

THE TRULY DIVERSE FACULTY

NEW DIALOGUES IN AMERICAN  
HIGHER EDUCATION

*Edited by*  
*Stephanie A. Fryberg*  
*and Ernesto Javier Martínez*

palgrave  
macmillan

2014

## CHAPTER 9

### BREAKING THROUGH THE ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR GLASS CEILING

*Mari Castañeda and Michael Hames-García*

For many faculty members from racial and ethnic groups that are underrepresented in the US academy, the goal to become a full professor is not careerist but rather a political project that aims to challenge a glass ceiling that remains an important historical barrier in higher education. Unlike the hiring of assistant professors or the granting of tenure and promotion to associate professors or the hiring of senior administrators, the promotion-to-full process has not been a high-profile topic of discussion in debates over diversity in academia. Although many colleagues often do not readily admit to it, becoming a full professor grants faculty a certain level of status that opens opportunities. For instance, letters from full professors in tenure and review process are generally more highly esteemed than those from associate or assistant professors, and usually, only full professors review the promotion cases of associate professors. Chairs of the most important university committees are typically full professors rather than associates, as are deans, vice provosts, and vice presidents, not to mention provosts, presidents, and chancellors. Since white men constitute 75 percent of full professors in universities across the United States while white women comprise 16 percent of the rank, albeit with lower salaries, it is white faculty who are also the majority of deans, provosts, and chancellors at colleges nationwide; and thus the dominant reviewers of most faculty personnel actions (Chait & Trower, 2002).

Faculty of color, on the other hand, continue to be underrepresented at the full professor rank and consequently are disproportionately underrepresented in the pool from which candidates are drawn to fill the senior administrative ranks of universities across the United States. At a time when affirmative action and diversity initiatives are becoming legally and culturally challenged, the effort to increase the number of faculty of

color, especially at the level of full professor, is more pressing than ever. The reality is that future gains will undoubtedly become more difficult to achieve as these initiatives are compromised or repealed. The urgency is valid if universities are to remain meaningful and effective institutions for learning, scholarly production and problem solving, which are more effective with diverse groups (Rhode, 2006; Giroux, 2007; Fish, 2008). With this in mind, what does the hiring landscape look like in academia today? What are the expectations for becoming a full professor? What are the barriers that keep faculty at the rank of associate professor? Finally, what can be done to help shatter the glass ceiling of professorial promotions? In the following sections, this chapter will address the aforementioned questions and, we hope, contribute to the broader and more critical conversation about not only the inclusion of underrepresented groups in the future of academia but also the potential for higher education to become a role model for achieving a more egalitarian and just society in the twenty-first century.

### CURRENT STATE OF HIRING IN ACADEMIA

In addition to hiring at the full professor rank, promotions to full professor in colleges and universities are very much dependent on the number of faculty who are hired as tenure-track professors and then promoted to the rank of associate. Yet faculty cannot be promoted if they are not hired in the first place. Given this process, how are people of color and women faring in the academic landscape?

Unfortunately, the state of employment for faculty of color has not improved much in the last decade. African American, Native American, and Latino faculty are still greatly underrepresented across the nation's institutions of higher education. Despite the fact that faculty of color constitute 22 percent of all tenure-track and tenured faculty, it is impossible to know at the national level exactly what portion of this percentage actually represent US minorities since mandates for most colleges and universities to report the differences between US and international faculty of color are not enforced. This issue is not insignificant. We (Mari and Michael) have both personally experienced many instances where faculty whose life experiences—and often much of their academic careers—were spent in Latin America before moving to the United States for graduate school or university employment have refused to acknowledge themselves as faculty of color and resent being labeled as “minority professors.” Often international faculty members have backgrounds with class and racial privilege, which sometimes makes it difficult to form coalitions with US faculty of color. As an undergraduate, Mari encountered two Latin American and Caribbean faculty members who lacked knowledge

about or empathy for the experiences and struggles of people of color in the United States, which shocked her because she assumed they were allies. It was very difficult for these professors to advocate for more racial and ethnic diversity on campus, or to mentor US-born students of color, especially those who were first-generation and low-income college students. Obviously, most international (Latino) faculty are not this disengaged (which is especially evident in the article by Luis Ponjuan, 2011), but it is important to acknowledge that solely relying on quantitative data regarding minority faculty often fails to reveal the nuances of academic hiring and the need for more inclusive campus climates.

