

Neutrality for Whom? Racially Minoritized Tenure-Track Faculty Navigating Resource Deficit Consciousness in the Academy

Raquel Wright-Mair
Rowan University

Delma Ramos
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

***Abstract:** As the discourse on racially minoritized faculty success expands, there is evidence that institutions of higher education are dismissive of the racist and discriminatory institutional practices and policies that these faculty must navigate trying to meet the outlined metrics of success for tenure and promotion. With an emphasis on deconstructing and constructing new definitions of faculty success, this manuscript seeks to expand the discourse on how current universally accepted metrics of success for tenure-track faculty do not account for the unique contexts within which racially minoritized faculty operate, and which are inherently biased against them. Thus, applying the theory of racialized organizations, we argue that systemic inequities in the tenure and promotion process lead tenure-track faculty to develop what we term a resource deficit consciousness of time, money, and prestige. Precisely, we theorize that the unique experiences of racially minoritized tenure-track*

Raquel Wright-Mair is an Assistant Professor in the Educational Services & Leadership Department at Rowan University.

Delma Ramos is an Assistant Professor in the Teacher Education and Higher Education Department at University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

Copyright © 2021 by *The Journal of the Professoriate*, an affiliate of the Center for African American Research and Policy. All Rights Reserved (ISSN 1556-7699)

faculty in academia, paired with higher demands in their academic positions, push many of these faculty to develop this resource deficit consciousness. A faculty resource deficit consciousness then shapes the trajectory of tenure-track faculty on their journey towards tenure. Implications for research and practice are provided.

Keywords: Resource Deficit Consciousness, Racialized Institutions, Racially Minoritized Faculty

Introduction

There is a growing body of research on the experiences of racially minoritized faculty within the contexts of Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs; Anthym & Tuitt, 2019; Arnold et al., 2016; Harris, 2020; Haynes et al., 2020; Pittman, 2012; Quaye et al., 2020; Wright-Mair, 2017). Most recently, our understanding of the experiences of racially minoritized faculty has broadened to examine how these faculty conceptualize success within neoliberal contexts, and how traditional metrics used to evaluate faculty success, specifically for tenure and promotion, are shaped by neoliberal ideologies (Wright-Mair & Museus, 2021). Findings from this research outline ways racially minoritized faculty push back against these narrow metrics of success, by (re)defining their own success through the positive impact they have on their communities and through the mobilization of their voice(s) for advocacy. In line with an emphasis on deconstructing and constructing new definitions of faculty success, this manuscript seeks to expand the discourse on how current universally accepted metrics for success of tenure-track faculty (e.g., abundant publications in high impact journals, grant productivity, and high scores in teaching evaluations) are dismissive of the unique and inherently biased contexts within which racially minoritized faculty work. Precisely, we theorize that the unique experiences of racially minoritized tenure-track faculty in academia, paired with higher demands in their academic positions, push many of these faculty to develop what we term a *resource deficit consciousness* of time, money, and prestige.

We define a *resource deficit consciousness* of time, money, and prestige as faculty members' internalized negative perceptions of their ability to meet and exceed traditional metrics for tenure and promotion. Further,

engaging a resource deficit consciousness impacts these faculty in ways that foster negative competitive mindsets and individuation, neither of which serve or support racially minoritized faculty's collaborative way of being or the advancement of equity agendas. Equity agendas are a set of goals, objectives, outcomes and commitments aimed at acknowledging, and rectifying systemic inequities in society (Garrison-Wade et al., 2012).

Our framing of resource deficit consciousness among racially minoritized faculty is linked conceptually to notions of scarcity and scarcity mindsets theorized by scholars in behavioral economics (e.g., Roux et al., 2015; Shah et al., 2012). Scholars aptly recognize scarcity as a ubiquitous phenomenon present in nations throughout history, but neglect critical investigations of factors that lead to a scarcity mindset beyond a mere lack of resources and rarely envision scarcity beyond economic contexts and consumer behavior (e.g., Roux et al., 2015; Shah et al., 2012). Furthermore, while this research addresses competition as a behavior stemming from a scarcity mindset, it does not interrogate the role of race and its intersection with societal systems of oppression that uniquely define scarcity mindsets. Thus, our theorization of resource deficit consciousness expands notions of scarcity and scarcity mindsets as an effort to highlight how systemic inequities, especially those in tenure and promotion, shape the experiences of racially minoritized faculty in the academy. We examine what leads to the development of a resource deficit consciousness and highlight the implications for faculty success and advancement through academic ranks. In what follows, we draw upon existing literature to theorize and demonstrate how racially minoritized tenure-track faculty develop and navigate academia through *resource deficit consciousness*.

In this manuscript, we contextualize the presence of racially minoritized faculty in academia by discussing racially minoritized doctoral graduates pursuing academic careers, and racially minoritized faculty employment by academic rank and institutional type. We then review universally accepted metrics for tenure and promotion and the unique experiences of racially minoritized tenure-track faculty in academia. Next, we theorize how racially minoritized faculty develop a *resource deficit consciousness* of time, money, and prestige in relation to neoliberalist metrics for promotion and tenure and explain how this resource deficit consciousness shapes racially minoritized faculty perspectives of

achieving promotion and tenure. Finally, we conclude this manuscript by outlining implications for institutions of higher education that want to support and retain racially minoritized tenure-track faculty in their careers.

Racially Minoritized Doctoral Graduates and Tenure-Track Faculty Pursuing Academic Careers

Data from the annual United States Survey of Earned Doctorates estimate 55,195 doctorates were awarded in 2018 (NSF, 2018). Figures on doctorates awarded by race/ethnicity show that more than half of these degrees (i.e., 28,585) were awarded to White people, demonstrating great inequality in degree attainment. The numbers of doctorates awarded to racially minoritized graduates are as follows: 3,058 degrees to Black/African Americans; 3,603 to Hispanic/Latinos; 14,815 to Asians; and 116 degrees were awarded to American Indian/Alaska Native graduates (NSF, 2018). Moreover, graduates from more than one race earned 1,213 doctoral degrees and graduates from a different race/race not reported earned 862 degrees while graduates with an ethnicity not reported earned 2,943 doctoral degrees. It is worth noting that the Survey of Earned Doctorates uses the Asian category to include Asian Americans and the different race category to include Asian Pacific Islanders.

In terms of post-graduation plans, data from this survey revealed that, in 2018, 34,289 doctorate recipients had a definite post-graduation commitment at the time of data collection, about 62% of all doctoral recipients that year. However, only 21,053 reported full-time employment plans and 13,235 reported pursuing a post-doctoral position. From those who indicated full-time employment plans, 18,922 provided their employment sector. Data indicate that 8,174 or 43.2% secured employment in an academic position. These academic positions were allocated as follows: Latino/Hispanic (525), American Indian/Alaska Native (32), Asian (396), Black/African American (462), White (4,976), more than one race (234), a different race or race not reported (53), and ethnicity not reported (33) (NSF, 2018). This data suggests that most academic positions during this survey cycle went to White doctorate earners, ensuring they remain the majority in academic positions. Table 1 includes the figures represented here.

