RESEARCH FACULTY and EXTENTION PROFESSIONALS
PROMOTION DOSSIER GUIDANCE

A promotion dossier consists of a Summary page, a Qualification Statement, and a Research Faculty (RF) Curriculum Vitae (CV). Research Faculty titles include Extension Professionals, Associates, Engineers, Scientists, and Technologists. The dossier should be a complete package that addresses the breadth required of the named promotion rank.

When a RF promotion candidate is preparing their dossier, they will want to prepare the Summary page and the Qualification Statement, and update their RF CV.

There is one template for a RF CV. The RF CV Template and accompanying RF CV Guidelines Document can be found on the website of the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (https://faculty.gatech.edu). Research Faculty should prepare a CV and update it on a regular basis, at least yearly when preparing for the yearly appraisal with their supervisor. It may be helpful to remember that "curriculum vitae" in Latin literally translates to "the course of [one's] life." While other nations typically think of a CV as a short résumé, in American academia, it is intended to capture *everything* you have done in your academic/professional career. Working on your CV over time will be much easier than trying to compile all the information when your promotion dossier is due.

The Summary page and Qualification Statement should be organized to address the promotion criteria for the research faculty promotion rank being sought (Researcher II, Senior Researcher, or Principal Researcher). The criteria for RF promotion are located in the *Faculty Handbook*, section 3.2.1, Research Faculty Hiring and Promotion Guidelines, 3.2.1 Research Faculty Hiring and Promotion Guidelines.

It is recommended that the Summary and Qualification Statement use the same phrases that are in the promotion criteria. For example, "Mr. Burdell is nationally recognized for his **mastery in the technical field** of embedded software systems and open-architecture design."

Summary: The Summary should include content that clearly addresses the promotion criteria for the rank level being sought.

> The one-page Summary statement should quickly address how the candidate has accomplished each of the promotion criteria. It is an executive overview of material covered in the Qualification Statement and supporting CV material (ex: general background, areas in which the candidate excels and brief highlights to exemplify why, etc.). If the candidate is an exception for time-in-rank and/or years of experience, identify the exception and include a brief explanation on why this promotion merits exceptional consideration and this exception should be granted. If a translation matrix is included in the dossier, include a reference to the translation matrix. Consider using the same phrases that are in the promotion criteria and bolding those words (e.g., mastery of a technical field, technical contributions and innovation, leadership and supervision, broad recognition of technical stature, etc.); or a bulleted list with short paragraphs that highlight/summarize each criterion. Make it easy for a reviewer to quickly realize the candidate has achieved each of the criteria.

Qualification Statement: The Qualification Statement should provide a walk-through of each of the promotion criteria, not a narrative bio sketch. The Qualification Statement is limited to five (5) pages and is an opportunity for the promotion candidate to detail their career and impact; it is an opportunity to detail how the candidate meets and exceeds the promotion criteria through outstanding capabilities and leadership.

a. Promotion merit guidelines reflect work performed by the candidate during their current time-in-rank at GT. The recommendation to the candidate is to focus on their work in their current rank (implies work since their last promotion or since being hired into the current rank). The candidate will have to determine what best details their work and impact regarding the criteria.

b. The candidate should explain their general background and area(s) of interest, how long they have been at GT, etc. Any prior employment should be briefly described here, if relevant. Do not make prior employment the bulk of any description.

c. A candidate should briefly describe their primary role and area(s) of contribution at GT that will help reviewers understand the material that follows. If the candidate's role is not a typical research faculty role, the candidate should describe their role and responsibilities to clearly show how they are valued as a member of the research faculty; they might consider preparing a translation matrix that helps correlate the promotion criteria to the candidate's role and work activities and responsibilities. (Ex1: "Mr. Smith has been a key leader developing software to do the following for the ABC community that needed help doing XYZ." Ex2: "Ms. Jones is recognized nationally as a two-time NIST National Conference best practice presenter for Strategy Development & Deployment Process and for Assessment Process.")

