance the excellent research of a host of Italian scientists who have gained international prominance by dint of their great intelligence and hard work, it will immediately rescind these silly requirements.

Sincerely,
Steven Gottlieb
Professor of Physics

5.1.201 H.O. Lutz - Univ. of Bielefeld

Dear colleagues, in response to your inquiry about common procedures to assess the activities of scientific personnel I can confirm that time keeping by magnetic cards to verify quantity and quality of scientific work sounds a bit unusual. I cannot exclude that such techniques are actually in use in some places; if they are, they by themselves would certainly not stimulate new ideas. Measuring scientific output and quality of research is a very difficult task, as we all know, and many different schemes have been developed in the course of time (from simply counting the number of published papers to a detailed evaluation by the peer community). To replace this by simple time keeping looks a bit unimaginative. Sincerely yours

H.O. Lutz
University of Bielefeld
Faculty of Physics
Universitaetstrasse 25

33615 Bielefeld
Germany

5.1.202 Dieter Gromes - Heidelberg Univ.

Dear Colleagues,

I agree completely with your opinion, that the planned clock in/out control for physicists is ridiculous, contraproductive and - at least to my knowledge- internationally unique. Essentially all physicists I know work much more then they are supposed to, often including evening, night, and weekend. Certainly one sometimes also finds some very rare exceptions of people who do a bad and lazy job. But the planned regulations are certainly not suited to untertake anything against these type of -as I emphasize, very rare - people. The only effect which it will probably have is to discourage and to frustate the majority of physicists who, up to now, liked their profession and did good work. I would not be surprised, if many of them from now on will decide to stop working exactly at 17.00 o'clock every day.

Dieter Gromes
Heidelberg Univ.

5.1.203 Peter Young, Univ. of California, Santa Cruz

Dear Professor Macrì,

I am writing to express my concern about the decision by the Management of INFN (Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, the Italian main Institute for High Energy Physics) that researchers have to clock in/out from the 1st of July 1998.

This rule is tiresome bureaucracy which is completely unknown in an academic environment. I have worked for many years at universities in England and the United States, and have also made exended visits to International Institutes, such as the ICTP Trieste and the ITP Santa Barbara, and have never encountered such regulations.

If the object is to determine the quality and quantity of research being carried out, it will have no effect. Other measures, such as:

1. appointing an external review committee to review a group

2. determining the number citations

(while not perfect) would be a much better way to measure quality of research and productivity.

Sincerely,
Peter Young
Physics Department,
University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064

5.1.204 Samir Mathur - Mit

I indeed think that it is nonsensical to have timed working hours for researchers. I just wanted to add one point: if they want to clock your timings, will they also agree to pay overtime and extra pay for weekend work just like in all other professions where timings are recorded?

Regards
Samir Mathur
Associate Professor
Center for Theoretical Physics
M.I.T.

5.1.205 Jens Vigen - CERN

Dear Andrea,

I think actually researches have little to fear, unless that it will result in more administration, but the administrators will get this ball bounced back when they will realise how many ours a researcher is working pr. week. I think the keyword "compensation for overtime" will make to proposal fall.

Good luck,
Jens Vigen
Scientific Information Service
Scientific information officer
CERN

5.1.206 Richard Firestone - LBNL

Mario Macri:

The prospect of INFN scientists being subjected to scrutiny by a time clock sends a chilling message to scientists worldwide. It could only be justified by establishing an hourly wage for scientific labor. In that case, I believe that many INFN researchers would be entitled to substantial overtime reimbursement for past efforts. I would suggest that you fully document all time spent on research, both at home and in the laboratory.

As a graduate student I too was subjected to a similar inquiry about my time. After logging 100 hours per week, it became apparent that labor laws were being violated. The matter was then quietly dropped by management.

Good luck in your battles with the bureaucracy.

Richard Firestone

Isotopes Project

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Berkeley CA

5.1.207 Fay Ajzenberg-Selove - Penn. Univ.

The idea of making you sign in and out is totally stupid. Perhaps it would have some merit if you would receive extra funding for any hour that you spend, above the 40 hours, or whatever is standard and minimal. I bet that the administrators who have made this amazing rule do not plan to pay you more....

Best wishes, Fay

Fay Ajzenberg-Selove

Penn. Univ.

5.1.208 Marti Ruiz-Altaba - UNAM

Dear Italian Researchers,

The proposed time stamp for entry/exit of researchers not only is abhorrent in principle, it is actually contrary, both in spirit and in practice, to the actual development of research activities. As a consequence of the 1968 movement, the statutes of Mexican research institutes and universities explicitly exclude the possibility of such controls on the work of researchers, on the ground that (translated, of course) "the pursuit of knowledge in research and development can only be fruitful in the framework of freedom and without any constraints". Will experiments turn off at 5 pm? Will it be legal

to stay up all night debugging a program? How many journal lines must be written per hour?

With heartfelt solidarity,
Marti Ruiz-Altaba
Instituto de Fisica, UNAM

5.1.209 Gerardo Ganis - Max Planck Inst.

Sono completamente d'accordo con quanto affermato nel messaggio che ho appena ricevuto e che riporto sotto.

La flessibilita' di orario e' sicuramente uno degli aspetti piu' importanti della ricerca scientifica. Peraltro, questo e' provato dal fatto che tutti i piu' importanti istituti e laboratori di ricerca permettono ai ricercatori di lavorare 24 ore al giorno, 365 giorni all'anno.

Il numero delle ore che un ricercatore passa in istituto non deve assolutamente essere un criterio su cui valutare la sua produttivita' scientifica.

Gerardo GANIS
Max-Planck-Institut fuer Physik, Monaco, Germania

5.1.210 Juerg Froehlich - ETH-Zurigo

Dear colleagues,

I acknowledge receipt of your message concerning control of activities of researchers at INFN. The fact that the new rules have been introduced suggests that the old system used to get abused. Members of INFN ought to have reacted to abuses earlier and without external pressure. May be, it is not too late for reasonable proposals and improvements, yet.

Of course, I agree with you that the measures that have now been introduced are somewaht humiliating and are "unuseful". I hope they will be removed again, before long!

Best wishes,
Juerg Froehlich
ETH-Zurigo

5.1.211 C.Legeland - Daimler Chrysler

Dear Mario Macri,

I got your letter concerning the clocking of worktimes at the INFN. Here my response, which you may use as you like, if cited correctly and entirely.

My name is Christian Legeland. I graduated in physics from Bielefeld university in 1995 and will finish my Promotion (Ph.D.) in November 1998. My subject was Lattice Gauge Theory on massiv parallel Quadrics systems. At no time at the university we had to clock in (and out). If you pay Ph.D. students and ask them to clock in, they will start to work the in the contract given times. As Ph.D. students in Germany are paid 1/2 a full salary, they WILL work half time. This would bring down science immediatly. I am now working for DaimlerChrysler as a scienctific collaborator. In the departement I entered clocking has been stopped. We have -if we want- our own list. Additional hours can be taken as free time or -if the project has the budget- can be paid as additional salary. This system is based on confidence: Both sides trust in the each other and avoid so most overhead.

So far. May it help

Bye from Stuttgart, the home of the fastest formula one cars.... ;-)

C.Legeland

5.1.212 Luca Lusanna - INFN FIrenze

Caro Macrì,

sono completamente d'accordo con la lettera circolata (se serve potete aggiungere il mio nome alla lista).

Sono pero' molto pessimista sul futuro: e' piu' probabile che l'ottusita' della nostra burocrazia (sostenuta di pari grado da molti professori universitari e dai sindacati) porti a mettere il cartellino anche per gli universitari piuttosto che toglierlo agli Enti di Ricerca.

Credo che la cosa piu' importante sia premere su Berlinguer e sui suoi esperti in vista della riforma degli enti di ricerca. Devono aver chiaro le implicazioni per i prossimi trent'anni di una struttura della ricerca completamente burocratizzata con un conseguente clima di disimpegno all'interno dei vari laboratori.

Cari saluti

Luca Lusanna

Direttore di Ricerca INFN-Firenze

5.1.213 Despina Hatzifotiadou - INFN Bologna

Dear Colleague,

It was with a great sense of relief that I read today the letter signed by a number of italian physicists concerning the latest bureaucratic novelty, namely the introduction of magnetic cards to record the time spent by researchers in their offices! Even worse, people who are abroad, for instance at CERN, have to report how many hours a day they worked, if thay had a break etc..

This is indeed a shame. My reaction was to fill in what was needed and forget about it, rather than take it seriously and even get angry.

However I am very glad to see some reaction now. I hope this is followed up and we ask for the cancellation of these measures, which only add to the bureaucracy and improve nothing concerning the scientific output of our community.

I completely agree with the paragraph in the letter, saying that this is a substitute for a proper effort to find ways of "measuring" the quality and quantity of our scientific work and further, to create motivations for real research.

I thank you in advance for adding my name to the list of persons who have already signed it.

Despina Hatzifotiadou,

INFN Bologna

5.1.214 Piero Zucchelli - INFN Ferrara

Sottoscrivo totalmente il senso della civile protesta. Mi sembra proprio un nonsenso, soprattutto perche' inutile come puo' dimostrare qualunque trattamento statistico dei dati che avranno raccolto in questi mesi. sia chiaro: non fa male alla salute (almeno alla mia!), ma puo' generare la convinzione che - fatte le mie 7.12 ore! - ho fatto il mio dovere e quindi me ne vado a casa. L'INFN e' l'INFN perche' non ha funzionato così! sottoscrivo volentieri qualunque messaggio nello spirito di quello indicato qui sotto.

Cordiali Saluti,

Piero Zucchelli

INFN Ferrara

5.1.215 Juan Leon - Spanish Research Council

This is a letter to praise the person who got the seminal idea of measuring and control scientific research and/or the researchers' activities by the use of a clock.

No doubt, the Italian Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare will achieve a sizeable increase in its productivity after the enforcement of this new rule. It is also clear that the excellence and quality of its scientific output will be greatly enhanced by this rule. I hope that the European Union bureaucrats will realize that this is the true path to the future, and will stop their pain-necking Framework programs and the like, sending instead, control clocks (without the 2KY problem) to all the scientific institutes in Europe. I am sure that CERN, EMBL, ESA, ESO, and the rest of the european research organizations will adopt the rule ASAP once told of the success obtained at INFN. I am expecting to see the rule also enforced at the national research councils Europe-wide; this will be a blessing! European scientists should use the same control cards with the instructions in the different languages of the Union. The cards should also cope with the problems of the winter time/ summer time; coffee breaks vs. tea time; time consuming computing messages, like this, and much more! In this way, a true standarization of science and research would be operating all across Europe.

Please, let the OST know about it!

Dr. Juan Leon

Research Scientist

Spanish Research Council

5.1.216 Eric van Herwijnen - CERN

Dear Mario

Ofcourse I completely agree that this is bureaucratic non-sense. Keeping time or measuring percentages of work does not make any sense at all in a research environment. One simply works until the work is done. The result will only be a tremendous demotivation for all people working for INFN. They will also see that people are working far longer hours than what they are paid for. Or, if they force people to work only 8 hours a day there will be a tremendous drop in productivity. I am extremely worried that such a measure could 'blow over' to CERN. It is a completely unnecessary waste

of money (to install the equipment) and people (to check that everybody is clocking in and out). May I suggest that if this measure is ever put in practice, that you and your colleagues simply ignore the clocking and go on working just as before. I wish you good luck in stopping this crazy measure.

Kind regards,
Eric van Herwijnen,
CERN - LCHb

5.1.217 D.L. Wiltshire - Univ. of Adelaide

It is sad to see that such bureaucratic nonsense is widespread. Don't say it too loudly or the idiots over here might try it.

Think of this: you can spend many hours in your office and not do anything in useful, or many hours beavering away at home at night when you have an idea.

What the bureaucrats really need to do is to hardwire little chips into people's brains which record the level of brain activity and correlate all the data and compare the quality of all the thoughts and their potential global impact. Obviously the first tests should be done on specimens for which the level of activity is close to zero, as collecting and analysing such data would be very difficult. The obvious specimens to do the trial runs on are therefore university and research institute bureaucrats. This would have the added effect of providing some solid grounds for firing them, reducing the amount of trivia with which are bombarded and therefore greatly increase our efficiency!

This is what one would call an effective management model.

Best regards,
D.L. Wiltshire
Dept of Physics and Mathematical Physics
University of Adelaide
AUSTRALIA

5.1.218 Dave Goss - Nebraska Wesleyan Univ.

My dear Colleagues,

I heartily concur in your opinion that making scientific workers clock in and out is counterproductive and silly. It is well known that the scientific

enterprise depends upon, and is judged by, a tremendous amount of logical thought. This is something not measurable by magnetic cards. The effort expended to produce a scientific result of value is simply not proportional to time expended.

However, there is a group associated with every endeavor for which such procedures might be appropriate: I refer to the management or administrative workers. Since they claim to provide guidance and inspiration, it is clear that they can do this only by being present on site. This procedure of making them clock in and out would be quite appropriate for them. After all, they only shuffle paper at a given rate, so that the amount of paper-shuffling should be proportional to the time they spend at it.

This is such a thoroughly idiotic idea that I am afraid that it will catch on in the U.S.A. bureaucracy as well, so that if you are able to rescind it, you will have rendered the world (and the taxpayers of our countries) a signal service.

Dave Goss,
Physics Department,
Nebraska Wesleyan University

5.1.219 Renata Zukanovich Funchal - Instituto de Fisica da Universidade de Sao Paulo

Hi,

I would like to express my solidarity with you. I think it is incredible how bureacracy and stupidity walk hand in hand. I hope it is not too late to turn back on such a decision. I am affraid such measures might work as an inspiration for our on local bureacrats since this type of control is easy to be implemented although it is not a criteria for good research work and certainly does not encourage scientific activity. Unfortunatelly, it seems, bureacrats are not concerned by the later.

Good luck in your fight,

Renata Zukanovich Funchal
Dep. de Fisica Nuclear - Pelletron
Instituto de Fisica da Universidade de Sao Paulo
Caixa Postal 66318
05389-970 Sao Paulo - S.P.

Brazil

5.1.220 Thomas A. DeGrand - university of Colorado

Is this a joke or did Mussolini rise from the grave? I advocate smashing all the magnetic key machines!

Yours,
Thomas A. DeGrand
Professor of Physics
university of Colorado

5.1.221 Donald W. McLeod - Univ. of Illinois at Chicago

Yes, this is outrageous! I hope you get many, many replies to show political people in charge of INFN. I'd suggest, if possible, that you fill in these cards for very large amounts of time (which may be the truth during experiment runs!) then demand corresponding pay. Maybe this will stop the nonsense.

Good luck!
Donald W. McLeod
Professor of Physics
High Energy Heavy Ion
University of Illinois at Chicago
Physics dept. M/C 273 845 W. Taylor St.
Chicago Il 60607-7059

5.1.222 Lane -

Dear Dr. Sansoni:

My advice to you is mass civil disobedience, as many did here in the 60s by opposing racial oppression and the Viet Nam war. This only works if everyone (or nearly everyone) does it, however. For example, eveyone might refuse to use the time cards altogether. Even better, all might use them all the time, with no correlation with work done. If this fails, we will be happy to trade you Ken Starr for your time cards.

Naturally, I will deny having sent this. Good luck!

5.1.223 Dieter Notz - DESY

Dear Stefano,

I read your mail concerning your new rules.

These sort of rules indicate that the climate at INFN degrades. The rules will certainly not help to improve the output of research.

It could well be that your management is under pressure from the government. In this case one can hope that the times are all registered but that nobody will look in all these numbers. What you should avoid in any case is that the registration will be done electronically.

You should request that all data must be deleted after one month.

With best wishes

Dieter Notz

DESY F1

5.1.224 Jos Vermaseren - NIKHEF

The best thing is to clock whenever you think of physics (also when in bed) and charge for the overtime. It will be hard to keep it under 40 hours per week.....

Jos Vermaseren

NIKHEF

5.1.225 P. van Baal - Instituut-Lorentz, Leiden

Space-time invariant no-go theorem on the possibility of clocking creative thought:

The paperwork required to implement the clocking of creative thought can be proven with the help of Einstein's theory of relativity to lead to collapse into a black hole, with time coming to a halt on the horizon of achievement. Heisenberg's uncertainty and quantum theory will not help, due to the requirement of positive output. Loss of information is the only logical consequence of this cosmic censorship. Therefore, it is logically impossible to measure the time required for creative thought.

Pierre van Baal

Instituut-Lorentz

Leiden, The Netherlands.

5.1.226 Klaus Ziock - Univ. of Virginia

Dear colleagues

Your plight brings to mind a parable I was once told by a friend in a similar context: A university (national lab, etc) is like a big tree in the branches of which many birds (faculty, staff, etc.) have made their nests. If you shake that tree three things will happen:

1. The dead birds will fall to the ground,

2. the old and useless ones will hang on with all their strength,

3. the young and healthy ones will fly away never to return.

The moral of the story?
Even your administrators should be able to figure it out
Good luck
Klaus Ziock
Universiti of Virginia

5.1.227 Simonetta Liuti - Univ. of Virginia

Ehm! ehm! Embarassing indeed.....

Ma come?! Lo avrei firmato volentieri anche io la e-mail: perche' non mi avete fatto sapere niente? Vabbe' che sono in congedo, ma se volete la mia opinione dall'estero eccola:

Io del cartellino non ne voglio sapere nulla. Non voglio nemmeno vedere come e' fatto e di che colore e', e così via. Scusate ma perche' non facciamo uno sciopero bianco? Ossia se nessuno lo usa che succede ci licenziano? Il guaio credo, e' che all'interno dell'INFN non c'e' unanimita', vedi la sezione di Bologna. Quindi, che ci aspettiamo dall'intervento estero se non sappiamo nemmeno risolvere la questione in casa?

(Comunque mi rendo conto che e' facile parlare stando fuori, per questo mi scuso).

Simonetta Liuti
Department of Physics
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22901

5.1.228 Dennis Grier - CERN

Clock cards are normally only used for measuring the output for tasks where productivity is directly linked to hours present ie. factory assembly lines. The workers are then normally paid hourly. Try the following.

1. Insist to be paid according to the hours on the cards and also for hours worked outside your institute.

2. Make sure every hour of work is registered (even pondering on a problem in your bathtub) and paid for.

After some time the card system will be abandoned.

Dennis GRIER
CERN

5.1.229 Daniel ben-Avraham - Clarkson Univ.

Hi, I agree that the clocking is complete nonsense! I think that the best way to combat it is simply to ignore the instructions: just don't do it!