Table 1*Number and Percentage of US Doctorates and Recipients' Academic Employment by Race*

Race	US Doctorates Awarded		US Doctorates Pursuing Academic Employment	
	N	%	n	%
Asian	14,815	26.84%	396	4.84%
Black/African American	3,058	5.54%	462	5.65%
Hispanic/Latino	3,603	6.52%	525	6.42%
American Indian/Alaska Native	116	.21%	32	.39%
white	28,585	51.78%	4,976	60.87%
More than one race	1,213	2.19%	234	2.86%
Different Race/ Race not reported	862	1.56%	53	.64%
Ethnicity not Reported	2,943	5.33%	33	.4%
Total	55,195		8,174	

Note. Adapted from National Science Foundation, 2019, Employment sector of doctorate recipients with definite postgraduation commitments for employment in the United States, by sex, citizenship status, ethnicity, and race, table 47 (<https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf20301/data-tables>).

Employment of Racially Minoritized Faculty

Data from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, 2020) show that in fall 2017, there were 1.5 million faculty employed at degree granting institutions of higher education in the US. Of that 1.5 million, 53% were employed full-time and 43% part-time. Full-time faculty represented in these data include tenured and tenure-track faculty, including full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors. In contrast, part-time faculty consist of instructors, lecturers, and adjunct and interim professors. Since this manuscript emphasizes the experiences of racially minoritized tenure-track faculty, we present more specific employment data for full-time faculty below.

In terms of race and ethnicity, of the full-time faculty employed in fall 2018 White females and males represented 35% and 40%, respectively,

while 7% and 5% were Asian American/Pacific Islander males and Asian American/Pacific Islander females, respectively. The numbers of full-time faculty were lower for Black females, Black males, Hispanic females and Hispanic males, who accounted for 3% each. Furthermore, American Indian/Alaska Native and those who were of two or more races represented 1% or less of faculty employed full-time (NCES, 2020).

Figures related to full-time faculty ranks also revealed great disparity across racial/ethnic groups. For instance, of all full professors 53% were White males and 27% White females, 8% Asian American/Pacific Islander males and 3% Asian American/Pacific Islander females. Moreover, Black males, Black females, and Hispanic males accounted for only 2% of full professors while Hispanic females, American Indian/Alaska Native faculty, and faculty of two or more races represented 1% and less than 1% of full professors. Among associate professors, 41% and 35% were White males and White females, respectively, while Asian American/Pacific Islander males and Asian American/Pacific Islander females accounted for 7% and 5% accordingly. Black males, Black females, and Hispanic males represented 3% each and Hispanic females accounted only for 2% of all associate professors. These figures were much smaller for Indian/Alaska Native faculty, and faculty of two or more races represented 1% and less than 1% of associate professors (NCES, 2020).

At the assistant professor rank, estimates were not much different than those for associate and full professors. That is, White males and White females accounted for 34% and 39% of full-time assistant professors. In contrast, Asian American/ Pacific Islander males and Asian American/Pacific Islander females represented 7% and 7% respectively, while 5% were Black females. Furthermore, Black males, Hispanic females, and Hispanic males each accounted for 3% of assistant professors and American Indian/Alaska Native faculty and faculty of two or more races each represented less than 1% of the total number of full-time assistant professors (NCES, 2020). Table 2 represents the distribution of full-time faculty employment by race and academic rank.

Table 2

Percentage of US Faculty by Race and Gender

Race	Academic Rank								
	Assistant Professor			Associate Professor			Full Professor		
	Female	Male	%	Female	Male	%	Female	Male	%
American Indian / Alaska Native			<1%			1%			1%
Asian / Pacific Islander	7%	7%		5%	7%		3%	8%	
Black	5%	3%		3%	3%		2%	2%	
Hispanic	3%	3%		2%	2%		<1%	2%	
white	39%	34%		35%	41%		27%	53%	
Two or more races			<1%			<1%			<1%

Note. Adapted from U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), 2019, *The Condition of Education 2020* (NCES 2020-144), Characteristics of Postsecondary Faculty (<https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61>).
^a “Sex breakouts excluded for faculty who were American Indian/Alaska Native and of Two or more races because the percentages were 1 percent or less” (U.S. Department of Education, 2020).

Universally Accepted Metrics for Promotion and Tenure

It is widely understood that full-time faculty on the tenure-track are commonly evaluated for promotion and tenure in three main areas: research, teaching, and service (American Council on Education, 2000; Turner et al., 2008). In order to evaluate individual faculty members, colleges and universities rely on a wide array of indicators to assess performance on each of these metrics. For example, to evaluate research, indicators most frequently comprise quantity of publications, type of publications, journal impact factors, authorship order, publication readership statistics, and number of external grants, among others (Bullough, 2014; DeSanto & Nichols, 2017; Huber, 2002; Park & Riggs, 1993). Similarly, indicators to evaluate teaching consist of attaining positive student teaching evaluations, peer teaching observations, and contributions to curriculum development, and so on (See, 2016; Trower,

2012). In contrast, service is evaluated at most institutions in relation to activity in the program, department, college, institution, international, and professional association levels (See, 2016; Trower, 2012).

While these metrics are universally accepted in evaluating tenure-track faculty for promotion and tenure, scholars caution that emphasis and interpretation of these metrics vary greatly by institution (Damasco & Hodges, 2012; McGill & Settle, 2012; Park & Riggs, 1993). Notwithstanding, leading professional associations in higher education (American Council on Education, 2000) advocate for enhanced clarity of standards and procedures to ensure consistency in evaluation across all tenure candidates. Nonetheless, the latter assertion suggests that all tenure candidates should experience the tenure-track or pre-tenure probationary period in a similar fashion, and thus, be evaluated by similar methods. Such reasoning inevitably dismisses the diversity of tenure-track faculty, which yields vastly different experiences. Specifically, racially minoritized faculty who experience pre-tenure much differently than White faculty (Turner et al., 2008). With this in mind, the section below examines scholarship on the experiences of racially minoritized tenure-track faculty.

Experiences of Racially Minoritized Tenure-Track Faculty in Academia

Research on the experiences of racially minoritized tenure-track faculty asserts that they experience lack of recognition and discrimination in their job duties and expectations (Eddy, 2000; Guillaume & Apodaca, 2020; Haynes et al., 2019; Price & Cotten, 2006), which negatively shape their experiences. Yet, other scholars argue that racially minoritized faculty are expected to do double the work in any and all areas of their jobs, and be experts in areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion (Chabram, 2016; Espino & Zambrana, 2019; Fries-Britt & Kelly, 2005; Stanley, 2006). In fact, some scholars (Harris, 2020; Kelly et al., 2017; See, 2016; Smith, 1997) posit that the tenure process is fundamentally embarrassing and condescending towards racially minoritized faculty and closely resembles hazing that often occurs in fraternities and sororities where much of a members' accomplishments is derived from others' perceptions of fit.

