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Scope

This document specifies procedures for the following reviews for tenure-track and tenured faculty members who have a paid iSchool\(^1\) appointment:

1) Annual progress reviews for tenure-track Assistant Professors and for Associate Professors without tenure.
2) Pre-tenure contract renewal review for Assistant Professors.
3) Review for appointment at or promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, or for the award of tenure to untenured Associate Professors.
4) Review for appointment at or promotion to Professor.

For faculty appointed in the iSchool on a paid partial appointment who have their tenure home in another unit, the iSchool’s report will be prepared as described in this document, but it will be advisory to the tenure home unit and timelines will be adjusted to meet the schedule requirements of that unit’s process. For promotion and tenure reviews that require letters from external reviewers, the letters obtained by the faculty member’s tenure home will be used.

Procedures for initial appointment as an Assistant Professor are not addressed by this document. Procedures for merit pay reviews, for periodic and comprehensive review of tenured faculty, and for the iSchool’s faculty mentoring program are found in separate documents.

Criteria for all reviews, including the reviews for which procedures are specified in this document, can be found in the iSchool Criteria for Review, Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty, a separate document.

Policies

The University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure is the controlling document for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure cases. Links to this and all other documents referenced in this document can be found on the iSchool intranet.

The iSchool Plan of Organization is the controlling document for the iSchool Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT). The iSchool APT committee is responsible for the annual faculty progress reviews, faculty appointments, faculty promotions, and for the award of tenure to faculty. Two unusual characteristics of the iSchool APT committee should be borne in mind when reading this document. First, the APT committee elects other committees as described below; although these are in essence subcommittees of the APT committee, they are

\(^1\) Throughout this document, iSchool refers to the College of Information Studies, University of Maryland, College Park.
referred to as committees to conform with the terminology used in the University’s APT manual. Second, only iSchool faculty members at or above the rank to which an appointment, promotion, or the award of tenure is being considered are members of the APT committee for the discussion and vote on that case. In other words, the membership of the iSchool APT committee adjusts automatically (as described in the Plan of Organization) to be appropriate for the matter at hand. The same provision extends to the election by the APT committee of record preparation committees, report drafting committees, and annual review committees – in such elections, faculty present for the discussion and vote on the committee’s membership are limited to those who will be eligible to vote on the results of the committee’s work.

All eligible faculty members, as specified in the Plan of Organization, are expected to participate in the APT committee, and to stand for election to committees elected by the APT committee, unless they are on sabbatical, on authorized leave from the iSchool, or subject to a conflict of interest. Unconflicted faculty members who are on sabbatical or authorized absences from the iSchool for a semester or longer may, at their option, participate in APT committee activities. In such cases, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform the chair of the APT committee of their intention before a meeting on the matter in which they wish to participate is scheduled.

Conflicts of interest that arise from close personal relationships (e.g., marriage), unusually close financial relationships (e.g., business partners), or a supervisory relationship in another unit of the University are recognized by the university in a diverse set of policies (e.g., those relating to faculty appointments and those relating to faculty participation in outside employment). Ordinary professional and personal interactions (e.g., co-authoring, personal friendship, or professional disagreements) do not normally create a conflict of interest for the purposes of faculty review, appointment, promotion, or tenure. Except as noted below (in the case of the annual progress review committee), it is the responsibility of the iSchool APT committee chair to inform the APT committee of the existence (but not necessarily the nature) of a conflict of interest that makes a specific faculty member ineligible to participate in a specific matter. If a known conflict of interest makes the APT chair ineligible to participate in a specific matter, the Dean will inform the APT committee of that fact and the APT committee will elect an acting chair for that matter. Faculty members who believe that they may have a conflict of interest in a specific matter should consult with the chair of the APT committee (or, in the case of the chair, with the Dean) before the APT committee meets to consider the matter.

**Annual Progress Reviews**

The iSchool conducts a progress review for each Assistant Professor and for each Associate Professor without tenure at least once during each academic year prior to the year in which they submit an application for promotion or tenure. Lecturers hired with a contractual provision for automatic appointment to Assistant Professor upon earning a doctorate are reviewed on the same basis as Assistant Professors.