Ironically, minority populations in the United States are expected to grow significantly by 2025, and Latinos in particular will comprise nearly 20 percent of the US population. Unless colleges and universities take direct and explicit action, the hiring landscape for faculty of color will not improve, which will be a major challenge for the future of academia if it does not reflect the cultural and class diversity of the United States. *The Advocate* (2008) is correct in its conclusion that “given the recent growth in the Hispanic population, as well as the increasing number of both Hispanic and African-American students attending postsecondary institutions, the gap will continue to increase unless serious effort is given to encouraging young scholars from minority backgrounds to work in the nation's colleges and universities” (p. 6). Additionally, once young scholars of color are brought to campus as faculty, they must be fully supported, given retention incentives, hired in tenure-track positions, granted tenure, and mentored throughout their careers in order to reach promotion to full professor. At both of our institutions, the University of Massachusetts–Amherst and the University of Oregon, the percentages of faculty of color are dismal. At our institutions, like other research universities, hiring minority faculty is an important issue, but retention and promotion of the faculty is also vital to the overall success of diversity efforts. Thus there must be a systemic commitment to addressing the inadequate number of faculty of color on college campuses if institutions of higher education are to keep pace with the changing demographics of the nation. Ultimately, this entails hiring, retaining, and promoting faculty of color to the highest ranks.

With regard to women faculty, the hiring percentages are much more positive: they make up 45 percent of full-time assistant professors, 34 percent of full-time associate professors, and 20 percent of full-time full professors (Perna, 2001). While these percentages are encouraging, there is much to do if they are to be proportionate to the US population or to the female student populations at most coeducational institutions. Another disconcerting trend that is emerging is the number of women who are hired as non-tenure-track instructors. Currently, they

comprise 51 percent of non-tenure-track instructors, and unfortunately, the percentage is expected to grow as more universities and colleges replace tenure-track faculty with adjunct positions and adopt neoliberal approaches. The effect of this trend is already being felt at the higher professorial ranks.

In the last decade, for instance, the number of full professors decreased, in large part because colleges and universities hired more part-time instructors rather than tenure-track professors. A recent issue of *The Advocate* also noted that the number of full professors in the United States steadily declined between 1990 and 2007. Currently, full professors constitute less than 30 percent of all professors at US colleges and universities, whereas the number of instructors and lecturers outside the tenure track has nearly doubled in the same period (2008). Paradoxically, the Bureau of Labor Statistics certified that the impending population growth will require nearly 23 percent more postsecondary instructors, many of which will be nonrank, part-time workers rather than tenure-track professors. Consequently, the academic hiring landscape for permanent tenure-track positions will be more limited and competitive, and the working conditions may potentially become even more challenging. This does not bode well for future academic employees, especially women faculty and faculty of color who are hired less frequently than white males. For those faculty members who are able to overcome the challenges of getting hired and achieving tenure, a whole new set of challenges emerge as they work toward becoming full professors. The next section discusses those challenges and expectations more specifically.

### EXPECTATIONS FOR BECOMING A FULL PROFESSOR

Every university and college approaches faculty promotion procedures differently. However, there are several commonly shared understandings at research institutions about the most important (and idealized) benchmarks that must be achieved in order to be promoted to full professor. First and foremost, faculty must maintain and expand their presumably solid publication record. In most fields, the research expectations are equal to or greater than for promotion to associate, both quantitatively (numbers of peer-reviewed articles and/or books) and qualitatively (estimations of national or international standing and evaluations of research impact). Ideally, an associate professor is publishing additional peer-reviewed journal articles in various areas of expertise equal to or greater than the number produced for tenure. Furthermore, in some disciplines, they are also expected to produce book-length publications that are regarded as important scholarly contributions to the field. In fields that require books for tenure as well, the expectations for the

impact of a posttenure book is often greater than for pretenure books; the same can be the case with regard to articles in those fields where articles are the primary mechanism for research publication. In literature fields at research institutions, it is generally the case that at the tenure level, edited volumes usually do not count toward promotion, except as a “bonus” beyond the sole-authored book. Another important benchmark in some fields is successful grant applications. Applying for and receiving grants, either as a principal investigator or as part of a team, demonstrates that a faculty member’s research agenda speaks to an issue that funding agencies view as valuable. Although large sums of money are always viewed positively, receiving grants of any amount shows a faculty member’s willingness to make a case about the significance of her or his research. In some departments (particularly in the sciences), having the principal investigator status on a major grant (or a series of major grants demonstrating continuous funding) is a requirement for promotion to full professor.

Documenting the number and quality of scholarly citations can also be an important task for demonstrating the significance of faculty research in some fields. Such undertaking illustrates that scholars in the field believe in the quality of a professor’s research and its ability to push the intellectual discussion of the field further along. The last benchmark that is often cited as necessary for full promotion is national or international reputation, which is sometimes demonstrated through the attainment of a highly visible position or office in a national or international professional organization or agency or through a range of invited presentations and keynote addresses. Accomplishments such as these demonstrate that a faculty member has a distinguished standing in the field and that fellow academics view the faculty member (in this case the associate professor) as demonstrating academic leadership with vision and productive skills. Finally, they are typically expected to perform service to the university at levels far exceeding than what was expected as an assistant professor. Ultimately, if an associate professor wishes to become a full professor, most of the aforementioned benchmarks must be achieved. Yet these already-difficult accomplishments can become nearly impossible to achieve when associate professors are called to do heavier academic service and teaching while having fewer opportunities for research leaves. Consequently, the expectations for achieving full professor are becoming harder to meet. What are other additional challenges?

