**Dear Research Faculty Peer Review Committee Chair,**

Please consider using the following template when preparing the peer committee letters addressed to the next level of review (school chair, lab director, dean, unit director). The following includes additional information, guidance, and examples for each promotion level.

These letters are read by the school chair/lab director, College committee/GTRI Directorate committee/unit level committee, Dean/GTRI Director/Unit Director, the Institute Peer Committee, the EVPR/Provost, and the President. Therefore, some consistency in these letters would be helpful for all reviewers. Most importantly, unique and useful information should be included in the lab peer committee letters. In addition, explaining mixed votes or negative votes is helpful as future reviewers want to understand the concerns peers, who usually know the candidate and their work, may have.

Just as each candidate is unique, the information in the peer committee letter should be unique and should provide useful information for reviewers.

* Do not repeat information that is in the candidate’s summary page.
* Explain why the committee believes the promotion candidate has earned a promotion; detail the candidate’s mastery and contributions that demonstrate the promotion criteria.
* If a Principal candidate, include a statement about the external letters of evaluation, referring to the external reviewers only by an assigned number and give a balanced account, including any negative comments in the external reviews.
* If there was a mixed vote or different opinions about the candidate overall or for any of the criteria, please do explain the discussion and opinions of the committee members.
* If the candidate is an exception, the letter must explain the exception and state whether the committee, all or a subset, supports the exception.

***Revision 09.22.2021***

**Researcher II Template**

[DATE]

Memorandum

To: [Unit Dir Name, Title]

From: [Peer Review Chair Name], [Unit Name] Peer Review Committee Chair

Subject: Recommendation for [Candidate Name]

[introductory sentence that describes the overall committee opinion of the candidate’s progress and a second sentence that describes the categories of performance]:   
The Peer Review Promotion Committee met on [meeting date] and deemed Mr. X as having good progress towards performing at a Researcher II level. As such, he was regarded as having [**superior | acceptable**] performance in *(a) papers published or products created with significant contributions*, and [**superior | acceptable**] performance in *(b) significant managerial efforts on sponsored projects or significant support in developing relationships in the sponsor community*, the 2 categories for promotion to Researcher II.

[State explicitly how the candidate has demonstrated the researcher II promotion criteria. Also state why this candidate is unique and any gaps they fill as the lab’s SME. If there are concerns expressed by any or all of the committee for any of the criteria, please do explain.]

**[No votes]** If there are no votes for this candidate, please explain the concerns expressed by a few or all of the committee. The same way the memo identifies strengths for the candidate, if there are concerns that keep the committee from voting “yes”, these need to be explained.

**[Exception]** if the candidate is an exception, explain the exception and if the committee members accept the exception.

[record the vote and summarize the endorsement]

The committee (yes-no-abstain) gives [Candidate name] its endorsement for [Recommended Rank].

*Example 1*: The committee unanimously (7-0-0) gives Mr. X its strongest endorsement for Senior Research Engineer.

*Example 2*: The committee (7-0-0) gives Mr. X its endorsement for Senior Research Engineer.

*Example 3*: The majority of the committee (8-3-0) supports a recommendation for Mr. X to be promoted to Senior Research Engineer.

*Example 4*: The committee (2-5-0) does not support a promotion for Mr. X at this time. *(concerns will have been detailed earlier in the letter, but a statement here may be in order)* Although Mr. X is on a path to earn a promotion and is taking on some of the responsibilities expected of a RII, the committee believes he needs more time to earn the promotion and to demonstrate the criteria needed for a promotion to Researcher II.

[List Peer Review Committee Names and their research faculty rank, with signature of at least the committee chair]

**Senior Researcher Template**

[DATE]

Memorandum

To: [Unit Dir Name, Title]

From: [Peer Review Chair Name], [Unit Name] Peer Review Committee Chair

Subject: Recommendation for [Candidate Name]

[introductory sentence that describes the overall committee opinion of the candidate’s progress and a second sentence that describes the 5 categories of performance]:

The Peer Review Promotion Committee met on [meeting date] and deemed Mr. Y as having demonstrated an overall **superior** level of scholarly achievement and technical, managerial, and entrepreneurial productivity commensurate with the highest standards of Georgia Tech. As such, he was regarded as having [**superior | acceptable**] performance in *(a)* *mastery of a complex and difficult field*, [**superior | acceptable**] performance in *(b) technical contributions and innovation*,[**superior | acceptable**] performance in *(c) supervision of others*, [**superior | acceptable**] performance in *(d) sponsored program development*, and [**superior | acceptable**] performance in *(e) representation in service and/or dealings with outside organizations*, the five categories for promotion to Senior Research Scientist.

*Example 1:* The Peer Review Promotion Committee deemed Mr. Y as having superior performance in (a) mastery of a complex and difficult field, (b) technical contributions and innovation, and (c) supervision of others. The opinion of the committee deemed him acceptable in (d) sponsored program development, and e) representation in service with outside organizations, the 5 categories for promotion to Senior Research Engineer.

*Example* 2: The candidate was regarded as having **superior** performance in *(a)* *mastery of a complex and difficult field*, **superior** performance in *(b) technical contributions and innovation*, **acceptable** performance in *(c) supervision of others*, **superior** performance in *(d) sponsored program development*, and **acceptable** performance in *(e) representation in service and/or dealings with outside organizations*, the five categories for promotion to Senior Research Scientist

[State explicitly how the candidate has demonstrated the 5 promotion criteria. Also state why this candidate is unique and any gaps they fill as the lab’s SME. If there are concerns expressed by any or all of the committee for any of the criteria, please do explain.]