Daniel ben-Avraham
Clarkson University

5.1.230 Walter Winkler - Muni MPQ

Dear colleagues,

I have got the e-mail reporting about the plans of the INFN to introduce magnetic cards for control of the time spent by scientists in their labs or elsewhere. I can not see a single positive effect resulting from this step. Good science is done by motivated scientists, and a treatment like this must destroy motivation. This will be the main result.

One is tempted to say: there are always two sides involved in a fight, and the plan mentioned sounds like an attack. What would happen, if these cards are simply not used?

In sympathy

Walter Winkler and colleagues

5.1.231 Bertrand Giraud - SACLAY

Subject: BURROWCRATS

Dear colleagues

I assume you know what a burrow is. My experience with bureaucracy is that it often pays to fight it back with its own weapons. Why not prove that scientists work long weeks, often 60 hours if not more per week rather than legal time (40 hours/week?). Geet support from some newspapers, labor unions and lawyers, sue the employer for additional time pay. All that!

Friendly, B.G.

5.1.232 Bernard Frois

Dear Colleague,

I support my colleagues from INFN. I believe that no research institution requires scientists to clock in/out.

Bernard Frois

5.1.233 Bennie Ward

Dear Prof. Macri:

Please include my name as physicist from the international community that supports the position of the Italian physicists in the letter included below.

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

B.F.L. Ward

5.1.234 Arif Akhundov - Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences

Dear Colleague, I am fully agree with you and support you.

Arif Akhundov

Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, Baku

5.1.235 Meinulf Goeckeler - Regensburg Univ.

To whom it may concern

In my opinion, these measures taken by INFN are not suitable for improving the quality of the research done in the INFN institutes. On the contrary, they are likely to create a bureaucratic atmosphere which is opposed to the spirit of creative work. It is in the interest of both the INFN management and the researchers to arrive at a more reasonable solution - in particular, since this procedure seems to be unique among comparable institutes.

With best regards

Meinulf Goeckeler

5.1.236 Esteban Calzetta - IAFE, Buenos Aires

I totally agree that the attempt to quantify scientific work by the second can only backfire and is contrary to the spirit of science-

Esteban Calzetta

5.1.237 Roberto Trinchero - Centro Atomico Bariloche

Dear Sirs, I believe that creative activities can be done more efficiently with freedom than with useless burocratic controls. Therefore I recomend you not to apply the clock in/out of Italian researchers in INFN. With best regards

R. C. Trinchero

Grupo de Altas Energias

Centro Atomico Bariloche

Argentina

5.1.238 Chris Allton - Swansea Univ.

I'd like to add my support to your campaign to end the INFN policy of clocking in/out for researchers.

I was an INFN Borsa di Studio in the Universita' di Roma I, and am well aware of the situation in Italy. Certainly there is no such policy of clocking in/out in the UK.

I wish you every success in your campaign!

Buon lavoro !
Chris Allton

5.1.239 Lee Lin - National Chung Hsing Univ., Taiwan

Dear Sir:

I am shocked by the ruling that researchers have to clock in/out and are required to declare the the exact time and activities outside..... I simply do not believe it. But today is not the All Fool's Day (April 1), and I therefore take it as a real message. I therefore strongly protest against this kind of (almost) dictatorship-like ruling. This is a humiliation to intellectuals. Any office which makes this kind of ruling should be severely criticized and disbanded.

Sincerely yours,
Lee LIN
Dept. of Physics
National Chung Hsing University
Taiwan

5.1.240 A group of theoretical physicists in Zhongshan Univ. Guangzhou, PR China

Dear Sir,

The following is a letter from your physicists.

In our opinion the new rule is terribly meaningless and nonsense. We hope you would delete it as soon as possible. This will be benificial to the progress of physics in your country.

A group of theoretical physicists in Zhongshan Univ.
Guangzhou, PR China

5.1.241 Charles Nash - St. Patrick's Coll., Maynooth

Dear Italian Colleagues at INFN,

I am horrified to hear of your arbitrary and unfair treatment regarding your working conditions.

Please add my views to the list of supporting messages that you have received.

Yours Sincerely

Charles Nash

5.1.242 Fujio Takeutchi - CERN

Dear Friend

I am quite impressed by reading the story. This summer I was impressed by the new regulation introduced by Russian bureaucracy about the per diem rule (housing). We were thinking that the Japanese bureaucracy was the worst, only the German one was near to it, but now I am changing the view.

I find your rule just nonsense. If any evaluation is needed, it should be done on the scientific outputs.

Fujio Takeutchi

5.1.243 Yoshimatsu Yokoo - Department of Physics, Fukui Medical Univ.

Dear Dott. Mario Macrì,

I agree you. The ruling that researchers have to clock in/out,is negative for scientific researches.

Yoshimatsu Yokoo

Department of Physics, Fukui Medical University

Matsuoka, Fukui 910-1193, Japan

5.1.244 Cecilia von Reichenbach - Universidad Nacional de La Plata

I think that the iniciative of the italian government in checking the time spent in searching by the researchers is simply humilliating, specially for a scientific community as the italian one, which has extensely proven it excelence in science with the fruits of its results. I hope that this decision can be revised and canceled.

Sincerely yours,
Cecilia von Reichenbach
Departamento de Fisica
Universidad Nacional de La Plata
Argentina

5.1.245 Victor H. Hamity - Univ. Nacional de Cordoba

The rule impose by the Management of INFN is useless and just pure burocratic. It is not implemented in most of the research institute in the world. I hope that it is canceled inmediately. People can only do good research if they have freedom to work.

Victor H. Hamity
Universidad Nacional de Cordoba
Cordoba, Argentina

5.1.246 Vladimir Gapienko - IHEP, Protvino

Dear Colleague,

My opinion: strong control over fundamental science may be well (may be not!) in case if a state keeps "star war" against aliens. Thanks for God, no such war in Europe now...

Vladimir GAPIENKO,
IHEP, Protvino, RUSSIA

5.1.247 Regina Celia Arcuri - UFRJ, MPhy

I completely disagree that the researchers have to clock in/out . It is not in this way that one is going to produce more.

Regina Celia Arcuri, Ph.D.

5.1.248 Li Xinhua - IHEP, Chinese Academy of Sciences Beijing, P.R.China

Dear Prof. Mario Macri

It's surprised me that our Italian colleagues in the High Energy Physics Society are forced to follow such a requirement. It is nature for some companies or factories to do such a thing. However, how to do research work in the scientific world? Freedom always!

I strongly agree with you to rule out that requirement.

Best regards,

Li Xinhua
IHEP, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, P.R.China

5.1.249 Marie-Claude Lemaire - SPP/DAPNIA Saclay

I completly join your point of view as the new rules instored in infn are bureaucratic nonsense as by definition the physicist does'nt count its time to get an experiment running or get the data analyzed.

Marie-Claude Lemaire
SPP/DAPNIA, bat.141, CE Saclay
91191 Gif-sur-Yvette France

5.1.250 Leszek Lukaszuk - Inst. for Nuclear Studies, Poland.

Dear Professor Macri,

A story about magnetic checks sounds improbable but evidently is true. Let me take this opportunity and say that I find this system of checking a pure nonsense as far as real progress in research is taken into account.

Sincerely yours

Leszek Lukaszuk,
Institute for Nuclear Studies,Poland.

5.1.251 Julian Stander - Univ. of Plymouth

Dear Sir,

I am writing to say that I agree completely with the sentiments expressed in the above mentioned letter.

Yours faithfully,
Dr Julian Stander
School of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Plymouth
Drake Circus
Plymouth, PL4 8AA, UK

5.1.252 Sreeram Valluri - Univ Of Western Ontario

Dear Mario:

I very strongly support your position in connection with the ruling from the Management of INFN.I believe it is totally out of place and leads to harmful actions and a lowering of overall morale of the Physicists. I do request the management of INFN to eliminate this ruling which does not do good to anyone.

Yours truly,
Dr.Sreeram Valluri,
dept of Physics & Astronomy,
Univ Of Western Ontario,London,Canada

5.1.253 Elizabeth Vokurka

The people who choose to work in a research environment are not in it for money or for lack of being employable outside of academia.

They are doing research because they love to do research, and their work day does not begin and end as they enter and leave the office of their home institution.

As a research physicist, I find it appalling that someone has decided to quantify scientific worth by the amount of time spent at a desk, not by their quality of research.

Scientists are not assembly line workers.

Yours faithfully,
Dr. Elizabeth Vokurka

5.1.254 Robert A. Leacock - iowa state university

dear dr macri: it has come to my attention that infn is plannig to institute keeping track of its scientists using time clocks. if this comes to pass, it is likely to be highly counter-productive. it is well known that good scientists work basically 24 hours per day. monitoring them is unnecessary and hostile.

sincerely,
robert a leacock
dept physics
iowa state university

5.1.255 Amand Faessler - Tuebingen Univ.

Dear Dr. Mario Macri,

That scientists should use magnetic cards to clock in and out to control their working time seems to me more a joke than a realistic proposal. Each scientist who is really a scientist, is so motivated, that I expect that he is working much more than 40 h per week, be it in the lab or at home.

I hope this strange rule is in the meantime revoked.

Best regards,
Amand Faessler

5.1.256 Alex Finch - Lancaster Univ.

The 'bean-counters' (english slang for mindless accountants who want to count everything) seem to be taking over everywhere, but this is the first time I've heard of this. I hope you are able to fight it.

Good Luck,
Alex Finch
(Physics, Lancaster University)

5.1.257 Arnd Leike - Sektion Physik der LMU

Dear Colleagues of the INFN,

I was astonished receiving your mail with the information that scientists at the INFN have to use magnetic cards to record their working time.

I don't know about such a system for scientists at other HEP institutes in the world.

Almost all scientsts I know work much more than the regular time. What about the additional working hours which will be recorded? Will they be paid by the institute? Will scientists be allowed to work only a maximum time per day?

I'm sure that the new method will certainly increase the costs for the INFN. I have doubts that it will help to increase the quantity and/or quality of the research.

I think that this will soon be recognized by the management of the INFN.

Sincerely, yours

Arnd Leike
Sektion Physik der LMU
Theresienstr 37
D-80333 Muenchen
Germany

5.1.258 P. Giarritta - Univ. of Zurich

Dear Colleague,

I fully agree with your concerns about introducing clocks and magnetic cards.

I hope that the decision will be withdraw as soon as possible.

Best regards

P. Giarritta Physik-Institut, University of Zurich

5.1.259 Marek Gazdzicki - Univ. of Frankfurt

I fully support protest of Italian physiscist against burocratic nonsens in their institute.

Marek Gazdzicki
Institute of Nuclear Physics
University of Frankfurt

5.1.260 Faheem Hussain - ICTP Trieste

Dear Dr. Macri,

I was distressed to hear that the INFN is instituting a clock in/out system to control the movements of its scientists. In my opinion this is a very retrograde move and will seriously damage the research atmosphere in INFN. I recommend strongly that this action be repealed.

Yours sincerely
Faheem Hussain
ictp.trieste

5.1.261 Sean Frigo - ANL

Dear Mario,

The situation you describe is certainly unsettling. I would find such control apalling and a bit Orwellian. I would not work at such a facility. The atmosphere would not be compatible with the need for a free environment that fosters creativity needed to perform research.

You have my support in condemning such a policy.

Sincerely,
Sean Frigo
Argonne National Laboratory

5.1.262 Alex Vilenkin - Tufts Univ.

Dear Dr. Macri,

I am writing regarding the decision of the Management of INFN to introduce time cards for physicists. I think this is a terrible idea. Creative work can only suffer from this kind of administrative intrusion. The great majority of physicists that I know do not require any incentives to spend more time doing physics. On the contrary, they continue doing it at home, and even at the dinner table. Unnecessary reglamentation will only lower the morale and reduce the productivity.

Sincerely,
Alex Vilenkin

5.1.263 Xin-Heng Guo - Univ. of Adelaide

Dear Prof. Macri,

I completely agree that the new ruling of INFN Management (that researchers have to clock in and out) is totally nonsense. Science is different from business. The ruling for business is not suitable for science.

Best wishes,

Xin-Heng Guo

Special Research Center for Subatomic Structure of Matter

University of Adelaide

Australia

5.1.264 G. Glass -

RESPONSE to the time card requirement. I believe this requirement will do much to discourage talented people from being in the field. It represents an administrative ploy to insure time spent doing research is documentable. However, it will backfire as far as productivity is concerned. Good luck in thwarting this attempt at putting an administrative hold on scientists.

g. glass

5.1.265 Andre' LeClair - Cornell Univ.

Dear Mr. Macrì

This is about the issue of clocking in for INFN researchers.

The idea to do this seems absolutely ridiculous. As is well known, many people, in fact many of the greatest, like to work at home where there are less distractions, or like to work late at night. Physics just isn't a 9 to 5 job. For many people it is a morning to midnight job and this wouldn't register on the "clock".

Sincerely,

Andre' LeClair

Cornell University

5.1.266 Jonathan Katz - Washington Univ.

Subject: Clocking in is crazy!

Nowhere else in the world that I have heard of requires scientists to do this. Often the best work is done when going for a walk to think quietly.

Good luck.

Jonathan Katz, Dept. Physics,
Washington U., St. Louis, Mo. 63130 USA

5.1.267 Victor O. Rivelles - Sao Paulo Univ.

Dear Mr. Macri,

It is a shame that the work of Italian physicists should be evaluated in this way. Certainly there are more efficient means of evaluation.

Sincerely yours

Dr. Victor O. Rivelles

5.1.268 Markus Finkemeier

Sir,

I am a former theoretical physicist, now working at a Wall Street investment bank in quantitative research.

Clocking in and out of work is something Wall Street professionals would laugh about - there is no such thing here at any place I know. To have that in physics seems even more absurd. I hope you can help to prevent Italian scientists to become the laugh of the international scientific community.

Sincerely,

Markus Finkemeier

5.1.269 Joaquim da Silva-Marcos - CERN

Dear Colleagues,

I read your mail and was absolutely astonished by the proposal of the management of INFN to establish a clock, like in factories, in order to control your working ours.

What can I say? It is such an absurd measure that it can only be thought up by people who do no creative work at all. A clock for physisists? Why not a switch for the brain?

Best regards

J.I. da Silva Marcos

5.1.270 Geronimo Wanderley Machado - Brasile

Io mi associo al vostro problemi u alle vostre preoccupazzione... Geronimo Wanderley MACHADO, Brasile

5.1.271 Shuqian Ying

I think that under normal situations this kind of management of research activities would not achieve its objectives since research processes can not be industralized and researcher are not factory workers.

Shuqian Ying

5.1.272 Dierck-E. Liebscher - Astrophys. Inst., Potsdam

Dear colleagues,

I am sure that you are right in your evaluation of the clock-in rule which you are complaining about. Effectivity of scientific research will not be raised by such a procedure but by both sensible and fair criteria for verifying the work done.

Through own experience, I suppose your management as well as you yourselves have a problem with the justification of the expenses for science, and for nuclear physics in particular. In the long run, this can be helped only by more public activities, public lectures, articles in newspapers and so on.

Dierck-E.Liebscher

5.1.273 Luis Lavoura - Universidade Tecnica de Lisboa, Portugal

You describe the INFN ruling as "useless bureaucratic nonsense", but I think it is potentially much worse than that. Indeed, researchers and University professors have a very important position in promoting democracy, public discussion, and alternative views. This can only happen if they are formally or informally allowed time out to spend in public activities like discussion forums, studies of other subjects than their own field of research, work in citizen's associations, and the like. This is what happens in most democratic

countries. As such, the "clock in/out" ruling, which effectively forces high-energy physicists to do no more than high-energy physics, should probably have a very bad effect on democracy. And that's extremely bad.

Luis Lavoura

(Universidade Tecnica de Lisboa, Portugal)

5.1.274 Frank Antonsen - Niels Bohr Inst.

Dear collegues,

I sympathise with your sitaution and think something should be done about it.

This attempt at bureaucratic control is the prelude to cut-backs (not only in physics but in all institutes of higher education and research). A country wanting to meet the convergence criteria of the EMU cannot afford to have a big budget for wellfare, health, education and research. As this is a problem for every country in the EU (including the countries not participating in the EMU-project), scientists and teachers all over Europe are likely to experience similar worsenings of our situation in the near future. In such a situation it becomes the task of every intellectual to protest at every planned cut in wellfare, health, education and research, irrespectively of whether these planned cuts touch his/her own field of work. It is also our task to take part in the public debate about where the money is going to come from and how existing funds are to be allocated (places where money can be taken from in most instances, without reducing the wellfare of ordinary citizens, include of course the military, large parts of the ruling (often corrupt) bureaucracy, and the stock exchange (which is currently wrecking havoc with the world causing millions to starve in South East Asia, Russia and Latin America, preciesly because it is unfettered – a greater tax on speculation could dampen it and help prevent bubble-economies and attacks on weak contries currencies).

The best of luck

Frank Antonsen, Niels Bohr Institute

5.1.275 Peter Minkowski - Bern Univ.

Caro Dr. Macri,

Ho letto una lettera, firmata da cento fisici (uomini e donne) , che lavorano con varie funzioni in seno all' INFN. Capisco da quella, che viene

introdotta dai dirigenti dell INFN una misura nuova che obbliga gli scienziati ad introdurre una cartolina magnetica per ritenere le ore di lavoro sia all laboratorio, sia a casa.

Sono fisico teorico, impiegato all'universita di Berna in Svizzera. Dunque devo riconoscere per primo, che nel piu grande laboratorio n a z i o n a l e di fisica in Svizzera, il Paul Scherrer Institut (PSI) che fa parte della Scuola Politecnica Federale a Zurigo, la stessa misura e' imposta da alcuni anni.

Pero' sono d'accordo con i fisici che hanno firmato quella lettera, che questa misura da solo deve apparire inutile a quelli come appare anche a me. Mi pare senza rischio dare una previsione della m e d i a d'ore settima nali, risultante dell'evaluazione di queste cartoline : sara fra 50 e 60 ore.

Vorrei piutosto rendere attenti i dirigenti dell impresa scientifica dell INFN a quello che mi pare molto piu importante nel presente ambiente :

Fra quella centinaia di fisici credo che sono molti giovani(e) . Fanno parte di gruppi molto piu numerosi che nel tempo dei 'bambini della via Panisperno' . Pero' sono certo, che danno del loro meglio , vogliono impiegarsi per il meglio, mossi da uno spirito di ricerca e anche degli esempi di scienziati straordinari come (50 anni fa Ettore Majorana, Enrico Fermi ...) .