### CHALLENGES THAT IMPEDE PROMOTION

Not surprisingly, “it is not *just as difficult* to achieve the rank of full professor as to achieve the rank of tenured associate professor, but rather

that it is *more difficult*" (Geisler, Kaminski, & Berkley, 2007, p. 146). Compound those difficulties with systems of oppression that discriminate, in very subtle ways, against women and people of color, and the ability to achieve full professorship becomes an incredibly difficult task where the odds are stacked against you. Unfortunately, these same systems of oppression, which are often not recognized as such, shape the perception of more senior faculty and administrators as to when associate professors are "ready" to put themselves up for full promotion.

In several informal conversations with female as well as Latino and African American full professors, many shared how they encountered resistance from their departments when the topic of full promotion arose during discussions about future personnel actions. The main issue that many of the faculty encountered, with regard to their department's resistance, centered on the number and "quality" of journal publications and books. The insistence that excellence be quantified in those terms also detracted from the fact that the numerical expectation for publications had increased exponentially in recent years, despite concerns that numerical increases do not necessarily translate into excellence. Compounding such concerns, the definitions of quality and excellence are often subjective and largely determined by the faculty on personnel committees. Who is to say, for instance, that a faculty member's newspaper column, which translates research for a lay audience, is not excellent or has value, especially beyond the walls of the ivory tower?

Various faculty members noted that they have had to educate their personnel committees about their research and its importance both within and outside of the academy. Additionally, they had to advocate for themselves when they encountered resistance in their departments. In terms of educating personnel committees, faculty in some instances held one-to-one meetings with members of the committee in order to carefully explain their research's influence within their area of expertise as well as to share details about their participation in university-community partnerships. Faculty also shared that they met with the chair of their department yearly in order to receive feedback and to ensure that the chair supported their research plans. Despite these efforts, some faculty remarked that they were told to wait for full promotion after having been an associate professor for six years, and after an additional two to three years, they resubmitted their names. It is important to note that if women and faculty of color do indeed submit their case for full professor promotion, it is often 16 to 18 years after receiving their doctoral degrees whereas white males on average submit their cases within ten years of their degree. Clearly, there is a discrepancy, but why?

Few quantitative analyses of the underrepresentation of female faculty and faculty of color at senior academic ranks exist. Laura Perna's (2001)

analysis of the 1997 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Fall Staff Survey is therefore of particular interest. Even after controlling for educational attainment, experience, number of refereed publications, type of institution, academic field, and work role, Perna found that women were 10 percent less likely than men to be full professors at four-year colleges and universities. Perna also notes that, among US citizens, blacks and Latinos at four-year institutions and Asians and Latinos at two-year institutions are less likely to hold the rank of full professor than are whites. However, she concludes that the lower rates of promotion along racial and ethnic lines "are entirely attributable" to differences in educational attainment, experience, refereed publications, academic field, and type of institution as well as networking and mentoring opportunities. (Notably, the same was not true for the underrepresentation of faculty of color among tenured faculty vs. nontenured faculty.)

Perna (2001) thus concludes that there is a clear gender bias in the promotion of faculty from associate to full professor, even though it does not alone account for the full underrepresentation of women at full professor rank. In other words, some women have fewer refereed publications or less experience than their male counterparts, but even among those for whom this is not the case, gender bias appears to influence the likelihood for promotion to full professor. By contrast, according to Perna, although there is a similar bias at work in *tenuring* faculty of color, it seems less of an issue at the point of promotion to full professor. The finding that associate professors of color, in Perna's study, are as likely to become full professors as their equally qualified white counterparts in similar fields at similar institutions conflicts with most qualitative studies, suggesting further research is in order. One possible explanation for her data might be that the bias present at the tenure level removes faculty of color, and the bias at the promotion-to-full level does not reach statistical significance. It is important to note that there are fewer faculty of color than women in the 1993 data set from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty that Perna draws from, thus patterns of bias may be harder to demonstrate. Another possible explanation might be that faculty of color in the study included both men and women, and thus the percentages do not account for gender differences within this group, and the ways in which these differences would affect bias for faculty of color at the level of full promotion.