Specifically, literature pertaining to the trilogy of research, teaching, and service metrics by which tenure-track faculty are evaluated for promotion and tenure reinforces how problematic and dismissive the process is for many racially minoritized faculty members. Effectively, racially minoritized tenure-track faculty have unique experiences including navigating racism, discrimination, and disparate expectations in the academy and the broader society. In many instances, these experiences contribute to the emergence of a *resource deficit consciousness* among these faculty, primarily in relation to time, money, and prestige. In the following section, we review literature on tenure expectations for racially minoritized faculty in relation to research, teaching, and service. Although extant research lacks specificity as to what is really required to fulfill such metrics successfully, current literature demonstrates that these metrics are inherently biased against racially minoritized faculty (Gregory, 2001; Guillaume & Apodaca, 2020; Siegel et al., 2015; Trower & Bleak, 2004).

Research. As referenced earlier in this manuscript, research productivity of tenure-track faculty is evaluated on an array of factors most often including: publication volume, journal impact, publication readership statistics, maintaining an active research agenda, and securing internal and external research grants (Bullough, 2014; DeSanto & Nichols, 2017; Huber, 2002; Park & Riggs, 1993). Traditionally, these metrics are thought of as neutral and solely based on merit. Nonetheless, research on the experience of racially minoritized faculty asserts otherwise. Specifically, a dominant narrative framing racially minoritized faculty as less productive than White faculty reigns (Museus, 2020; Stanley, 2006), in light of the false neutral meritocracy built around research metrics.

Scholars posit that a major challenge of racially minoritized faculty on the tenure-track is the devaluation of their scholarly contributions (Alfred, 2001; Gonzales & Núñez, 2014; Gregory, 2001; Turner et al., 2008). In some cases, racially minoritized faculty encounter institutional climates that place little value on the foci of their research agendas. For instance, Settles et al. (2020) found that racially minoritized faculty pursue research to benefit marginalized communities and questioned whether the contributions of these faculty are valued as much as other research agendas. In the same vein, racially minoritized tenure-track faculty may encounter resistance to innovative research approaches and

theoretical inclinations that deviate from what often is held as, or considered by academic leaders to be the “norm.” In turn, this resistance may impact their ability to publish (Turner et al., 2008) and certainly may limit their chances for publishing in major academic journals in almost every discipline.

Furthermore, many racially minoritized faculty experience work environments that lack adequate resources and support to pursue their research agendas. The scarcity of research assistants and research funding (Chabram, 2016), as well as lack of support for grant writing and research design, faced by many racially minoritized tenure-track faculty (Siegel, 2015; Turner et al., 2008) make these obstacles difficult to overcome in a tenure review. Support for research that is missing comprises: funds to travel, graduate assistants’ availability, grants to support the pursuit of equity oriented research agendas, and research skills mentorship (Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Rodriguez et al., 2014; Siegel et al., 2015; Trower, 2012; Turner et al., 2008).

Teaching. Although teaching is said to be valued more highly than research at teaching focused institutions, when faculty are able to secure external research grants there is often higher value placed on that achievement despite the weight of teaching in the tenure process at those institutions. In contrast, at non-teaching focused institutions, the second element of the trilogy of metrics for tenure and promotion is teaching. Tenure-track faculty are evaluated on indicators that suggest “high quality” teaching and pedagogy. Examining some of the indicators, such as student evaluations of teaching, peer teaching observations, teaching recognition beyond their institution, and contributions to curriculum development (Park & Riggs, 1993; See, 2016; Trowers, 2012) suggest that deconstructing these indicators may assist an institution to better understand the context of racially minoritized faculty, particularly at PWIs. Like markers for research productivity, indicators to evaluate effectiveness and excellence in teaching are not free of bias (Sensoy & DeAngelo, 2017).

Scholarship highlights several barriers that racially minoritized faculty encounter in their teaching experience. One of these challenges is the minimal preparation to teach that most faculty receive in their doctoral programs (Trower, 2012). Lack of teaching mentorship as a graduate student results in much learning about teaching taking place on the job as

a faculty member. The challenge of learning to teach, coupled with scarcity of resources such as teaching assistants to support teaching and grading (Chabram, 2016; Trower, 2009; Trower, 2012), high teaching loads, and lack of mentoring and professional development to improve teaching performance (Tillman, 2001) further marginalizes racially minoritized faculty.

An equally significant challenge is the reliance on student evaluations to assess teaching effectiveness. For years, scholars have asserted that student evaluations are implicitly biased against racially minoritized faculty and are not a reliable measure to evaluate teaching effectiveness (Boring et al., 2016; Fan et al., 2019; Sensoy & DeAngelo, 2017; Williams, 2007), especially for those who teach courses centered on race and racism or race-related inequities (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002; Brooms & Brice, 2017; Brunnsma et al., 2013; Matthew, 2016). Specifically, scholars highlight that racially minoritized faculty are frequently rated lower in their teaching than White faculty (McGowan, 2000; Stanley, 2006; Williams, 2007). Problematic for multiple reasons, racially-motivated, unfavorable student evaluations do “not end with racist students; it is an institutional problem, as colleagues and administrators are often unequipped and unwilling to recognize and to deal with racism” (Williams, 2007, p. 169). When university administrators and tenured faculty ignore these abrasive signs of systemic racism initiated by anonymous individuals making racist comments, the narrative of neutrality for evaluation of teaching effectiveness is reinforced.

Service. Service is the third pillar on which tenure-track faculty are evaluated for the purposes of tenure and promotion. Indicators to assess service typically include serving at the program, department, college, institution, international, and professional association levels (See, 2016; Trower, 2012). Scholars argue that from the trilogy of metrics for tenure and promotion, service is one of the areas where racially minoritized faculty place higher value and significantly greater amounts of time, although service is not as highly regarded as research productivity and teaching effectiveness in most tenure and promotion processes (Baez, 2000; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; See, 2016; Turner, 2009). This idea, which dismisses the role of academic environments in shaping service expectations, is challenged by research that asserts that

the academy places higher unrealistic demands for service on racially minoritized faculty (Baez, 2000; Diggs et al., 2009).

On average, service is the least emphasized area of the three in tenure and promotion for faculty members at 4-year institutions. While some faculty workloads allocate only 20% to service (Garrison-Wade et al., 2012; Rodriguez et al., 2014), racially minoritized faculty often are asked to serve on a multitude of initiatives that easily require more than 20% of their workload (Rosser, 2005). Service demands include implicitly asking to serve as the representative for their racial/ethnic group in their academic program/department, advising racially minoritized students, serving on diversity, inclusion, social justice committees, and participating in equity focused initiatives and dissertation committees with related topics (Rosser, 2005).

