

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

UNCLASSIFIED

Memorandum 6L-231

Copy No. 1 of 20 copies  
Page 1 of 3Division 8 - Lincoln Laboratory  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Lexington 73, Massachusetts

SUBJECT: GROUP LEADERS' MEETING - December 12, 1955

To: Group Leaders and Associate Group Leaders

From: C. W. Parr

Date: December 15, 1955

Present: J. W. Forrester, R. R. Everett, J. A. Arnov, D. R. Brown, G. H. Dodd,  
C. W. Parr, J. F. Jacobs, B. E. Morris, Jr., J. A. O'Brien,  
W. W. Papien, J. C. Proctor, E. S. Rich, H. H. Taylor, P. YoutzAgenda: 1. Promotional Increases  
2. LPO Approval of Lincoln Plans and Work  
3. MIT-Lincoln Relationships1. Promotional Increases

Proctor reported that the Personnel Office had turned back applications for promotional increases for Section Leaders on the grounds that the DDL Office had found the responsibility description too similar to previous descriptions for Assistant Section Leader.

Proctor will rewrite the responsibility description with the help of the Group Leaders.

2. LPO Approval of Lincoln Plans and Work

Morris stated certain problems relating to reports LPO proposes to issue with which Lincoln does not concur.

Forrester pointed out that Lincoln must document the Laboratory position by letter in the case of any reports issued by LPO for which our approval has been requested and cannot be given.

Discussion centered around the ESS test program in which, Everett pointed out, Lincoln has the designers privilege of devising and running tests we consider necessary.

Everett suggested that the problem be discussed with Col. LaMontagne and that any communications with the LPO relative to approval be placed on a formal basis. Dodd asked Morris to draft a letter to the LPO requesting written presentation of any items on which they desire Lincoln approval.

|                            |
|----------------------------|
| CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO: |
| 4 BY: <u>DD-261</u>        |
| By: <u>ARF</u>             |
| Date: <u>3-15-60</u>       |

RECEIVED  
DEC 20 1955

JAY W. FORRESTER

UNCLASSIFIED

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Memorandum 6L-231

UNCLASSIFIED

Page 2

3. MIT-Lincoln Relationships

Forrester pointed out that the purpose of this discussion is to uncover any items which should be called to the attention of the Steering Committee for action by the Director at an academic council meeting in February. He suggested deferring any questions which could be answered within the group.

Farr reviewed the list of questions suggested before the meeting by Group Leaders and Associate Group Leaders.

Jacobs discussed the promotion of non-staff personnel to staff positions. Everett acknowledged the necessity of a consistent policy and agreed to speak with Holloway about Hill.

Forrester and Everett stated that the proposed ceiling on the number of Laboratory personnel is self-imposed by Lincoln and not limited by MIT policy.

Taylor asked whether we should encourage staff to take academic courses. Forrester replied affirmatively stating that transportation was to be provided and that we are hoping for an arrangement to provide financial assistance in the payment of tuition.

Brown reviewed the Building 10 program restating recommendations which he has presented in writing to Forrester, (summarized below):

- a. Research Assistants should make Cambridge their headquarters.
- b. Research Assistants should be made responsible members of Lincoln Sections and look to their Section Chiefs as their close supervisory contact.
- c. Research Assistants should be given Lincoln white badges (after clearance) and have access to Lincoln facilities.
- d. Research Assistants should begin work with a temporary DDL Staff appointment the summer before starting academic work; failure to do this results in much lost motion during orientation.
- e. Research Assistants need the technical and administrative supervision of a mature Lincoln staff member physically quartered in Building 10.
- f. Research Assistants at Lincoln have already stimulated mutual interests between Lincoln staff and Cambridge faculty members.

UNCLASSIFIED

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Memorandum 6L-231

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
UNCLASSIFIED

Page 3

Faculty participation in the Building 10 program is still an incompletely solved problem. From the faculty viewpoint, it is anxious to see the results of its participation showing up in better academic courses. Taylor reported Verzuh's acknowledgement of improved pulse circuitry growing out of the relationship; Youtz reported on special tubes made for Cambridge classroom work. Brown reported Buck is an instructor, Weisling is a lecturer. This type of personnel sharing is important. Forrester pointed out that Lincoln must take the initiative if we are to "grow some instructors" from among the younger staff members.

Brown urged that arrangements be made so that Research Assistantships can be offered as part of the current recruiting package. Forrester said that this item has a high priority.

At this point, Forrester and Everett, and certain others, left for a meeting to discuss Murphy space; the remainder of the group continued discussion of Lincoln-MIT relationships.

Farr brought up a question of the future of the Laboratory as it relates to the personnel problems of answering the questions of existing staff members and recruits concerning the permanence of a Lincoln staff job.

Discussion explored the rotation plan which is a policy of DIC and the question of whether MIT will continue indefinitely to hold an affiliation with Lincoln Laboratory or whether the bond may be severed as in the case of the Flight Control Laboratory recently transferred to RCA. This question was recently asked of Dr. Julius Stratton, at the PGEM meeting of the IRE; his answer which spoke of the organizational decentralization of MIT's various groups has apparently been interpreted differently by various people.

The important fact developed by the discussion is that concern over the possibility of application of a rotation policy to Lincoln staff calls for a better understanding in Division 6 at the Group Leader level, in order to deal with personnel problems effectively.

Farr agreed to summarize this discussion for Everett prior to the Steering Committee meeting December 12.

*C. W. Farr*  
C. W. Farr  
Secretary

CWF:rw

UNCLASSIFIED  
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~