

May 2020

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF A DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION OR APPOINTMENT TO ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR¹

The Executive Committee of the Division of Natural Sciences does not regard the promotion to full professor as an automatic step in a faculty member's career. Significant and new accomplishments over and above those needed to become associate professor are required for promotion to full professor. The committee is not trying to establish uniform criteria for promotion. The relative importance of the contributions in different areas may vary from person to person, and greater strength in one area may compensate for lesser strength in another. The candidate should have demonstrated national and/or international standing in his/her field. Evidence for such may include but it is not limited to serving on the editorial boards of major journals, chairing international conferences, giving invited talks, or being recognized by external reviewers for the candidate's international standing in scholarly work, education, or service.

A subcommittee comprising the full professors of the Executive Committee will consider the qualifications of a candidate for promotion to or tenure as full professor with reference to the following:

I. Research achievements.

The Subcommittee regards evidence based upon scholarship and expertise in research as the foremost criterion for promotion to full professor, provided that the individual's teaching career has been progressive and successful.

Refereed publications, together with funding from government agencies, industry and/or foundations provide prima facie evidence of the candidate's research accomplishments.

The candidate is expected to have achieved a high level of scholarship, expertise and stature in his/her field as evident from a consistent record of refereed research publications, particularly of primary research, and successful research funding. We ask the candidate's department to seek out letters from impartial expert scientists who can evaluate the individual in question. (For details, see VII.A)

2. Educational achievements.

High quality teaching is expected of all faculty members. Teaching effectiveness must be documented in any case for promotion. In exceptional cases, the Subcommittee will consider a distinguished record in education (not solely teaching) as a possible area of achievement warranting promotion to full professor, providing that the individual's scholarship (as demonstrated by refereed publications, books, successful grantsmanship and other signs of recognition such as national and/or international awards) has been active and of high quality.

3. Service to the candidate's department, college, university, profession, and professionally related service to the community.

¹ It is suggested that departmental criteria for promotion adhere as closely as possible to these criteria.

The Subcommittee regards evidence of service as a contributing area that enhances the value of the individual to the University, but in itself does not warrant promotion to full professor.

The following format is designed to organize effectively the information about a candidate and to bring out the strengths of his/her abilities, interests, and performance. It outlines ways in which such claims should be identified and documented. Any other relevant information may be included whether or not it is specifically mentioned.

May 2020

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES

FORMAT FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION OR APPOINTMENT TO FULL PROFESSOR

Departments must prepare files for promotion or appointment to professor or for granting tenure as full professor (i.e., new appointments) in accordance with the outline provided on the following pages. The committee strongly urges the department to refer to the checklist to ensure that the file conforms to the content and organization requirements. The committee will return incomplete files that do not follow the provided outline. Completed files should be sent to the appropriate dean, and not directly to the Divisional Executive Committee. After examination by the dean, the dean transmits the file to the Divisional Executive Committee.

The Divisional Executive Committee now asks for fully electronic submissions. The electronic version must be transmitted via a flash drive, OneDrive or SharePoint link. *(Please note that the entire path, including the file and folder names, must contain fewer than 200 characters.)* The department must submit to dean:

(1) A primary file consisting of: index; letter from chairperson of the executive committee; department and school/college criteria for promotion; a statement from the candidate electing an open or closed meeting of the Divisional Executive Committee; biographical data; research, educational and service achievements; and a statement on the effect of the candidate's promotion on the overall departmental balance.

(2) An appendix consisting of: letters of evaluation; a list of the reviewers that includes the reviewers' status in their field or a summary of expertise and how each reviewer was selected (indicate which reviewers were suggested by the candidate); and supporting documents (publications, manuscripts, teaching portfolios, and recent grant applications).

REQUIRED ORGANIZATION FOR FILES OF PROMOTION AND APPOINTMENT:

I. LETTER FROM CHAIRPERSON

A letter from the chairperson of the department, or another designated representative, should present the recommendation for promotion. The letter should tie the recommendation together and include subjective judgments as well as facts. In quoting from reviewers' letters, reviewers must not be identified by name. The vote on the recommendation should be stated precisely in this letter. The candidate's accomplishments should be discussed in the context of the department's criteria. The letter should certify that responsibility for obtaining material for items V.B.3. and VII.A were assigned to a person other than the candidate.