In some cases, institutions of higher education frame greater service demands for racially minoritized faculty under the facade of recruitment and retention efforts geared specifically at racially minoritized faculty (Anthym & Tuitt, 2019; Garrison-Wade et al., 2012). That is, institutions benefit doubly from having racially minoritized faculty labor for institutional advancement in areas of diversity, equity, and inclusion while benefiting from showcasing the diversity of their faculty/appearing as diverse institutions in support of racially minoritized faculty. Such dynamics lead racially minoritized faculty to feel tokenized and used to advance institutional interest at the expense of their time, energy, and ability to further their research and teaching trajectories on the road to tenure and promotion (Garrison-Wade et al., 2012). Thus, scholars urge for protection of racially minoritized tenure-track faculty from too much service and to increase the promotional weight of service in evaluating candidacy for tenure and promotion (Rodriguez et al., 2014; Trower, 2012). When research, teaching and service are put in the context of a theory of racialized organizations (Ray, 2019), the resulting byproducts of systemic racism, which are inherently biased against racially minoritized faculty members in higher education, are better understood.

Our Positionalities

Our collective identities as immigrant women of color as well as our racial justice research agendas and personal experiences as faculty members working in predominantly White environments impacted our

decision to write this manuscript. The first author is a Black, multi-racial, first-generation immigrant woman, born and raised in Jamaica, and attended college and graduate school in the United States. Personal and professional experiences navigating PWIs influenced her decision to focus her research on creating equitable campus environments for racially minoritized populations, specifically faculty members, in order to challenge dominant discourse in the academy that often holds racially minoritized faculty members to unfair and unjust standards.

The second author is a Mexican immigrant, Woman of Color, first-generation graduate , and a first-generation faculty member. Born and raised in Mexico, she became interested in researching inequities that impact racially minoritized communities upon immigrating to the United States and navigating an inequitable educational system both personally and professionally. These experiences shaped her career trajectory as well as motivation to engage in critical scholarship to deconstruct power structures, systems, and ideologies that perpetuate inequity in higher education.

Both of our identities are central to the arguments highlighted in this paper; additionally, our identities are integral to understanding how we perceive the academy and how the academy perceives us, and many of our racially minoritized colleagues. We commit to continued engagement in discussions that may not always be looked on as favorable, but that are absolutely necessary in order to support the advancement of racially minoritized faculty in the academy.

Theoretical Framework

The theory of racialized organizations posits that the foundation and hierarchies of any organization is inherently based on racism and, as such, the distribution of, and access to, resources varies by race (Ray, 2019). The theory of racialized organizations provides a critical framework to understand more clearly the institutionalization of racial inequities throughout organizations (Ray, 2019). In this paper, we make direct connections to PWIs as racialized organizations as they uphold and reproduce racial order and inequities in the academy. Racial order refers to a specific set of beliefs, assumptions, policies, and practices that influence how specific racial groups interact with and are connected with

each other (Hochschild et al., 2012). Racialized institutions shape faculty agency specifically by controlling the usage of time and limiting access to resources such as money and prestige. Utilizing the theory of racialized organizations and applying it to PWIs allows understanding of how these institutions are constructed from a racialized foundation and therefore continue to perpetuate inequities across the board for racially minoritized faculty. We apply the four tenets of racialized organizational theory below using specific examples of how this manifests in the White neoliberal academy.

The first tenet, *racialized organizations enhance or diminish the agency of racial groups* (Ray, 2019, p. 36), translates to faculty with privileged identities continuously having access and agency to navigate the academy primarily because of their racial privilege. Compared to racially minoritized faculty whose agency is diminished solely based on their minoritized racial identities, White faculty have greater access, agency and capital. The second tenet, *racialized organizations legitimate the unequal distribution of resources* (Ray, 2019, p. 38), is revealed in the academic hierarchy and institutional metrics of evaluation as prime examples. To illustrate, untenured racially minoritized faculty must have single authored articles, attain a certain quantity of publications, and publish in high ranked journals, allowing for hazing by higher ranking faculty in their departments and across the profession (professional associations, for example). The academy upholds the message that there is a level playing field and assumes a color blind or race-neutral ideology (Crenshaw et al., 2019; Ray, 2019), rather than acknowledge the systemic nature of racism as deeply embedded in the foundation of these inherently biased organizations. In fact, all institutions of higher education, PWIs in particular, hire racially minoritized faculty who do not have the same social capital as White faculty.

The third tenet, *Whiteness is a credential* (Ray, 2019, p. 41), relates to the delegitimization of racially minoritized faculty who attain the same credentials as their White counterparts, and often surpass them with little or no recognition. Racialization of people is more important to these institutions than credentials because racially minoritized populations are often perceived as being ‘less than’ strictly based on race. Whiteness supersedes all other requirements for success in a racialized organization. The fourth tenet, *decoupling of formal rules from organizational practice is often racialized* (Ray, 2019, p. 42), presents the rules and policies of

the academy as neutral and just, for example the tenure process. These “rules” look vastly different when put into practice for many racially minoritized faculty. Not everyone is assessed equally, research often is discredited as lacking objectivity, and oftentimes the unseen labor offered and endured by many racially minoritized faculty is not considered in tenure and promotion or is simply not valued. Another example is student course evaluations, which are fundamentally biased against racially minoritized faculty, especially in relation to the courses they teach, but are crucial to attaining promotion and tenure (Arnold et al., 2016).

The theory of racialized organizations allows us to deconstruct why universally accepted metrics for success of racially minoritized faculty discount the unique contexts in which they operate and allows for careful examination of systemic underpinnings that anchor institutional philosophies, policies, and practices across academe. Since racialized organizations inherently benefit from White neoliberal power structures, there is little or no desire or urgency to challenge a system that dismisses a group of people who are not considered as beneficial or integral to the functions of those particular organizations (Ray, 2019). In the next section, application of time, money, and prestige to the experiences of racially minoritized faculty are captured in relation to a resource deficit consciousness.

Racially Minoritized Faculty Navigating Resource Deficit Consciousness

Oftentimes, institutional metrics do not account for contexts with limited resources that enable faculty to succeed. This is especially true for racially minoritized faculty members, many of whom often construct research agendas on advancing equity and inclusion without structures and resources that ensure their success (Diggs et al., 2009; Stanley, 2006). The experiences of racially minoritized faculty at prominent research universities, for example, differ significantly from racially minoritized faculty at teaching-focused, regional institutions or community colleges (Levin et al., 2015; Neumann, 2012). In many instances, faculty members at research focused institutions have access to much more time, money, and prestige than those faculty working at non-research focused institutions. Many of the racially minoritized faculty at non-research institutions experience a greater resource deficit

consciousness as they face numerous barriers to accessing resources that advance their research agendas (Baez, 1998; Settles et al., 2019). It is important to note that within the triad of neoliberal metrics for faculty promotion and tenure, research is more favorably valued, even in institutions where this is not top priority, as success is almost always singularly equated with research productivity. Since research generates additional funding and notoriety for institutions of higher education, a direct result of academic capitalism (Gonzales & Nunez, 2014; Park, 2011), it is easy to identify the inconsistency in institutional stated values and practice. The ways in which racialized neoliberalist institutional systems shape faculty access to structures that make time, money and prestige in short supply for racially minoritized faculty are discussed below, and examples of how these manifest in the experiences of faculty are provided. Finally, a discussion about how time, money, and prestige contribute to competition among faculty and prohibit the advancement of equity agendas in the academy is discussed.

