

Department of the History of Art and Architecture  
University of Pittsburgh  
Adopted January 26, 2007  
Revised: April 4, 2025

## **GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION WITH TENURE**

### **I. Criteria for Promotion with Tenure**

Following University policy, the Department of the History of Art and Architecture recognizes faculty accomplishment in three areas: research, teaching, and service. Assistant professors should consult the *Faculty Handbook*<sup>1</sup> and the tenure criteria adopted by the Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences. The DSAS characterizes the promotion to Associate Professor with tenure using the following language:

“In judging excellence, the indispensable ingredient for promotion to tenured rank should be creative or intellectual vitality as reflected in the candidate's teaching, and in the candidate's contribution to the advancement of knowledge or in his or her artistic activity. Vitality is best revealed through the candidate's activities—classroom performance, research, writings, artistic creations. These should be assessed for the evidence they reveal of intellectual power and originality. Quantitative measures of productivity and popularity, however useful, are no substitutes for qualitative judgments. Evaluations of the candidate's record of achievement will be used primarily to judge future promise. Elements of this evaluation shall include the quality and originality of the candidate's contributions to the advancement of knowledge, the candidate's status with respect to the standards of excellence in the discipline, and performance as a teacher. Tenure is not a reward for past services, but a kind of contract, a lifetime of security in exchange for a lifetime of continued creative scholarship.”<sup>2</sup>

#### **1. Research Criteria**

In the Department of the History of Art and Architecture, promotion to tenure requires a substantial body of original scholarly work that makes a significant contribution to knowledge within the field. In accordance with the DSAS's guidelines for tenure, special care will be taken to establish achievement expectations for candidates being considered for tenure whose work is interdisciplinary, collaborative, multidisciplinary or translational in character, or whose intellectual contributions and innovation are registered in part through significant societal impact, and evaluation processes should take account of unusual aspects of those expectations.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Faculty Handbook* online at: [https://www.facultyhandbook.pitt.edu/bylaws-chapter-ii-faculty#Article\\_IV](https://www.facultyhandbook.pitt.edu/bylaws-chapter-ii-faculty#Article_IV)

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.as.pitt.edu/tenure-criteria>.

The single-authored monograph remains the standard in most subfields. Because the Tenure Committee will holistically consider a candidate's research impact, it may put forward a candidate's dossier that does not include a single-authored monograph. We encourage Assistant Professors to plan for the lengthy timeline to publication of a single-authored monograph, which is laid out in general terms in Appendix 1. Recognizing this, the Department of the History of Art & Architecture affirmatively states that we fully support tenure dossiers that move forward with a copy-edited single-authored book manuscript which is in production (i.e. a book that is under contract and with final approval from the press rather than a published book). Moreover, the department also recognizes that collaborative publications are increasingly common. Co-authored publications will be given due weight according to the relative share of the candidate's contribution, which should be described clearly in the candidate's research dossier. Edited volumes, while not a substitute for the candidate's own single-authored or co-authored work, do make valuable contributions to knowledge and may enhance the candidate's dossier. As a general rule, scholarship presented for tenure review will be in English; however, if the candidate would like to have work considered that is published only in a foreign language, the candidate should present a detailed summary of the work in English along with a statement discussing the work's impact in their field.

While it is generally expected that publications should be subject to peer review, the Tenure Committee recognizes that practices of peer reviewing vary in each subfield of art and architectural history, as well as in interdisciplinary venues of publication. In certain subfields, formal peer review is not the practice in some highly influential publications, which nevertheless maintain high standards through editorial board oversight. The committee will take these variations into account when assessing the significance of the candidate's publishing record. The candidate may assist in this process by explaining briefly the prevailing practices in his or her subfield, and if appropriate by indicating the importance of publishing in venues that do not engage in traditional forms of peer review. The Tenure Committee will also be attentive to the fact that publishing standards vary from country to country, and candidates who are publishing internationally should have a chance to explain how their work fits within international standards. Online, Open Access, and other forms of public-facing scholarship will also be given due consideration.

The research dossier should include all research completed during the period under review. This should include published work, all unpublished manuscripts for which a book contract or a journal's commitment to publish has been obtained, and all reviews of that work including readers' reports of unpublished manuscripts. If any of this work has been collaboratively produced, the candidate should clearly describe the nature and amount of his or her contribution to the final product. Work that is not in English should be accompanied by an English-language summary in order to be read and considered by the full Tenure Committee.