**Timing:** The review is normally scheduled in the second half of the Spring semester. Faculty who receive their appointment in a Spring semester will normally receive their first review in their third semester, other faculty will normally receive their first review in their second semester.
Materials: The faculty member being reviewed will provide a c.v. in the University’s required format (see additional guidance below), a research statement (see guidance below), and a teaching statement (see guidance below). For the final annual review before consideration for tenure, the faculty member being reviewed will be asked for a full tenure package (see below, but omit the names of external reviewers). The same due date (normally the second Friday in March) will be used for all faculty being reviewed during a given academic year.

Annual Review Committee: The APT committee will annually elect a single Annual Review Committee for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (henceforth, the “review committee”) that will prepare annual reviews and contract renewal reviews for untenured tenure-track faculty.

- The review committee will consist of two Professors and two tenured Associate Professors, plus (if not already a member) the faculty mentor assigned to the faculty member being reviewed (serving ex officio, with voice and vote), plus the dean (serving ex officio with voice but no vote). The committee’s term begins on the first day of the Fall semester (August 22 under present policy), and faculty members who have been notified that they will be promoted to Associate Professor with Tenure by that date may serve as members. The committee shall elect a chair from among its members (other than ex officio members) at its first meeting.

- To foster continuity, one member of the committee should continue from one year to the next. To foster a diversity of perspectives, other members of the committee should be rotated (to the extent possible). To foster broad engagement, membership on the review committee should be rotated so that (to the extent possible) each eligible faculty member will have the opportunity to review each junior faculty member before their tenure case is presented. A faculty member who serves in a mentoring role in a jointly appointed faculty member’s other unit(s) and who is not otherwise appointed as a voting member of the committee may participate with voice, but no vote. Any nonmember in the rank of Associate Professor or Professor who holds a paid iSchool appointment may silently attend. The review committee may, at its option, invite nonmembers to speak, but they will have no vote.

- No faculty member may attend or participate in the preparation of a review for which they have a conflict of interest, as determined by the Chair; conflicts of interest for the chair will be determined by the Dean. Conflicted review committee members will not be replaced unless fewer than three faculty members without conflicts remain, in which case the Chair may appoint replacements to reach the minimum of three members.

- The review committee will normally operate by consensus, but in the event of disagreement on the content of the review report to be forwarded to the faculty or on how the faculty comments should be incorporated in the final report, a simple majority will suffice. When operating other than by consensus, voting shall be by secret ballot.

Process: The review committee will meet to assess the progress of each faculty member. The faculty mentor will normally serve as recording secretary to draft the written report, which will normally be about two pages. The review shall consider research, teaching, and service, together with introductory and concluding comments. The draft report will be made available for editing by all members of the review committee, and then finalized by the Chair (unless the Chair is the faculty mentor, in which case the committee will designate an alternate faculty member to finalize the report). This finalized draft report will then be made available for comment by the Dean and all tenured members of the APT committee (except those with a conflict of interest) for a period of at least one week. If comments are received, the Chair will share the comments with
members of the review committee along with any changes made by the chair to the draft report in response to those comments, and the members of the review committee will be asked to approve (or further revise) the report. Upon approval, the report will be forwarded to the Dean, and the Dean will then meet with the faculty member to discuss the report.

Pre-Tenure Contract Renewal

**Timing:** Contract renewals for tenure-track faculty will be scheduled in accordance with each faculty member’s contract, normally once at the completion of the third year after starting the tenure clock. In years in which a contract renewal is scheduled, that review will also serve as the annual progress review, and it will normally be conducted on the same schedule as annual reviews for that year.

**Materials:** Same as for the annual progress review.

**Report Drafting Committee:** The review committee (the committee that prepares annual progress reviews for tenure-track faculty) will act as a report drafting committee, preparing a draft report for consideration by the APT Committee.