Time. Faculty advance their careers via their involvement in research, teaching, and service (Eagan & Garvey, 2015). Depending on the institution and academic discipline, the level of involvement in each of the three areas outlined above varies greatly. While institutional requirements for tenure and promotion may differ, one fact remains true: all three of these areas require substantial time commitments. Well planned research requires the development of an idea and agenda, a search for funding, study execution, data analysis, and the reporting of findings to prospective publication outlets. In many instances, faculty are juggling one or more research projects. Teaching requires a semester or quarter long classroom preparation plan and, depending on teaching loads, this looks significantly different for different faculty. For example, a faculty member with lower teaching loads (e.g., one to two courses for the academic year) has greater time availability to commit to engaging in research-related activities. Contrastingly, faculty members with higher teaching loads (e.g., four courses per semester) have less time available for research-related activities, which often contributes to lower research output. In addition to classroom preparation, grading responsibilities, office hours, dissertation committees, and requested meetings with students to either review material not understood, or process varying emotions and experiences they face in and out of the classroom during their specific academic programs, create massive time demands on racially minoritized faculty. Service, the most undervalued of all three

requirements for faculty frequently requires high time commitments and great emotional investment. Oftentimes, racially minoritized faculty carry a higher service load and are expected to serve on and represent every, and any, committee created for diversity, equity, and inclusion across the institution (Shavers et al., 2014).

Scholarly work on faculty experiences in the academy posits that many faculty members simply do not have enough time to spend on research, teaching, and service and a feel a sense of overwhelm at the competing demands required to advance their careers (Barnes et al., 1998). These demands on faculty productivity and output continue to increase and create significant constraints for faculty members as they seek to balance both their professional and personal lives. Many tenure-track faculty report feelings of burnout within the first three years of their appointment and report high levels of stress and unhappiness with their job because of the many requirements they are expected to fulfill simultaneously (Eddy & Gaston-Gayles, 2008). In fact, it is also noted that upon achieving tenure and promotion, newly minted associate professors are significantly unhappy and unsatisfied (Blanchard, 2012). Time constraints are pervasive throughout higher education, and faculty members constantly face the challenge of balancing competing priorities. Competition for time means one or more areas are compromised and likely not carried out well, if at all (Berebitsky & Ellis, 2018). Additionally, time constraints become even more limiting for racially minoritized faculty and women in the academy, who often are overextended simply because of their race and gender identities (Settles et al., 2019). Within academe, the notion of managing time efficiently and even attempting to outsmart time is prevalent as institutions continue to embody White supremacist capitalistic values (Walker, 2009).

When considering what structures contribute to the scarcity of time, three components are noted including the tenure clock, increased demands of faculty members, and technology (Walker, 2009). The tenure clock, typically no more than seven years, dictates how long a faculty member has to produce a certain number of scholarly publications, receive strong teaching evaluations, and engage in various service commitments, all of which are utilized to demonstrate how successful tenure-track faculty have been within their probationary period and potential for continued success. As the field of higher education continues to move away from serving the public good to functioning as a capitalistic enterprise

(Slaughter & Rhodes, 2004), the demands on faculty continue to increase. In many cases, faculty not only are balancing professional demands of research, teaching, and service but also personal demands including managing family responsibilities and their own health and wellness. Oftentimes, faculty who are parents and/or caregivers to family members find it extremely difficult to keep a healthy balance between their personal and professional lives (Berebitsky & Ellis, 2018). In many ways, technology has also made time scarce because of the pressures for instant communication between colleagues and students. As such, many faculty feel as if they have to respond to varying requests as soon as they are made (Walker, 2009) or be faced with negative institutional consequences, such as being viewed as non-student centered, and framed as not being a ‘team player’ or lacking ‘fit’ within their academic departments.

Money. As higher education continues to be commercialized, money remains a central focus and priority of institutions of higher education (Slaughter & Rhodes, 2004). Revenue generation has become a major business for institutions that depend on tuition dollars from students and external sources of grant funding from faculty to increase spending power and status (Szelenyi, 2013). Thus, for many institutions of higher education, increased funding resources enhance prestige and power and attract top talent whether it be faculty or students who are then able to bring in external funding and contribute to revenue. However, depending on the institution or the academic discipline, access to money, especially from external sources, could make or break a faculty member’s career. Money creates inequalities across institutions of higher education and clear divisions between faculty who are able to acquire funds and those who are not able to do so. In fact, disciplinary nuances involved in engaging positively or negatively with academic capitalism are clear (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). That is, not all academic disciplines are created equally, and not all will benefit from academic capitalism which seeks to commercialize activities and find customers (i.e., their students and those who want to pay for their research) (Ylijoki, 2013).

The privatization of funding sources, nature of research, and ranking of institutions are inherently racist structures that contribute to the scarcity of money. The privatization of funding sources limits how much money is available to faculty, as the allocation of funds is determined based on

how closely aligned the agendas of these organizations are with the faculty's area of expertise. The nature of faculty research dictates to what extent they are fundable. In many instances, a specific type of academic discipline is favored over the other and thus deemed worthy by independent and federal foundations, institutions of higher education, and national organizations, and often granted larger sums of money. Finally, an institution's ranking plays heavily into the scarcity of money because faculty at more prestigious institutions are rendered worthy enough to have (more) institutional resources allocated to them and are able to access greater private funding, which further enhances the credibility of external funding sources than faculty at less prestigious institutions (Gonzales & Nunez, 2014; O'Meara & Bloomgarden, 2011).

Prestige. Ranking universities is not something new and has existed since the beginning of US higher education (Pusser & Marginson, 2013; Gonzales & Nunez, 2014). The system of ranking universities has become a major enterprise, and benefits both the institutions who are ranked most prestigious, as well as the news outlets who market this information (Lynch, 2013). While university rankings are problematic, in that the institutions who are highly ranked remain disproportionately favored, ranking continues to position the wealthiest and most renowned as the premiere institutions to attend and for which to work (Lynch, 2013). Benefitting as well from prestigious rankings are faculty who yield highly individualized rewards from being associated with the highest ranked institutions (Slaughter & Leslie, 2001). Standards of productivity, value of degree, and the hierarchy of academic jobs are structures that contribute to making prestige scarce. Standards of academic productivity are often modelled after the most productive scholars in a given academic discipline.