Quindi dobbiamo domandarci se a parte le cartoline magnetiche d'un tipo o d'un altro siano richiesti forse altri segni fra i giovani(e) e i dirigenti della ricerca nella fisica delle particelle elementari. La risposta a queste domanda mi pare affermativa:

aspirano tutti fisici(e), anche quelli che non potranno forse affermarsi come 'artisti' o 'scienziati straordinari' , ma il cui lavoro e' ottimo, eppure necessario per aspirare ad un vero progresso, ad una affermazione dell loro impegno. Voglione sentire un certo riconoscimento, anche moderato, che dia una minima certezza del senso – generale – di questo impegno.

Sono queste alcune idee che vorrei cummunicarvi.

'Best greetings' , Peter Minkowski

5.1.276 Yunxiu Ye

Dear prof. Macri, It is strange that researchers have to clock in and out using magnetic card. Generally, researchers' brains work on besides in their lab. or offices for considering or solving some problems. According to the "magnetic card rule", how to estimate this kind of work?

Good luck with your reseachers in near futhure.
Yunxiu Ye

5.1.277 R. Rey-Mermier - CERN

Cher Monsieur Macri J'ai eu le plaisir ces dernieres annees de travailler a Gene,Rome et au CERN avec des gens de l'INFN. Durant ces collaborations,pour des raisons de dates fixees a l'avance nous fumes tous obliges d'etre extrememement flexibles avec l'horaire soit pour le lunch soit en fin de journee. C'est sans aucuns problemes que nous avons tous tire sur cette double corde technique et scientifique pour terminer notre travail dans les delais. Les mesures administratives lues dans un e-mail le 24.9. me semblent aller a l'encontre de l'esprit qui nous motive dans notre vie professionnelle et meme je dirai contre productives. En vous remercient de votre attention recevez Monsieur Macri mes salutations les plus respectueuses r.rey-mermier

5.2 Suggestions and examples of how to evaluate research work

5.2.1 Peter Wanderer - BNL

I work at Brookhaven Lab in the US. Everyone (including scientists) must report his or her own time and the account number for the cost. We report by writing our hours worked (or vacation or ...) on a time card. We sign the card, and our supervisor signs the card. The card is supposed to be filled in every day. Some people fill it in only once a month.

This year there is a new system for judging the quality of work. (It is new for scientists. Others at the lab have used it for several years.) The scientist and his/her supervisor writes down job duties, goals, and accomplishments for the past year, and a list of goals for the coming year. Also, the supervisor rates everyone by number, from 1 to 5. Most are 2 (very good) or 3 (average). The numerical rating is painful. The supervisor signs the form and reviews it with the subordinate. The subordinate is requested to sign the form (to indicate that it has been discussed with him/her), and can write a rebuttal if desired. One benefit of this is for documenting the poor performance of staff who need to be fired. The numberical rating is also directly tied in to the range of pay raises that can be given.

I know of colleagues who work at several other labs in the US (Fermilab, Berkeley, SLAC, Los Alamos). As far as I know, no one "punches in" using a time stamp on a card.

Peter Wanderer

Brookhaven National Laboratory

5.2.2 Rui Vilela Mendes - Univ. of Lisboa

At present in our Institute the method of evaluation of the scientific work of each research group is the following: Each three years an external (international) panel evaluates the group based on the scientific production (papers) and a direct presentation in front of the panel by each researcher of a summary of his (her) past work and perspectives for the future. The grading of the panel (bad;fair;good;very good;excellent) has then an automatic effect on the research funds that are given to the group in the next three years. A grading of "bad" means a stoping of research financing and between "fair"

and "excellent" there is a factor of around 4, I think. This factor may be even larger because for well rated groups the panel may recommend a special additional funding. There is no clocking system for the research activities. There is such a system (of course) for teaching activities (for those of us that hold teaching posts, not for the full time researchers)

Rui Vilela Mendes
Mathematical Physics Group
Complexo Interdisciplinar
University of Lisboa

5.2.3 Paolo Di Vecchia - NORDITA, Copenhagen

Caro Dr. Macrì, ho ricevuto una lettera firmata da vari ricercatori INFN riguardo l'introduzione del cartellino per i ricercatori INFN e vorrei in questa lettera mandare qualche commento che forse puo' aiutare a valutare meglio questo provvedimento. Mi pare importante e assolutamente necessario specialmente nella societa' attuale che un istituto di ricerca abbia dei metodi per valutare la qualita' della produzione scientifica dei suoi dipendenti e che prenda anche dei provvedimenti nei riguardi di coloro che non diano un contributo adeguato. Tuttavia quando si arriva ad un provvedimento come il cartellino mi pare che si scelga di rinunciare a valutare i dipendenti in base alla qualita' della loro produzione scientifica o almeno questo aspetto passa in secondo piano in quanto il criterio piu' importante in pratica diventa il tempo passato sul posto di lavoro. E questo mi pare uno sviluppo da evitare in quanto non contribuisce ad alzare il livello della ricerca, ma solamente a introdurre per i ricercatori degli obblighi formali per poi esimerli da obblighi piu' sostanziali.

Posso capire che un simile provvedimento venga dall'esigenza di trattare in maniera uguale i ricercatori da una parte e i tecnici e le segretarie dall'altra. Pero' se si vuole arrivare ad una maggiore uguaglianza tra i vari tipi di dipendenti sarebbe molto meglio che si vada nella direzione di rendere piu' flessibile il tempo di lavoro dei dipendenti tecnici e che anche loro vengano valutati piu' rispetto a quanto producono invece che per il tempo passato sul posto di lavoro. E' mia esperienza che le segretarie diventano molto piu' efficienti se vengono responsabilizzate dei problemi che devono affrontare anche se poi si e' molto flessibili rispetto al tempo di lavoro. Lo stesso

immagino succeda per i tecnici.

In conclusione io, se dovessi prendere dei provvedimenti di uguaglianza, andrei nella direzione opposta a quella connessa con l'introduzione del cartellino salvo poi ad avere delle vere valutazioni scientifiche.

Per finire voglio anche far presente che non ho mai sentito parlare di un simile provvedimento in nessun altro paese europeo per migliorare il livello della ricerca. Questo provvedimento certo non avvicina l'Italia agli altri paesi europei!!

Paolo Di Vecchia

5.2.4 David Myers - Leader, LHC Experiments Joint Controls Project, CERN

Your message amazed me. As scientific researchers you are paid to think, not bolt pieces together on a production line. Forcing you to spend a fixed number of hours at a fixed place will not help you to think faster. What is required is a proper monitoring procedure to set goals for the work to be done and to evaluate the results. The CERN "MOAS" system is a step in this direction.

With regards,

David Myers

Leader, LHC Experiments Joint Controls Project.

5.2.5 Manfred Fleischmann - IT-CS

Good morning Mario,

Thanks for putting me on your mailing list. I am not sure if I am really 100% competent to make valid comments, but I'll try, even knowing that I might look at it from a completely different viewpoint. So please ignore my bla, bla, ... if you think that I did not really understand/appreciate your worries.

As you know, I am not a Research Physicist, nor a business consultant but in my time at CERN I believe to have acquired a certain understanding of the culture of researchers and the work style which they have to adopt:

That's why I think that this suggested "In/Out control" at INFN is totally against the spirit in which fruitfull research can be carried out. It is counter-

productive, will only demotivate people and certainly, as you say, not result in producing more or better scientific results.

However, to me, such a system can be necessary and justified in certain environments, such as factories, industrial production and for user services, in particular if there are officially gliding/flexible working hours.

In fact, I think that it should be even used at CERN for certain job categories. I don't want to create 'classes' of different people but - to me - it is a fact that an administrative officer/secretary, a craftsman in a workshop, a service engineer, ... does and can not have the same work style as a research physicist. And to me, there is abuse at CERN in the sense that everybody takes the right to 'behave like a research physicist' as far as flexible working hours are concerned, without 'giving anything back'. ... but now, I'm getting off the track, this is a CERN problem.

Yet, I have a few further - perhaps unorthodox - comments:

- What about turning the whole thing round (you are the expert in 'anti' matters), i.e. try to think and act in terms of your management? Let me explain:

  Once more, I think it is a question of style and culture that such an idiotic administrative procedure should not be imposed on researchers, but, on the other hand, ...

  I'm sure that no serious research physicist is afraid that the suggested system would show that he works less than his con- tractual working hours. On the contrary, you could use this system to show management that you are putting much more effort in your work than what you are paid for and then you should invite management to be consequent and pay you (or provide another way of 'compensation') for your overtime, incl. night- and weekend allowances .... Or, if they don't want to give more but insist that you work 'contractually correct', they should hire more (young) scientists so that your research programme can be properly carried out.

- How was the measure officially announced/justified, i.e. why does your management want to do it at all? Was there just a clever salesman who sold his system/machines to your admin. Director? Or, do they really accuse you to not work enough?

- Could there be a security aspect in this measure, i.e. to know who is on site in case of an emergency situation?

- Unfortunately, I do not have a sensible idea on how to assess quantity and quality of scientific work: number (pages) of publications, Nobel Price, ...

- In my simple mind I believe to have seen that it is easy to do freely scientific and research work if there is plenty of money and resources, as in the early days of CERN. But, as soon as there are external restrictions (like budget cuts) the problem arises of how to properly assess the 'productivity' of scientific activities. My 'experience' seems to show that then management typically tries to apply procedures and tools which certainly exist and work in industry and business, but they are totally inadequate instruments in research labs. For me, the MOAS story at CERN is a perfect example; it just costs a hell of time and effort but does not contribute to a more efficient running of the Lab; but (my personal opinion) it keeps some people - and unfortunately not only administrators - busy !

- Concerning your worry about ' .. a proper effort to find sensible and fair criteria ... ' I assume that this does not yet exist and - before introducing counterproductive bureaucratic procedures - one should try to understand the differences and problems of 'measuring' scientific and industry/business work, hoping that this could lead to more appropriate and more intelligent measures.

I hope that I did not waste your time too much with my 'ideas'
Best regards,
Manfred Fleischmann IT-CS

5.2.6 Paula A. Whitlock - City Univ. of New York

Dear Mario Macri, National Spokesperson of INFN Researchers:

This letter is in response to the e-mail I received describing how INFN researchers must now punch into timeclocks. I assume this is being done to assess scientific productivity. However, scientific productivity can not be

measured by the number of hours an individual occupies a chair. Traditionally, there have been many other measures:

- papers published and their importance
- annual or semiannual research reports
- conferences attended
- collaborators, both locally and internationally
- seminars given where research is described
- referring activity for research journals
- editting activities, both for conference books and journals

When one is actively engaged in research, one's thoughts are continuously occupied with that research and its challenges. New insights don't neccessarily occur at your desk, but more often when you are engaged in other activites, like riding a train, driving a car or sleeping. To assess a researcher's worth by counting hours present at a desk undervalues their actual intellectual worth and suggests that their value is solely based on the physical space they occupy.

I would hope that the management of your research facility would use better ways to assess the quality of their scientist's contributions.

Sincerely,
Paula A. Whitlock
Associate Professor
Brooklyn Colleg, City University of NY

5.2.7 Marc Rayet - Universite Libre de Bruxelles

I completely agree with you that enforcing such a regulation is indeed a bureaucratic nonsense. It may exist, or may have existed in other centers with strong bureaucratic, military like, traditions (Saclay, Geel, Karlsruhe ...?), I don't know, but to enforce it now is pretty ridiculous. You should ask your authorities to provide each of you with portable black boxes which you could switch on and off everytime your brain switches on or off professional concerns

(duely registered of course as part of your authorized scientific activities) when you are out of your institue, in your car, your toilet, your shower, or drinking your morning coffee. By the way, do you have to clock out to have an expresso? That would would be hell ! Your story reminds me of a famous text by Umberto Eco describing how a library works (I think it was an inaugural address to a new library in Milano) and concluding that the perfect library was a library without readers!

Some 15 years ago the same sort of regulation was proposed by the authorities at Brussels University with the demagogic argument, directed of course to the trade union representatives, that all categories of workers would be placed on the same footing, from lady cleaners to faculty professors. The proposal was rapidly swept away by the unions and by the academics, the former (but not the latter) suggesting that suppressing the whole clocking system in the University would have the same result (but that was not accepted by the authorities).

More seriously, you are right to point out, behind the inconvenience of your situation, the problem of the scientific work evaluation. This is really a crucial issue which has dramatic consequences on our personal status (although in the scientific community, individual are still -but for how long?- relatively well protected compared to other sectors) and on the whole system of scientific funding. A recent particular perversion of this system lies in the systematic evaluation of the quality of a scientific production by -and often only by- the "impact factor" which everybody knows now and which is the stupidest, uncontrollable, system one can imagine. This is one important issue which should be discussed by the scientists, independently and on an international basis, since many important programs are now discussed on a continental or world-wide scale.

Hope to hear about a positive issue to your problems.

With best wishes.

Marc Rayet
Institut d'Astrophysique, CP 226
Universite Libre de Bruxelles

5.2.8 John Morton - The Univ. of Liverpool

Dear Mario,

I am glad to add my name to the list of those who are amazed that researchers at the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare are required to clock in and out of their home institute and to provide detailed accounts of time spent when away from base.

I have been a researcher (physicist/engineer) for more than half my life and the nature of the work has always required a very flexible approach to work, both on the big experiments and also when based in the home lab. Like nearly all others, I have visited rigs in the middle of the night, worked overnight at my house or away and, crucially, discussed projects with colleagues over a meal (the "China Blossom" tracker layout was thrashed out in a restaurant of that name - though I wasn't present), or while travelling.

As it happens, I actually record, for some of my researcher and technical colleagues, their days employed/leave/sick/time-in-lieu (instead of overtime payments we cannot make) to help our University employer to fulfil its legal obligations. No-one suggests that this should be *rigorously* timed or reflect actual work output.

In our institution, efficiency and quality of work are judged by results. If particular goals are not going to be met, it is the responsibility of the researcher to point out that more effort, or a change in approach or whatever, is needed, and it is equally the responsibility of a superior in the group to keep in touch with the project and point out when things are not going to plan and discuss solutions constructively. It would be an enormous surprise to me if this was different in the Istituto Nazionale. Questions of which particular times are spent in what way are entirely irrelevant. So clocking in and out will cost commitment, time and effort that is lost from projects.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. John Morton
Physics Department,
Oliver Lodge Laboratory,
The University of Liverpool,
LIVERPOOL, U.K.

5.2.9 Rolf Mertig - Mertig Research & Consulting

from my own experience in 10 years of research, and now 2 years in software industry (there I have to write reports every TWO weeks), please, let me

tell you that for any kind of creative work any pressure and unnecessary reglementation is harmful and very counterproductive.

There are much smarter ways to exert some control over the staff (which may be not a bad idea in general) like:

- giving out prices for important research or papers being done
- linking part of the salary to production of papers (this is done in Mexico, though it is dangerous)
- having "evaluation committees" which visit the groups every year or so and interview them and write a report on the activities; this is done here in the Netherlands; and, if a group (or also a branch of science) is truly unproductive and does not contribute to the knowledge of mankind in any sensible manner anymore: the committee has the power to recommend the shut-down of that group and even the right to fire people (now, this seems to work rather well and this is an incentive for the rare lazy researchers to still work).

HOWEVER, it is certainly the case that the vast majority of researchers is motivated from a deep interest in physics and they truly love what they are doing (otherwise they would have studied law, medicine, or management, which undoubtetly yields more money); and therefore any, especially too detailed, control is not only unnecessary but just against the very nature of what drives a researcher. Only free people can have great ideas and perform beautiful work.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. Rolf Mertig
Mertig Research & Consulting
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

5.2.10 Vladimir Gavrilov - CERN

Dear Prof.M.Macrì,

I was informed from my Italien Colleagues, that the Management of INFN decided recently to monitor the exact time spent by scientists at their offices. I hope that the management of INFN realises that an efficiency of scientific research is not correlated with the amount of time spent by scientits in the

labs. Moreover the intension of usage such a criteria for any rating of efficiency of scientific work could have a very bad impact to the spirit of science, because all scientific discoveries are made by internal intention of scientists and if any external frameworks will be set for reglamentation of the scientific work, these action early or later will led to degradation of the level of research.

If for any reasons any quantitative criteria for efficiency of scientific research of different institutions will be required, there are many criteria, which will be more appropriate for this purpose. Namely the number of papers, published in the scientifics journals, number of talks, given at the large international scientific conferences, number of young scientists defended their thesises during certain period, etc.

I hope that if the Management of INFN is intended to keep the Italian science (which gave all of us such brilliant names like E.Fermi, W.Pauli and many others) at the highest World level, the wise approach for an improvement of the evaluation of the efficiency of scintific research will be found.

Sincerely yours,

Vladimir Gavrilov,

Member of Advisory Committee of CERN Users

5.2.11 Peter Vogl - Technical Univ. of Munich

This is nonsense and only serves to frustrate researchers. Research can only flourish in an environment that is based on mutual acceptance, trust, and excitement.

If your burocracy is worried about people not being active, they might consider a model adopted in the research labs of Siemens. Every scientist is asked to write down when he comes in and when he leaves and sum up the number of hours monthly. It should reach a certain number of hours per month, as a matter of fairness to all those employees (taxpayers in our case) who have to work from 8 to 5.

I would like to warn you to propose a scheme of payment that is based on number of publications etc. Nowhere in the world this has ever worked to produce good science (in contrast to rumors, such a stupid scheme has never been used at Bell Labs)

Yours sincerely,

Peter Vogl
Walter Schottky Institut
Technical University of Munich
D-85748 Garching

5.2.12 Bekhzad Yuldashev - Director, Inst. of Nuclear Physics Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Dear colleagues:

To our understanding it is internal affair of any administration to control a time spent in the lab by its emploees. The method "innovated" in your lab in our opinion would be more efficient in the factory or mine but not in research center. In our practice we estimate the efficiency of our scientists (except those who should be on the shifts due to their duties) by the number and quality of their publications and patents as well as by final and productive results of their activity. Regards

Bekhzad Yuldashev
Director
Institute of Nuclear Physics
Ulugbek, Tashkent, UZ-702132
UZBEKISTAN

5.2.13 John Galayda - ANL

Dear Dr. Sansoni,

There is no timecard system in place for scientists and engineers at Argonne. Performance of a scientist or engineer is evaluated annually, rather than on a daily basis. at the discretion of a supervisor, a scientist or engineer may be required to submit a weekly activity report. A count of hours worked is not included, in all such weekly reports I have seen. Employees are required to request permission from supervisors before taking days off. While flexible definition of working hours is permitted by lab policy, an employee must have his/her supervisor's permission to make a significant or permanent change in working schedule. It is the responsibility of the immediate supervisor of an employee to take corrective action if the employee is late to work or absent to an extent that hurts the empoyee's performence. Working

rules are essentially the same at Brookhaven National Lab, where I worked for 13 years.