**Process:** The pre-tenure contract renewals are conducted in lieu of the annual progress review for any year in which a pre-tenure contract renewal is due. The same process will be followed as for an annual progress review up through preparation of the report by the review committee. The review committee shall vote by secret ballot on the content of the draft report before forwarding the draft report to the APT committee, and the results of that vote shall be reported to the APT committee. The case will then be discussed at a meeting of the APT Committee, and a vote by secret ballot will be conducted by the APT. The report will be revised to include the results of the APT committee vote and to make any other changes that the APT may direct. It will then be forwarded to the Dean, who will make the final decision on contract renewal.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure, or Award of Tenure to an Untenured Associate Professor

**Timing:** Review for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure normally occurs during the Fall semester of the sixth full year after appointment as an Assistant Professor, although there are provisions for earlier or later reviews in specific cases. Review for the award of tenure to untenured Associate Professors will occur at the time specified in their contract. When the review will be in the Fall semester, preparation of the case normally begins in May and the faculty vote is normally scheduled to occur in early December.

**Materials:** Faculty members are required to submit a personal statement (see guidance below), a c.v. in the University’s required format (see additional guidance below), a representative selection of publications (see guidance below), a teaching portfolio (see guidance below), University teaching evaluation summaries for any courses taught in academic units other than the iSchool since the previous promotion, citation statistics for published work (see below), and (in a sealed envelope or as an encrypted email attachment) eight or more recommended external reviewers (see guidance below). The final list of recommended external reviewers and drafts of
all other materials should normally be submitted on May 1; final materials other than citation statistics and the teaching portfolio should normally be submitted on August 1; the final teaching portfolio and citation statistics should normally be submitted on October 1. It is important that the draft materials submitted on May 1 be in nearly final form, lacking only comments and updates, because schedules will preclude extensive review and comment on subsequent versions. Additionally, iSchool staff will prepare the required teaching evaluation summaries (both the per-section teaching evaluation summaries that include student comments for review by the committee and the statistical summary required by the University APT) by August 1.

Record Preparation Committee: The APT Committee will elect one Record Preparation Committee (RPC) for each promotion or tenure case. The RPC will consist of an elected chair and two other elected members, all of who must be elected from faculty who are (at the time of the election) eligible to vote on the case. The candidate for promotion or tenure shall be given the opportunity to suggest to the APT a faculty member to chair their RPC. The Dean serves ex officio on the RPC with voice but no vote. To facilitate timely requests for letters from external reviewers, the RPC for a promotion or tenure case that will be voted on in the Fall semester should be elected no later than the date of the last regular iSchool Assembly of preceding Spring semester. The time and location of each meeting of the RPC should be announced in advance to all faculty members who will (at the time of the vote) be eligible to vote on the case. A faculty member who serves in a mentoring role in a jointly appointed faculty member’s other unit(s) may participate with voice, but no vote. Any member of the APT who will (at the expected time of the vote) be eligible to vote on the case may silently attend. The review committee may, at its option, invite nonmembers to speak, but they will have no vote. The RPC will normally operate by consensus, but in the event of disagreement a simple majority will suffice. When operating other than by consensus on any matter (e.g., the selection of external reviewers, the choice of materials to send to external reviewers, or the content of any document), voting shall be by secret ballot, and the vote results shall be reported to the APT.

Process: The normal process is:

- The RPC will normally first meet in mid-May to provide feedback on the draft materials, to select the external reviewers, and to make tentative selections of the representative publications to be sent to external reviewers. The chair will then obtain advance commitments from a sufficient number of external reviewers (normally three from the candidate’s list and three others chosen by the RPC).
- The RPC will then normally confer again by email or teleconference in early August to review the final materials and to make the final selection of representative publications to be sent to external reviewers. Review packages will normally be sent in mid-August, with a requested response date of October 1.
- The chair will draft the Summary Statement of Professional Accomplishments (see guidance below) and will submit that statement to the faculty member being reviewed by mid-September in order to provide to provide at least two weeks for comments and, if the faculty member desires, filing a written response.
- The review committee will then normally meet in October to review the letters from external reviewers and the teaching portfolio and to discuss the contents of the evaluative report. The chair will then draft an evaluative report, and the committee will then meet again no later than mid-November to review and approve that report.

2 The University APT manual refers to the Record Preparation Committee as the “Advisory Committee.”
The entire tenure package will then be forwarded to the APT committee, which will meet to discuss and vote on the tenure case, normally in the first week of December.

The report will then be revised by the chair of the RPC to report the outcome of the vote and to make whatever other changes the APT may direct.

The report will then be sent to the Dean, who will prepare an independent report. Subsequent handling of the case will then proceed as specified in the University’s APT manual.