II. STATEMENT OF DEPARTMENT'S CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

III. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

- A. Name of candidate.
- B. Education (include university, degrees obtained, thesis titles, major professors, dates, and the area of specialty, also include data on postdoctoral appointments and fellowships).
- C. Positions held (list chronologically without gaps).
- D. Special honors and awards.

IV. RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENT Accomplishments since promotion to associate professor must be clearly separated from work prior to that time.

A. Publications.

Publications must be listed with complete reference information in the categories indicated below. Include all names of authors in the order in which they appear. In the case of multiple authorships, the candidate should clearly and succinctly explain the specific contribution of authors (e.g. using a system such as that employed by journals in their field, see McNutt et al. Transparency in authors' contributions and responsibilities to promote integrity in scientific publication. PNAS. <http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1715374115>) and identify students and postdoctoral researchers from their own research group for their relevant publications. List the number of the first page and of the last page of the paper. If papers are submitted or accepted for publication, copies of the letters of receipt or acceptance must be provided. Manuscripts in preparation should not be listed. Note that papers of a principally pedagogical nature must be listed in section V.C.I. Citation of publication and research results and measures of productivity or quality (e.g., H-Index, and Journal Impact Factors) must be included.

1. Books and monographs.
2. Scholarly publications in refereed journals. The department must provide an evaluation of the listed journals.
3. Conference proceedings and abstracts.
4. Patents.
5. Non-refereed publications, including major house reports, etc.
6. Papers presented at professional meetings. (Point out special presentations: invited papers, keynote speeches, etc.) In some instances, these lists may be so lengthy that a strong case can be made by including only those items dating from promotion to associate professor.
7. Invited lectures presented at universities, industry, etc.

Please include the most recent and important contributions (e.g. sample publications) of the candidate in the appendix

B. Research in progress.

1. A brief description of current projects and their status relative to publication.
2. A brief description of plans for future research not yet initiated and an estimate of when it might be started.

C. Grants, contracts and research awards.

List all research grants, contracts, and awards submitted or received. Provide pertinent details: complete list of grantees (underline name[s] of PI[s]), agency, total dollar amount to candidate, granting period, UWM grant number, proportion of award to candidate, etc. Note that grants or contracts for teaching and for service work should be listed in V.C.2 and VI.C.3, respectively.

1. External funds.
2. Internal funds.
3. Proposals currently pending.
4. Proposals submitted but not funded.

D. Special honors and awards.

- V. EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT Accomplishments since promotion to associate professor must be clearly separated from work prior to that time.

Provide evidence that the candidate is a competent teacher. The departmental recommendations should include an evaluation of the candidate's teaching interests and effectiveness. Scholarly achievements, initiative, imagination, and creativity should be specifically documented and evaluated in a manner similar to the evaluation of other scholarly achievements. The following format should be adhered to:

- A. Experience as a teacher.
1. All courses taught by candidate (listed by semester).
 2. Supervisory responsibility for courses taught by others.
 3. Responsibility for supervising teaching assistants and lecturers.
 4. Undergraduate and graduate research projects, theses and dissertations directed. List in chronological order all MS and PhD degrees obtained by students supervised by the candidate.
 5. Participation in teaching special institutes, programs and seminars.
 6. Statement of past and anticipated future contributions to the instructional programs of the department and the school or college.
- B. Evaluation of teaching.
1. Awards for excellence in teaching.
 2. Summary of teaching evaluations. The evaluations must be up-to-date and should be compared with evaluations of other departmental faculty members; keys explaining the individual evaluations must be provided; class sizes and number of respondents should be reported for every evaluation; a blank copy of the evaluation form and accompanying instructions must be supplied.
 3. Statements by students and colleagues regarding teaching effectiveness include peer evaluations).
 4. Participation in workshops, institutes, short courses, etc., relating to improvement of teaching.
- C. Creativity and scholarship in teaching.
1. Publications: textbooks, laboratory manuals, articles in journals oriented toward teaching.
 2. Grants related to teaching and curriculum development. Details must be provided including: complete list of grantees (underline name[s] of PI[s]), agency, total dollar amount to candidate, granting period, UWM grant numbers, proportion of award to candidate, etc.)
 3. Initiation of new courses, programs, curricula.
 4. Development of teaching aids and materials, innovation and use of experimental techniques (such as computer-assisted instruction).