d. The candidate may format their Qualification Statement however they desire. Each candidate will be evaluated against the promotion criteria detailed in the *Faculty Handbook*. The Qualification Statement should clearly address the identified criteria. One suggestion is to format the Qualification Statement into the categories that will be evaluated (include a sub-titled section for each of the promotion criteria).

e. Break down the criteria for which the candidate will be evaluated.
   - Candidates are evaluated in all areas for the recommended rank; however, if the candidate is clearly strongest in certain areas, identify and highlight them in the Qualification Statement.
   - It is most helpful to the reviewer if the candidate describes those contributions that are most prominent in recent years first (since the last promotion or hiring at GT) and then work backwards.

f. The "Mastery of a Complex Field" and "Technical Contributions and Innovation" criteria (RII, Senior) or the "Nationally or Internationally Recognized Original and Innovative Work" and "Development and Management of Significant Technical Thrusts" criteria (Principal) should not read like a listing of projects on which the researcher has worked.

g. The content should provide proof of the technical mastery and contributions expected of someone aspiring to promote to the named promotion rank
   - Content should include information like the problem addressed, the actions taken, the results of the actions, and the value to the sponsor or organization.
   - Content should provide the breadth to prove technical mastery expected of the promotion rank.

Researcher II Dossier: The *Faculty Handbook* RII criteria states:
> *The promotion recommendation shall include substantive evidence of the candidate's progress toward developing the capabilities for performing at the level expected of research professionals in the same field holding senior Research Faculty ranks at Georgia Tech.*

The promotion criteria for the Senior RF rank describes five (5) criteria; therefore, the well written RII dossier will highlight the 5 Senior criteria and detail the candidate's work experience that demonstrates the promotion criteria. Reviewers are looking at the RII candidate's progress

towards senior capabilities, but they are evaluated on developing a mastery and for demonstrating managerial efforts.

Senior Dossier: The *Faculty Handbook* identifies five (5) senior researcher promotion criteria (summarized here):

> *1. mastery of a complex and difficult field of specialization, 2. technical contributions and innovation, 3. supervision of others' work, 4. sponsored program development, and 5. service to and dealings with outside organizations.* Therefore, the Summary and Qualification Statement should clearly discuss the candidate's work that demonstrates these five (5) criteria and reference the CV sections that provide supporting details.

Principal Dossier: The *Faculty Handbook* identifies four (4) principal researcher promotion criteria (summarized here):

> *1. Consistent performance in making original and innovative contributions (mastery), 2. Leadership in developing and managing a technical thrust, 3. Contributions to Georgia Tech by service to the Institute, the State, the Nation, or to the candidate's profession, and 4. Broad Recognition of Technical Stature.* The well-prepared dossier will include a Summary and Qualification Statement that clearly addresses these four (4) criteria and points the reviewer to the appropriate sections of the CV that address and support the criteria.

Georgia Tech has one CV outline for all research faculty. The major sections of the CV outline closely mirror the five (5) criteria for the senior researcher; the references to the candidate's CV in a senior dossier are easy to identify. The principal researcher criteria are not as clearly identified, but the information is contained within the CV. It is strongly recommended that the promotion candidate provide references in the Qualification Statement to the sections in the CV that provides detailed information and supports the promotion criteria.

> For example, one way to demonstrate the principal candidate's fourth criteria, Broad Recognition of Technical Stature, is by invited papers at conferences or seminars; therefore, when detailing work that demonstrates this, a dossier statement should reference the CV section, I.B.3 that lists invited presentations (ex, "Dr. Jones has been invited to present at two IEEE Conferences and invited to provide the key note address at the Association of Computing Machinery Artificial Intelligence Symposium. See CV section I.B.3, Invited Conference Presentations, for details.")