Promotion to Professor

**Timing:** Consideration for promotion to Professor occurs in response to a request from the faculty member. Faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion to Professor are expected to inform the Dean by mid-December of the year prior to the academic year in which they wish to be considered. The review process then proceeds on the same timeline as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

**Materials:** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

**Process:** Same as for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

Guidance on Specific Documents

The following guidance applies to documents submitted by current iSchool faculty members. Documents may be submitted in hardcopy or digital form. When documents are required to be signed, a physical signature on the first page of the document is required, so at least one page will need to be printed in such cases. Applicants for an initial appointment are specifically allowed by the University to submit their c.v. in some alternative format that provides similar information, and the iSchool will make similar accommodations for other documents by applicants for initial appointment. However, the requirement that the specified content be substantively addressed, regardless of format, remains. In the rare cases in which jointly appointed faculty have incompatible format requirements levied by units in which they hold appointments, they should strive to include the content required by each unit and they should make format decisions in any reasonable and consistent way.

**Curriculum Vitae (c.v.) [always required]:** The University APT guidelines provide detailed guidance on the preparation of a c.v. in the format specified in the University APT manual. The following additional notes can serve as a useful reference when interpreting the university guidelines:

- The university requires that the c.v. must begin with the statement “I have read the following and certify that this curriculum vitae is a current and accurate statement of my professional record.” and that it be signed and dated.
- Subsection headers for subsections with no entries can be omitted, but to facilitate cross-referencing with the University’s required format subsection numbers should not be resequenced.
- Subsections can be further divided when doing so results in added clarity. For example, invited talks could be divided into keynote (and similar) addresses and other invited talks,
and refereed conference presentations could be divided into presentations with full papers, presentations with short papers, and presentations without papers; presentations with full papers could be further subdivided into presentations with full papers in highly selective conferences, presentations with full papers in other conferences, and presentations with full papers in workshops. Because the goal is to communicate clearly, this is an information design problem, the results of which will vary between faculty members working in communities with different expectations.

- Subsections can contain brief initial text that assists with interpretation of information in that subsection, either at the start of the subsection or as a footnote on the title of the subsection. Some specific items (e.g., courses) may also include brief explanatory text, but in general the c.v. is a listing rather than a narrative and extensive or frequent use of explanatory text should be avoided.
- Items in each subsection should be listed in reverse chronological order (most recent first) and numbered for easy reference.
- The asterisk that is required (by the university) to designate which names in a list of authors were students should be used only to indicate students for whom the faculty member had some guidance or supervisory role. For readability, the asterisk should immediately precede (rather than follow) that student’s name.
- Acceptance rates for conferences and 5-year Journal Citation Report impact factors for journals can be provided where it is appropriate to do so. In general, reporting impact factors is always appropriate; reporting acceptance rates for conference is generally appropriate for highly selective conferences.
- The university requires that page numbers be shown for all publications. If no page numbers are available, the number of pages should be shown. For non-paginated publications, the number of words should be shown.
- Items should be formatted consistently.
- The university requires only that five years of teaching be shown; more may optionally be listed, should the faculty member wish to do so.

**Research Statement [required only for pre-tenure reviews]:** A research statement is required only for annual reviews and contract renewals. The goal of the statement is to convey your current thinking on your research trajectory and your research accomplishments. Writing a good research statement is hard because the readers will have markedly different backgrounds; it is important for the same reason. One way of getting started is to outline what you are seeking to accomplish, how you are going about it, why you have chosen that approach, what you have accomplished to date, and what your planned next steps are. Then re-render that outline as a narrative, put it aside, and come back to it later with fresh eyes and read it closely for intelligibility and conciseness. Once you have done so, read a few other research statements, and then try rewriting yours one more time. Then ask your mentor and a few other faculty members to review it. Allow several weeks for this process. Because we do not also request a service statement, you may elect to mention your service activities where they relate to your research, but service should not be a substantial focus in this statement. The research statement is limited to 4 pages with margins and a font size that makes the document easy to read, and it may include illustrations or tables. References should be by number to items in your c.v. The research statement must be signed and dated.