Setting aside the issue of bias in evaluation, Perna's (2001) study still shows lower rates of promotion for faculty of color, although she links those rates primarily to lower rates of productivity. Perna's research coheres with Antonio's finding that faculty of color produce fewer publications than white faculty. However, Antonio also finds that faculty of color report devoting *more* hours per week to research and scholarly

writing than white faculty and that they are *far more likely* to have chosen their profession because it afforded opportunities for research (Antonio, 2002). One possible explanation for this discrepancy between research aspiration and publication is that disproportionate service responsibilities fall to women and people of color, thus interfering with the substantial amount of time they devote to research and possibly making their time less efficient and productive. (We go on to discuss the significance of service next.) The work of social psychologists on stereotype threat, tokenization, and solo status suggest additional possible explanations.

Stereotype threat is generally understood as a psychological mechanism resulting from situations in which a person is at risk of confirming a negative stereotype about a group to which that person belongs (Steele & Aronson, 1995; Steele, Spencer & Aronson, 2002). Solo status refers to situations where a person is the only member her or his group present in a given context (Sekaquaptewa & Thompson, 2003; Sekaquaptewa, Waldman & Thompson, 2007), while token status describes situations in which a person is one of only a few of members of her or his group (Kanter, 1977; Niemann, 1999; Niemann, 2003). Many female faculty and faculty of color believe that they must be twice as good to go half as far (Turner & Myers, 2000). Faculty might spend extra time perfecting their work (more time spent on research) and might be more likely than white faculty to try submitting their work to the most prestigious publication venues in their field, increasing the likelihood of manuscript rejection, the need for resubmission, and the delays associated with peer reviews from multiple journals (fewer publications). They might also deliberately choose the most complex and time-consuming research questions in order to prove themselves, or if their research focuses on new subjects or on race and ethnicity, it might be subjected to inordinate scrutiny and misunderstanding during the submission and revision process. One colleague shared the story of being asked by peer reviewers to explain why innate intellectual inferiority might not explain her data on Native American student achievement. The expending of extra effort to disprove stereotypes about the inferiority of one's group is one possible cause for the reduced performance associated with stereotype threat (Harkins, 2006; Jamieson & Harkins, 2007). Because of the laws of diminishing returns, this extra effort might not always be evident in greater numbers of publications, but might instead form part of the hidden cost of tokenization and solo status as a member of a stigmatized group. The research of Charles Lord and Delia Saenz (1985), for example, has shown the extent to which perceptions of heightened scrutiny affecting tokenized individuals can negatively influence memory retention, while their token status appeared to benefit the ability of non-tokenized observers to remember what the tokenized individuals said in

monitored conversations (Lord, Saenz, & Godfrey, 1987; Saenz & Lord, 1989). The combined effects of tokenization, stereotype threat, and solo status, therefore contribute to stunted scholarly production (Sekaquaptewa & Thompson, 2003).

In addition to the psychological burdens of solo status and tokenization, colleges and universities typically call on female faculty and faculty of color to perform more service (Antonio, 2002; Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004; Calhoun, 2003; Corntassel, 2003; Harley, 2008; Taylor & Myers, 2000). For example, faculty of color are "a third more likely to advise student groups involved in community service and 29% more likely to pledge the professional and personal goal of providing services to the community" (Antonio, 2002). Both coauthors of this chapter can attest, based on their personal experience, that faculty of color are indeed committed to community work, both inside and outside the university, but pay a price with their research productivity. Based on a 1995 faculty survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, Anthony Antonio (2002) concludes "that faculty of color can be differentiated from white faculty in terms of their lower publication record with respect to journal articles and books, higher commitment to research activities, stronger support for educational goals that encompass the affective, moral, and civic development of students, and in the more explicit connection they make between the work of their profession and service to society" (p. 594). For faculty of color, their small numbers also place them in a position where they are often the "go to" professors for an array of diversity expectations, which indisputably cuts into their research and publishing productivity. Their small numbers on campus, combined with the rising number of students of color, turns them into beacons of mentoring and support that students desire and need, but it also eats away at the time available for producing scholarship. These are challenges that impede promotion to full professor and are often not acknowledged as such when personnel committees review a faculty file for full promotion and concentrate instead on the number of publications to deserve advancement. This also includes preferring sole-authored scholarship to coauthored, edited, or coedited publications. Yet the collaboration involved in coauthored and coedited publications does not diminish quality, but in fact, can enhance its excellence. Rethinking outdated notions of authorship and collaboration in research, especially in the social sciences and humanities, is critical if the scholarship of faculty of color and female faculty is to be considered worthy of promotion to full professor. One of the coauthors of this piece, Michael, is currently finishing his third coedited volume and his third cowritten essay despite receiving his PhD from a field (English) in which such collaborative work is not only rare but routinely discouraged and discounted.