When cross-referencing the principal promotion criteria to the RF CV, the following are examples:

- The first criteria are detailed in the first CV section I. Mastery of a Complex Field; and CV section II, Technical Contributions and Innovation.
- The second criteria, Leadership in developing and managing a technical thrust, includes information in both CV section III, Project Leadership and Supervision, and CV section IV, Sponsored Program Development.
- The third criteria, Contributions to Georgia Tech by service to the Institute, the State, the Nation, or the candidate's profession, correlates with CV section V, Outreach and Service.
- The fourth criteria, Broad Recognition of Technical Stature, has information throughout the CV that demonstrate broad recognition. Some of these include section I.B.3, Invited Conference Presentations; section V.A, Professional Activities (if on the board of a professional society); section V.E, Conference Session Chair; I.B.7, Editorial Work for Technical Journals; V.C, Reviewer work for Technical Journals; and V.D, Reviewer Work for Conferences. The candidate may have

additional information in the CV that they reference to demonstrate this fourth criteria for broad recognition.

PRINCIPAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION:
The promotion dossier for a principal promotion candidate will include a minimum of three (3) letters of evaluation from highly qualified persons in the candidate's professional field who are not now or previously employed by the Institute. The Institute will contact these individuals to request a letter of evaluation based on the principal promotion criteria. When the Institute receives these letters, they will add them to the dossier. The promotion candidate does not solicit the letters of evaluation, but they do suggest who these external evaluators should be. When identifying strong evaluators, consider individuals who:

- Have technical background and experience to appropriately evaluate the candidate's capabilities as a function of the principal promotion criteria
- Know the promotion candidate's work (as a sponsor, professional society peer (board members together, conference committee members, book/chapter co-author, etc.)
- Nationally or internationally known
- Not a Georgia Tech employee (now or in the past)
- Should not be a colleague

TRANSLATION MATRIX:
A translation matrix is not required, but a promotion candidate may include a translation matrix if the promotion candidate wants to provide a cross reference between the candidate's work and the promotion criteria. This is often done for those research faculty who have non-traditional research roles within the Institute, or those holding a research associate or research technologist title. The translation matrix helps identify analogous achievements between promotion criteria and job responsibilities. These translation matrixes are unique to the individual as it will identify analogous work that the promotion candidate performs that demonstrates the promotion criteria and provides examples of that work.

PROMOTION CRITERIA (from the *Faculty Handbook*)	ANALOGOUS ACHIEVEMENTS	EXAMPLES
	Translation of candidate's job duties to demonstrate similar achievements	*Candidate experience that demonstrates fulfillment of the analogous criteria*

CV: For information and guidance on how to prepare a Research Faculty CV, please reference the Research Faculty CV Guidance Document (scroll down on this page: https://faculty.gatech.edu/promotion-and-tenure).

Please clearly delineate items you list in each section of the CV that were completed prior to your last promotion (or hire date).

FORMATTING, STYLE, and WORDS of WISDOM:

1. Use a 10-point or larger font only.

2. Incomplete promotion packages or inconsistent data between the Summary, Qualification Statement, and the CV calls into question the quality and accuracy of the dossier.

3. Accurately explain candidate contributions and their value to the organization and back it up with CV evidence; avoid misrepresentations of value to the organization.

4. *The candidate must explain their technical area*. Don't say "I'm a great SW writer." That is generic. Don't say "I'm a great tester." Explain (briefly) why what you do (e.g., testing an aircraft) is **technically hard and vitally important.** Tell the reviewer that writing software for an airplane is not like coding for a Coke machine. Take two paragraphs and explain why the problem you solve is technical and important so the reviewer doesn't say "so what?" right off the bat.

5. Address major points of the promotion criteria: use key words from the criteria.

6. Include all applicable sections. Senior or Principal candidates should complete something for each promotion criteria and include information for each major section of the CV if possible.

   a. Missing sections in the CV puts the burden of evidence on the remaining sections and may adversely affect the success of the dossier.
   b. If a section is not included, then include only those CV section titles for which the candidate has data; renumber sections as necessary.

7. All narratives should be written in the third person and clearly indicate accomplishments since the last promotion or being hired at GT. Do not use the first-person singular pronoun. Write in third person (Mr. GTRI, Ms. Jones, Dr. Smith, Mr. George Burdell).