**Teaching Statement [required only for pre-tenure reviews]:** A teaching statement is required only for annual reviews and contract renewals. The goal of the statement is to convey your
approach to teaching, the contributions to teaching that you have made to date, and your current plans for future teaching contributions. One way of getting started is to reflect on and then describe your teaching philosophy, then to reflect on and then describe the way you are drawing on that philosophy to craft educational experiences for our students. Continuous improvement is an important part of how master educators learn their craft, so it would then be useful to reflect on how you gain insight into the effects of your choices and how you integrate that understanding into your future thinking. As you do this, it is useful to bear in mind the many parts of our educational activities, including curriculum design, course preparation, classroom teaching, assessment, advising, mentoring, and other activities outside of class. Finally, you should attach this to the specifics of courses you have developed and offered, those you plan to offer in the future, and other specific contributions to teaching. As with the research statement, the teaching statement can benefit from iterative refinement and review by colleagues. The teaching statement is limited to 3 pages with margins and a font size that makes the document easy to read, and it may include illustrations or tables. It must be signed and dated.

**Personal Statement [required for all promotion or tenure cases]**: The personal statement is the counterpart to the research statement from earlier reviews. The university places no restrictions on the contents of a personal statement, but it is intended that the research statement will serve as a good starting point for its content. The personal statement is one of five things received by external reviewers in a promotion or tenure case (the other four are the c.v., three representative publications, a letter containing specific questions, and the iSchool’s promotion and tenure criteria), so it should be written in a way that will help to explain to those external reviewers how you see your own promotion or tenure case. As with the research statement, it is useful (for conciseness) to cite references using numbers from your c.v. The personal statement is limited to 4 pages, and it may include illustrations or tables. It must be signed and dated.

**Teaching Portfolio [required for promotion or tenure cases]**: A teaching portfolio is required only for promotion or tenure cases. Candidates may wish to include any of the following components in their teaching portfolio:
- An introduction,
- Syllabus, including both course procedures and a list of topics,
- Examples of assessment instruments (assignments, examinations, projects, grading rubrics),
- Reading lists (or similar lists of materials to be used outside of class),
- Examples of materials used in class (e.g., notes or slides),
- Communications received from students commenting on the impact of your teaching, mentoring, and advising.

It is recommended that you include the materials that will best illustrate and explain your teaching, so selectivity is important. The teaching portfolio is not sent to external reviewers, so you can gain some measure of conciseness by writing specifically for a University of Maryland audience. The teaching portfolio must be signed and dated.

**Recommended Representative Publications [required for contract renewal reviews and for promotion or tenure cases]**: For promotion or tenure cases, the review committee will select three representative publications in consultation with the faculty member to send to external reviewers. This selection will be based on recommendations received from you, so you should recommend three plus a few alternatives that you feel are worth considering. The nature of the selected publications will vary somewhat from one discipline to another, but in general we will
select at least one journal article when it makes sense for us to do so and no more than one book, we will select only publications in which you were the primary faculty author, and (except for contract renewal) we will not consider work that is presently under review. Within those constraints, we will seek to select a set of publications that spans the most important aspects of your work, we will normally select publications that appeared in highly regarded venues, and we will seek to avoid redundancy of method or focus within the set. You should consult with the faculty member leading the review of your case on your initial selections, and you should suggest three publications and at least two alternates.

**Recommended External Reviewers [required only for promotion or tenure cases]:** For promotion or tenure cases, candidates are asked to suggest the names of external reviewers. The University’s APT Guidelines includes the following statements:

- “External letters of evaluation should be solicited from reviewers suggested by the candidate and from reviewers suggested by the Department.”
  - “The Department APT Review Committee Is Responsible For … Requesting at least six external evaluations (with at least three names selected from the candidate’s list) …”
- “Candidates should be informed of the University’s perspective on appropriate evaluators and the right of the Department to select from the candidate’s nominations those evaluators that the APT Review Committee deems appropriate.”
  - “Evaluators should ordinarily hold the rank of Professor or its equivalent.”
  - “Because evaluators are asked whether the candidate would be promoted at their institutions, the prestige of the evaluators’ institutional affiliations and their accomplishments should be taken into account in selecting them.”
  - “An evaluator who is the candidate’s dissertation advisor, former teacher, co-author, or student should be avoided.”
- “Candidates should also be informed about University rules of confidentiality.”
  - “Candidates may not contact evaluators to determine their willingness to provide information, or to enquire about the contents of the evaluation.”