Another area of service that impedes faculty productivity is lower-level administrative positions, such as directorships of programs and centers, associate deanships, or supervisors of campus agencies. Although such positions may have a certain level of distinction and perhaps extra stipends or course releases, they often include heavy administrative duties, time-consuming political maneuvering, and the development of a knowledge base that is often outside of the faculty member's area of expertise. One of the coauthors of this piece, Mari, for instance, served as the faculty advisor for a campus agency called Student Bridges. Although she was committed to the scholarly community work that the agency promoted, the position was very time consuming due to dealing with a large budget, student staff members, community partners, and complicated administrative procedures. Michael was asked as an assistant professor to be the director of undergraduate studies for a department with six hundred majors. Unfortunately, the intensive work required for achieving success in these types of positions can burn out faculty, which not only affects their ability to complete research projects but also lessens the likelihood of their willingness to serve as higher-level administrators later in their careers. The burnout factor can thus hinder the advancement of faculty who would be excellent as deans, provosts, or chancellors. Furthermore, many faculty of color are channeled into student affairs and diversity affairs positions, which typically have little power to reshape the institution and provide little opportunity to advance to more prestigious vice provost or vice president positions in academic affairs or in research affairs, not to mention dean, provost, or presidential positions.

When faculty of color and female faculty do come up for promotion, they are often viewed negatively for having overengaged in service, as if their commitment to service signals a lack of self-control, inability to say no, or a lack of dedication to research. Many scholars of color have discussed this conflict of worldviews. Nimipu (Nez Perce)-Chicana scholar Inés Hernández-Avila (2003) has written that her promotion to full professor was initially rejected. An ad hoc committee report cited her "moral and cultural commitment" as a "hindrance to [her] career" (p. 243). Hernández-Avila successfully appealed the negative decision. Elsewhere, Cherokee scholar Anne J. Calhoun (2003) recounts an encounter with a white, female colleague who did not understand why Calhoun could not simply say "no" to calls for service to Native American communities on campus:

I mentioned that there appeared to be a discrepancy of expectations for American Indian faculty members in the institution. She asked me to explain my perceptions. I stated that while I was assigned to my particular school from which I am paid, the administration of the institution also

appeared to expect that I would serve as a faculty member, including doing teaching, research, and service, in a second department in another college without recognition for this work . . . I closed by stating that I felt morally and socially obligated to maintain this dual but unrecognized assignment because of who I am. Her response was that "this is just a social obligation" and I "should just say no to such an assignment." . . . She obviously felt she could walk away from any social or cultural commitment . . . I walked away trying to imagine how she could believe that a cultural and social (religious) commitment expected by my traditional community could possibly be equated with being a member of a bridge club or ball team. (p. 143)

Tsalagi (Cherokee) scholar Jeff Corntassel (2003) also speaks to this issue, noting that on his campus he has often felt that if he does not agree to represent indigenous perspectives on committees and at events, then those perspectives will simply not be acknowledged.

Faculty of color and female faculty often find service to be valuable, in part, because it can create support networks that overcome the frequent isolation of being the only woman or person of color in a department. While many white male faculty members perceive service only as burdensome, many women and people of color find it both rewarding and sustaining (Baez, 2000; Bird, Litt, & Wang, 2004). However, because female faculty, especially in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and minority faculty in almost any field are so often the only one or one of very few, the burden of representation can be onerous. This situation is worse for tenured professors since many committee chair assignments are only available to associate and full professors. Internal Review Board (IRB) assignments, for example, are notoriously labor intensive, yet because of the ethical nature of their work, it is often desirable to have representation from faculty of color and female faculty on these boards. This well-intentioned move cannot help but place a disproportionate burden on the small numbers of tenured faculty of color and female faculty on a given campus. One of the coauthors, Michael, has found himself the only person of color on several demanding committee assignments, including the university-wide tenure and promotion committee and two search committees for dean positions. In some of these cases, he has also been the only associate professor, making his status as the sole minority even more visible, as if qualifications had to be lowered in order to include a person of color.

Perhaps the most notorious culprit in demanding extra time from female faculty and faculty of color are diversity and gender-equity committees. Corntassel (2003) recounts a not-uncommon experience as a junior faculty member: "I was 'volunteered' to serve on most diversity

committees at either the college or university level. At one point I was invited to attend an introductory Cultural Diversity Committee meeting and found my name prominently listed on the blackboard as the chair of a committee and a member of the executive committee—all of this without my knowledge or without being asked! My friend, Harry, who is Eastern Cherokee, was just as surprised when he found himself listed as a diversity committee member, having never been consulted” (pp. 162–163).

Feminist scholars have described this kind of service as “institutional housekeeping,” analogizing it to the unpaid labor frequently performed by women in households (Valian, 1998; Bird et al., 2004). The power of this analogy lies in its recognition that, within the institution of the academy, much of the uncompensated work of ensuring greater access and equity for women and people of color falls on women and people of color. The work of institutional housekeeping (as “academic maids and custodians”) is unlikely to result in traditional research publications. Plus, this work is usually performed by ad hoc and standing committees that are separate from more institutionally powerful committees such as those addressing policy related to promotion and tenure, curriculum, fundraising, research, building construction, and so on. As a result, female faculty and faculty of color find themselves torn between accepting positions designed to improve the status of women and people of color as a group and accepting positions that would more quickly advance their own status within the institutional hierarchy. Furthermore, they often trade valuable research time for institutional housekeeping assignments that do not benefit their promotion cases to the extent that other kinds of administrative service assignments might (Bird et al., 2004).