I know that Daresbury Lab in the UK has required engineers and scientists to use a time-clock to account for hours worked. This has been true for many years. Generally engineers and scientists are not allowed to work "overtime" unless explicitly approved, though the employee has a certain amount of flexibility in choosing hours. An employee that works too many hours for a few weeks is expected to take "time off in lieu" of pay. The only complaint I have heard about this system is that it forces scientists to spend FEWER hours than they would otherwise spend at the lab. However I am sure you can get more accurate and detailed information on the effects of this policy from colleagues at Daresbury.

Best regards
John Galayda
ANL

5.2.14 Joseph C. Varilly - Universidad de Costa Rica

Dear Prof. Macri:

Allow me to add my name to the list of people who are writing to protest the proposed rule by the INFN.

Time spent in the office may, but often does not, correlate with creative scientific work. No need to elaborate on that; but what about the time spent at conferences and meetings far from the home institute, where a lot of scientific progress is made? Will you have to take along your magnetic card when you go to a workshop in, say, Poland?

Actually, I am reminded of the major brouhaha about "effort reporting" that took place in the United States in the early 80's, when the feudal government tried to have NSF-funded researchers submit detailed checklists with the percentages of time and effort devoted to each professional activity. Despite the craziness of the idea and the arbitrariness of any possible enforcement, it took a lot of time and effort to beat it back. One of the leaders in this effort was Serge Lang, who was very vocal about it. Have you had contact with him on this matter?

Sincerely,

Joseph C. Varilly
Departamento de Matematicas
Universidad de Costa Rica
2060 San Jose, Costa Rica

5.3 Recent examples of introduction of clocking, or proposals, then abonadoned.

5.3.1 Erich Vogt - Former Director of TRIUMF

Dear Mario:

I was surprised and astonished that in a world-leading laboratory such as Frascati it was considered advantageous to institute time clocks for scientists. For thirteen years, 1981-94 I was director of TRIUMF, Canada's particle physics laboratory. I would have resisted very strongly any efforts to diminish the science program of TRIUMF by such measures.

In the past I have worked at some institutions which used time-clocks for scientist. Effectively, this was done at Chalk River in the early days but later abonadoned. It has been my experience that when time clocks are brought in there is a tendency of the scientist to work less: they work the canonical hours instead of the long hours which they otherwise put into their work. This being the case it is then extraordinarily generous of INFN management to let other world laboratories of less distinction catch up with it scientifically by effectively reducing the quality of Frascati science. I believe it is possible in Italy to find management which would want to enhance Frascati's science even further, but the time clocks would then need to be abandoned.

yours sincerely,
Erich Vogt
Former Director of TRIUMF,
Canada.

Dear Mario:

On the weekend I met with Alessandro Bettini and showed him your email message. He informs me that the time clock business arises from the Italian Parliament and not from the Frascati INFN management as your message says. Is that correct? If so, I would not want to be critical of the INFN management who are likely trying their best to cope with the unreasonable conditions imposed on them. My views about the undesirability of the time clock business remain and I hope, for the sake of Italian physics, that you are able to avoid its impact.

yours sincerely, Erich Vogt

5.3.2 Ahmed Ali - DESY

There are two aspects of this issue which have to be kept in mind and weighed against each other in finding an equitable solution. The first aspect is that in many countries (at least this is the case in Germany) government funded research institutes are subject to the rules and regulations applied to the public service as an overwhelming majority of researchers is so-called "Angestellte in Oeffentlichen Dienst" (employees in public service). The second aspect has to do with the quality of scientific output, in which the freedom of the working environment and the choice of research topics play a fundamental role.

Concerning the former, the fixation of the weekly working hours is a vital point on the agenda of the trade unions negotiated each year. For us this is 38 hours weekly, written explicitly or implicitly in all service contracts. In fact, also the arrival and departure times to the offices are stated in service contracts. The trade unions have prevailed upon insisting and achieving flexible arrival and departure times, which approximately is about a hour and a half at both ends. This is the formal (or legal) aspect of this issue, as seen by someone working for a publicly funded German national research institute.

Computerized time cards are in use in Germany for the non-scientific staff since a very long time. However, so far the scientists working in public research institutes have been spared of this mechanical control. The reason is simple, namely that on average scientists work lot more than the mandatory 38 hours per week. An equally important aspect is that a lot of the research-related work is done at home and on weekends. In most cases we do have institute-supported PCs and modems at our homes which are quite extensively used for research work. Then, many of us participate in experiments and their analyses away from home institutes, are involved in workshops and conferences, sit on committees, referee scientific proposals and papers, lecture at universities, supervise graduate students, write recommendation letters and on and on. There is no way to clock this activity. Moreover, all this extra work which is necessary for the scientific vitality and excellence is done without any financial renumeration. This has been accepted by both the management and the trade unions of the research institutes here in Germany. Hence, there are no time cards for scientists working at DESY, the Max-Planck institutes, to name two from our field.

It will be counter-productive to introduce time cards for the scientists. This measure would take away most of the drive and originality from the scientists and reduce them to office employees who have no scientific commitments. This is not to deny that our productivity and performance should not be subject to evaluation. However, the units in which scientific performance is measured are different. Here, the focus should be on the quality and the overall quantum of scientific research. This can be judged in terms of the only tangible product scientists produce, namely the scientific papers and patents and their impact on the field. While I don't know much about patents, I say, both enviously and in recognition of my Italian colleagues, that scientists working at the INFN laboratories and universities have produced in the past some of the seminal papers in high energy physics or have carried out experiments which have contributed very significantly to the development of this field. This was done without any time cards. So, why change a system based on mutual trust which has proven its worth and has worked so remarkably well in the past?

With this letter, I join my INFN colleagues in protesting against the introduction of time cards for scientists. The nature of our scientific and academic activities is not congruent with such mechanical measures. Scientists should be evaluated on their performance, measured in terms of the intrinsic contribution to their field and in terms of the overall scientific culture that their work helps produce.

Ahmed Ali

Staff Member, DESY

5.3.3 Art Olin - TRIUMF

Dear Mario,

It has come to my attention that a new time card system is being implemented by INFN, with the intention to use the information to monitor scientific performance. My institute (TRIUMF) has been also concerned with the issue of measuring scientific performance in the last years. It is not an easy problem, and our lab implemented a system that I consider destructive to moral and with little more specificity than a lottery. This INFN system seems no better. There really should be no correlation between scientific performance and time spent in a specific setting, and monitoring and rewarding

this aspect is likely to have negative consequences. Spending valuable time filling out useless forms won't help either. Our lab now requires a monthly report of estimated time spent on various activities, and at that level (5 min per month) it is marginally acceptable. The problem is not the time, but the unnecessary break in concentration that is so distructive to creative work.

Ciao,
Art Olin
Senior Research Scientist
TRIUMF

5.3.4 Michael Flohr - Kings Coll., London

Dear Mario, there is not much to say about this absolute nonsense! Why is it that burocrats cannot admitt that creativity as the one in research does not work with the clock. On the contrary, imposing the clock usually does decrease creativity. I have the following personal xperience. In Germany, there exist some so-called research-establishments where govermental regulated research is conducted. There, you have to work with the clock, and as a result, the scientific output of all the establishments is almost nil. The clock destroys the whole scientific attitude.

All the best
Michael

5.3.5 Jan-Ake Larsson - Link, Math

Dear Andrea,

I am a PHD student working in mathematical physics in Linkoping, Sweden. I couldn't agree more that the ruling is "useless bureaucratic nonsense".

Being a theoretician, my situation might be different, but I find that the best work, the finest ideas, etc, are found and worked out when I am not at the office. Usually this takes place late nights at home. When my daughter has gone to sleep and the TV volume is turned down, I find the peace and quiet that I need to get things done. At the office I seldom get time left over, since there always are very many things that has to be done immediately (preferably yesterday). Even when there is time over, it is divided into small pieces, so one can only do simple things. The difficult research is often pushed into the future.

Another point is that, some time ago, the clock in/out thing was tried at some department here (I fail to remember which). Since PHD students are paid salary in Sweden (I don't know how it works in Italy), the result was that the PHD students wanted pay for the overtime they did. Naturally the University refused to pay overtime to PHD students and subsequently took the clock down. They didn't want the actual workload of the PHD students on record.

One might wonder if this will happen in Italy too?

For what it's worth

Kind regards

Jan-Ake Larsson

5.3.6 Wolfgang Lange - DESY Zeuthen

Dear Mr. Macri,

for me it was very funny to read about the new regulations found... I'm watching the same tendencies here in Germany where responsible persons think they have to have everything under control - including the time budgets of their collaborators and coworkers. We have the regulations you described (magnetic cards, checking the time spent at different places and so on) already introduced here. Up to now they are applied only to technical personal, secretaries, librarians and so on.

This has a serious consequence: Once the time budget of a person is over (=3D time declared by the working contract and the corresponding rules and convnetions) you won't find that person anymore since there is no way to pay for additional working time. If you didn't check these persons that accurately they normally would stay as long as neccessary and not as long as their time budget lasts...

There were also attempts to apply these regulations to scientists and engineers.

Because "THEY" din't trust "US" we wanted to find out the "true working time". So we simply wrote down our time spent at work for a few weeks, including the time spent at the experiments and doing measuring shifts. There was no person below twenty percent additional working time, fifty percent were quiet normal. Since (at least here) there is no way to pay for this additional working time the idea of registering all working time was

quickly forgotten by the authorities...

Another fact is the demotivation and frustration which will go along with such regulations - they express more or less that YOU are not trusted. If a person is not allowed to decide on his or her own their creativity will go down. The more the restrictions increase the more the creative output will decrease...

So think about... When even Germans - known for their strict rules and their tendency to have everything under control - refused from these regulations...

Best regards, Wolfgang Lange

Dr. Wolfgang Lange

DESY Zeuthen

5.3.7 Philippe Lerch - Paul Scherrer Inst.

Dear Dr Macri,

I have heard rumors that the Management of INFN (Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, the Italian main Institute for High Energy Physics) decided to have researchers clock in/out from the 1st of July 1998.

This is a very surprinsing decision, kwnowing for a fact that producitivity and originality in scientific and technical areas can not be measured by the amount of time spent at work.

As an example, PSI, the Paul Scherrer Institute in Switzerland (1000 people doing research) had a clock in/clock out system for while, and abandonned it after a few years. The cost of the such systems can be as high as a million of $ / year for a large institutions, and the benefit is zero.

Another example, is ABB, a large multinational compagny, avoided the cost of such a system. A clock in/out system is merely useful in order to protect some workers from being exploited. This is unlikely to be the case in research areas.

Make the best of these comments, and I whish you a nice week-end. Kind regards, Philippe Lerch

Dr Philippe Lerch

Cryogenic Detectors

Laboratory of Astrophysics

Paul Scherrer Institute

CH-5232 VILLIGEN, Switzerland

5.3.8 John Morris - RAL

I agree entirely with your reaction to the ruling. Here at RAL Particle Physics Dept. we are more fortunate in that we were given the option of joining, or not joining, a scheme which would have involved clocking in/out. In a democratic vote all but one of our 90 staff were against the scheme. Many objections were raised including the difficulty of keeping a record of working hours when we were abroad (many of us spend extended periods working at CERN, DESY, ILL or SLAC) and the belief that the efficiency of the department would be degraded, rather than enhanced, because of the increased bureaucratic load.

Good luck!
John Morris
Particle Physics Dept.,
Rutherford-Appleton Laboratory,
Chilton, Didcot,
Oxon., OX11 0QX UK

5.4 References to institutes where a form of time-monitoring is implemented

5.4.1 Jean Nuyts - Universite de Mons-Hainaut

Dear Colleague,

Visiting SISSA last year during the month of July, I realized the magnetic card supervising which has been imposed on physicists in the Institute.

I was more than chocked by this decision but I didn't know how to express my incomprehension.

This is obviously a measure decided by people who don't know at all what research is, or by the push of workers union whose members are very often not devoted to their work. Government are then trying to impose at least some presence if they cannot impose efficiency and the reaction of the unions is to impose the same rules everywhere.

It is clear that very many of us are very devoted to their work, and often don't even devote enough time to their families by working home at undue times. But this cannot reach the minds of the people who don't know.

It must be said that some researchers are not working as they should usually because they are not really motivated. But forcing them to stay in their offices will not modify their output in the slightest manner. Other means to judge them are to be devised and those who do not belong should be pushed gently in directions more compatible with their interest (for example teaching ...)

In the university I belong to (Mons, Belgium), the administration decided also, a few years ago, to put a clock system into action. And for some time, except for professors, the heads of the administration advocated the idea to have the researchers and the assistants be enrolled in the system. Fortunately, our rector, with the help of all the professors, was able to prevent the measure to be extended too far. The argument he used in the board of trustees of the University is that we would be laughed at by the international community as being utterly stupid and unknowing of the actual research (this is in fact true). That argument worked and the measures didn't extend to researchers.

May be, you could send us the name of the person who advocated the decision so that indeed we could tell him that we laugh (behind his back).

If you want me to send any letter either by snail mail or by email to any-

body, I will do it with great pleasure. It is a serious issue and a disease which could propagate easily through Europe with tremendously bad consequences.

Amities Jean NUYTS Universite de Mons-Hainaut 7000, Mons, Belgium

5.4.2 Bob Jantzen - Villanova Univ.

I agree with your statement. I have spent years of collective time as a visitor at La Sapienza Fisica in Rome so I am quite familiar with the Italian research scene.

I am already hampered in my collaboration with a CNR member in NAPLES when I am visiting ROME because he is tied to his institute by their clock watching policy.

It is not only ridiculous but inhibits free movement for collaborative purposes.

I hope you can blow this regulation out of the water before it takes effect.

Good luck,

bob jantzen

International Center for Relativistic Astrophysics

Villanova University, USA

5.4.3 Manuel Aguilar-Benitez - CIEMAT and CICYT

Dear Colleague ,

I acknowledge the reception of a letter from a group of italian physicists corcerning the implementation of such an unpopular regulation .

Unfortunately , in my Institute this regulation is in operation since 15 years . Before that , the clock in/out control was limited to technicians and administrators . It was felt by the high level officials at the Ministry of Industry , that the distinction between scientists and engineers and the rest of the personnel was inadequate and the target of many criticisms fron unions and the staff association . At the beginning people did complain . With time passing , everybody is used to this apparently unappropriate rule .

Best regards ,

Manuel Aguilar-Benitez ,

CIEMAT / Ministry of Industry
CICYT / Ministry of Education

5.4.4 Grisa Mocnik - Jozef Stefan Inst.

Dear Colleague,

at our institute we also have to clock in/out every time we go outside of the institute. While nobody likes this arrangement also nobody checks it. It seems to much data is produced - there are 700 reserchers at the institute. It is true that we do not have an electronic clocking system. What I would suggest is that each and everyone clocks out and immediately in again several times a day including declaring leaving the institute every 5 minutes thus flooding the responsible people with information they cannot process. The management will get the message eventually. Is there somebody employed just to do this checking? If so I find this outrageous you could employ a researcher instead.

Best regards,
Grisa Mocnik
Dept. of Physical Chemistry
Jozef Stefan Institute
Jamova 39
SI 1001 Ljubljana
Slovenia

5.4.5 Terry Goldman - Harvard

Dear Colleague,

A few years ago, regulations at Los Alamos changed to require weekly reporting of the number of hours worked, up to 40 per week as one was not allowed to report any excess. We thought this was outrageous, but at least the reporting is on the honor system. However, the INFN has far exceeded our management at demonstrating a complete lack of understanding of the true nature of the creative research enterprise. Worse, it will have a negative effect on the quality of work and the quality of researchers willing to labor under such conditions. I sincerely hope this ridiculous ruling can be overturned.

Terry Goldman
(Ph. D., Harvard, '73)

5.4.6 Claudio Tuniz - Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation

Cario Mario, ho visto il vostro disperato messaggio inviato alla comunita' internazionale sul problema della nuova metodologia di "time recording" adottata dall'INFN. E' triste vedere che l'immaginazione italica non ha trovato qualcosa di piu' fantasioso per misurare la produttivita' degli scienziati. Non e' vero che i metodi da voi menzionati sono assenti a livello internazionale, specialmente negli enti di ricerca del mondo angloceltico. In Australia, per esempio, sia i ricercatori dello CSIRO (equivalente a CNR) che dell'ANSTO (equivalente all'ENEA) hanno adottato da anni metodi molto complessi e burocratici per 'controllare' il lavoro dei ricercatori. Sono contento di vedere che non accettate passivamente la situazione. Buona fortuna,

Claudio Tuniz
Prof Claudio Tuniz
Director, Physics Division
Australian Nuclear Science and Technology Organisation
New Illawarra Rd,
Lucas Heights - PMB 1 Menai NSW 2234,
Australia

5.4.7 Luis Gonzalez-Mestres - IN2P3 Lapp

Dear Colleague,

Thank you for sending me your communiquee on undue restrictions to the freedom of scientists at INFN. I am not surprised, we have similar problems at IN2P3 , as you can see from the web sites:

http://perso.wanadoo.fr/intsynd-lpc

http://www.mygale.org/02/virtuel2

Of course, you have my warmest support. I have forwarded your E-mail to the Admiroutes forum on research:

http://www.admiroutes.asso.fr/ACTION/courriel/recherche

with the title: "Controles electroniques et liberte des chercheurs". It is displayed since this morning.

..... OMISSIS .....

I finally wish to transmit to you the support from the Intersyndicale (joint local unions) of the Laboratoire de Physique Corpusculaire of College

de France, of which I am a member.

With kindest regards

Luis Gonzalez-Mestres

5.4.8 Alfredo U. Luccio - BNL

I agree with your statement, a magnetic card is inappropriate for scientists. In Brookhaven, our contract states that a scientist should work an "honest" given total of hours per week, at the location he/she thinks is appropriate. We only fill up a card each month stating how many hours we had been working for each specific project and to charge those hours to that account. We also put our vacation hours on that card. To my knowledge, only at Daresbury in England they use a magnetic card.

