Critical Hire Justification Guidance

Communicate Effectively
1. Follow grammar and spelling standards.
2. Answer each question thoroughly and clearly, but also concisely. Sometimes more is just more and the business case for the role can get lost in lengthy narratives.
3. Spell out any acronyms the first time they are used.
4. Responses to the questions should contain a clear and persuasive narrative. Assume the preference is to not fill the role and you need to provide enough facts and data to overcome that preference.
5. Upload any additional information that helps paint the picture. Additional items might include job descriptions, budgets, or metrics supporting the criticality of the hire.

Detail how the Position Supports the Institute Strategic Plan
1. Explain how the position’s responsibilities support the Institute Strategic Plan.
2. Outline how the Institute Strategic Plan will be negatively impacted if the position is not filled.

Explain the Critical Need
1. Clearly articulate how the position directly impacts critical areas of student success, patient/life safety, or contractual requirements/regulatory compliance.
2. Explain how the critical area will be impacted if the role is not filled.
3. When compliance is cited as a reason for posting, clearly state what regulatory or external compliance requirement or auditable factor would be impacted.

Give the Appropriate Context
1. Since Georgia Tech reviewers may not be deeply familiar with the positions or business needs of your unit, it is important to:
   a. Provide context. Be sure that the narrative includes a brief description of your unit and the position.
   b. Explain the position in context of your team/unit. This is particularly important for units with multiple submittals in a short period to help reviewers understand how the different positions complement each other.
      i. Example: If requesting multiple of the same position, there needs to be an explanation as to why multiple positions are needed. What is the negative impact if only one is filled?
   c. Provide data. Wherever possible, objectively state the impact of a position through metrics or measures.
Position Review

1. When describing the last review, change or restructure of this role, you can share recent official and informal reviews of the position.
   a. When an opening is expected, the hiring manager should informally review the role to understand:
      (a) how the workload can be covered during a short gap; and
      (b) how they would like to focus this position in the future.
   b. Articulate essential points internal and GTHR reviews of the position to create a more complete picture for reviewers.

Alternatives

1. If a position has been vacant for over 12 months, explain the interim solution and why that is no longer sustainable, as well as the negative impact of not filling the position.
2. When addressing what alternatives have been considered, requestors should directly address whether they could support the workload in the short term through leveraging other resources (collaborative sharing with other units, etc.), managing workload among existing resources, or hiring temporary resources.
   a. In assessing temporary resources as an alternative, include feasibility, risks, and costs/benefits.
   b. Turnover, learning curves, expert knowledge, and other factors play into whether temporary resources are a viable alternative for the short-term (ex., six months).

Review the Following Examples

Strong Responses

1. Explaining compliance requirement for a sponsored research support role:
   The position plays an important role in compliance related to the research enterprise at Georgia Tech under the Federal requirements established in 2 CFR 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (commonly referred to as “Uniform Guidance”). Georgia Tech is audited to these standards by individual sponsors, Federal agencies, the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), and under the annual Federal Single Audit.

2. Additional information uploaded and referred to in a justification narrative:
   This position focuses heavily (70%-80%) on review and approval of purchasing transactions in the new Workday system. The role is critical in ensuring orders are placed, and that equipment, materials and services that support the academic, research student, and administrative missions are made in a timely way and in compliance with State DOAS purchasing regulations. Please see the attached job description for a full listing of the duties of this role.

3. Describing the impact of not filling role:
To not fill this vacant position in a timely manner has a significant negative impact on department personnel and creates financial risk to Georgia Tech. The result would include existing personnel assuming some of the workload; under the significant volume of research awards noted above there would be delayed establishment of sponsored contractual award initiations and modifications in Georgia Tech’s accounting system. Delays have a negative impact on the timely posting of allowable transactions which then results in delays in billing sponsors, leading to delays in payment receipts and potential non-payment. Delays throughout the sponsored award lifecycle could also lead to audit findings related to allowable costs, billing, and collections. Adequate staffing is paramount to meeting the financial compliance requirements expected when accepting Federal funding.

Response Recommendations

1. **Explain the impact of not filling the role:**
   Response: There will be a detrimental impact to other staff who have to take on additional workload.

   Suggestions:
   - This statement could be quantified in terms of the impact on specific workload or compliance requirements.
   - The impact of staff absorbing workload is important but may not be persuasively critical to reviewers.
   - Quantifying the amount of overtime or the workload/capacity challenges this creates, along with any compliance risks, would be helpful.

2. **Share when the position was last reviewed, changed or restructured:**
   Response: The position was last reviewed in 2005.

   Suggestions:
   - It may be more helpful to articulate how the opportunity created by turnover was used to rethink or reaffirm the need for and focus of the position.
   - Some level of context should be articulated beyond the date of the last HR review of the role.

3. **Describe what alternatives have been considered:**
   Response: There are no other alternatives.

   Suggestions:
   - You should include 2 or more alternatives that have been considered for the position and why they are not viable.