One of the most recent incarnations of this kind of institutional housekeeping for people of color has been the proliferation of “diversity officers” at the departmental, college and university levels. As early as 1987, Adalberto Aguirre warned about the pitfalls of these positions for faculty of color: “Since the participation of Chicano faculty in minority-oriented service activities does not necessarily decrease as they ascend the academic ladder, the role of Chicano faculty as sponsors in maneuvering Chicano faculty into nonminority-oriented activities within postsecondary organization is limited” (Aguirre 1987, p. 77). In the same year, describing what he calls the “barrioization” of Latina/o faculty members, Hisauro Garza (1987–1988) cites survey data showing that most Chicana/o faculty members’ participation in administration was limited to committees and programs concerned with affirmative action, student-of-color retention, language, minorities, and study abroad. He notes that “committees concerned with larger campus, instructional, research, and related policy issues, are rarely among the list of choices available to Hispanic faculty” (Garza, 1987–1988, p. 124).

## WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Twenty years ago, James Blackwell (1988) recommended that “as long as minority faculty members are expected to respond to the needs of minority students over and above regular duties, that work should be factored into the scale of values used to determine merit for tenure” (p. 428). During the following years, many other scholars have made similar recommendations (Turner & Myers, 2000). By 2004, acknowledging that service burdens are unlikely to shift any time soon, Bird, Litt, and Wang (2004) could only continue to echo a similar recommendation in relation to female faculty: “To the extent that service work is gendered at universities, then the equal application of existing merit and promotion standards will disadvantage women. Thus, in thinking about how universities can situate themselves for accomplishing change, administrators must first acknowledge the inequality inherent in the way different faculty carry out their jobs” (p. 202). They suggest that the weight for institutional housekeeping, specifically the work of undoing inequities for marginalized groups, must shift to unburden women and faculty of color. They also recommend that universities develop reward structures to acknowledge the importance of this work.

We further believe that such reward structures must continue after tenure. Associate professors are often called on to take on more institutional roles, and many indeed feel a responsibility since “it’s now their turn,” as one senior faculty member shared. Thus, when shifting service responsibilities within a department, it is very important to ensure that equity and fairness is applied to all levels. In both our experiences, it is often recently tenured women faculty and faculty of color who carry the burden of posttenure service. Mari was told by a senior faculty member on her campus that she no longer had to be “protected” since she was now a tenured associate professor and thus could now take on more leadership roles at her university and in the field. The fact that this message was conveyed in a positive and congratulatory tone made it difficult to argue against since achieving tenure is always a source of relief. The prospect of working toward and achieving promotion to full professor in a timely manner thus becomes a distant and difficult goal. In Mari’s case, she became acting chair for one semester a year after achieving tenure, but this lost semester of writing will most likely be undervalued when she applies for full promotion. In Michael’s case, he chaired a faculty search committee the year after tenure, with the duties extending well into his posttenure sabbatical.

Consequently, universities must communicate very clearly to faculty the specific criteria for promotion to full professor. Although most research universities require that cases for full professor demonstrate a



national and/or international reputation in their area of expertise, it is critical for faculty to understand the measures for achieving such a reputation. Patricia Ann Mabrouk (2007) lists the following as examples of an excellent academic reputation: "Professional awards or other honors, peer-reviewed articles, review articles, books, patents, external grant support, external research presentations, service on grant review panels, editorial boards, organizing symposia and national/international conferences, responding to emergent changes in your discipline" (p. 988). These examples are very useful, but it is also important to understand the departmental context of where faculty members are employed and whether they are open to interdisciplinary research and service work. Although Mari is in a communication department, for instance, she also served as chair of the National Association of Chicana and Chicano Studies, and her research is at the intersection of Latina/Chicana studies, media studies, and political economy. Thus far, her department has been very receptive of her transdisciplinary research yet not all departments are amenable to reputations that extend beyond their discipline. Thus Mabrouk (2007) not only recommends that faculty expand their professional networks beyond the pretenure mentoring relationships to include colleagues from other universities within and outside the United States in order receive feedback on their continued development as an expert in the field but also urges departments to view such networks as extremely beneficial and important. University administrations also need to ensure that department chairs and other senior faculty recognize the extra duties female faculty and faculty of color often face and ensure that departments enable associate professors to continue to focus on meeting requirements for full professor rather than exploiting them for unrewarded service.