Alfredo U. Luccio

Brookhaven National Laboratory

AGS - 911B

Upton, NY 11973-5000

5.4.9 Gwyn Williams - BNL

Dear Andrea,

I received your letter with interest. But, I am sorry to have to tell you that here at Brookhaven we also have to account for all our activities and apply our time to financial accounts, even when working at home and traveling. (We do not have to physically clock in, but we also do have the magnetic strips and have to use them to reach the lab so things are in fact recorded).

Also at Daresbury lab in England they have to clock in and out.

At industrial labs in the USA and England this practice is normal too.

I agree it is undesirable to have to clock in and out, but it just means that you are (fortunately) late in joining the trend in the world!

Gwyn Williams

Brookhaven National Laboratory

5.4.10 Michael Flohr - Kings Coll., London

Dear Mario, there is not much to say about this absolute nonsense! Why is it that burocrats cannot admitt that creativity as the one in research does

not work with the clock. On the contrary, imposing the clock usually does decrease creativity. I have the following personal xperience. In Germany, there exist some so-called research-establishments where govermental regulated research is conducted. There, you have to work with the clock, and as a result, the scientific output of all the establishments is almost nil. The clock destroys the whole scientific attitude. All the best Michael

5.4.11 Wolfgang von Ruden - GSI

You have been asking for comments about the useage of time cards and for information on the rules in other institues. I give you a short summary of the situation at GSI, Darmstadt, Germany. Please note that this is NOT an official statement, but a personal assessment.

Working time regulations at GSI

The employment contracts for all GSI employees, with the exception of the Directorate members and the professors having also a contract with an university, follow the nation-wide tariff called BAT for state employees. In addition, there are a number a agreements between the Institute management and the Betriebsat (Staff Association).

We have two options for working times:

1. Fixed time

The hours per week are fixed as well as the starting/ending times. No timing card is used. This option is used by almost all scientists, but they are free to chose option 2 as well.

2. Flexible time

This options foresees a 'kernel'time from 9am to 3pm and, of course, a total number of hours per month. People using this option are mainly in administration, workshops, technical staff. They use a 'punched' card to start/stop a electromechanical counter, which is not electronically readable for reason of data privacy (in my mind an anachronism). Overtime up to 16 hours can be carried over into the month, people fill in a balance sheet once a month on which they mark all exeptions (travel, sickness, etc) as well a the total time worked. This sheet is signed by the supervisor and sent to personnel administration. There is virtually no control possible nor even attempted.

Recently, the Betriebsrat tried to force the scientists to use option 2 as

well. The main argument was that they are 'workoholics' and that they must be protected. There was a huge protest by the scientists and also the management, since we strongly believe that a scientist has to know by him/herself how to organise his/her time. The discussions are still going on, but I believe that we will go on as up to now.

Using a card to know if people are on site is good for safety reasons and when you are looking for people. The real worry of our scientists was, that they quite often work 60-70 hours per week and that some burocrate would prevent him from doing this.

I hope that this helps you a bit ...

Regards, Wolfgang ovn Ruden

Wolfgang von Ruden

Director, Scientific and Technical Infrastructure,

GSI, Planckstrasse 1, D-64291 Darmstadt, Germany

5.4.12 F. Gomez -

Santiago 25th Sept

Dear Colleagues,

I understand your embarrassment about the work schedule control. It is difficult to compare the research work with any standard "productive" job. Einstein sometime said that research had to be taken as a hobby, because the scientific production of a researcher was sometimes erratical or unpredictable (research lines can be finally useless or well worth). Anyway, as in real life we are paid for research (and there is some people that have to judge its validity for giving scientific project fundings) I do understand that the administration has the willing to know how many real hours a scientist is in its working place (like any other civil servant or worker).

It is not true that the clok in/out is not used in any other research center. In Spain the CSIC (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas) has since many years the clock in / out procedure for its members (included grant students).

Sincerely yours,

F. Gomez

5.4.13 Weimin - Fermilab

It is supprised that Italian goverment establish such rule... IHEP in Beijing has tried to apply similar role, because people come to office later, and left earlier....it was not advanced method, but neverthless did the same thing...it did not work out.

what do you do, if someone come later or leave earlier? kick them out? they lose job?....it is not the jargement to scientists if they come to office on time...simply it is different with industry. the jargement to scientists of their value is their results, not the duration of they show up in office.

probably, Italian physicists are too relax, it is likely be true. But the solution is not good, and will not work. so if goverment want to find solution, think about something else, not timeing their duration if office.

IHEP finally gave up....so will Italian goverment, I believe.

all the best

weimin

5.5 References to institutes where clocking was enforced, usually from the ex-soviet world

5.5.1 Jacek Gajewski - DESY

Dear Andrea,

Another story:

Over 20 years ago I was working in the Institute belonging to the Academy of Science in the country, which no longer exists. The management came to the conclusion that we are 'too lazy' - so they introduced the time control: a list of names have been hanged out and everybody has an obligation to write down the time of any entry or exit from the building. Since magnetic card readers were not known at those times several persons were given a task to observe that others are writing the time correctly and were reporting to the managment the cases when somebody went to neighbouring building without 'signing out' in the first one and 'signing in' the second one. Another army of people were summing up the working times and comparing the totals with a 'norm'. Employees were divided into smaller groups, which should compete between each other.

In the first month only one team was above a norm and won a title of 'hero of socialistic work', everybody got a diploma and the team leader got a medal.

In the second month **all** teams were above the norm and the grand total time was a complete absurd indicating that in average every employee worked 11.5 h/day. People just learned how to leave the institute without signing out. Noone got neither a diploma nor a medal, and although some 'hawks' were trying to invent the system of unexpected control visits in the offices, the director decided to drop the time control system.

I do hope that your managment will reconsider an idea of the time control system.

Sincerely Yours,

Jacek Gajewski

5.5.2 Vitaly N. Melnikov - President of Russian Gravitational Society

Dear Dr.Macri,

We have known about new regulations in INFN about clocking in/out of researchers. Such practice existed at some periods in the former USSR and the results are very well known because the scientific work is a creative process. People are starting to do formal things which have nothing to do with science, a lot of time is spent on discussion of topics far from scientific fields and of course the feeling that they are constrained does not lead to normal work. These regulations were usualy introduced by newly appointed beurocrats in science and soon they were totally abolished. It is not a practice in leading scientific institutes in Russia and as we know abroad. The methods of control of scientific labor are also very well known: publications in the leading international journals, reports at international conferences, citations etc.

With best regards,

Prof. Vitaly N.Melnikov

President of Russian Gravitational Society

5.5.3 C.Zupancic - Ludwig-Maximilians-Univ. of Munich

Dear dr.Macri!

From a letter signed by a group of Italian physicists I have learnt that the Management of INFN has started to require from its researchers to clock in and out of their offices and laboratories. This news has shocked me.

It reminds me of a period back in the late 50's when a serious reactor accident at the Institute "B.Kidric" near Belgrade persuaded the Yugoslav government that researchers were not capable of managing themselves. Internationally renowned scientists were replaced by managers from industry as directors, not only of the Institute "B.Kidric" but also of the two other Yugoslav nuclear institutes "R.Boskovic" in Zagreb and "J.Stefan" in Ljubljana. The new director of "J.Stefan", where I served at the time as head of the physics department, had not the slightest idea how researchers work and introduced administrative measures (including fixed working hours) supposed to "establish order" in the institute. The results were disastrous. They

induced several researchers including myself to leave the institute. Some of us eventually left Yugoslavia, among them the previous director professor Anton Peterlin who went to USA to become director of the Triangle Institute of Polymer Science.

Slovenian science was lucky in that political authorities in Ljubljana realized their mistake a few years later and reintroduced self-management of the Institute "J.Stefan" by its remaining leading scientists. It has prospered ever since, largely due to its close collaboration with the Slovenian universities.

If INFN is in need of reforms (in these days of rapid change, which institution is not?), administrative measures of the kind described in the letter of Italian physicists can only delay them. Worse, these measures do not bode well for the rationality of further reforms. In hindsight, it might be understandable that forty years ago an accident with one man dead and several people seriously injured had caused the totalitarian authorities of a developing country to react in a nonsensical way. That such a thing happens today and without apparent reason in one of the seven leading countries of the industrial world borders on a scandal of international proportions. By its decisions your Management has demonstrated that it does not understand how research functions; thus it is not fit to run any scientific organization. To my mind, the best way it can serve INFN and Italy is to resign.

To prevent misunderstandings, let me stress that I do not belong to those who revere scientists as a priesthood beyond external control. Elected politicians have the responsibility to decide how many resources should be devoted to a particular branch of science such as "nuclear physics", taking into account its performance. However, society is well advised to leave the management of the allocated resources to an elite of scientists in that branch who have been most successful and are best trusted by their peers. No system is perfect but I am not aware of any other scheme of research management that has yet worked better.

Sincerely yours,

C.Zupancic,

professor emeritus of physics at the

Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich, Germany

5.5.4 Andjelka Andrasi

Dear Colleague,

Your letter was a big surprise to me. Concerning the ruling of INFN that your researches have to clock in/out from the 1st of July 1998, it remainded me of the past times we had in the wrechted last Yugoslavia.

Only when I came to Britain in 1976, I felt freedom of movement, speech and thought. And I was much more efficient in my research than ever before.

Therefore I do not understand the ruling of INFN.

Yours sincerely

Andjelka Andrasi

5.5.5 Michael Lashkevich - Landau Inst. for Theoretical Physics

Dear Prof. Macri:

I agree the decision of the INFN administration to be embarassing and abusive. The researchers of the Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics are due to visit the Institute once a week at the general seminar, and the Landau Institute remains to be one of the best centers of physics. The decision of the INFN administration recalls me the year in Russia under the leadership of the former KGB head Yuri Andropov. Trying to save the perishing socialist economy, he organized round-ups at cinemas and other public places to catch the persons that are not at their working places during the working time.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Lashkevich,

Researcher of the Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics

5.5.6 Juris Lukstins, JINR Russia

Dear Colleagues!

I still support you!

Juris Lukstins

5.5.7 Alexei A. Abrikosov, jr. - ITEP, Moscow

Dear Colleagues,

I read your mssg concerning the introduction of the strict controlling of the time spent by researchers in their laboratories. In Soviet era I spent several years under a press of such a system and learnt well that this is not a best way to stimulate science. Here are the motives.

1. The idea of a system originates from the opinion that researchers are a bad lot wasting the taxpayers money without any control.

   I will not object that there are such guys in the community. However they are a minority. In fact most of scientists are overworking. This includes not only the extra time spent in laboratories but also sleepless nights of people obsessed by unsolved problems. In what follows I'll speak for those.

   Wasting the taxpayers money is a complete nonsense. One good idea pays for centuries. Let us not refer to the inventor of the weel. But if Einstein had patented the famous $E = mc^2$ formula by now he would own trillions of dollars! This money is his donnation to the mankind.

   There is an efficient control of scientific activities. We are publishing papers and participate in conferences. Success in scientific competition does not favour long-sleeping ones.

2. The value of a researcher adds up of many pieces. Among those are qualification, labour but the main are fantasy and freedom of mind. Restrictions will inevitably hurt the latter transforming enthusiasts into mediocrity.

3. People behave as they are treated. In order to bring up a hero you should encourage him from the very beginning. Treating scientists like wasters will unnoticeably undermine their selfrespect and responsibility. During the period of the strict time controle our lunch and tea breaks increased both in length and number. Not to mention politic and other discussions. There even appeared an expression "stealing working time" for doing something (say knitting or even laundry) in the lab. Having games and browsers installed on computers people have much more entertainment possibilities now.

At the end I want to stress that I'm moved not by corporative interests. This is simply a piece of my own experience. After rushing through the

crowded morning metro people could not pull themselves together for hours. We envied postgraduates who was coming an hour later right to their desks. And certainly this was not the most productive period in my life.

Very truly yours,

Dr. Alexei A. Abrikosov, jr. (ITEP, Moscow).

PS: The above-mentioned experience is related to the other institution. During the period of the "struggle for discipline" we had a retired army general for Vice-Director.

5.5.8 A.K. Likhoded et al. - IHEP, Protvino

Dear colleagues,

We certainly agree with the your negative reaction to the bureaucratic attempt to monitor scientific researchers by the clock in/out procedure. We would like to point to that is not a new method, since here in Russia the same approach was applied without any success.

There are other way to estimate the personal scientific activity, say, citation index, publications in referenced journals and so on. We think that your administration will be so wise to find some approach giving real results. Note, the registration of time in/out is, indeed, useful for somebody doing nothing in physics.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Likhoded A.K., Kiselev V.V., Onishchenko A.I., Berezhnoy A.V.

and a lot of theoreticians from IHEP,

Protvino, Russia.

5.5.9 Dmitri Vassilevich - Leipzig Univ. and St.Petersburg Univ.

Dear Professor Macri!

Thank you for sending me the message about new regulations at INFN laboratories.

Similar measures were attempted in the Soviet Union around '83 at even larger scale. Such methods proved to be counterproductive and were abandoned quickly. I can see no reason for Italy to repeat mistakes of the Soviet Union of late stagnation epoch.

I hope my negative opinion is quite clear from this message.
With best regards,
Dmitri Vassilevich
Leipzig University (Germany)
St.Petersburg University (Russia)

5.5.10 Khazret Nirov - INR, Moscow

Dear Professor Macrì,

Dear Italian Researches,

I am embarrassed very much by the information you have distributed by your Letter. The decision of the INFN Management is ultimately disappointing and discouraging. The new ruling imposed on the Italian high energy physics community is not only a useless bureaucratic nonsense, but, from my perspective, is simptomatically dangerous. Actually, a similar controlling was used within the well-known GULAG system's research departments (see, for example, the corresponding writings by the Nobel Prize winner Alexander Solzhenitsyn). Believe the sore experience of Soviet-Russian researches, it will be a catastrophe for the Italian science community when the new ruling with magnetic cards becomes standard for your everyday professional life.

With best regards.
Yours truly,
Khazret Nirov
INR, Moscow

5.5.11 P. P. Goldstein - Soltan Inst. for Nuclear Studies

Dear Professor Macri,

Recently we learned about new regulations in Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, stating that your researchers have to clock in/out from the 1st of July 1998.

Such regulations were not applied in my department even in communist Poland, as completely inappropriate to the specific character of research work, which is a long-term job and can only be evaluated on a long-term basis. The only time when we had to clock in and out were the first few

months of the martial law in 1981/82. The actual regulations at your Institute may thus be considered a martial law for scientists. Declarations of the exact time and activities for each day spent outside home institutes are of the same spirit. Further idea of the kind could be e.g. obligatory planning what the scientist would discover in the forthcoming month or year.

The plague affecting a lot of Polish employees during the time of communist ruling (and still affecting some of them) was that they stayed at work rather than did their work. The current regulations at your institute encourage such attitudes.

I hope that those regulations will soon be lifted and replaced by sensible and fair criteria for verifying both quantity and quality of the work done, encouraging true scientific activity. I am looking forward to hearing such news from you.

Yours sincerely
Dr P. P. Goldstein
Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies
Hoza 69
00-681 Warsaw, Poland

5.5.12 Walter Craig - Chair, Department of Mathematics Brown Univ.

Dear Prof. Macri,

The newly formulated regulations that have been instituted at your laboratory are highly restrictive to a working researcher, and they are very unusual in comparison with international norms for working conditions. I am reminded of one precedent for such regulation of researcher's office time. It was in Chile under the former dictator Pinochet's regime. The most successful under these constraints were the administrators and the scientifically unproductive faculty. I wish you well in your protest and objections to these rulings.

Sincerely,
Walter Craig, Chair
Department of Mathematics
Brown University

5.5.13 Christoph Schweigert - CERN

Dear Prof. Macri,

needless to say, I share your concern as for clocking in of researchers. I would like to point out to you that the only other place (to my knowledge) where researchers had to clock in was KFKI in Budapest in the communist times. You might wish to contact Peter Vecsernyes for more information.

Best regards,

Christoph Schweigert

5.5.14 Jose A. de Azcarraga - Dpto. de Fisica Teorica and IFIC (CSIC) Valencia, Spain

8 September, 1998

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to you on the project of using a magnetic card/clock to control the presence of INFN scientists in their respective institutes.

Valencia University tried to do something similar a few years ago for the lecturing staff, who were required to sign somewhere before each lecture. The measure was the result of yielding to the demands of the administrative personnel of the University, who have a fixed work timetable and who insisted, in the negotiations syndicates-University of Valencia, that the teaching/research staff should also be subjected to similar control rules. Apparently the syndicates and ultimately the University failed to appreciate that the teaching and research activities have completely different dynamics and timetables from those of administrative work. I refused to obey the scheme (the signing on a book before each lecture) as a matter of principle, and also because the system proved immediately to be a complete failure: it was subjected to all kind of deviations/corruptions and became immediately a considerable bureaucratic loss of time without any practical benefit whatsoever. As a result of my refusal, the University Rector (a theoretical physicist!) tried to sanction me, but finally common sense (and a new Rector) prevailed, with the result that the scheme was discontinued.

The INFN system which you mention might look, superficially, more sensible; at least, there is no loss of time for the research personnel, since the control is automatic by means of a swipe card. However, this may serve to provide an alibi for the lack of real scientific activity while, at the same time,

may be used to downgrade the scientific activities of those more scientifically active. In my opinion, this projected measure might appear tolerable (after all, we are all paid by the tax payers, and we owe something to them) if (and only if) it is clearly stated that it will serve only to register and to correct extreme, continued and unjustified absences, since the real control should be made on the scientific output (as measured by external, independent referees). Otherwise, a 'presence control' will simply become an 'apparent' external control, which may look (but only look) to society as a measure in the 'politically right' direction. In practice, however, it will only serve to hamper the work of the more scientifically active people who are, precisely, the ones who should be protected by the system.

In summary: clocking may look 'politically correct' in present times, but it is useless in general, and if there are extreme cases of unjustified absences, these are known without the need of any clocks. In fact, there is a real danger of misuse of clocking to justify the lack of real scientific activity. And to measure scientific output, clocks are useless: there is no substitute for external evaluation.

With best regards,

Jose A. de Azcarraga
– Jose A. de Azcarraga
Professor of Theoretical Physics
Dpto. de Fisica Teorica and IFIC (CSIC),
Facultad de Fisica
E-46100-Burjassot (Valencia), Spain

5.6 Other historical references to clocking

5.6.1 Peter Galison - Harvard Univ.

Dear Andrea,

I can relate to you the following story. In the midst of his work in the United States, Enrico Fermi was asked by military authorities to punch in and out of a time clock. He said that would be absolutely fine, but since he worked essentially around the clock he's also want a clock installed in his car, his house, his bathroom, and everywhere else he went. The authorities dropped the idea.