- VI. SERVICE Accomplishments since promotion to associate professor must be clearly separated from work prior to that time.

- A. Significant committee service. List contributions to special programs: e.g. minority/disadvantaged programs. Include duties and approximate time expended.
1. Department.
 2. College.
 3. University.

- B. Administrative service.
 1. Department.
 2. College.
 3. University.

- C. Community service.
 1. Extension work; list courses taught, programs, etc.
 2. Outreach and community service (provide specifics, time involved, etc.)
 3. Grants and contracts for community service work. Provide full details: complete list of grantees (underline name[s] of PI[s]), agency, total dollar amount to candidate, granting period, UWM grant number, etc.
 4. Public lectures, press, radio, TV, and other media presentations.

- D. Professional.
 1. Editing of journals.
 2. Refereeing of journal articles, books, grant proposals, etc.
 3. Panel participation.
 4. Offices held in professional organizations.
 5. Participation in planning professional programs.

- E. Consulting activities: indicate company or organization for which consulting was done, approximate time involved, and whether paid or volunteer consultant.

VII. ASSESSMENT OF PROFESSIONAL STATURE

- A. Letters of evaluation.
 While the candidate may be asked to suggest names of reviewers, both the content and identity of the writers of evaluation letters are confidential and must not be revealed to the candidate, unless the reviewer waives confidentiality. Confidential letters of evaluation cannot be used if a candidate elects an open meeting. If an open meeting is elected and confidential letters have been obtained, waivers of confidentiality or non-confidential letters must be obtained before the file is reviewed by the Division of Natural Sciences Executive Committee.

If the candidate has provided names of reviewers, this must be reported. The appendix must include a list of each reviewer's status in his/her area of expertise, his/her relation to the candidate, and how s/he was selected (indicate which were suggested by the candidate). Emphasis should be placed upon obtaining letters that are likely to provide a full and accurate assessment.

Letters should be requested from individuals outside UWM who are in a position to provide an objective evaluation of the candidate's contributions in research, service, and teaching (if possible). Signed electronic files on official letterhead (pdf files) are required.

The committee requires a minimum of seven letters from well-established, senior reviewers, at least five of whom have no close working relationship with the candidate. The names of the latter group of reviewers must not be provided by the candidate. A copy of the departmental letter requesting the evaluations must be included in the appendix. The committee expects the reviewers' letters to contain the following information:

1. Reviewer's relation to candidate.
 2. Evaluation of quantity and quality of candidate's research.
 3. Candidate's standing in the subject and profession.
 4. Anticipated future contributions by the candidate to his/her area of research.
 5. Assessment of the candidate's record of research funding (numbers and magnitudes of grants) and probability of continued success compared to others in his/her field.
- B. Published reviews of candidate's books, monographs, or publications (e.g. Mathematical Reviews).
- C. Other evidence of professional stature.

VIII. RESUBMISSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION OR APPOINTMENT

In the case of resubmission of a recommendation for promotion, information added to the earlier documentation must be clearly marked as additions.

<i>Revised 10/81</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/92</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/03</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/14</i>
<i>Readopted 9/82</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/93</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/04</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/15</i>
<i>Revised 10/83</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 10/94</i>	<i>Editorially revised 7/05</i>	<i>Editorially revised 4/16</i>
<i>Revised 10/84</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 10/95</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/06</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/17</i>
<i>Revised 5/85</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/96</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/07</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/18</i>
<i>Revised 5/86</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 8/97</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/08</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/19</i>
<i>Revised 5/87</i>	<i>Editorially revised 4/98</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/09</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/20</i>
<i>Reaffirmed 5/88</i>	<i>Editorially revised 8/99</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/10</i>	
<i>Revised 5/89</i>	<i>Editorially revised 10/00</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/11</i>	
<i>Editorially revised 6/90</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 9/01</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/12</i>	
<i>Reaffirmed 5/91</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/02</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/13</i>	

May 2020

**The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES**

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF A DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION OR
APPOINTMENT TO TENURE AS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR¹

The Executive Committee of the Division of Natural Sciences will consider the qualifications of a candidate for a tenure appointment with reference to the following areas.

