

Department of History of Art and Architecture
Guidelines for Promotion to Professor
(adopted April 4, 2025)

This document articulates the Department of History of Art and Architecture's established standards and expectations for recommending promotion to the rank of professor and the principles that the department follows in helping associate professors to achieve that goal. This is intended to clarify the process and provide useful guidance for associate professors about how to create and demonstrate records of scholarly achievement worthy of a positive departmental recommendation. These standards and expectations reflect the university's and the Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences' (DSAS's) criteria as well as the norms of our discipline.

University and DSAS Criteria

Standards for promotion and tenure are described in broad terms by the university and by the DSAS. Tenured and tenure-stream faculty should familiarize themselves with the policies regarding appointments and tenure set forth at the University level, which can be found in Article II of the Faculty Handbook (with Chapter IV describing criteria for the different ranks in the tenure stream: https://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty-handbook/ch2_appt_tenure). The relevant criteria for promotion to the rank of professor at the university level are as follows:

The rank of professor recognizes the attainment of authoritative knowledge and reputation in a recognized field of learning and the achievement of effective teaching skill. The professor should have attained superior stature in his or her field through research, writing, professional practice, or leadership in professional and learned organizations, as well as having exceeded the standards described for [the rank of associate professor].

While the Dietrich School does not have a specific statement about promotion to full, it does use the following language in the templates used to request external evaluations:

It may be helpful for you to know that the Bylaws of the Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences set the criteria for promotion to professor as “... *the attainment of authoritative knowledge and reputation in a recognized field of learning and effective teaching skill. The professor should have attained superior stature in his or her field through research, writing, professional practice, or leadership in professional and learned organizations...*” In judging authoritative knowledge in research we place great weight on the candidate's accomplishments to date, the intellectual power and originality that are revealed by those accomplishments, and the impact that these accomplishments have had on the discipline. And for those candidates whose work is interdisciplinary, collaborative, multidisciplinary or translational in character, or whose intellectual contributions and innovation are registered in part through significant societal impact, we ask that special care be taken to establish achievement. We are, of course, keenly interested in the candidate's promise of future growth and productivity.

An alternate version of the template uses this language (following immediately after the full text of the university criteria above):

In applying these criteria with respect to scholarship, we place particular weight on the substantive impact of one's work in their discipline. With this in mind, your specific assessment of the candidate's most significant contributions would be greatly appreciated.

Departmental Criteria

Promotion to professor recognizes that the promise of tenure has been fulfilled. Accordingly, the recommendation for promotion to the rank of professor is a qualitative judgment of other full professors in the department that is informed by the judgment of eminent scholars in the field, and it takes into consideration that evaluation of the candidate's record will differ in certain respects from the evaluation at the time a candidate stands for tenure. Consistent with university and the DSAS's guidelines, we emphasize that while authoritative knowledge and reputation can be demonstrated in numerous ways, special consideration is given to intellectual power and originality as revealed in a candidate's scholarly accomplishments and their impact on the discipline.

Successful candidates for promotion to professor in the Department of History of Art and Architecture will not only have a record of excellence in their teaching and research as set forth in the department's guidelines for promotion to associate professor. They will have exceeded those standards and demonstrated attainment of authoritative knowledge and reputation, through the following:

- a substantial body of research that makes significant contributions, in the candidate's career to date and beyond the record at the time of tenure. The single-authored monograph remains the standard in most subfields. Because the Committee of Full Professors 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 emphasize that a substantial and significant body of research might include major exhibitions, catalogues, a number of important essays, and other projects that garner stature nationally and internationally.
- evidence that the candidate is providing intellectual leadership and has had, and continues to have, a significant impact on the field.
- evidence of continued teaching excellence and significant experience mentoring and advising students.
- a record of significant and continuing leadership and service across the department, the university, and the profession at large.

Tenure affords scholars the freedom to take greater risks in their scholarship, and we expect to see that those risks have paid off—in publications, projects, grants received, awards and honors won, and so on. Thus, it is important to stress that, more so than in the case of criteria for promotion to the rank of associate professor and the awarding of tenure, the time and trajectory to the rank of professor is expected to vary among candidates. The following two sections below lay out best practices for preparing the candidate and their dossier for promotion.