Research funding (in the form of grants, fellowships, subsidies, etc.) is highly desirable and enhances the candidate's dossier. Collaborative funded research is becoming more common in the humanities, and is encouraged, although it is not regarded as essential at

this stage of a candidate's career.

In assessing candidates' work, the key criterion for promotion will be the candidate's success in carrying out a significant and sustained scholarly program, one that has been positively received and that has made a demonstrable contribution to the field. Candidates should demonstrate that their research program is ongoing and will continue to be original and substantial in the future. While the tenure review focuses on research produced during the candidate's period of appointment as Assistant Professor at Pitt, the Tenure Committee shall take special care to consider research productivity from before the candidate's appointment to that role as evidence of a sustained research profile. In making judgments about the professional status of unpublished and forthcoming work, the Tenure Committee will, in accordance with College Art Association Guidelines for promotion and tenure,<sup>3</sup> consider informed opinion within its ranks and the evaluations of external reviewers. For published work, the judgment of the Tenure Committee and of external reviewers may be augmented by published reviews and/or other recognitions of the candidate's work.

Similarly, the Tenure Committee will holistically evaluate the placement of publications for both articles and monographs. Since at least 2005, the College Art Association has recognized a "crisis" in book publishing that includes (but is not limited to): the shrinking of book publishing opportunities in specific areas of the field; the exorbitant and prohibitive price of image licensing and reproduction fees that can limit the publication of a book; and the move away from commercially unpopular titles by university presses and other conditional factors. For decades, university presses have been the standard in the field, and that designation has served as a proxy for importance and prestige. However, the publication landscape is ever evolving and there is a financial component to publishing with university presses over which faculty have little to no control. Therefore, the Tenure Committee will evaluate a candidate's dossier in light of several factors, including their proactive attempts to court university presses even in the case that those efforts are not successful.

## **2. Teaching Criteria**

Promotion to tenure requires a genuine commitment to teaching excellence. As with scholarship, this commitment is a life-long process that involves ongoing intellectual work and creativity. In making assessments of teaching effectiveness, the department is interested not merely in performance as measured by student surveys, but also in the quality of the learning that takes place in the course. As faculty in a research institution, the department understands that we have a responsibility to make scholarship in the discipline come alive within the classroom.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.collegeart.org/standards-and-guidelines/guidelines/art-history-tenure#:~:text=The%20criteria%20for%20promotion%2C%20retention,the%20community%3B%20and%20teaching%20effectiveness>. (accessed 13 February 2025).

The department expects candidates for promotion to tenure to teach at a variety of levels, from introductory undergraduate courses to advanced graduate-level work. Some mentoring work is expected of all candidates for promotion, but the amount and kind depend on the candidate's overall contributions to the department. Typically, the candidate for promotion should have some experience both in mentoring undergraduates and in serving on PhD committees. All candidates must be members of the Graduate Faculty and be willing and able to chair PhD committees if they have not already done so.

Candidates for promotion demonstrate their effectiveness as teachers through a teaching dossier. The department has a faculty mentoring program to help junior faculty build their dossiers and to give them constructive feedback early in their teaching careers. The teaching dossier documents not only classroom and mentoring work, including the development of new courses and other pedagogical initiatives undertaken to enhance student experiences in the department. Dossiers include both student and faculty evaluations. Student evaluations will be considered, but not as the sole or even primary factor in evaluating teaching effectiveness. It is the responsibility of departmental mentors to assist candidates in developing high-quality peer evaluations over several years for each candidate.

HAA recognizes that teaching and research ought to be in a relationship of mutual reinforcement: traditionally, research has been understood to flow into teaching, but we also recognize that teaching beyond one's area of research expertise often leads to the discovery of new research competencies and interests, and we are fully supportive of this. More specifically, the Tenure Committee will look recognize the efforts of faculty members who teach beyond their subfields or areas of expertise in order to advance the strategic objectives of the department. Doing this work responsibly requires serious effort, and that must be recognized by the Tenure Committee.

### **3. Service Criteria**

Assistant professors are expected to play an active role in departmental governance and program building. While service carries less weight than research and teaching excellence in the promotion decision, the department expects all candidates for tenure to have provided meaningful service to the department by participation on committees and at department meetings. The conferral of tenure is also a recognition that a candidate has sought alignment between their professional goals and the strategic objectives of the department.

The department also recognizes and welcomes service to DSAS, the university, the local community, and professional organizations. Candidates are encouraged to discuss their aspirations for leadership with their mentors.