The review committee normally requests six letters, with exactly three selected from reviewers suggested by the candidate and exactly three from reviews chosen independently by the review committee before receiving suggestions from the candidate. It is not uncommon for the committee and the candidate to suggest some of the same names. We therefore require that the suggested external reviewers be submitted by the candidate in a sealed envelope (or some electronic equivalent) so that the review committee can first select reviewers independently and then select additional reviewers who were suggested by the candidate. In order to preserve the independence of the review committee’s selections, the candidate may not discuss their recommendations with any member of the review committee other than his or her mentor. A member of the faculty with whom the candidate has discussed their recommendations may not participate in the committee’s initial independent selection of reviewers. Candidates may not contact potential reviewers to ascertain their willingness to serve as a reviewer. The following additional guidance is provided:

- For promotions to Associate Professor with tenure, the committee will normally request almost all of the letters from full Professors in the USA, typically with at most one letter requested from a full Professor in Canada. For promotions to Professor, it is not uncommon for the committee to select one full Professor from outside North America as an external reviewer.
• Emeritus faculty are not normally selected as reviewers, and therefore should not normally be suggested.
• The RPC will not normally select two external reviewers from the same institution, and the RPC might choose not to select any external reviewers from outside the USA. Therefore, to ensure that the RPC has a sufficient range of choice, the list of potential reviewers submitted must include a minimum of eight qualified external reviewers, each from different institutions, all within the USA.
• Candidates are welcome to additionally suggest external reviewers from elsewhere in the world, to suggest more than one external reviewer from the same institution, or to go beyond the criteria suggested above in any other way that they feel is appropriate. In all such cases, such additional suggestions must be in addition to the eight qualified external reviewers that meet the criteria specified above.
• The review committee will often seek to select at least one iSchool Dean, or some similarly qualified individual, so it is useful to consider that qualification when suggesting external reviewers.
• For each suggested reviewer, contact information and a brief justification for their selection should be provided.

Summary Statement of Professional Accomplishments [required only for promotion or tenure cases]: The Summary Statement is prepared by the RPC with input from the candidate. The Summary Statement is allowed to contain only objective facts. Any suitable information that is provided by the candidate, including information not specifically requested below, will be given full consideration, but the final content of the Summary Statement is decided by the RPC. The candidate will be invited to comment on a draft of the summary statement, and the RPC may elect to make changes based on comments on that draft that are received from the candidate. The candidate must then sign and date the Summary Statement, indicating that they are aware of its contents, and they may elect to file a written response if there are aspects of the Summary Statement with which they disagree. The University’s APT manual specifically requires that citation counts for published papers be included somewhere in each APT package. Colleges are allowed to place that information in the Summary Statement, and the iSchool routinely does so. Candidates are asked to provide a feeder report containing the following input as spreadsheet tables:

• For every publication, citation counts in Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science or other indications of quality as appropriate. For each publication, show the authors, title, venue, year, and citation counts as separate columns. Candidates with a very large number of publications may elect to omit publications with citation counts below some reasonable cutoff (e.g., 10). As with all information requested from candidates, the decision on which citation statistics to actually present in the Summary Statement rests with the RPC.
• For the candidate and a representative set of active scholars at peer institutions who conduct research on similar topics, their h-index using Google Scholar citation counts. For each scholar show their name, current institution, year Ph.D. earned, and h-index. The purpose of this data is to provide representative points of comparison; it is often not necessary to be exhaustive, but the selection criteria should be specified. For example, in many cases it would suffice to select only tenured or tenure-track faculty at peer institutions in the USA. We understand that presenting h-index comparisons is not appropriate in every case, but we can not make decisions on specific cases without access to the data. As with all information requested from candidates, the decision on whether
$h$-index statistics should appear in the Summary Statement, and if so in what form, rests with the RPC.

- Additional information that the candidate believes to be useful (e.g., objective measures of journal reputation) may also be provided, at the candidate’s option.

The date on which each set of statistics was collected should also be indicated. Journal impact factors and conference acceptance rates will be obtained from the c.v. and verified by the RPC, so that information need not be provided again.