Many highly productive faculty are idolized by both students and other faculty colleagues and become the standard that is used to measure the individual successes of faculty without considering that not all faculty experiences are equal. Many of the scholars idolized have had access to time, money, and prestige in a multitude of ways. For example, a faculty member working at a highly ranked research one institution with a teaching load of two classes a year, and access to more funding (both internal and external) has greater opportunities and resources for more productivity in the area of research when compared to a scholar at a teaching institution with a higher teaching load of eight classes a year

and almost no access to research funds. The hierarchy of academic jobs also contributes to the scarcity of prestige, in that many doctoral students are prepped for tenure-track jobs that are extremely limited. A hierarchy of prestige is also created: among those who secure a tenure-track faculty position, clinical/visiting lines, administrative positions, or adjunct faculty positions, with those on the tenure-track viewed as being the most “successful.”

Competition and Equity Agendas

The points raised above highlight opportunities, limitations, and challenges across faculty lines and experiences. Given the inequities latent within higher education structures, competition is reinforced throughout faculty ranks and especially within the tenure and promotion process. As scholars have noted, “institutional production, largely sustained by faculty productivity, is fueled by competition” (Levin & Aliveya, 2015, p. 13) among an institution’s faculty. While levels of competition vary depending on institutional type, faculty behavior is typically influenced by neoliberal practices that encourage a culture of outdoing counterparts, sometimes at any cost (Terosky & Gonzales, 2016). Faculty in neoliberal institutions often boast high publication numbers and acquire large prestigious research grants (Carson et al., 2013; Roux et al., 2015) which breeds a negative culture of over competitiveness, often compromising their personal and professional lives. Specifically, the availability of time, prestige, and money interact together in a cyclical manner within the academy and continue to be further perpetuated by those who occupy it. Those who have access to more resources, be it time, money, or prestige rank higher on the academic ‘food chain,’ meaning they receive the awards and recognition that accompany higher accessibility to resources. Ultimately, these privileged faculty yield the benefits of being recognized as the best and most successful in the academy. Those faculty who do not have access to the same resources operate in a resource deficit mindset and are often left to feel ‘less than’ other colleagues who do have access to more resources. Experiencing these feelings may cause faculty members deep psychological distress as well as a strong urge to engage deeply with trying to solve the problem by overcompensating on quantity, rather than quality (Shah et al., 2012).

Equity agendas require extensive time, care, and engaged scholarship; these agendas cannot easily meet a check-list criteria and should not be rushed. However, when faced with a resource deficit consciousness, many scholars make decisions that benefit their scholarly success toward tenure and promotion, as opposed to meaningfully forwarding their research agendas because of the constraints of time, money and prestige in the midst of an overly competitive academy. For example, in order to meet tenure metrics, a tenure-track faculty member may decide to submit a publication to a 'lower ranked' journal to be able to meet the metric of publication quantity per year, but may miss the mark for impact in a journal based on time constraints and the impending time it takes for a journal to shuffle manuscripts through their review pipeline.

Awareness of the lack of time, money, and prestige is paramount for neoliberal institutions in search of helping racially minoritized faculty succeed. In order to challenge resource deficit consciousness, which is driven by competition, the academy is in dire need of leaders who understand and support equity agendas and acknowledge that it takes support, time, resources, and anti-racist policies and practices to engage in transformational academic work. Leaders who are willing to challenge neoliberalist tenure and promotion requirements are needed in order to support the success of racially minoritized faculty invested in equity scholarship, teaching, and practice, in particular.

Implications for Research and Practice

There are several implications for research and practice that are necessary in order to honor, value, and affirm the unique contexts in which racially minoritized tenure-track faculty operate. It is crucial that higher education stakeholders reject the deeply rooted, racist history of academic metrics of success and understand how they dismiss the lived experiences, interests, and commitments of racially minoritized faculty on the tenure-track. First, future research should explore the complications that racially minoritized faculty experience by "playing the game" (Wright-Mair & Museus, 2021) based upon the inherently racist foundations which most institutions of higher education in the U.S. are built. What does it mean to play the game? What are the costs of playing the game? And who benefits most from playing the game? An examination of why racially minoritized faculty have to play the game differently is also important. Second, research should account for the

impact of pursuing and attaining narrowly defined notions of “success” on racially minoritized faculty morale and self-worth in the academy and analyze the inherent cost for many of these faculty. When these costs are identified, it helps expand how racially minoritized faculty are disproportionately affected both personally and professionally, and how their research agendas, especially those that center inclusion, equity, and anti-racism, benefit or suffer from current metrics of success.

Third, more research is needed to illustrate that copious amounts of research productivity is not the only way to be successful in an academic career. Working toward disrupting a longstanding hierarchy and academic culture that perceives highly productive scholars as more successful than other scholars doing work of equal value and stature in a non-research related context must be part of the success equation in a racist neoliberal institution. A deep analysis of the impact of competition’s perpetuity among tenure-track faculty is also warranted. Research that disrupts internalized ideologies of markers for faculty success that continue to reinforce competition and negative feelings experienced by racially minoritized faculty in the academy may ultimately lead to increased racially minoritized satisfaction and retention.

For practice, first it is crucial to understand the needs of racially minoritized tenure-track faculty and honor their contributions. Institutions can more broadly support these faculty by providing resources for those engaging in equity and anti-racist research agendas across the board and not just in preferred disciplinary areas. Such support could include grants that sustain all types of work, not just research, course releases, and additional rewards as a first step toward dismantling the fundamental structural racism of higher education that disproportionately causes these faculty to experience a resource deficit consciousness. Professional associations can also play a role in this endeavor by awarding different tier awards to tenure-track faculty at various institutions and not preserve a continuous cycle that only favors those faculty members who have access to and benefit from more time, money, and prestige in the academy.

Second, tenure and promotion processes need to be restructured to value what racially minoritized tenure-track faculty contribute to higher education. Current metrics for success related to promotion and tenure

must be removed and new metrics need to be created that account for discipline/ departmental variation in workloads and responsibilities. For example, tenure-track faculty should not chair dissertation committees and, if they do chair, not be penalized when the quantity of their scholarship suffers. Another example is when racially minoritized faculty engage in copious amounts of service because they are deemed the 'expert' on all diversity related matters in their departments, college units, and/or institutions. This practice needs to end.

Finally, institutions of higher education, regardless of academic classification, need to stop pretending neutrality is ubiquitous and examine how power, money, and prestige influence the work lives of racially minoritized tenure-track faculty in disparate ways compared to White faculty. For example, following the acceptance of the inequity ingrained in the tenure and promotion process, institutions must respond by engaging in strategies that reject practices, policies, and ideologies that maintain the racist structures that sustain a resource deficit consciousness. As such, a tenure and promotion review committee that understands and accepts the fundamentally racist structure of the academy and, by extension, the tenure and promotion process, can choose to be more equitable when evaluating candidates by applying metrics that seek to value rather than quantify and rank faculty contributions.