In exceptional circumstances, junior faculty may sometimes assume leadership positions within the department that go far beyond the standard service expectations. While such

extraordinary service for the department cannot substitute for research or teaching accomplishment, that service merits special recognition and does enhance the candidate's overall dossier. In no instance should diversity of committee membership be invoked to justify a disproportionate service expectation on the part of any faculty member of any rank.

Tenured faculty must work collectively for the benefit of the department. All tenure stream faculty should begin preparing for this in the appropriate ways during their probationary period. At a fundamental level, the Tenure Committee believes that research, teaching, and service are best conceived of as being in a virtuous circle: attainment in research and teaching offers entryways into more meaningful service, through which HAA will help shape our communities, which include the field at large and the university.

## **II. Responsibilities, Mentorship, and Timelines**

### **1. Departmental Responsibilities**

#### **A. Review**

i. Each untenured faculty member will be reviewed by the Chair in an annual evaluation letter, as recommended in the Provost's guidelines for faculty evaluations (<https://www.provost.pitt.edu/annual-review-faculty>).

ii. Since promotion evaluations require the collective judgment of the tenured faculty, tenured professors will meet at the third-year review to generate feedback for all assistant professors on their progress toward promotion.

iii. The associate professors' feedback will be conveyed to each assistant professor by the Chair shortly after the third-year review meeting of tenured faculty.

iv. The department shall ensure that records of teaching evaluations are being compiled in such a way that all candidates will have sufficient documentation to apply for promotion.

#### **B. Mentoring**

i. Upon hiring, each assistant professor will be assigned a mentor by the Chair. This person will offer advice on expectations for promotion to associate professor.

ii. Mentors should meet formally at least once per semester with assistant professors.

iii. Mentors should, with the Chair, clearly and faithfully convey the results of annual departmental evaluations to assistant professors.

iv. Mentors will, ideally, be in dialogue with the mentee's subfield.

v. Any assistant professor may request a change of mentor from the Chair without explanation.

vi. Assistant professors are encouraged to find informal mentors in other departments, within and beyond Pitt.

### C. Service

- i. We expect all faculty members (of all ranks) to treat one another with respect.
- ii. Tenured professors judge promotion cases on the merits, and all tenured professors have a responsibility to uphold this norm in our discussions and deliberations and to hold others to it.

## **2. Annual Evaluation and Promotion Timeline**

### A. Annual Evaluations

Each untenured faculty member will be reviewed annually by the Chair, according to DSAS's guidelines. The annual review includes both a written evaluation and a meeting to discuss it. In this annual meeting the Chair and the faculty member shall discuss any issues raised by the written review and more generally his or her progress toward tenure.

Recommendations for contract renewal are made by the Department of the History of Art and Architecture's Tenure Committee, which consists of all the tenured members of the Department.

### B. Timeline

For new faculty in the tenure stream, contract decisions are made on a 3+3+1 sequence of contracts. The initial contract is for three years; the Tenure Committee normally will review the candidate's case for reappointment in the third year of the initial contract period. If this review is positive, a second three-year appointment will be offered to the candidate. In the sixth year, the Tenure Committee will review a candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. The schedule for tenure review is ultimately determined by the Dean's Office, which decides which categories of leave do and do not "pause" the tenure clock. It is the responsibility of the Chair and the Candidate to monitor the DSAS's accounting and ensure that it accurately reflects the candidate's tenure clock. A negative decision taken at either the third-year review or the sixth-year tenure review will result in an automatic contract extension of one year; that extension will be non-renewable.

### **C. Accelerated Promotion**

A pre-tenure faculty member who believes that the demonstrable excellence of his or her record warrants it may at any time make a formal request in writing to be considered for early promotion to tenured rank. The department cannot initiate early promotion without the written consent of the faculty member under consideration. However, per DSAS's regulation a faculty member can only be considered for tenure a single time, and candidates are therefore advised to refrain from requesting consideration for early tenure unless they have the full support of the Tenure Committee. In this instance, "early promotion" is understood to mean below six years; there may be instances in which, for a

variety of reasons (leaves of one sort or another, global pandemics, etc.), the tenure clock has been extended. The faculty member can, in consultation with the Tenure Committee and Associate Dean, forego those extensions and request consideration for promotion on at the six-year mark without triggering any heightened scrutiny.