**Mastery:** detail how the candidate has demonstrated mastery of a technical field.

**Technical Contributions:** statement how the candidate has demonstrated technical contributions.

**Supervision:** statement how the candidate has demonstrated the criteria.

**Sponsored Program Development:** statement how the candidate has demonstrated the criteria.

**Representation in Service:** statement how the candidate has demonstrated the criteria.

[**No votes**] If there are no votes for this candidate, please explain the concerns expressed by a few or all of the committee. The same way the memo identifies strengths for the candidate, if there are concerns that keep the committee from voting “yes”, these need to be explained.

**[Exception]** if the candidate is an exception, explain the exception and if the committee members accept the exception.

[record the vote and summarize the endorsement]

The committee (yes-no-abstain) gives [Candidate name] its endorsement for [Recommended Rank].

*Example 1*: The committee unanimously (7-0-0) gives Mr. Y its strongest endorsement for Senior Research Engineer.

*Example 2*: The committee (7-0-0) gives Mr. Y its endorsement for Senior Research Engineer.

*Example 3*: The majority of the committee (8-3-0) supports a recommendation for Mr. Y to be promoted to Senior Research Engineer.

*Example 4*: The committee (2-5-0) does not support a promotion for Mr. Y at this time. *(concerns will have been detailed earlier in the letter, but a statement here may be in order)* Although Mr. Y is on a path to earn a promotion, the committee believes he needs more time to earn the promotion and to demonstrate the criteria needed for a promotion to Senior Researcher.

[List Peer Review Committee Names and their research faculty rank, with signature of at least the committee chair]

**Principal Researcher Template**

[DATE]

Memorandum

To: [Unit Name Dir, Title]

From: [Peer Review Chair Name], [Unit Name] Peer Review Committee Chair

Subject: Recommendation for [Candidate Name] to Principal Researcher

[introductory sentence that describes the overall committee opinion of the candidate’s progress and a second sentence that describes the 5 categories of performance]:

The [lab]Peer Review Promotion Committee met on [meeting date] and deemed Mr. Z as having demonstrated an overall outstanding level of achievement, managerial leadership, and entrepreneurial productivity commensurate with the highest standards of the Georgia Institute of Technology. As such, he was regarded as having **[outstanding | acceptable]** performance in (a) Excellent original and innovative contributions, **[outstanding | acceptable]** in (b) Leadership in development and management of significant technical thrusts, **[outstanding | acceptable]** in (c) substantial contributions to Georgia Tech, and **[outstanding | acceptable]** in (d) Broad recognition of technical stature; the 4 categories for promotion to Principal Researcher.

[Provide an assessment of the external evaluator letters.]

***Excellent original and innovative contributions supported by external peer review****:* Provide a statement of how the candidate has demonstrated the criteria. Include an evaluation of the external letters of reference. Examples of letter evaluation:]

*Example 1*: Mr. LastName’s external letters include endorsements from current sponsors, U.S. Air Force General Officers, and members of the Senior Executive Service (SES). They each provide unique insight into Mr. LastName’s contributions and expertise while praising his performance at GTRI as one of the foremost experts in the U.S. on mobility operations.

*Example 2*: Mr. Burdell’s external letters are solid, high-level, and direct. They enthusiastically endorse the quality and excellence of his work, effusively cite its impact, call out his technical leadership, and substantiate how highly it is regarded by the community.

*Example 3:* Mr. Z’s external letters of reference endorse the quality and excellence of his work, clearly indicate the breadth of his expertise, and enthusiastically praise the impact of his work within the Department of Defense.

*Example 4*: The candidate’s letters of reference were exemplary from highly qualified researchers and leaders with knowledge and authority in the field.  The body of work documented in his vita substantiates these letters.

[State explicitly how the candidate has demonstrated the 4 promotion criteria. Also state why this candidate is unique and any gaps they fill as the lab’s SME. If there are concerns expressed by any or all of the committee for any of the criteria, please do explain.]

***Leadership in development and management:*** statement how the candidate has demonstrated the criteria.

***Substantial contributions through service to the Institute, State, Nation, or profession*.** statement how the candidate has demonstrated the criteria.

***Broad recognition of technical stature on national level*.** statement how the candidate has demonstrated the criteria.

**[No votes]** If there are no votes for this candidate, please explain the concerns expressed by a few or all of the committee. The same way the memo identifies strengths for the candidate, if there are concerns that keep the committee from voting “yes”, these need to be explained.

**[Exception]** if the candidate is an exception, explain the exception and if the committee members accept the exception.

[record the vote and summarize the endorsement]

The committee (yes-no-abstain) gives [Candidate name] its endorsement for [Recommended Rank].

*Example 1*: The committee unanimously (7-0-0) gives Mr. Z its strongest endorsement for Principal Research Engineer.

*Example 2*: The committee (7-0-0) gives Mr. Z its endorsement for Principal Research Engineer.

*Example 3*: The majority of the committee (8-3-0) supports a recommendation for Mr. Z to be promoted to Principal Research Engineer.

*Example 4*: For reasons detailed earlier, the committee (2-5-0) does not support a promotion for Mr. Z at this time. *(concerns will have been detailed earlier in the letter, but a statement here may be in order)* Mr. Z is a valuable member of (unit) and on a path to earn a promotion, but the committee believes he needs more time to earn the promotion and to demonstrate the criteria needed for a promotion to Principal Researcher.

[List Peer Review Committee Names and their research faculty rank, with signature of at least the committee chair]