References

Alfred, M. V. (2001). Reconceptualizing marginality from the margins: Perspectives of African American tenured female faculty at a White research university. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 25(1), 1 –11. <https://doi.org/10.32469/10355/10798>

American Council on Education. (2000). Good practice in tenure evaluation: Advice for tenured faculty, department chairs, and academic administrators. A Joint Project of The American Council on Education, The American Association of University Professors, & United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group. Retrieved from: <http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore/pdf/tenure-evaluation.pdf>

Anthym, M., & Tuitt, F. (2019). When the levees break: The cost of vicarious trauma, microaggressions and emotional labor for Black administrators and faculty engaging in race work at traditionally White institutions. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 32(9), 1072–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1645907>

Arnold, N. W., Crawford, E. R., & Khalifa, M. (2016). Psychological heuristics and faculty of color: Racial battle fatigue and tenure/promotion. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(6), 890–919. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.11780891>

Baez, B. (1998). *Negotiating and resisting racism: How faculty of color construct promotion and tenure*. ERIC Clearinghouse.

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 363–391. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1003972214943>

Barnes, L. L., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(4), 457–469. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018741404199>

Berebitsky, D., & Ellis, M. K. (2018). Influences on personal and professional stress on higher education faculty. *Journal of the Professorsiate*, 9(2), 88–110.

Bernal, D. D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the "legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713845282>

Blanchard, K. (2012, January). I've got tenure: How depressing. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 31. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/ive-got-tenure-how-depressing/>

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research, 1*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.14293/s2199-1006.1.sor-edu.aetbzc.v1>

Brooms, D. R., & Brice, D. A. (2017). Bring the noise: Black men teaching (race and) White privilege. *Race and Justice, 7*(2), 144–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2153368716689490>

Brunsma, D. L., Brown, E. S., & Placier, P. (2013). Teaching race at historically White colleges and universities: Identifying and dismantling the walls of Whiteness. *Critical Sociology, 39*(5), 717–738. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0896920512446759>

Bullough Jr, R. V. (2014). Higher education and the neoliberal threat: Place, fast time, and identity. *Journal of Thought, 48*(3-4), 13–32. <https://doi.org/10.1108/s1479-368720190000032004>

Carson, L., Bartneck, C., & Voges, K. (2013). Over-competitiveness in academia: A literature review. *Disruptive Science and Technology, 1*(4), 183–190. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1089/dst.2013.0013>

Chabram, A. (2016). Tenure in the contact zone: Spanish is our language, too. In P. A. Matthew (Ed.), *Written/unwritten: Diversity and the hidden truths of tenure*. (pp. 95–108). University of North Carolina Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9781469627724_matthew.9

Crenshaw, K.W., Harris, L.C., HoSang, D.M., & Lipsitz, G. (Eds.). (2019). *Seeing race again: Countering colorblindness across the disciplines*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520972148>

Damasco, I. T., & Hodges, D. (2012). Tenure and promotion experiences of academic librarians of color. *College & Research Libraries, 73*(3), 279–301. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-244>

DeSanto, D., & Nichols, A. (2017). Scholarly metrics baseline: A survey of faculty knowledge, use, and opinion about scholarly metrics. *College & Research Libraries*, 78(2), 150–170.

<https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.78.2.150>

Diggs, G. A., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2009). Smiling faces and colored spaces: The experiences of faculty of color pursuing tenure in the academy. *The Urban Review*, 41(4), 312–333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-008-0113-y>

Eagan Jr, M. K., & Garvey, J. C. (2015). Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(6), 923–954.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2015.0034>

Eddy, W. (2000). Race, gender, and faculty work lives: Data from the University of Michigan. *Diversity Digest*, 3–16.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/aman.12888>

Eddy, P. L., & Gaston-Gayles, J. L. (2008). New faculty on the block: Issues of stress and support. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 17(1-2), 89–106.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10911350802168878>

Espino, M. M., & Zambrana, R. E. (2019). "How do you advance here? How do you survive?" An exploration of under-represented minority faculty perceptions of mentoring modalities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 42(2), 457–484.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0003>

Fan, Y., Shepherd, L. J., Slavich, E., Waters, D., Stone, M., Abel, R., & Johnston, E. L. (2019). Gender and cultural bias in student evaluations: Why representation matters. *PloS one*, 14(2), 1–16.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209749>

- Fries-Britt, S., & Kelly, B. T. (2005). Retaining each other: Narratives of two African American women in the academy. *The Urban Review*, 37(3), 221–242. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0006-2>
- Garrison-Wade, D. F., Diggs, G. A., Estrada, D., & Galindo, R. (2012). Lift every voice and sing: Faculty of color face the challenges of the tenure-track. *The Urban Review*, 44(1), 90–112. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11256-011-0182-1>
- Gonzales, L. D., & Núñez, A.-M. (2014). The ranking regime and the production of knowledge: Implications for academia. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(31), 1–24. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n31.2014>
- Gregory, S. (2001). Black faculty women in the academy: History, status, and future. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 70(3), 124–138. <https://doi-org.libproxy.uncg.edu/10.2307/3211205>
- Guillaume, R. O., & Apodaca, E. C. (2020). Early career racially minoritized faculty and promotion and tenure: The intersection of advancement in the academy and cultural taxation. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2020.1718084>
- Harris, J. C. (2020). Multiracial faculty members' experiences with teaching, research, and service. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 13(3), 228–239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000123>
- Haynes, C., Taylor, L., Mobley Jr, S. D., & Haywood, J. (2020). Existing and resisting: The pedagogical realities of Black, critical men and women faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 91(5), 698–721. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2020.1731263>

- Hochschild, J., Weaver, V., & Burch, T. (2012). *Creating a new racial order: How immigration, multiracialism, genomics, and the young can remake race in America*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400841943>
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Sadao, K. C. (1998). The common experience of "otherness:" Ethnic and racial minority faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(4), 315–342.
- Kelly, B. T., Gayles, J. G., & Williams, C. D. (2017). Recruitment without retention: A critical case of Black faculty unrest. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 86(3), 305–317.
- Levin, J. S., & Aliyeva, A. (2015). Embedded neoliberalism within faculty behaviors. *The Review of Higher Education*, 38(4), 537–563. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.1998.0010>
- Levin, J. S., Jackson-Boothby, A., Haberler, Z., & Walker, L. (2015). “Dangerous work”: Improving conditions for faculty of color in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(9), 852–864. <https://doi-org.libproxy.uncg.edu/10.1080/10668926.2014.917596>
- Lynch, M. (2013). Diversity in college faculty just as important as student body. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://diverseeducation.com/article/52902/>
- Matthew, P. A. (2016). What is faculty diversity worth to a university? *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/11/what-is-faculty-diversity-worth-to-a-university/508334/>
- McGill, M. M., & Settle, A. (2012). Identifying effects of institutional resources and support on computing faculty research productivity, tenure, and promotion. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 7, 167–198.

McGowan, J. M. (2000). Multicultural teaching: African-American faculty classroom teaching experiences in predominantly White colleges and universities. *Multicultural Education*, 8(2), 19–22.