### **3. The Tenure Subcommittee**

At the conclusion of their first year in the tenure stream, the Chair and candidate's mentor shall confer to form a Tenure Subcommittee composed of three Faculty Mentors: one is the mentor, one will be the Department Chair, and a third member will be brought on in consultation with the candidate. Preferably this third member will have intellectual and professional interests closely aligned with the candidate. However, consideration will also be given to maintaining an equal distribution of subcommittee service across the Tenure Committee. The Tenure Subcommittee is to serve throughout the period prior to the tenure decision as mentors and resources for untenured faculty. They observe courses, review materials, and provide guidance and support for the candidate's scholarly projects, teaching, and service. The candidate and members of the Subcommittee should be in regular and close contact.

The full Subcommittee is charged to prepare a report for the third-year review as well as the tenure review. In the writing of the report, the job of the Subcommittee is to present the candidate carefully and fully for review; there is no responsibility for or expectation of advocacy. Assuming mutual agreement between the candidate and the committee, the subcommittee will continue in this form until the tenure review. The subcommittee shall also ensure that the candidate is aware of the extraordinary resources available for mentorship in teaching through HAA's appointment stream faculty, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and other university resources.

It is the responsibility of the Tenure Subcommittee to share with the candidate at an early juncture the "Chair's Checklist" for tenure dossiers and to ensure that the candidate and Subcommittee have established a plan for collating the necessary documents well in advance of all milestones.

### **III. PROTOCOL FOR 3<sup>RD</sup> YEAR CONTRACT RENEWAL**

For a renewal dossier, the DSAS only requires certain documents (typically a C.V., annual evaluation letters, and OMETs / teaching evaluations). Because we believe the third-year review is an opportune time to undertake holistic review of a candidate's progress, the Tenure Committee in HAA asks candidates for renewal to submit documents like those they will submit for their dossier (i.e. statements on teaching, research, and service, publications, a complete teaching dossier, etc.). External letters are not solicited for renewal.

Third-year review typically unfolds early in the spring semester of the appropriate year; the deadline for the submission of renewals is established by the DSAS, and it is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that renewals are processed in a timely manner. During the summer before review, the Tenure Subcommittee will work with the candidate to review drafts of documents, identify any gaps, and ensure that the candidate's dossier is prepared in a timely manner.

The candidate's dossiers will be available for review at least one month in advance of the meeting at which a vote shall be taken. All members of the Tenure Committee are responsible for reviewing the full range of materials in sufficient detail and depth in order to make a professional judgment.

The Subcommittee also writes a thorough and balanced report. The primary function of the report is to represent a candidate's work in research, teaching, and service. The report should place scholarly work in the context of other work in the field and it should provide a careful summary of the teaching and service dossiers. It should offer a professional judgment of the candidate's record and an assessment of the candidate's progress toward the tenure review. The purpose of the document is not advocacy but to inform the Tenure Committee in detail about a candidate and to enable the Chair and the Subcommittee to communicate formative advice to the candidate about his or her career.

During the meeting, a vote will be taken of all the tenured faculty members of the department concerning the recommendation for reappointment or non-renewal. The vote on contract renewal is yes or no. It is taken by ballot and announced at the meeting. Absentee ballots are allowed under special circumstances. Following the meeting, questions, comments, further information and/or objections to the report by members of the Tenure Committee should be sent in writing to the Subcommittee and appended to the final version of the report. A follow-up letter will be sent to the Assistant Professor with specific feedback.

#### **IV. PROTOCOL FOR THE TENURE REVIEW**

In most cases, the meeting of the Tenure Committee will be held early in the Fall term of the 6<sup>th</sup> year. The Subcommittee and the candidate should meet in the Fall term of the 5<sup>th</sup> year to begin to prepare the dossiers, to identify external reviewers, and to draft a report.

**External Review:** The candidate and Subcommittee will prepare materials for external review. These documents should be based on the "Chair's Checklist" for tenure dossiers. The candidate and Subcommittee will prepare a pool of external reviewers, no more than three to be proposed by the candidate. (The file must indicate those reviewers selected by the Subcommittee and those selected by the candidate.)

- A&S requires a minimum of 6 letters, though HAA may wish to collect more letters to ensure the dossier is sufficiently robust. The Subcommittee should make preliminary contact with the reviewers. Please note if reviewers decline or are unable to write. This



must be part of the record. The letter requesting the review will be sent by the Department Chair.