Best of luck, peter galison

Harvard University

5.6.2 Peter G.O. Freund - Univ. of Chicago

Dear Dr. Macri,

The clocking requirement imposed on INFN physicists is indeed inappropriate, though not without precedent. As this precedent involves a famous Italian physicist, I thought I should relate it to you, maybe you can use it to your advantage.

During the Manhattan project the government administrators instituted a clocking requirement. Enrico Fermi said he supported this requirement, but demanded that a clock be installed by his bedside in his home. He justified this by pointing out that often at night he couldn't sleep and would spend time in bed thinking on Manhattan project problems, so that he should be paid for this time. As soon as he made this requirement, the clocking system was dropped by the government officials. Reduction to the absurd is one of the few mathematical ideas effective even in bureaucratic circles.

Best wishes

Peter G.O. Freund

5.6.3 Daniel Fivel - Univ. of Maryland

Dear Colleague:

I received an email about the time clock regulation that has been inflicted on you by INFN. You may be interested to know that during World War II

at Los Alamos, General Groves who was in charge of the Manhattan Project tried to make the scientists punch time clocks. Fermi told him that they would have to give him a portable time clock so that he could punch it whenever he began to think about physics — in the bathtub, on the toilet, or driving his car. That was the end of the time clock idea. Perhaps you and your colleagues could make the same request.

Daniel Fivel

5.6.4 James J. Griffin - Univ. of Maryland

Dear Colleagues,

I find it especially interesting that Italy should spawn such a discussion of scientists' punching time clocks, because for me the final answer to that question was provided many years ago by Enrico Fermi.

It happens that I never actually knew Fermi, except by the anecdotal tales lived on after him, wherever he had been. I went to Los Alamos in 1956, and heard many E. Fermi stories which still persisted from his days there.

One story in particular involved the attempt by the commander of the base (You may recall that during the war the Los Alamos Labs were a military base, under the command of an army general) to require the scientists of the lab to punch a time clock when they began and finished their time at work.

Fermi, the story goes, ended the discussion when he announced that he would gladly punch a time clock upon arrival and departure at the lab, provided that the general would assign an assistant to follow him around whenever he was not at the worksite, who would punch a timeclock on and off whenever Fermi began to think about his work, or to jot down notes of some ideas, or to talk to a colleague about physics. Because Fermi was Fermi, and possessed the total respect of everyone who knew him, the issue was not pursued further at Los Alamos.

I recall this clearly, because every month we here at the University of Maryland must fill out a little calendar, noting (by "D") on which days "Duties" were performed, which days were weekends, and which days are vacation or personal leave days. Therefore every month as I do so, I remember Fermi and the army general, and I fill in "D" for EVERY DAY, because in truth, every day, usually even before getting out of bed, I think about the

physics upon which I am currently working. I believe it is what Fermi would have recommended.

Best wishes to you all in your struggle with mindless bureaucracy,
James J. Griffin
Physics, University of Maryland,
College Park, Md.20742

5.6.5 Ephraim H. Frei - Weizmann Inst.of Science

Dear Collegues

Requiring physicists (and other scientists) working in research to "CLOCK IN" is an idea that occured to administators in the past. This does not make it a better idea, Researchers think where they are and not only sitting on their chair in the office. This maybe difficult to explain to some managers, but I would like to tell them a few things of the past: Prof. Giulio Racah an Italien Nuclear Physisist of 1930st -who was considered number two- after Fermi went to Jerusalem when the war started and taught at the Hebrew University. One of his known achievments were the "Rakah Functions" then widely used in nuclear physics. The (British) mandatory government imprisoned him as a citisen of an enemy country. For weeks he continued to work and write a paper in prison, also asked some his students to visit him and examined then during the visit. Prof. Marcus Reiner a physisist -one of the creators of the field of Rheology- always said that scientists have to dream duting sleep of their problems.

Ephraim H. Frei
Prof.Emer.
Weizmann Inst.of Science
Israel

5.6.6 H. M. Fried - Brown Univ.

Dear Dr. Macri,

After reading your message, I am reminded of the story concerning an attempt by the Indiana State Legislature, some years ago, to cut back the salaries of the professors at their State University. The legislature was composed of lawyers and farmers; and one of the university representatives spoke to them in this way - and it is a remark which may be of value to you, in

your present circumstance: Gentlemen, A professor is like a bull. It is not how much he does that is important, it is what he does that is important.

Good luck to you !....

H. M. Fried

Brown University

5.6.7 Alex Harvey

Dear Dr. Bianco,

I am reminded of a personal experience of many years ago. While still engaged in PhD research I was employed as an engineer in a private organization. One day the management had a time clock installed. The net result was that people began to line up at the clock a few moments before checkout time. The main boss noticed this one day and remarked that in a "real" engineering office people did not line up at the time. I responded that in a "real" engineering office time clocks were not installed.

Sincerely,

-Alex Harvey

5.7 Answers from Italian University Professors

5.7.1 Guido Altarelli - Univ. Roma III

Caro Macri, io considero il cartellino per i ricercatori una perfetta, stupida assurdita', un altro esempio di come ci sappiamo rendere ridicoli agli occhi dei nostri colleghi stranieri. Gia' all'inizio di questa vicenda io avevo mandato un fax di protesta a Luciano Maiani, che ti riproduco qui nel seguito.

Cari saluti

Guido Altarelli

[NdR: gia' Direttore Divisione Teorica CERN]

Prof. Luciano Maiani
Presidente dell'INFN
Roma, 16 Giugno 1994

Caro Luciano,

mi duole di constatare che la tua popolarita' presso i ricercatori dell'INFN e' ai minimi storici per questo penoso affare dei cartellini. Io non ho dubbi che tu saprai certamente agire per il meglio, pero' resta il fatto che il cartellino per i ricercatori non e' difendibile in linea di principio e infatti non esiste in nessun paese civile che io conosca. Molto meglio sarebbe istituire delle forme reali di controllo sulla validita' del lavoro scientifico dei singoli ricercatori, che invece esistono altrove e hanno rilevanza per la carriera e per ottenere finanziamenti di ricerca.

Non voglio ulteriormente annoiarti ma io francamente ti consiglio di fare di tutto per evitare di cedere a questa assurda pressione.

Cari saluti

Guido

5.7.2 Marco Napolitano - Univ. Napoli

Dr. Mario Macrì

Rappresentante Nazionale dei Ricercatori INFN

Caro Mario,

sono sempre stato convinto che la qualita' e la quantita' del lavoro svolto da un ricercatore non possa essere assolutamente misurata attraverso il mero conteggio delle ore passate nel proprio studio o laboratorio, le quali, per altro, sono normalmente ben piu' di quante richieste dai contratti di lavoro, come sappiamo tutti per esperienza diretta.

Sono anche convinto che l'imposizione ai ricercatori "dell'orologio marcatempo" non solo svilisca nei fatti l'entusiasmo, anzi direi la passione, e la dedizione che essi sempre hanno posto e pongono nel proprio lavoro ma, a lungo andare, possa risultare rischiosa in quanto potrebbe tendere a diffondere tra gli interessati un'attitudine "impiegatizia" (gli impiegati mi scusino il termine che non vuole certo essere dispregiativo) assolutamente estranea alla nostra comunita', con grave danno per l'attività di ricerca. So per esperienza diretta che Presidente, Giunta e Consiglio Direttivo hanno per anni ed anni tentato di evitare di applicare ai ricercatori il controllo dell'orario di lavoro per mezzo di "orologio marcatempo" o sistemi equivalenti, anche assumendo responabilita' personali. Sono sicuro che non hanno cambiato opinione anche se, loro malgrado, sono stati costretti a soccombere. Spero vivamente che l' azione intrapresa dai ricercatori possa condurre al piu'

presto a porre rimedio a questa stortura.

Cordiali saluti

Marco Napolitano

Prof. ord. di Fisica Generale

Universita' e INFN, Napoli

(gia' membro della Giunta Esecutiva e vicepresidente dell'INFN)

5.7.3 Renato Ricci - Presidente Societa' Italiana di Fisica

Caro Macri,

in merito al problema del controllo orario dei ricercatori INFN (e non solo) ti informo di averne parlato al recente Congresso Nazionale della SIF a Salerno. E' indubbio che la materia sia alquanto delicata e ponga la questione del contesto burocratico-statale in cui gli enti di ricerca si trovano ad essere conglobati (vedi ad esempio anche lalegge di riordino). Personalmente, anche come dirigente INFN, ho partecipato alle battaglie contro le distorsioni burocratiche introdotte a suo tempo dallalegge del Parastato e vorrei ricordare che, allora, perfino il termine "ricercatore" era messo in discussione. Qualcuno (leggi i sindacati) disse di "aver vinto" ma di temere la chiusura delle attivita' di ricerca (sic!).Grazie alla lungimiranza della dirigenza INFN e al supporto della componente universitaria, si trovo' il modo di ovviare parzialmente a tali improvvide legiferazioni. Oggi il problema e' tornato ad essere grave ed e' arrivato alla sua esasperazione burocratica. Palliativi e diversioni diventano difficili e il discorso si riapre sul fronte politico e sindacale oltre che istituzionale. Occorre una forte presa di posizione da parte di tutte le componenti della ricerca e dell'Universita' verso il Parlamento e il Governo (qualunque esso sia), che devono comprendere che l'attivita' di ricerca non e' un lavoro a termine, costretto in limiti temporali. Questo, a mio parere, vale in linea generale e dovrebbe essere un patrimonio, non un privilegio, di tutto il personale addetto alla ricerca. Quando a Legnaro diressi l'installazione del primo acceleratore Tandem per ioni pesanti (anni 70) non si controllava l'orario di lavoro ma non c'erano limiti all'attivita' e alla collaborazione di tutto il personale dei Laboratori, pur senza incentivi o straordinari. Altri tempi? Ma la ricerca scientifica non conosce altro modo di lavorare, in ogni tempo e in ogni luogo. I politici nostri, anche ammantati di sensibilita' per le

"sorti progressive", non sembrano in grado di capirle. Proporro' al Consiglio della SIF una posizione in merito da far conoscere alle istanze governative. Per intanto puo' utilizzare, come meglio crede, il mio messaggio.

Cordialmente.

Renato Ricci

Presidente SIF

5.7.4 Mario Calvetti - Univ. Firenze

Caro Mario

voglio comunicarti la mia opinione sul controllo orario con il cartellino che viene applicato per i ricercatori dell'INFN. A mio parere non e' in questo modo che si promuove il lavoro di ricerca nei nostri laboratori e nelle nostre biblioteche. Considero il "cartellino" non solo inutile a promuovere la ricerca scientifica ma persino dannoso in quant o demotiva i ricercatori inutilmente. La fiducia nelle capacita' scientifiche ed il riscontro puntuale sui progressi della ricerca dovrebbero essere i paramet ri usati. In nessun laboratorio di ricerca che ho frequentato e' presente la pratica del cartellino per il controllo dell'orario dei ricercatori.

Ti saluto e ti ringrazio per il tuo lavoro.

Mario Calvetti

Univ. Firenze

Coordinatore Nazionale Gruppo I dell'INFN

5.7.5 Arnaldo Stefanini - Univ. Pisa

Caro Macrì,

volentieri aderisco alla lettera che mi hai mandato sulla follia del controllo dell'orario

Arnaldo Stefanini

Direttore del Dipartimento di Fisica

Universita' di Pisa e INFN

5.7.6 Paolo Franzini - Univ. Roma I

Caro Mario, che io sia assolutamente contrario al cartellino credo sia ben noto ai ricercatori dell'INFN. Ne fanno fede la prima dichiarazione contraria,

indirizzata al Direttivo dell'INFN)e quindi anche a te) da parte del Comitato Esecutivo di KLOE, la mia dichiarazione pubblica di fronte alla Commisione I durante la riunione annuale a Grado lo scorso settembre - chissa' se la mettono a verbale - ed il mio personale impegno nelle discussioni coi giovani di KLOE. Anche se ripetitivo voglio riaffermare che trovo degradante alla dignita' di persone che svolgono, per ragioni di solito tutte proprie, lavoro di ricerca l'imposizione della piu' assurda ed inefficace forma di controllo del loro lavoro. E poi chi e' capace di valutare se ricerca e' valida, a volte ci vogliono cento anni. Come detto da altri, tale imposizione e' la negazione della ricerca e puo' portare solo allo svilimento dei ricercatori. Come stava scritto sull'ingresso del Cosmotrone a Brookhaven, la ricerca e' fatta "for the benefit of mankind". E tale ricerca dovrebbe, potrebbe, esser fatta sotto un controllo irrilevante? Un solo appunto vorrei fare. Non credo sia stato corretto dire che il cartellino e' stato imposto dall'INFN. La colpa dell'INFN rimane quella di non essere riuscito ad impedirlo, per quanto, come ha detto Marco Napolitano ci abbia provato infatti al suo meglio.

Cordiali saluti,

Paolo Franzini

Professore di chiara fama

Universita' di Roma, La Sapienza

[NdR: Responsabile Nazionale Esperimento Kloe ai Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN]

5.7.7 Giorgio Parisi - Univ. Roma I

mi associo alla lettera allegata.

Giorgio Parisi

Dipartinento di Fisica, Universita' di Roma La Sapienza

5.7.8 Tullio Regge - Univ. Torino

Aderisco

Tullio Regge

5.7.9 Italo Mannelli - Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa

Ho letto con interesse il messaggio in oggetto. Non sono esattamente informato delle regole che sono state approvate dall'INFN riguardo all' "orario" dei ricercatori. Certo la produttivita' scientifica non si misura col cartellino! Immagino che lo scopo delle regole fosse quello di poter avere una base "obbiettiva" per poter intervenire in improbabili casi di eclatante assenteismo. Il danno potenzialmente indotto da regole del genere supera a mio avviso di gran lunga il beneficio di rendere piu' facile l'applicazione di sanzioni, quando eventualmente richieste da comportamenti scorretti. In tali casi si deve avere il coraggio di chiedere spiegazioni anche senza il supporto di evidenze burocratiche.

In conclusione mi associo alle richieste di eliminare controlli fiscali di orario, che in nessun caso potrebbero essere utili per valutazioni di produttivita' scientifica o in connessione con la carriera di ricercatori.

Italo Mannelli

Scuola Normale Superiore, PISA

5.7.10 V. Flaminio - Univ. Pisa

I fully agree that is is a complete nonsense. In addition it interferes with other important Institutional activities of INFN Researchers, that requires their complete freedom from absurd constraints like the one under discussion.

V. Flaminio

Physics Dept. University of Pisa and INFN.

5.7.11 Giorgio Bellettini - Univ. Pisa

Caro Mario,

sono d'accordo, firmo anche io. Che posso aggiungere a quello che scrivono Glashow et al? La sottigliezza italiana, che queste informazioni si raccolgono nella precisa coscienza che nessuno intenderebbe ne' potrebbe farne mai alcuno usa pratico?

Ciao,

Giorgio Bellettini

5.7.12 Giovanni Gallavotti - Univ. Roma I

Caro Dr. Macri

la ringrazio per la lettera in oggetto e concordo pienamente con le osservazioni sulla assurdita' della pretesa di valutare il lavoro svolto nella ricerca in base al numero di ore segnate da un orologio. Chiunque svolga lavoro di ricerca sa che questa idea balzana puo' solo venire a chi non ha reale esperienza in materia.

Cordialmente: Giovanni Gallavotti

5.7.13 Renzo Cirelli - Univ. Milano

Caro Macrì,

l'istituzione del "punching-clock" per i ricercatori INFN merita tutto il sarcasmo con cui l'idea fu accolta in una riunione a Roma della Commissione Nazionale del Gruppo 4 alcuni anni orsono (8 ?, 10 ?). Vedo che le proposte stupide hanno radici tenaci e resistenti: mi auguro che i ricercatori INFN manifestino nell'opporsi altrettanta tenacita‘ e resistenza. In hoc hanno e avranno tutta la mia solidarieta‘.

Renzo Cirelli

5.7.14 Giovanni Borreani - Univ. Torino

Torino 16 ott.98

Caro Mario,

avendo letto la maggiore parte delle lettere che hai ricevuto sull'argomento del controllo orario dalla comunita' internazionale dei fisici, mi pare che, nel generale consenso che la cartolina sia inutile e dannosa, siano particolarmente significativi i pareri di alcuni direttori o ex-direttori di laboratori prestigiosi, ove una procedure simile a quella ora praticata dall'INFN fu in passato sperimentata e rapidamente abbandonata, o proposta e neppure presa in considerazione dalla dirigenza.

Nella fase in cui raccoglievi i pareri internazionali, mi sono astenuto dall'aggiungere il mio, parendomi che in quella fase opinioni provenienti dall'interno dell'INFN, potessero indebolire la iniziativa. Mi domando se ancora adesso non lo fanno, ma poiche' me lo hai chiesto, ti rispondo che io

sono d'accordo con la comunita' internazionale che un ricercatore non debba bollare la cartolina.

Aggiungo che ora il problema e' di modificare l'articolo della legge del parastato che prevede un controllo "obbiettivo" dell'orario per tutti, stabilendo che l'articolo non si applica ai ricercatori degli enti di ricerca, i quali, invece, nell'ambito di regolamenti autonomamente redatti da ogni singolo ente controllano la produttivita' dei ricercatori. Questo emendamento sarebbe in linea con le leggi sulla autonomia delle universita' e dati i legami stretti tra universita' e enti di ricerca potrebbe essere difeso con facilita' in parlamento.

Infine: immagino che tu abbia chiesto il parere dei professori di prima fascia perche' la classe politica dara' piu' ascolto a quelli; tuttavia, secondo me sarebbe piu' utile raccogliere il parere di tutti i professori ordinari (fisici) inclusi quelli non associati all'INFN.

Cordiali saluti

Giovanni Borreani

ps: questa lettera e' terribilmente lunga: ti auguro che tutti gli altri le scrivano piu' brevi!