Research ability and accomplishments
and
Teaching ability, interest, and performance

An attempt will be made to consider past accomplishments and probable future contributions in these areas. No candidate will be considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure without evidence of continuous research scholarship and accomplishments, including refereed publications and efforts to raise funds. It is important that the claim of a candidate's strengths be documented and supported by specific evidence. The following format is an attempt to organize the information about a candidate to bring out the strengths of his/her abilities, interests, and performance. Any claims to superior performance must be identified and documented. Similarly, any relevant information should be included whether or not it is specifically mentioned in the outline.

In addition to teaching and research, service to the candidate's department, college, university, profession, and professionally related service to the community will be considered. However, the committee regards evidence of service as a contributing area that enhances the value of the individual to the university, but in itself does not warrant promotion to associate professor with tenure.

¹ It is suggested that departmental criteria for tenure and promotion adhere as closely as possible to these criteria.

May 2020

**The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES**

**FORMAT FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION OR APPOINTMENT TO TENURE
AS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

Departments must prepare files for promotion or appointment to associate professor or for granting tenure as associate professor (i.e., new appointments) in accordance with the outline provided on the following pages. The committee strongly urges the department to refer to the checklist to be sure that the file conforms to the content and organization requirements. The committee will return incomplete files that do not follow the provided outline. Completed files should be sent to the appropriate dean, and not directly to the Divisional Executive Committee. After examination by the dean, the dean transmits the file to the Divisional Executive Committee.

The Divisional Executive Committee now asks for fully electronic submissions. The electronic version must be transmitted via a flash drive, OneDrive or SharePoint link. *(Please note that the entire path, including the file name and folder names, must contain fewer than 200 characters.)* The department must submit to dean:

(1) A primary file consisting of: index; letter from the chairperson of the executive committee; department and school/college criteria for promotion; a statement from the candidate electing an open or closed meeting of the Divisional Executive Committee; biographical data; research, educational and service achievements; and a statement on the effect of the candidate's promotion on the overall departmental balance.

(2) An appendix consisting of: letters of evaluation; a list of the reviewers that includes the reviewers' status in their field or a summary of expertise and how each reviewer was selected (indicate which reviewers were suggested by the candidate); and supporting documents (publications, manuscripts, teaching portfolios, and recent grant applications).

REQUIRED ORGANIZATION FOR FILES OF PROMOTION AND APPOINTMENT:

I. **LETTER FROM CHAIRPERSON**

A letter from the chairperson of the department, or another designated representative, should present the recommendation for promotion. The letter should tie the recommendation together and include subjective judgments as well as facts. In quoting from reviewers' letters, reviewers must not be identified by name. The vote on the recommendation should be stated precisely in this letter. The candidate's accomplishments should be discussed in the context of the department's criteria. The letter should certify that responsibility for obtaining material for items V.B.3 and VII.A were assigned to a person other than the candidate. A statement from the chairperson of the department is required indicating the department's evaluation of the candidate's capabilities and standing in his/her field.

II. **STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT'S CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

III. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

- A. Name of candidate.
- B. Formal education (includes university, degrees obtained, thesis titles, major professors, dates, and the area of specialty; also include data on postdoctoral appointments and fellowships).
- C. Positions held (list chronologically without gaps).
- D. Special honors and awards.