Another challenge that faculty face is the belief that promotion to full professor is very different from tenure to associate since a faculty member can reapply for full promotion if they are unsuccessful during their first application and since there are no explicit time restrictions to when a full promotion can take place. However, developing a case for full professor takes enormous time and energy and thus is not a process that should be taken lightly. The notion that a professor can reapply for promotion fails to take into account the emotional, physical, and material tolls that such a process places on a faculty member. Both Mari and Michael know faculty who have been discouraged and dispirited by the process, and this unfortunately produces disengagement by folks who would otherwise be fantastic colleagues, which then causes other faculty to carry the departmental and university load. Consequently, it is imperative for faculty to be very clear about the expectations for embarking on a full professor review as well as be counseled as to when a case should be submitted for a successful review. Lastly, Richard Verdugo (1995) suggests specific ways

that universities and colleges can help break the associate professor glass ceiling for women and minorities.

First, universities must be willing to acknowledge new discourses that do not conform to traditional models. In doing so, the experiences of women and minorities, especially with how they (re)define research, teaching, and service, should be appreciated and legitimized. Autoethnography, for instance, is a method that is often employed by scholars of color that deserves broader legitimacy. Second, policies that ensure the fair treatment of women and minorities must be enforced. When issues of unfairness arise, they should not be dismissed or viewed as trivial (which unfortunately is often the case). Department chairs are especially poised to ensure that faculty members are treated fairly since they frequently determine committee and teaching assignments. As campus leaders, they have the potential to be great models of how to practice equity and respect. Third, administrators and higher-ranked faculty who conduct full professor reviews should participate in diversity training. Although many senior faculty view themselves as being supportive of faculty from underrepresented groups, it is surprising that faculty from these groups continue to feel delegitimized in their departments and colleges, as we (Mari and Michael) have witnessed. This especially occurs when faculty of color or women faculty conduct research that critically examines race, ethnicity, class, and/or gender. Fourth, faculty of color in particular should not be placed in positions of status and power only in minority-related committees or projects but should be included in a range of committees that affect the general welfare of departments and universities. Although faculty of color and women faculty are often committed to the status of minorities and gender issues on campus, they should also be viewed as leaders who are capable of addressing a whole range of topics within academic and student affairs. However, they should not be included only to bring the "diverse point of view" but should be acknowledged as full and legitimate participants with an equal power to shape the discussion of the committee or project. For instance, it is interesting how universities and colleges consistently pat themselves on the back for championing "diverse committees" that include Latino or African American faculty members, but sadly, as many of those professors would attest, they are repeatedly made to feel like tokens and marginal members of the committee with little or no influence. Or left to endure insensitive and clueless comments, such as "where can I buy the best tacos in town?" We also believe that productive, collaborative, and visionary faculty of color must be included in the leadership of the university or college; again, not simply in roles related explicitly to "diversity" but in positions overseeing a wide range of research and curricular matters. Administrations must make room for strong leaders from minority backgrounds and encourage colleagues at all levels to support such individuals.

Lastly, as Verdugo (1995) notes, faculty of color, especially Latino faculty, cannot become role models at their institutions if the “ideological and structural factors that relegate them to second-class status in their own institutions” are not addressed first. For instance, the failure to support centers for Latin American, Caribbean, Latino, Chicano, and Puerto Rican studies on financial and philosophical levels creates an environment in which faculty from these backgrounds or those who conduct work in these areas are reduced in importance. Quite frankly, this makes no sense to us given the demographic, political-economic, and cultural shifts across the Americas. These factors not only have the potential of creating negative images of faculty of color—in this case, Latino faculty—but these images and stealth stereotypes can also ultimately affect their promotion to full professors and the success of Latino students. Universities and colleges must be willing to assess how they have treated faculty of color and women, and need to do so persistently at all levels, not only in the provost office. The willingness to acknowledge and rectify disparities across the faculty ranks is a major positive step toward creating a fair and equitable work environment in which *all* faculty members are able to achieve promotion to full professor.

### CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed the various issues that affect a faculty member’s ability to achieve promotion to full professor. In particular, it discussed how minority and women associate professors face a glass ceiling that affects their movement toward achieving the rank of full professor. Although Geisler et al. (2007) note that the low representation of women and people of color “can often make it difficult to identify specific problems that might exist in hiring and retention” (p. 150) and that ultimately, in assessing their promotion to full professor, these are issues that require serious examination if higher education is to remain relevant in a rapidly changing world. Faculty may be hired, tenured, and retained at a university or college, but being promoted to full professor is the final glass ceiling that is often very difficult to break through. For instance, both of us know a good number of women faculty and faculty of color in our universities and in our fields who will most likely retire as associate professors although they have made enormous (and often unacknowledged) contributions to the academy. Not only will this lack of promotion affect their retirement package, but their potential as full professors will never be fully realized, and this is a significant loss for all of us.