8. Do not use passive voice to describe your work.

   a. Ex: the phrasing "a software module was developed" does not explain what the candidate's role may have been in its development
   b. Clearly articulate the candidate's role in third person, such as "Mr. Smith led a small group of researchers to develop software module XYZ. In this capacity, Mr. Smith was responsible for the management of the development process and technical development of the core algorithms."

9. Be specific:
   a. Vague: Mr. GTRI is involved with committees and professional societies. He has written several proposals and been the project director on many projects.
   b. **Better:**
      Mr. GTRI has served on six (6) GTRI committees, two (2) GT committees, and is an active member and past president of the IEEE Atlanta Section. He has been a major contributor on six (6) proposals with four (4) funded for a combined value of $3.2M and

has been the project director or associate project director on 10 projects with a funded value of $8.7M.

10. Do not use excessive acronyms or jargon. Write for a reviewer not in your field.

11. Acronyms should be defined on first occurrence; acronyms may be used on subsequent occurrences. Be careful with acronyms and jargon, many reviewers will not understand your technical field.
    a. Don't just say ALR-69
    b. Define it for the first time, i.e., ALR-69 Radar Warning Receiver (RWR), and then refer to it as the ALR-69 RWR for the rest of the document.
    Provide a single sentence about what the system does. "RWRs alert the pilot to incoming threats by detecting and categorizing their Radio Frequency emissions." or something short like that.

12. Explain why what you did was
    a. TECHNICAL
    b. HARD TO DO (maybe rare)
    c. IMPORTANT

13. Avoid a lot of talk about tools. Reviewers may not care about the tool you used.
    a. "I created software, **written in C,** that became self-aware." Saying 'written in C' doesn't help. Explain why the software was important and unique.
    b. "Designed the world's fastest integrated circuit using Cadence Design Tools." Tell what you did that was clever to make it fast.

14. Capitalize and write out Bachelor's degree and Master's degrees, i.e., Bachelor of Science in Computer Science, not BS in Computer Science

15. Use $k, $M instead of $XX,XXX.

16. Ensure that proper grammar and spelling is used.

17. Numbers under ten should be written as words not numbers (i.e., "eight" not "8").

18. Present information with most recent data first – "what have you done for me lately?"

19. When listing papers, conference presentations, reports, etc. **bold** and/or <u>underline</u> your name

20. Group reports of the same type in the "Research Reports" or "Technical Reports" field.
    a. Also, document multiple similar reports as a series with one top-level entry with individual documents listed underneath if desired; for example, list a top-level entry for "Software Test Reports" and then list the individual software test reports underneath with appropriate information.
    Note that the number of pages and percentage of authorship must be listed for each report.

21. Prepare your best draft dossier, then ask others that know your work to review the dossier (supervisor, PDs/PIs, colleagues).

22. Format: if a section is blank, remove the section, and renumber—Recommend the candidate wait until all reviews and feedback are addressed before doing this as they may think of section inputs later rather than early in the process.

23. Reviewers may equate "managed" with "anybody can do that." In the mind of most people **Managed = Not Hard** or Technical. You didn't "manage" a project. You led the project. You directed it. You implemented it. You innovated.

24. When it comes to the Supervision section it is OK to say "I managed three Nobel Prize winners and two co-ops."

25. Be careful with terms that are used: Ex: Integrated Product Team Meetings, Working Group. The reviewer may question if this is a project meeting or a government conference where the presenters are selected and the attendees are selected. If it looks like a project meeting, explain it!

26. The reviewer might not be familiar with your department or work; briefly describe organizations, department, and projects the first time they are mentioned.

27. CV: Duplicate information if something supports more than one item; orient the information to the section in which the information appears; for example, if you can list a short course in the "Curriculum and/or Short Course Development" field (First section of CV; example "XXXX Short Course--Created short course called "XXXXX" as a sponsor tutorial") and then in "Special Activities" field (Outreach and Service CV Section) list the outreach generated as a result of the short course (i.e., "Short Course presented to potential sponsors on XX/XX/XX").