IV. RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENT

- A. Publications.
Publications must be listed with complete reference information in the categories indicated below. Include all names of authors in the order in which they appear. In the case of multiple authorship, the candidate should clearly and succinctly explain the specific contribution of authors (e.g. using a system such as that employed by journals in their field, see McNutt et al. Transparency in authors' contributions and responsibilities to promote integrity in scientific publication. PNAS. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1715374115>) and identify students and postdoctoral researchers from their own research group for their relevant publications. List the number of the first page and of the last page of the paper. If papers are submitted or accepted for publication, copies of the letters of receipt or acceptance must be provided. Manuscripts in preparation should not be listed. Note that papers of a principally pedagogical nature must be listed in section V.C.1. Citation of publication and research results and measures of productivity or quality (e.g., H-Index, and Journal Impact Factors) must be included.
 - 1. Books and monographs.
 - 2. Scholarly publications in refereed journals. The department must provide an evaluation of the listed journals.
 - 3. Conference proceedings and abstracts.
 - 4. Patents.
 - 5. Non-refereed publications, including major house reports, etc.
 - 6. Papers presented at professional meetings (point out special presentations: invited papers, keynote speeches, etc.).
 - 7. Invited lectures presented at universities, industry, etc.

Please include the most recent and important contributions of the candidate (e.g. sample publications) in the appendix.

- B. Research in progress.
 - 1. A brief description of current research projects and their status relative to publication.
 - 2. A brief description of plans for future research not yet initiated and an estimate of when it may be started.
- C. Grants, contracts, and awards.
List all research grants, contracts, and awards received or submitted. Provide pertinent details: complete list of grantees (underline name[s] of PI[s]), agency, total dollar amount to candidate, granting period, UWM grant number, proportion of award to candidate, etc. Note that grants or contracts for teaching and for service work should be listed in V.C.2 and VI.C.3, respectively.

1. External funds.
2. Internal funds.
3. Proposals currently pending.
4. Proposals submitted but not funded.

D. Special honors and awards.

V. EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

Provide evidence that the candidate is a competent teacher. The departmental recommendations should include an evaluation of the candidate's teaching interests and effectiveness. Scholarly achievements, initiative, imagination, and creativity should be specifically documented and evaluated in a manner similar to the evaluation of other scholarly achievements. The following format should be adhered to:

- A. Experience as a teacher.
 1. All courses taught by candidate (listed by semester).
 2. Supervisory responsibility for courses taught by others.
 3. Responsibility for supervising teaching assistants and lecturers.
 4. Undergraduate and graduate research projects, theses and dissertations directed.
List in chronological order all MS and PhD degrees obtained by students supervised by the candidate.
 5. Participation in teaching special institutes, programs and seminars.
 6. Statement of past and anticipated future contributions to the instructional programs of the department and the school or college.

- B. Evaluation of teaching.
 1. Awards for excellence in teaching.
 2. Summary of teaching evaluations. The evaluations must be up-to-date and should be compared with evaluations of other departmental faculty members; keys explaining the individual evaluations must be provided; class sizes and the number of respondents should be reported for every evaluation; a blank copy of the evaluation form and accompanying instructions must be supplied.
 3. Statements by students and colleagues regarding teaching effectiveness include peer evaluations).
 4. Participation in workshops, institutes, short courses, etc., relating to improvement of teaching.

- C. Creativity and scholarship in teaching.
 1. Publications: textbooks, laboratory manuals, articles in journals oriented toward teaching.
 2. Grants for teaching. Details must be provided including: complete list of grantees (underline name[s] of PI[s]), agency, total dollar amount to candidate, granting period, UWM grant number, proportion of award to candidate, etc.
 3. Initiation of new courses, programs, curricula.
 4. Development of teaching aids and materials; innovation and use of experimental techniques (such as computer-assisted instruction).

VI. SERVICE

- A. Significant committee service. List contributions to special programs: e.g. Minority/disadvantaged programs. Include duties and approximate time expended.
 - 1. Department.
 - 2. College.
 - 3. University.
- B. Administrative service.
 - 1. Department.
 - 2. College.
 - 3. University.
- C. Community.
 - 1. Extension work; list courses taught, programs, etc.
 - 2. Outreach and community service (provide specifics, time involved, etc.)
 - 3. Grants and contracts for community service work. Provide full details: complete list of grantees (underline name[s] of PI[s]), agency, total dollar amount to candidate, granting period, UWM grant number, etc.
 - 4. Public lectures, press, radio, TV, and other media presentations.
- D. Professional.
 - 1. Editing and reviewing.
 - 2. Refereeing of journal articles, books, grant proposals, etc.
 - 3. Panel participation.
 - 4. Offices held in professional organizations (include duties and time expended).
 - 5. Participation in planning professional programs.
- E. Consulting activities: indicate company or organization for which consulting was done, approximate time involved, and whether paid or volunteer consultant.