- On the selection of reviewers: Before meeting with the candidate to prepare materials and a schedule for the external review, the Subcommittee should prepare an ample list of potential reviewers. These names are not to be revealed to the candidate. The candidate must be asked if there are any possible reviewers that the Subcommittee should avoid, reviewers likely to have a negative bias toward the candidate and their work. The candidate may suggest three reviewers and an alternate. Names suggested by the candidate will remain on their list of recommended reviewers and should not be included on the Subcommittee list. In the case of all the referees the Subcommittee should be prepared to indicate any with a close relation to the candidate (as a mentor for example).

**Subcommittee Report:** The Subcommittee writes a thorough and balanced report. The primary function of the report is to represent the candidate's work in three areas: research, teaching, and service. The report should place the scholarly work in the context of other work in the field; it should also provide a careful summary of the teaching and service dossiers. The report should summarize the letters from external evaluators and the letters solicited from graduate students. It should offer a professional judgement of the candidate's record and make a recommendation for or against tenure and promotion.

- Questions, comments, further information and/or objections to the draft by members of the Tenure Committee should be sent in writing to the Subcommittee and to the Chair to be considered in revising the final version of the report.

**Internal Review:** The Tenure Committee should have early access to the candidate's research, teaching, and service dossiers; the Committee should also have timely access to the Subcommittee report. All members of the Tenure Committee are responsible for reviewing the full range of materials gathered to represent the candidate in sufficient detail and depth to make a professional judgment.

**Tenure Committee Meeting:** Members of the Tenure Committee are urged to present information at the meeting and to raise questions about the candidate's file. New documents, however, should not be presented at the meeting unless they have the prior approval of the Subcommittee and Chair.

- The vote to recommend tenure and promotion shall be by secret ballot. The vote will be yes or no. Absentee ballots are allowed under special circumstances.

The A&S bylaws state: "A departmental recommendation in favor of promotion to tenured rank should normally reflect a consensus of the department's faculty. At a minimum, such a recommendation must be supported by a majority of the votes of those who have participated in departmental deliberations." The Tenure Committee will recommend promotion with tenure if a simple majority of those voting vote in favor. If some members vote no, they are permitted to send a minority report directly to the Dean.

- The chair will summarize the meeting in a cover letter forwarding the tenure and promotion dossier to the A&S Dean. If the Chair dissents from the vote of the Tenure Committee, the Tenure Committee should be informed in a timely fashion so that appropriate steps can be taken to ensure adequate representation of the case at the Dean's level.
- It is the responsibility of the Chair to summarize the proceedings of the meeting for the candidate. Deliberations of the Tenure Committee are absolutely confidential.

## **Appendix 1**

Below is a rough timeline for the process of publishing a research monograph with an academic press at present (2025), with thanks to the Departments of History and English. We have adopted this calendar to the conventions of art history and provides notes on terminology. Manuscripts are considered “in progress” prior to this process:

- Submission to an interested acquisitions editor of a completed manuscript (“submitted/under review”)
- Internal review by press and decision to send out for review: 1-2 months
- External readers reports: 4-6 months; if positive, →
- Author makes revisions in response to reports, writes response letter: 6-18 months
- [(If necessary) Second review by outside readers: 2-6 months]
- Press accepts final manuscript and offers final contract with anticipated publication date (“under contract, forthcoming [date]”)
- Upon acceptance of the manuscript, the author begins procuring image permissions for every figure to be included in the book and begins preparing applications for publication subventions to cover the cost of publication (currently authors are expected to bring around \$10,000-25,000 to cover the cost of publication): 2-6 months (may run concurrent with the next phase)
- Author finalizes the complete book manuscript and image package for submission for submission to the press by a date stipulated in the publication contract: 2-6 months
- Copyediting by press: 2-4 months (“in production/in press, forthcoming [date]”)
- Author reviews copyedited manuscript: 1-3 months
- Design and typesetting, page proofs delivered to author: 2-4 months
- Author reviews page proofs, creates index: 1-2 months
- Press publishes book: 2-6 months

Thus, even assuming positive responses throughout, publication will often occur no sooner than 24-30 months after the initial submission of a completed manuscript to an interested press; it is not unusual for the process to take longer. Variance from press to press is significant, too. These dates are very flexible estimates. For example, some authors revise very quickly; some much slower. Some presses hold final publication for a seasonal catalog, some move a publication date up for other reasons. Colleagues should speak candidly with Acquisitions Editor and the press's production team about their timelines and about the experiences of authors who have published with them.