I. Departmental Responsibilities

A. Mentoring

1. Each associate professor will be assigned a teaching mentor and a research mentor by the Chair (which may be the same mentors assigned to the faculty member as an assistant professor). The teaching mentor may be drawn from the ranks of Associate Professor, Full Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, or Teaching Professor. Typically, the research mentor will be at the rank of Professor, unless the mentee requests a research mentor from another rank and the Chair agrees.
2. Mentors should meet formally at least once per semester with associate professors.
3. Mentors will, ideally, come from the same subfield as mentees, though this is not required.
4. Any associate professor may request a change of mentor from the Chair without explanation.
5. Associate professors are encouraged to find informal mentors in other departments, within and beyond Pitt.

B. Annual Review

1. The teaching and research mentors, plus one additional full professor, will constitute each associate professor's mentoring committee.
2. The mentoring committee, chaired by a full professor, will conduct holistic annual evaluations of the associate professor's progress.
3. Each committee will share a report of their findings with their delegated associate professor and the Chair, who will incorporate this feedback into the associate professor's annual evaluation letter, as recommended in the Provost's guidelines for faculty evaluations (<https://www.provost.pitt.edu/annual-review-faculty>).

C. Service

1. Tenure carries with it greater expectations for leadership and service. To reach promotion, associate professors must play an active role in departmental and/or university governance and program building. We count on associate professors to show creativity and initiative in contributing to common goods within and beyond the department.
2. We expect all faculty members (of all ranks) to treat one another with respect.
3. Full professors judge promotion cases on the merits, and all full professors have a responsibility to uphold this norm in our discussions and deliberations and to hold others to it.
4. 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.

II. Promotion Procedures

Note: If the Chair of History of Art and Architecture is not at the rank of Professor, and/or if the Chair is the candidate in question for promotion, and/or if the Chair has a conflict of interest with the candidate in question, then the Chair and Professors will coordinate with the dean's office to specify which role(s) in this document will be fulfilled by a Professor who is able to carry them out. This process should be coordinated prior to the start of any case.

A. Initiating a Case for Promotion to Professor

1. An Associate Professor who believes that their record warrants promotion to Professor may apply for promotion in writing.
2. Time in rank shall be a factor neither for nor against promotion to Professor.

B. Considering a Case for Promotion to Professor

1. The Department of the History of Art & Architecture affirmatively states that we fully support promotion 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).
2. The Department Chair and a Promotion Subcommittee of typically two Professors will review a candidate's CV. (The Chair may consult with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.)
3. The Chair and Promotion Subcommittee will solicit external reviews and prepare a report as described below.

C. Preparing a Case for Promotion to Professor

1. The preparation of a case for promotion to Professor follows procedures similar to those in a case for promotion to Associate Professor. The Chair and Chair's office will distribute to all necessary parties a timeline and schedule for preparing materials and submitting a dossier.
2. The Department Chair appoints a two-person Promotion Subcommittee. In consultation with the subcommittee, the candidate prepares all the elements of the dossier required by the DSAS. The subcommittee prepares a list of external referees in accordance with DSAS guidelines.
3. In preparing the teaching dossier, the candidate should consult the *Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching* for the DSAS.
4. If letters from students are solicited by the department, the solicitation should be systematic (e.g., all graduate students from a given course), and the anonymity of the students must be protected. Under no circumstances should the candidate solicit letters from their students.
5. The subcommittee writes a thorough and balanced report. The primary function of the report is to represent a candidate's scholarly and/or creative work in the context of other work in the field; it should 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 judgment of the candidate's record and make a recommendation for or against promotion. Any questions, comments, further information and/or objections to the draft by members of the Committee of Professors should be sent in writing to the subcommittee and the Department Chair to be considered in revising the final version of the report.
6. Meeting
 - a. Members of the Committee of Professors will discuss the case presented to them. Note that if the Department has fewer than five (5) full professors, full professors from other departments within DSAS must be appointed in consultation with the Dean to reach the minimum of five.
 - b. The vote to recommend promotion shall be by secret ballot. Voting will be Yes,

No, or Abstain.

c. The deliberations and vote of the Committee are confidential. Breaches of confidentiality are serious violations of trust and should be reported to the Dean.

d. The Department Chair will summarize the meeting in a cover letter forwarding the promotion dossier to the Dean.

e. If the Chair dissents from the vote of the Committee, the Committee should be informed in a timely fashion so that appropriate steps can be taken to insure adequate representation of the case at the Dean's level review.

7. Schedule

Cases typically must be submitted to the Dean's Office by late fall term. To be on schedule, a promotion case should be initiated in the Spring Term in order to have a complete file for review in the Fall. The Committee of Professors, then, would need to meet by mid-Fall term.