Geisler et al. (2007) note that overall college climate is dependent on the presence of senior women and faculty from all backgrounds. Universities and colleges need to understand that the overall diversity at the

senior level produces positive prospects not only for incoming faculty but also for students, staff, and even the upper administration. Everyone benefits. In an era where “the legal scrutiny of affirmative action” has created an environment of fear and potential lawsuits, institutions of higher education need to work more creatively and persistently to ensure the hiring, retention, tenure, and full professor promotion of women and faculty of color. Without their success, the future relevance of the academy is at stake.

### REFERENCES

- Aguirre, A., Jr. (1987). An interpretive analysis of Chicano faculty in academe. *Social Science Journal*, 24(1), 71–81.
- Aguirre, A., Jr., & Martínez, R. O. (1993). *Chicanos in higher education: Issues and dilemmas for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, George Washington University.
- Antonio, A. L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(5), 582–602.
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 363–391.
- Bellas, M. L., & Toutkoushian, R. K. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race, and family effects. *Review of Higher Education*, 22(4), 367–390.
- Bird, S., Litt, J. S., & Wang, Y. (2004). Creating status of women reports: Institutional housekeeping as “women’s work.” *NWSA Journal*, 16(1), 194–206.
- Blackwell, J. E. (1988). Faculty issues: The impact on minorities. *Review of Higher Education*, 11(4), 417–434.
- Calhoun, J. A. (2003). “It’s just a social obligation. You could say ‘no!’” *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1–2), 132–154.
- Chait, R. P., & Trower, C. A. (2002). Faculty diversity: Too little for too long. *Harvard Magazine*, 10(4), 33–37.
- Corntassel, J. J. (2003). An activist posing as an academic? *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1–2), 160–171.
- Garza, H. (1987–1988). The “barrioization” of Hispanic faculty. *Educational Record*, 68(4)/69(1), 122–124.
- Geisler, C., Kaminski, D., & Berkley, R. A. (2007). The 13+ club: An index for understanding, documenting, and resisting patterns of non-promotion to full professor. *NWSA Journal*, 19(3), 145–162.
- Giroux, H. A. (2007). *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Fish, S. (2008). *Save the world on your own time*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harkins, S. G. (2006). Mere effort as the mediator of the evaluation-performance relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(3), 436–455.

- Harley, D. A. (2008). Maids of academe: African American women faculty at predominately white institutions. *Journal of African American Studies*, 12(1), 19–36.
- Hernández-Avila, I. (2003). Thoughts on surviving as native scholars in the academy. *American Indian Quarterly*, 27(1–2), 240–248.
- Jamieson, J. P., & Harkins, S. G. (2007). Mere effort and stereotype threat performance effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(4), 544–564.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 965–990.
- Lord, C. G., & Saenz, D. S. (1985). Memory deficits and memory surfeits: Differential cognitive consequences of tokenism for tokens and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(4), 918–926.
- Lord, C. G., Saenz, D. S., & Godfrey, D. K. (1987). Effects of perceived scrutiny on participant memory for social interactions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 23(6), 498–517.
- Mabrouk, P. A. (2007). Promotion from Associate to Full Professor. *Analytical & Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 388(5–6), 987–991.
- Niemann, Y. F. (1999). The making of a token: A case study of stereotype threat, stigma, racism, and tokenism in academe. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 20(1), 111–134.
- Niemann, Y. F. (2003). The psychology of tokenism: Psychosocial realities of faculty of color. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. L. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial and ethnic minority psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perna, L. W. (2001). Sex and race differences in faculty tenure and promotion. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(5), 541–567.
- Ponjuan, L. (2011). Recruiting and retaining Latino faculty members: The missing piece to Latino student success. *Thought and Action*, 27, 99–110.
- Rhode, D. L. (2006). *In pursuit of knowledge: Scholars, status, and academic culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Law and Politics.
- Saenz, D. S., & Lord, C. G. (1989). Reversing roles: A cognitive strategy for undoing memory deficits associated with token status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(5), 698–708.
- Sekaquaptewa, D., & Thompson, M. (2003). Solo status, stereotype threat, and performance expectancies: Their effects on women's performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 68–74.
- Sekaquaptewa, D., Waldman, A., & Thompson, M. (2007). Solo status and self-construal: Being distinctive influences racial self-construal and performance apprehension in African American women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13(4), 321–327.
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 797–811.
- Steele, C. M., Spencer, S. J., & Aronson, J. (2002). Contending with group image: The psychology of stereotype and social identity threat. In M. P. Zanna

- (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 34 (pp. 379–440). San Diego: Academic.
- Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L., Jr. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Verdugo, R. R. (1995). Racial stratification and the use of Hispanic faculty as role models: Theory, policy and practice. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(6), 669.