5.7.15 Franco Buccella - Univ. Napoli

Caro Dr.Macri,

non posso che esprimere il mio piu' vivo dissenso dall'introduzione del cartellino di frequenza.In un campo come il nostro,dove il lavoro puo' essere valutato dalle pubblicazioni,questa misura burocratica non solo e' inutile,ma dannosa,in quanto il senso di liberta' del poter gestire il proprio tempo favorisce la creativita',elemento fondamentale nel lavoro del ricercatore.Sperando che questo ottuso provvedimento abbia vita breve e pronto a passare dall'arma della critica alla critica delle armi verso chi volesse estendere il provvedimento all'Universita',non posso che esprimere il mio convinto appoggio al vostro impegnoper abrogarlo.

Franco Buccella.

Universita' di Napoli

5.7.16 Sergio Petrera - Univ. dell'Aquila

Caro Mario,

do la mia adesione alla lettera riguardante l'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori INFN. Come ex membro del Direttivo ho assistito ad interminabili discussioni in proposito, anche se, a quei tempi nessuna decisione e' stata presa. Credo di poter comunque riportare che molti direttori vedevano l'insensatezza della cosa, ma che comprendevano che il problema era vivo e presente solo per l'INFN, ma non condiviso dagli altri Enti di ricerca. Varie volte il Presidente ha fatto presente che l'esigenza dell'INFN era completamente estranea agli altri presidenti. Nella sostanza tutti noi crediamo che l'orario di lavoro non e' una corretta misura dell'attivita' dei ricercatori. Cordiali saluti,

Sergio

5.7.17 Giorgio Giacomelli - Univ. Bologna

caro Mario,

sono in completo accordo con la vostra protesta per il controllo dell'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori INFN. Considero questa controllo come assurdo e controproducente. La stragrande maggioranza dei ricercatori INFN lavora certamente molto di piu' dell'orario contrattuale. Per un ricercatore il controllo della sua attivita' non va fatto sulla base dell'orario; ci sono metodi piu' efficaci basati sulla produttivita' scientifica.

Giorgio Giacomelli

Universita' di Bologna e INFN, Sezione di Bologna

5.7.18 Ettore Remiddi - Univ. Bologna

caro Macrì,

mi associo alle proteste per l'introduzione del cartellino per i ricercatori.

cordialmente

ettore remiddi

5.7.19 Guido Fano - Univ. Bologna

Al Rappresentante Nazionale Ricercatori INFN

Mario Macrì

Non vi e' nulla che io possa aggiungere a quanto e' stato detto da persone ben piu' autorevoli di me sul tragico errore dell'INFN di voler controllare il tempo e non la produttivita' dei ricercatori.

Quando, molti anni or sono, e' nato l'INFN , lo considerai un'isola felice nel panorama italiano, in cui il merito scientifico, l'inventiva, l'entusiasmo venivano premiati e le procedure burocratiche erano snelle ed efficienti. Speravo ingenuamente che questo esempio sarebbe stato contagioso. Invece e' successo il contrario. La burocrazia ha prevalso e ha contagiato l'INFN.

Sono quindi lieto di aggiungere il mio nome a quanti considerano una cosa abominevole l'introduzione del "cartellino" per i ricercatori. Ma attenzione ! Il controllo sulla produttivita' e' sacrosanto, e va misurato anche con parametri obbiettivi.

Guido Fano
Professore Ordinario
Universita' di Bologna

5.7.20 Giorgio Turchetti - Univ. Bologna

Caro Dr. Macri,

mi associo alle opinioni espresse da i numerosi ed autorevoli colleghi stranieri sull'inadeguatezza del concetto di orario di lavoro applicato alla Ricerca nella speranza che l'INFN voglia riconsiderare le proprie posizioni.

Cordiali saluti
Giorgio Turchetti
Universita' di Bologna

5.7.21 Gianluigi Fogli - Univ. Bari

Caro Mario,

sono del tutto d'accordo che l'applicazione dell'orario di lavoro ai ricercatori e' un non-senso dal punto di vista di una corretta impostazione del rapporto tra l'Ente di ricerca ed il suo dipendente. Appare, a mio modo di vedere, stupido, oltre che umiliante per chi lo deve subire. Vi sono ben altri e piu' significativi mezzi per controllare l'attivita' di ricerca scientifica, e ben li conosciamo.

Plaudo poi alla tua iniziativa di far conoscere il problema a livello internazionale. E' bene che i nostri governanti si rendano conto del ridicolo di iniziative di questo tipo. E forse questo ridicolo potra' essere l'elemento di pressione piu' rilevante, visto il consueto atteggiamento di dar scarso peso

all'opinione della comunita' nazionale in problemi di questo genere. Insisti, e vedrai che probabilmente si riesce a spuntarla.

Ciao

Gianluigi

5.7.22 Michele Veltri - Univ. Urbino

Concordo perfettamente, il cartellino e' un "useless bureaucratic nonsense"

Cordiali Saluti

Michele Veltri

Universita' di Urbino e INFN Firenze

5.7.23 Adalberto Giazotto - Univ. Pisa

Sono pienamente daccordo sull'assurdita' del controllo dell' orario come controllo sulla produzione scientifica dei ricercatori. Mi unisco quindi alla protesta e firmo il messaggio.

Adalberto Giazotto

5.7.24 Stefano Sciuto - Univ. Torino

Sono ovviamente d'accordo nel ritenere inutile e dannoso il controllo orario dei ricercatori infn.

Come professore, vorrei aggiungere che mi sembrerebbe invece utilissimo un controllo orario dei docenti universitari, non certo per imporre un orario fisso, ma per verificare che nell'arco dell'anno ci sia effettivamente la disponibilita' al colloquio con gli studenti (che richiede quindi presenza fisica in istituto) che la nostra funzione richiede.

La quantita' (non la qualita') della didattica si puo' controllare con la bollatrice, ma la ricerca no!

Stefano SCIUTO

Ord. di fisica teorica

Universita' di Torino

5.7.25 Aldo Covello - Univ. Napoli

Caro Macrì,

grazie per il tuo messaggio. Concordo completamente con le lettere da voi ricevute e do' con piacere la mia adesione alla tua lettera.

Cordiali saluti,

Aldo Covello,

P.O. presso la Facolta' di Scienze dell'Universita' di Napoli Federico II

5.7.26 Claudio Goletti - Univ. Roma II

Non ho molto da dire, tranne che avete del tutto ragione, ed esprimervi la mia solidarieta'.

Claudio Goletti

Roma Tor Vergata

5.7.27 Vladimir Wataghin - Univ. Torino

Caro Dr. Macrì,

riguardo alla necessita' della timbratura del cartellino per i ricercatori, introdotta recentemente dal Direttivo INFN, vorrei soltanto aggiungere una osservazione a quanto espresso molto giustamente da S. Weinberg, S. Drell e molti altri. E cioe' che mentre per un impiegato di un organo pubblico (Ministero,INFN,..)un criterio semplice, anche se non necessariamente il migliore, di valutazione del suo lavoro puo' essere il tempo trascorso sul luogo di servizio, per una persona che svolge della ricerca esiste il criterio di valutare la sua produzione scientifica che e' di gran lunga piu'importante e piu' significativa di una valutazione delle ore trascorse sul luogo di lavoro. Se si accetta questo criterio, ed e' difficile non farlo visto che e' semplice buon senso, allora esso vale per qualsiasi "studioso", sia esso ricercatore, professore associato o professore ordinario. Quindi e'assurdo fare una discriminazione nei confronti dei ricercatori.

Aggiungerei anche che tentativi di introdurre norme come questa sono state fatte in paesi come gli Stati Uniti , Germania, ecc. con il risultato di essere immediatamente rifiutati dal buon senso della comunita' scientifica e successivamente abbandonati dalle autorita'accademiche. Mi stupisce che le autorita' responsabili di simili decisioni non si informino e non tengano conto di queste valutazioni di paesi scientificamente all'avanguardia prima di prendere delle iniziative come questa.

Cordiali saluti,

Vladimir Wataghin,
prof. associato ,
Universita' di Torino

5.7.28 Ida Peruzzi - Univ. Perugia

Caro Mario,

ovviamente sono completamente d'accordo con i ricercatori INFN che protestano per l'imposizione del famigerato "cartellino" . Io sono stata dipendente di Enti di Ricerca (CNEN prima, INFN poi) per circa 20 anni, e ho quindi seguito questa vicenda dalle sue, ahime' lontane, origini. Io penso che si tratti esclusivamente di una questione di principio, peraltro molto importante, date le particolari caratteristiche del lavoro di ricercatore. Come tutte le questioni di principio, non si presta a sottili disquisizioni e "distinguo", ne' va trasformata in una battaglia sindacale. Tutti riconoscono (o almeno nessuno nega, mi sembra) che la stragrande maggioranza dei ricercatori lavora molte piu' ore di quelle richieste dal "contratto" e in genere "non stacca" dal lavoro neanche fuori dal proprio ufficio. Credo inoltre che il controllo imposto dall'INFN sia puramente formale e che nessuno mai si sognera' di controllare "the exact time and activities for each day we spend outside our home institutes". Non mi sembra che ci sia quindi nessuna reale limitazione della liberta' dei ricercatori, ne'il proposito di snidare le rare "pecore nere". Questo tuttavia non e' un'attenuante dell'imposizione, ma semmai un'aggravante: dimostra che si tratta di una copertura artificiale e puramente burocratica, che fa arretrare l'INFN ai livelli dei piu' famigerati Enti statali o parastatali, che adesso da piu' parti si vuole ristrutturare e rendere piu' efficienti. Tutti i dipendenti del settore pubblico, Universita' inclusa, sono ora oggetto di piu' attento scrutinio, e questo e' certamente giusto e nell'interesse di tutti. L'INFN ha la fortuna di non temere questo scrutinio, perche' in grado di dimostrare la propria produttivita', grazie al lavoro di dipendenti ed associati, che hanno sempre lavorato insieme senza distinzioni di ruolo. Non capisco l'uso del cartellino neanche se ci fosse bisogno di "difendersi": sia i politici che l'opinione pubblica non sono certo così sprovveduti da accontentarsi di una soluzione notoriamente inadeguata ad assicurare la produttivita', persino negli uffici dove la presenza fisica e' indispensabile per espletare il lavoro. Viceversa il danno che verra' all'INFN

dalla demotivazione e demoralizzazione dei suoi ricercatori e' sicuro e reale; mi unisco quindi al coro dei tanti colleghi che auspicano un ripensamento della questione. Ciao e cordiali saluti,

Ida Peruzzi

5.7.29 Aniello Nappi - Univ. Perugia

Condivido pienamente le critiche al controllo dell'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori INFN mediante tessera magnetica, in quanto elude totalmente il problema di una verifica seria della produttivita' scientifica, li- mitandosi ad una soluzione burocratica, tanto vessatoria ed umiliante, quanto inutile o addirittura controproducente.

Cordiali saluti.

Aniello Nappi

Universita' di Perugia

5.7.30 Fedele Lizzi - Univ. Napoli

Caro Macrì,

pur essendo un ricercatore universitario sono ovviamente scandalizzato dal fatto che i miei colleghi debbano timbrare. Mostra una totale ignoranza di come funzioni la ricerca scientifica! Puoi mettere il mio nome sotto tutti gli appelli che protestano per questa assurdita'.

Vorrei notare ulteriromente che, anche per l'universita', e' stata persa una occasione d'oro.

A mio parere i professori universitari ed i ricercatori sono pagati sia per fare didattica che per fare ricerca. Purtroppo non tutti i miei colleghi sono realmente attivi nella ricerca. Sino a ora questo non ha comportato problemi particolari. Ma ora, con la diminuzione dei posti, budgets di facolta' etc. si va verso un aumento del carico didattico. Sarebbe ragionevole che questo fosse a carico di chi non e' attivo nella ricerca. Ma questo pone il problema della valutazione della attivitita' di ricerca. In questo senso l'INFN che ha dipendenti che si occupano esclusivamente (o almeno prevalentemente) di ricerca poteva aprire la strada per l'individuazione di criteri validi per la valutazione delle attivita' di ricerca. L'INFN e' un ente piu' agile della universita' e poteva essere utile in tal senso che fungesse da apripista. E

sopratutto facesse passare il principio che la ricerca e' un lavoro che va giudicato con criteri particolari, ma non per questo e' una licenza per non fare nulla.

Non vorrei pensare male, ma non e' che dietro una certa tepidezza dei miei colleghi non c'e' un po' di timore per criteri di valutazione dell'attivita' di ricerca?

Cordiali saluti,

Fedele Lizzi

Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche

Universita' di Napoli

5.7.31 Francesco Nicodemi - Univ. Napoli

Sono totalmente daccordo che timbrare il cartellino per i ricercatori sia cosa priva di senso e anche controproducente introducendo uno spirito burocratico nella ricerca che andrebbe assolutamente evitato. Bisognerebbe trovare forme molto piu' specifiche di "controllo" che tengano realmente conto dell'attivita' svolta e possano valorizzarla.

Francesco Nicodemi

(ordinario di Fisica Teorica)

5.7.32 Flavio Cavanna - Univ. dell'Aquila

Dear Colleague,

I'm writing to you to express my opinion about the INFN recent ruling of the work time for INFN researchers. It seems to me totally nonsense! I think that trying to put a control on the research activity (which at the end is a way used in other areas of activity to push people to work more and produce more) will end-up to the opposite goal, i.e. discouraging people (INFN researchers) to work and to enjoy their job. If we cut the enthusiasm from our activity as physicist and reduce it to a daily duty to get a salary it will be the death of the research. I hope that this initiative of collecting opinions from the community will be successful and will bring the INFN Management to reconsider their decision about the clock-in/out.

Flavio Cavanna

Univ. of Aquila and INFN-Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso

5.7.33 Stefano Ragazzi - Univ. Milano

Caro Mario,

desidero esprimere a te e a tutti i ricercatori INFN la mia solidarieta' nella vostra protesta contro il controllo dell' orario di lavoro.

Stefano Ragazzi
prof. Associato
Dip. Fisica dell' Universita' di Milano

5.7.34 Tazio Pinelli - Univ. Pavia

caro Macri,

Gia' qualche anno fa avevo espresso un giudizio secco e contrario al controllo dell'attivita' di un ricercatore mediante il timbro di un cartellino orario.

Ora mi chiedo: e' questa l'unica strada che le autorita' preposte allo sviluppo della ricerca in Italia riescano a vedere? La ricerca frutta cultura e tecnologia. Il nostro paese ha urgente necessita' di arricchire il proprio contesto dei due suddetti aspetti, sia per ragioni di arricchimento generale del suo futuro che per ragioni di competitivita' economica. Nulla avverra'se non si sveglia la nostra classe dirigente per pervenire ad una seria programmazione dell'attivita' di ricerca in Italia. Questo e' il problema. Il controllo a mezzo cartellino avrebbe il solo esito di creare in Italia una nuova classe di cittadini il cui unico lavoro sarebbe...timbrare il cartellino. Ma di tali classi ce ne sono gia' troppe.

Cari Saluti
Tazio Pinelli
Universita' di Pavia

5.7.35 Silvia Limentani - Univ. Padova

Caro Macrì,

condivido il parere che il controllo dell'orario di lavoro e' assurdo e offensivo per la stragrande magioranza dei ricercatori dell'INFN ed alieno alla comunita' scientifica internazionale.

Cordiali saluti
Silvia Limentani
Professore Ordinario di Fisica delle Particelle Elementari

Universita' di Padova

5.7.36 Tullio Weber - Univ. Trieste

Caro dott. Macri,

le invio la mia incondizionata adesione alla vostra proteste: il provvedimento preso dall'INFN e' totalmente stupido, di tutto abbiamo bisogno meno che della stupidita'.

Tullio Weber
Cattedra di Fisica Teorica
Universita' di Trieste

5.7.37 Michelangelo Mangano, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa e CERN

caro mario, che vuoi che ti dica? La vicenda del cartellino e' ovviamente scandalosa, patetica, ed imbarazzante verso i nostri colleghi stranieri, che si stanno facendo grande risate. Ti scrivo dopo aver visto un appello ad inviarti commenti. Non penso di avere commenti piu' profondi e sagaci di altri nostri colleghi. Dunque mi limito ad autorizzarti ad usare la mia firma/nome per ogni manifesto, lettera, documento, etc che penserai di scrivere in protesta per questa novita'.

cari saluti,
michelangelo mangano

5.7.38 Giuseppe Marchesini - Univ. Milano-Bicocca

Caro Fabrizio,

come faccio a non sostenere queste ovvie ragioni?

Giuseppe Marchesini
Prof. Ordinario, Universita' Milano-Bicocca

5.7.39 Modesto Pusterla - Univ. Padova

Unisco la mia adesione a quella degli illustri colleghi italiani e non, affinche' le assurdita' della burocrazia che ci attanagliano continua- mente non superino un livello di guardia gia' molto preoccupante. Pertanto sono solidale

con i ricercatori INFN che non vogliono vincoli d'orario e cartellini da firmare per tot ore settimanali (lavorano molto di piu', ed e' anche per la loro attivita' che l'INFN ha potuto raggiungere prestigiosi traguardi riconosciuti internazionalmente).

Cordialmente
Modesto PUSTERLA

5.7.40 Ettore Gadioli - Univ. Milano

Caro Dr. Macri,

aderisco alla vostra iniziativa.
Ettore Gadioli,
Ordinario di Fisica Nucleare,
Universita' di Milano

5.7.41 Carlo De Marzo - Univ. Bari

Caro Mario,

sono contento dell'opportunita' che mi si offre di aderire ad un appello per modificare in senso piu' razionale la normativa sull'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori dipendenti degli enti di ricerca, ed in particolare dell'INFN.

Molti cordiali saluti,
Carlo De Marzo

5.7.42 Ezio Ferrari - Univ. Roma I

Caro Macri, facendo seguito all'appello contenuto nella lettera fatta circolare tra i ricercatori INFN, invio la mia adesione a quanto affermato nella lettera stessa. Il far timbrare il cartellino ai ricercatori INFN mi sembra una tale assurdita' che mi meraviglia il fatto che dei fisici (se ce ne sono stati) appartenenti al management dell'INFN abbiano accettato di far uscire una tale disposizione. Mi sembra addirittura inutile produrre ulteriori argomenti a dimostrazione dell'assurdita' della cosa; del resto, essi sono stati gia' prodotti da persone qualificate quali Drell, Lederman, Panofski, Predazzi e probabilmente altri di cui non conosco il pronunciamento esplicito. Augurando il successo alla vostra iniziativa, sostenuta anche in nome dell'efficienza e del buonsenso, ti saluto cordialmente

Prof. Ezio Ferrari Universita' di Roma "La Sapienza" Associato alla Sezione INFN di Roma I

5.7.43 Roberto Catenacci - Univ. Pavia

Aderisco pienamente alla lettera sull'orario di lavoro.