VII. APPRAISAL OF CANDIDATE'S STANDING IN HIS/HER FIELD

- A. Letters of evaluation.

While the candidate may be asked to suggest names of reviewers, both the content and identity of the writers of evaluation letters are confidential and may not be revealed to the candidate, unless the reviewer waives confidentiality. Confidential letters of evaluation cannot be used if a candidate elects an open meeting. If an open meeting is elected and confidential letters have been obtained, waivers of confidentiality or non-confidential letters must be obtained before review by the Division of Natural Sciences Executive Committee will commence.

If the candidate has provided names of reviewers, this must be reported. The appendix must include a list of each reviewer's status in his/her area of expertise, his/her relation to the candidate, and how s/he was selected (indicate which were suggested by the candidate). Emphasis should be placed upon obtaining letters that are likely to provide a full and accurate assessment.

Letters should be requested from individuals outside UWM who are in a position to provide an objective evaluation of the candidate's contributions in research, service, and teaching (if possible). Signed electronic files on official letterhead (pdf files) are required.

The committee requires a minimum of seven letters from well-established, senior reviewers, at least five of whom have no close working relationship with the candidate. The names of the latter group of reviewers must not be provided by the candidate. A copy of the departmental letter requesting the evaluations must be included in the appendix. The committee expects the reviewers' letters to contain the following information:

1. Reviewer's relation to candidate.
 2. Evaluation of quantity and quality of candidate's research.
 3. Candidate's standing in the subject and profession.
 4. Anticipated future contributions by the candidate to his/her area of research.
 5. Assessment of the candidate's record of research funding (numbers and magnitudes of grants) and probability of continued success compared to others in his/her field.
- B. Published reviews of candidate's books, monographs, or publications (e.g. Mathematical Reviews).
- C. Other evidence of professional stature.

VIII. EFFECT OF THE APPOINTMENT ON OVERALL DEPARTMENTAL BALANCE

Comment on how the candidate fits into the department. Do not provide merely an innocuous statement such as "this candidate will increase the balance in the department." Rather, explain how the candidate (1) is needed; (2) relates to the department's directions and goals; (3) will develop new areas in the department; or (4) will strengthen established areas. Will the candidate's most important contributions to the department be in areas of research, classroom teaching or service? If the candidate obtained his/her terminal degree or minimum qualifications in the promoting department, comment by way of justification.

IX. URGENCY

If it is urgent that the Executive Committee act at its earliest opportunity, please indicate in a cover letter.

X. RESUBMISSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTION OR APPOINTMENT

In the case of a resubmission of a recommendation for promotion, all information added to the earlier documentation (normally one-year old) must be clearly marked as additions.

<i>September 1973</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/92</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/10</i>
<i>Readopted 9/74</i>	<i>Revised 11/93</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/11</i>
<i>Readopted 9/75</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 10/94, 10/95, 5/96, 8/97</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/12</i>
<i>Readopted 9/76</i>	<i>Editorially revised 4/98, 8/99, 10/00</i>	<i>Editorial by revised 5/13</i>
<i>Readopted 9/77</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 9/01</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/14</i>
<i>Revised 10/78, 10/79, 10/80, 10/81</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/02</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/15</i>
<i>Readopted 9/82</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/03</i>	<i>Editorially revised 4/16</i>
<i>Revised 10/83, 10/84, 5/85, 5/86, 5/87</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/04, 7/05, 5/06</i>	<i>Editorially revised 4/17</i>
<i>Revised 5/88, 5/89</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/07</i>	<i>Editorially revised 4/18</i>
<i>Readopted 5/90</i>	<i>Reaffirmed 5/08</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/19</i>
<i>Readopted 5/91</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/09</i>	<i>Editorially revised 5/20</i>