Below are some observations and recommendations from the 2022-2023 P&T Subcommittee about the cases we reviewed this year.

**Preparation of Cases**

The committee observed some carelessness in the preparation of dossiers and the presentation of cases. Some of the issues can be attributed to the new Faculty Success system. In particular, we note:

• Inconsistencies in publication venues and dates across documents;

• Inclusion of publications in the dossier pre-dating those for consideration (i.e., outside rank);

• References to items not included in the candidate’s record;

• Links to items outside of Faculty Success that were broken;

• Difficulties in determining the peer-review status of publications.

We strongly recommend that candidates’ cases be carefully prepared with some third-party review (i.e., someone knowledgeable about the process to lend advice). At a minimum, cases should be carefully proof-read before submission. We hope, once the case is uploaded to Faculty Success, that candidates or their representatives have an opportunity to check the case for errors before being passed to reviewers.

In the past, the dossiers included clear markers of peer-review (the use of an asterisk) which is absent in the new, automated Faculty Success document (though one candidate managed to include them). The committee would like to see a standard adopted for future cases: whether marked in the dossier itself, on the candidate’s c.v., or in the “Intellectual Contributions of Faculty Report.” In addition, the dossier should clearly demarcate between publications in rank and those completed before consideration. In fact, we would recommend a common template for candidate c.v.’s be considered that includes listing of work appointment and differentiates between peer-reviewed materials and non-peer-reviewed materials.

Also, if a candidate relies on forthcoming or yet-to-be-published work in his or her case, supporting documentation as to its status should be included in the dossier. Such items could include signed contracts, readers’ reports, or other editorial correspondence. As always, should its status change during the review process, candidates should be allowed to amend their case.