Cari saluti,

Roberto Catenacci.

Sezione INFN di Pavia.

5.7.44 Raffaello Garfagnini, Ferruccio Balestra - Univ. Torino

Caro Marci

aderiamo alla tua richiesta sull'orario io e il prof.Ferruccio Balestra entrambi dell'Universita' e associati INFN. Cordiali saluti

Raffaello Garfagnini

5.7.45 GianCarlo Ghirardi - ICTP Trieste

Dichiaro di aderire alla lettera allegata.

GianCarlo Ghirardi

ICTP - Trieste

5.7.46 Riccardo Giachetti - Univ. Firenze

Aderisco all'iniziativa ed ai commenti contenuti nella lettera pervenutami.

Con i migliori saluti

Riccardo Giachetti

Universita' di Firenze, Dipartimento di Fisica,

5.7.47 Gian Carlo Bonazzola - Univ. Torino

Caro Macrì

desidero aderire alla lettera di protesta contro il controllo orario dei ricercatori INFN a mezzo scheda magnetica.

Cordiali saluti,

Gian Carlo Bonazzola
Dipartimento Fisica Sperimentale
Universita' di Torino

5.7.48 Carlo Maria Becchi - Univ. Genova

aderisco volentieri
Becchi

5.7.49 Giancarlo Gialanella - Univ. Napoli

Subject: adesione lettera su orario di lavoro dei ricercatori INFN Aderisco alla seguente lettera:

It has been decided by the Management of INFN (Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, the Italian main Institute for High....

Giancarlo Gialanella
Dip. Scienze Fisiche
Universita' di Napoli "Federico II"

5.7.50 Sigfrido Boffi - Univ. Pavia

Caro Macrì,

aderisco alla lettera sull'inadeguatezza del concetto di orario di lavoro applicato alla Ricerca e in particolare all'interno dell'INFN.

Cordiali saluti
Sigfrido Boffi
Dipartimento di Fisica Nucleare e Teorica
Universita' di Pavia

5.7.51 Maria di Corato - Univ. Milano

Caro Macri,

Aderisco alla protesta dei ricercatori INFN contro il controllo delle presenze.

Maria di Corato
(P.O. Univ. MI e INFN)

5.7.52 Pietro Negri - Univ. Milano

Caro Mario,

la presente e‘ per manifestare a te e a tutti i ricercatori INFN che aderisco alla vostra protesta contro il controllo delle presenze.

Pietro Negri

(P.O. Univ. MI e INFN)

5.7.53 Gianfranco Sartori - Univ. Padova

Caro Macri‘,

aderisco volentieri alla lettera sull’inadeguatezza del concetto di orario di lavoro applicato alla Ricerca di cui mi e‘stata inviata copia.

Cordiali saluti,

Gianfranco Sartori

(P.O. con incarico di ricerca INFN, Padova)

5.7.54 Claudio Conta - Univ. Pavia

Caro Mario,

aderisco con piacere e convinzione alla lettera allegata al mail di Stefano Bianco di venerdì 9/10/98 sul controllo dell’ orario di lavoro. Ciao, a presto

Claudio Conta

5.7.55 Antonio Bassetto - Univ. Padova

Aderisco alla lettera di cui sopra. E‘ chiaro che il provvedimento e‘ insensato, cio‘ che non mi e‘ chiaro e‘ come si possa cambiare la situazione, viste le condizioni al contorno.

Saluti

Antonio Bassetto

5.7.56 G.C. Mantovani - Univ. Perugia

Subject: lettera ricercatori

ovviamente aderisco...

Bye, G.C.Mantovani

PO fisica generale
Univ. Perugia

5.7.57 Gian Paolo Murtas - Univ. Napoli

Caro Mario
anche io do' la mia adesione al documento contro l'accertamento dell'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori INFN.
Cordiali saluti
Gian Paolo Murtas

5.7.58 Emilio Chiavassa, Alberta Marzari Chiesa - Univ. Torino

Subject: Lettera Ricercatori
Aderiamo lettera su orario ricercatori
Cari Saluti
Emilio Chiavassa, Alberta Marzari Chiesa
Prof.Ord. TORINO

5.7.59 Paolo Checchi - Univ. Padova

Subject: firma documento internazionale
Padova, 12-OCT-1998
Ciao Mario.
Mi scuso per il ritardo, ma vorrei firmare anch'io il documento
Paolo

5.7.60 Alfredo Molinari - Univ. Torino

Caro Macri,
aderisco pienamente alla vostra iniziativa. Cordiali saluti
Alfredo Molinari

5.7.61 Giulio Auriemma - Univ. della Basilicata

Vorrei aderire alla lettera sull' orario di lavoro:
Cordialmente
Giulio Auriemma
Professore Ordinario di Fisica presso la facolta' di scienze
Universita' della Basilicata,
Incarico di ricerca INFN presso la Sez. di Roma1

5.7.62 Piero Monacelli - Univ. dell'Aquila

Caro Mario,
aderisco volentieri alla vostra protesta contro il cartellino per i ricercatori.
Cari saluti,
Piero Monacelli
prof.ord. Fisica Generale Universita' L'Aquila
(gruppo coll. INFN-L'Aquila-Gran Sasso)

5.7.63 Yogendra Srivastava - Univ. Perugia

Caro Macri:
Please add my name to the long list of persons in support of your letter. All the luck to you in this endeavour.
Ciao e cari saluti
Yogendra Srivastava
Ordinario di Teorie Quantistiche
Universita' di Perugia & INFN
Sezione di Perugia
Perugia Italy

5.7.64 Giancarlo Susinno - Univ. della Calabria

Caro Mario,
ti prego di accogliere la mia adesione alla lettera relativa all'ineguatezza del controllo sull'orario di lavoro dei ricercatori. Un caro saluto,
Giancarlo Susinno,
Univ. della Calabria & INFN

5.7.65 Maurizio Basile - Univ. Bologna

Maurizio Basile
Dip. di Fisica Universita‘ di Bologna

5.7.66 Giancarlo Rossi - Univ. Roma II

Caro Macri,

desidero esprimere il mio appoggio alla lettera dei ricercatori INFN sulle nuove modalita’ di controllo dell’orario di lavoro. Ti prego quindi di voler aggiungere ad essa la mia firma.

Cordiali saluti
Giancarlo Rossi
Dipartimento di Fisica
Universita’ di Roma ”Tor Vergata”

5.7.67 Franco Romano - Politecnico Bari

Caro Mario,

puoi aggiungere il mio nome alla lista dei firmatari
Ciao Franco

5.7.68 Sandro Centro - Univ. Padova

Aggiungete il mio nome alla lista:
Sandro Centro Dipartimento di Fisica e INFN Padova
Saluti
Sandro

5.7.69 Cesare Rossetti - Univ. Torino

Aderisco all’iniziativa di sostegno alla vostra azione di protesta e sottoscrivo la lettera diffusa con appello ai prof. ordinari

Cesare Rossetti
Universita‘ di Torino
Sezione INFN di Torino

5.7.70 G. Ciapetti - Univ. Roma I

Potete ovviamente aggiungere il mio nome (lo avevo gia' dato a Nisati).
Saluti G.Ciapetti
roma1

5.7.71 Luisa Cifarelli - Univ. Salerno

Sottoscrivo,
Luisa Cifarelli,
Universita' di Salerno

5.7.72 Sergio Serci - Univ. Cagliari

Ciao Mario,

aderisco pienamente allo spirito della lettera per il problema del timbro sull'orario dei ricercatori. Ti autorizzo formalmente quindi a mettere il mio nome tra i firmatari.

Ciao a presto
Sergio Serci
Prof. Ord. Ist. Fis. Nucl. e Subnucl. e INFN CAGLIARI

5.7.73 Enrico Beltrametti - Univ. Genova

Caro Mario,

ti saro' grato se vorrai includere anche il mio nome tra i firmatari dell'appello.

Un caro saluto
Enrico Beltrametti INFN GE

5.7.74 Pietro Menotti - Univ. Pisa

Caro Macrì,

ho sempre ritenuto la firma per i ricercatori INFN (sia eventualmente quelli universitari in futuro) una assurdita'. Quindi sottoscrivo ben volentieri la lettera.

Cordiali saluti
Pietro Menotti

5.7.75 Federico Palmonari - Univ. Bologna

Prego aggiungere la mia firma
Federico Palmonari
Universita' e INFN, Bologna

5.7.76 Renato Potenza -Univ. Catania

Caro Mario,

sono pienamente d'accordo con quanto scritto nella lettera dei ricercatori e con i commenti allegati. Penso pero' che le colpe non siano tanto o solo dell'INFN, quanto della formulazione di una legge che, pur comprendendo gli Enti di Ricerca, ne sconosce la natura e le funzioni. Considerami comunque firmatario della lettera. Ciao.

Renato

5.7.77 Luciano Paoluzi -Univ. Roma II

caro morselli

aderisco completamente alla lettera di Macri' riguardante il problema del controllo dell'orario di lavoro per i ricercatori INFN

cordiali saluti luciano paoluzi

5.7.78 Giulio Manuzio - Univ. Genova

Dalla lettera di Macrì di fatto si evince che l'INFN ha instaurato il cartellino motu proprio. Si trascurano anni di storia e di contese sul cartellino Si ignora che l'imposizione del cartellino e' stata accettata solo dopo che le organizzazioni sindacali e l'ARAN hanno firmato un contratto di lavoro che ha forza di legge Si ignora che gli orologi sono stati messi con i controlli della finanza alle porte. Macri e' stato fortemente criticato in Consiglio direttivo INFN per tali inesattezze sostanziali, non ha trovato alcun appoggio e gli e' stato chiaramente spiegato che non e' possibile travisare la realta' dei fatti in modo del tutto disonesto e tendenzioso. A tali contestazioni non ha potuto opporre alcuna difesa Se si vuole cercare una linea di scontro totale, l'iniziativa di continuare a mandare in giro una richiesta con affermazioni

pesantemente tendenziose e' eccellente Avrei sperato in una condotta piu' rispettosa dei fatti reali

Saluti

Giulio Manuzio

PS: Affinche' tutto sia chiaro preciso che anch'io reputo una colossale sciocchezza imporre di far usare il cartellino ai ricercatori e che, ove fosse possibile stipulare un nuovo contratto, sarebbe serio abolirlo

Chapter 6

Negative replies

Hi,

One of my old friends is [NdR: an italian physicist] and he tells me (often) that there are two classes of people in his institute: those who work hard, and those who don't work and sometimes leave at 2 pm for their second job. They all have punch cards to punch in and out already, so it sounds like this new system is not really that new, just more technologically advanced. Those with other jobs just come in in the morning, stand around drinking coffee with their friends, leave for most of the day, and come back at 17:00 to punch out again.

I think the new system is mainly directed at those who hold second and even third jobs, run companies and businesses on the side, etc. I'm sure you and your friends work hard, so why not cooperate with managers to try to catch the people that are an embarrassment to CNR? Figure out a better way to catch them if you don't like the magnetic cards.

Yours,
Warren Wiscombe
NASA

6.0.79 Alexander Undrus - Ohio State Univ.

Dear Andrea,

I would like to expess my opinion about your petition, and this opinin-ion is negative. INFN is your employer, pays you money (which coming from taxpayers), and it (and taxpayers) has the right to know how are you

spending your working time. It is not a violation of human rights to require that employees must be in office during business hours. Finally, Italy is a democracy and I hope you may easily change for employer with less stringent discipline.

Regards,
Alexander Undrus
Ohio-state Univ.

6.0.80 Tommy Anderberg -

Well, since you asked, here's my answer: as long as you are a public employee, i.e. somebody being supported by the tax payers, there is no reason why you should not be held to the same rules of accountability which also apply to all other public employees.

Your employers, in this case anyone paying taxes in Italy (the real thing, money derived from earnings realized in the private sector, not the piece of accounting fiction being applied to your own, tax-financed paycheck), have every right to demand that you be at your place of employment at the times stipulated by your contract.

If you don't like your terms of employment, quit.

In fact, I have a great suggestion if you want real freedom. Do what I did: start your own business. Then you'll be able to call your own shots and work when, where and with whatever you feel like.

If, on the other hand, you don't think that you can make it in the marketplace, by all means do stay on the public dole. But have at least the decency not to bellyache about the truly minimal requirements for cashing in your guaranteed monthly check from the rest of us which you seem to find so offensive.

Tommy Anderberg

6.0.81 Kurt Artoos - CERN

I think that this is a very good thing . It is sure that some people do a lot more hours , just out of motivation . But it is also true that a lot of people do less hours than they are supposed to do . To protect against such situations I think it is a good idea. You can still work when you want and as much you want .

Regards
Kurt Artoos

6.0.82 Per E. Werner - CERN

Hello, I think a scheme like this would have both advantagous and disadvantagous seeing it from a pur technical point of view.

- - Seems rather/very bureaucratic.
- - I do not think it's suitable people in research.
- - Only suitable for people spending there worktime on the same place otherwise clocking in/out becomes tidous and uncertain.
- + In principle these schemes (very common in Sweden) comes with a flextime scheme, e.g., you can work up time in the winter and use it in the summer, etc. Here comes a question of paying overtime or maximise an individuals work hours !! This is usually waved in the resarch sector.
- + People really not doing their job is at least forced to 'do their hours' (or cheat).
- + To declare the exact time and activities for each day we spend outside your home institutes.

How persons spend their total workt time, e.g., meetings/conf., trips, projectA etc., is used by quite a lot of companies I think. The requirement by INFN seems more like a sign of mistrust than time management. I would more understand a requirement for time management information in home office and a more approximate information when your on official travel, e.g. to CERN.

Just some points from a more clock in/out oriented country (Sweden).
Best Regards,
Per E. Werner
CERN EP Division

6.0.83 Bob Mannix - RAL

Mario,

At Rutherford it is mainly administrative staff, ourselves (the ISIS Controls group) and some of the High Energy Physyicists. At our sister laboratory, Daresbury, I believe all staff are on flexitime.

The implementation is done by a "coherent work group" being unanimous (or nearly so) in wanting it. It is true that the most resistance to flexitime is on the part of research scientists. It is also true that, once flexitime starts to appear it becomes increasingly difficult to get previous working practices (sometimes called "unofficial flexitime"!) sanctioned, although this is still allowed here through a reasonably laissez-faire attitude.

The point I was making was that, with something back in return (the ability to take extra leave) and with the ability of supervisors to make corrections easily to staff time records, it's actually quite a nice thing. Without these it isn't!

For information those on flexitime have to attend (unless on leave) between 10.00am and 4.00pm (Monday-Thursday, 3.00pm on Friday), the "core time". They cannot start flexitime working before 7.30am or finish after 10.00pm. Staff have to clock out for lunch for a time between 30mins and 2hrs between 11.45am and 2.15pm. Failure to do this results in a 2hr break being logged but this and aother problems can all be corrected out by the supervisor (usually the line manager).

If you want any more details, please ask.

Yours,

Bob Mannix
Leader, ISIS Controls Group
Rutherford Appleton Laboratory
DIDCOT, OX11 0QX UK

Chapter 7

Miscellanea

7.0.84 Paulo Nogueira - IST Lisbon

Dear Dr. Macrì,

This is a (somewhat late) reply to the message entitled

"Letter from a group of Italian physicists"

which was sent to me by Dr. S. Bianco. I am therefore addressing you as a Spokesperson of the INFN researchers.

Although the above mentioned letter is not very detailed, I think I can say the following:

1. the time I spent in my home institute is not registered by anyone (as far as I know...) but that does not prevent me from spending a considerable period of time in there; however, it would be difficult for me to find serious objections to a *minimal* control provided the schedule was flexible enough

2. when I spend some time in another institute or lab I have to report the purpose and duration of the visit (and before that I have to ask permission for the leave), as well any results which derived from it; however, that is not an extremely detailed report

That said, I fully agree with you about the useless bureaucracy involved in extremely detailed reports: our best report should be our work, and I don't think any scientist is being evaluated daily! If, in addition, you are required to have a rigid working schedule (like "from 9 till 5") I would subscribe your letter in full.

Best regards,
Paulo Nogueira

7.0.85 Riccardo Capovilla - CINVESTAV IPN

ciao macri - magari la voce di un esiliato anche se non aiuta, nemmeno fa' danno...

sono curioso su questa nuova idea del management... se ricordo bene al CNR hanno un sistema simile, ma credo non magnetico (comunque accolto nello stesso modo).

qui in messico, esiste il dovere di giustificare a fine anno le attivita' svolte e un sistema di incentivi che aiuta a liberarsi di inetti e inutili e che pero' produce publicitis di tipo acuto. vi riferite a qualche tipo di controllo della produttivita'?

un altro fenomeno messicano interessante sono gli "aviadores". si tratta di professori, ricercatori che si presentano solo il giorno dello stipendio. (ricordo che quando chiedevo perche' non si depositava lo stipendio in una banca, mi risposero che era perche' così gli aviadores almeno lavoravano un giorno ogni due settimane...) aviadores nel infn ??? sarebbe l'unica scusa possibile per questa magnetica idea, pero' anche facile da verificare o meglio falsificare.

comunque buona fortuna con la vostra iniziativa. e ringraziate il cielo che non hanno pensato ai braccialetti....

ciao, riccardo
Riccardo Capovilla
CINVESTAV IPN

7.0.86 Mamoru Fujiwara - Osaka Univ.

Dear Sir,

I received your information on the new working style of Italian scientists. I understand that it is very difficult to control the working style of scientists, in general.

On the other hands, we should consider that this right of scientists is a special gift from the great scientists in the past. In the past, scientists found new principles which gave many great benefits to human being. At present, I believe it is so. I hope that it will be so in future in Italy.

Best regards,

Mamoru Fujiwara
Research Center for Nuclear Physics,
Osaka University
Mihogaoka 10-1, Ibaraki 567
Osaka Japan

7.0.87 Philip Yock - Univ. of Auckland, NZ.

Dear Prof Macri

New Zealand academics are striving to continue with a shrinking research budget in pure science. Many believe that good teaching of science at school level, and informed publicity for successful research programmes, may combat the trend.

Best wishes,
Philip Yock,
University of Auckland, NZ.

7.0.88 Gaetano Vignola - Frascati

ti ringrazio dell'informazione non richiesta. siccome l'ho letta permettimi di precisare che non e' esattamente corretta nelle premesse.

Gaetano Vignola
LNF-INFN

Index