Milem, J. F., & Astin, H. S. (1993). The changing composition of the faculty: What does it really mean for diversity? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 25(2), 21–27.

Museus, S. D. (2020). Humanizing scholarly resistance: Toward greater solidarity in social justice advocacy within the neoliberal academy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 33(2), 140–150.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1681544>

National Science Foundation. (2019). Survey of earned doctorates: Doctorate recipients by race/ethnicity & citizenship status: 1958-2018, table 19. <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf20301/data-tables>

National Science Foundation. (2019). Postgraduation plans of doctorate recipients with definite commitments, by sex, citizenship status, ethnicity, and race, Table 45. <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf20301/data-tables>

National Science Foundation. (2019). Employment sector of doctorate recipients with definite postgraduation commitments for employment in the United States, by sex, citizenship status, ethnicity, and race, table 47. <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf20301/data-tables>

Neumann, A. (2012). Organizational cognition in higher education. In M. N. Bastedo (Ed.), *The organization of higher education: Managing colleges for a new era* (pp. 304–330). The John Hopkins University Press.

O'Meara, K., & Bloomgarden, A. (2011). The pursuit of prestige: The Experience of institutional striving from a faculty perspective. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 4(1), 39–73.

- Park, T. (2011). Academic capitalism and its impact on the American professoriate. *Journal of the Professoriate*, 6(1), 84–99.
- Park, B., & Riggs, R. (1993). Tenure and promotion: A study of practices by institutional type. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 19(2), 72–77.
- Pittman, C. T. (2012). Racial microaggressions: The narratives of African American faculty at a predominantly White university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 81(1), 82–92.
<https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.81.1.0082>
- Price, J., & Cotten, S. R. (2006). Teaching, research, and service: Expectations of assistant professors. *The American Sociologist*, 37(1), 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-006-1011-y>
- Pusser, B., & Marginson, S. (2013). University rankings in critical perspective. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(4), 544–568.
<https://doi-org.libproxy.uncg.edu/10.1353/jhe.2013.0022>
- Quaye, S. J., Karikari, S. N., Carter, K. D., Okello, W. K., & Allen, C. (2020). Why can't I just chill?: The visceral nature of racial battle fatigue. *Journal of College Student Development*, 61(5), 609–623. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0058>
- Ray, V. (2019). A theory of racialized organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 84(1), 26–53.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418822335>
- Rodríguez, J., Campbell, K., Fogarty, J., & Williams, R. (2014). Underrepresented minority faculty in academic medicine: A systematic review of URM faculty development. *Family Medicine*, 46(2), 100–104.

Rosser, V. J. (2005). Measuring the change in faculty perceptions over time: An examination of their work life and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1), 81–107.
<http://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-004-6290-y>

Roux, C., Goldsmith, K., & Bonezzi, A. (2015). On the psychology of scarcity: When reminders of resource scarcity promote selfish (and generous) behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 42(4), 615–631. <http://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucv048>

See, E. S. (2016). Talking tenure don't be safe. Because there is no safety there anyway. In P. A. Matthew (Ed.). *Written/unwritten: Diversity and the hidden truths of tenure*. (pp. 148–162). University of North Carolina Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9781469627724_matthew.12

Sensoy, Ö., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). “We are all for diversity, but...”: How faculty hiring committees reproduce Whiteness and practical suggestions for how they can change. *Harvard Educational Review*, 87(4), 557–580.
<https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-87.4.557>

Settles, I. H., Jones, M. K., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2020, March 2). Epistemic Exclusion: Scholar(ly) Devaluation That Marginalizes Faculty of Color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. Advance online publication.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000174>

Settles, I. H., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2019). Scrutinized but not recognized:(In)visibility and hypervisibility experiences of faculty of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 113, 62–74.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.003>

Shah, A. K., Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2012). Some consequences of having too little. *Science*, 338(6107), 682–685. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1222426>

Shavers, M. C., Butler, J., & Moore, III, J. L. (2014). Cultural taxation and the over commitment of service at predominantly White institutions. In F. A. Bonner, a. I. marbley, R. L. Hughes, F. Tuitt, P. A. Robinson, & R. M. Banda (Eds.), *Black faculty in the academy: Narratives for negotiating identity and achieving career success* (pp. 41–52). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315852164>

Siegel, D. J., Barrett, T. G., & Smith, T. H. (2015). To stay or to go: A comparison of factors influential in the decisions of African American faculty to remain at two elite Southern research universities. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 84(4), 593–607. <https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.84.4.0593>

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university. Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.35-3451>

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. *Organization*, 8(2), 154–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508401082003>

Slaughter, S., & Rhodes, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Szelenyi, K. (2013). The meaning of money in the socialization of science and engineering doctoral students: Nurturing the next generation of academic capitalists? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 84(2), 266–294. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23486797>

- Smith, D. G., Tovar, E., & García, H. A. (2012). Where are they? A multi-lens examination of the distribution of full-time faculty by institutional type, race/ethnicity, gender, and citizenship. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, (155), 5–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.20019>
- Stanley, C. A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(4), 701–736.
- Taylor Huber, M. (2002). Faculty evaluation and the development of academic careers. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2002(114), 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.48>
- Terosky, A. L., & Gonzales, L. D. (2016). Re-envisioned contributions: Experiences of faculty employed at institutional types that differ from their original aspirations. *The Review of Higher Education*, 39(2), 241–268.
- Tillman, L. C. (2001). Mentoring African American faculty in predominantly White institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(3), 295–325. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018822006485>
- Turner, C. S. V., González, J. C., & Wood, J. L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139–168. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012837>
- Trower, C. A. (2009). Toward a greater understanding of the tenure-track for minorities. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 41(5), 38–45.
- Trower, C. A. (2012). *Success on the tenure-track: Five keys to faculty job satisfaction*. Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book.15132>

- Trower, C. A., & Bleak, J. L. (2004). Study of new scholars. Gender: Statistical report [universities]. *Harvard Graduate School of Education*. <https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/files/gse-coache/files/coache-race.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). *The Condition of Education 2019* (NCES 2019-144), Characteristics of Postsecondary Faculty. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61>
- Walker, J. (2009). Time as the fourth dimension in the globalization of higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(5), 483–509. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27750742>
- Williams, D. A. (2007). Examining the relation between race and student evaluations of faculty members: A literature review. *Profession* (1), 168–173. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1632/prof.2007.2007.1.168>
- Wright-Mair, R., & Museus, S. D. (2021). Playing the game just enough: How ‘racially minoritized faculty who advance equity conceptualize success in the neoliberal academy. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000304>
- Wright-Mair, R. (2017). A phenomenological exploration of how campus environments shape the success of racially minoritized faculty at predominantly 131 Raquel Wright-Mair & Gabriel Pulido White institutions. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 1262. University of Denver
- Ylijoki, O. H. (2013). Boundary-work between work and life in the high-speed university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(2), 242–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.577524>