Diversity and Inclusion

Hatch, Anna. 2019. To fix research assessment, swap slogans for definitions. Nature. https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-03696-w

In this article, Anna Hatch, the program director of the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) discusses scholarly writing and assessment and emphasizes the need for clearer more defined language within it. She argues that emphasis is put on scholars to use "high impact" words and slogans which leads to over-use of keywords in order to gain popularity. She also highlighted how unconscious bias related to intersectional identities within scholarly work reduces diversity within the research community. In order to improve equity within the academic world, Hatch believes that clarity in the guidelines for assessment is needed in order to improve inclusion and reduce the use of meaningless "impact words" within scholarly work.

Holtrop, Tjitske. 2018. "The Evaluative Inquiry: A New Approach to Academic Evaluation." CWTS. Accessed May 19, 2020. https://www.cwts.nl:443/blog?article=n-r2u2b4&title=the-evaluative-inquiry-a-new-approach-to-academic-evaluation.

Holtrop examines academic evaluation regimes in this article, and proposes the evaluative inquiry as a way to have a less homogenized, more exploratory evaluation process. This approach to academic evaluation is in essence a building up on initiatives such as DORA and Leiden Manifesto, by using a variety of versatile methods to evaluate any form of scientific work. Using versatile methods promotes the exploration of all science environments, and forces evaluators to reconsider the traditional ways of evaluating academic quality. Another point made in this piece is how academic evaluations typically value an individual unit- a university or a scholar. Holtrop proposes using a contextual focus within evaluations in order to further evaluate societal relevance and value, rather than individual excellence. This article challenges traditional evaluation techniques: rather than valuing the individual solely on what they publish and where, ignores the fact that it is important to relate to society.

Gadd, Elizabeth. 2019. "The Blind and the Elephant: Bringing Clarity to Our Conversations about Responsible Metrics." The Biblomagician. Accessed May 18, 2020. https://thebibliomagician.wordpress.com/2019/05/15/the-blind-and-the-elephant-bringing-clarity-to-our-conversations-about-responsible-metrics/.

This piece explores an important aspect of academic evaluation and ties it to a poem called "Five Blind Men and an Elephant". In the poem, five blind people are

approached by an elephant, and proceed to touch a part of the elephant in order to figure out what it is. This ties to academic evaluation, Gadd argues, because while responsible metrics have been talked about more recently, there is still a lack of clear definition of metrics and values within academia. Then, academics also have to address what is being measured, why and whether or not it is a valid method of measurement within research and evaluation. The main point is that one size doesn't fit all- each individual case must be evaluated on it's own, and within a societal context.

Hyon, S. 2011. "Evaluation in Tenure and Promotion Letters: Constructing Faculty as Communicators, Stars, and Workers." *Applied Linguistics* 32 (4): 389–407. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amr003.

Sunny Hyon, Professor of English at Cal State San Bernardino, wrote this piece as an exploration into the language used in RPT letters. Hyon examined 95 RPT letters written for 11 faculty members from 8 universities in the United States in order to understand and evaluate academic and community values within the promotion and tenure process. They found that the letters were written with seven key dimensions: presentation, expertise, conscientiousness, affect, prestige, uniqueness, and productivity (395). They also found that typically RPT letters are broken up into evaluated performance areas including teaching, research and service. The most noted wordage used within the letters relates to prestige of research (396). The implications of Hyon's findings include how faculty members are valued the most for what they produce- how significant their research is to their field, their level of expertise and rate of output of research (403). This lines up with previous research done on the RPT process- research and reputation is valued the most within academia.

Abdul-Raheem, Jalelah. 2016. "Faculty Diversity and Tenure in Higher Education." *Journal of Cultural Diversity* 23 (2): 53–56.

A professor of nursing at Redlands Community College, Abdul-Raheem discusses the need for increased diversity within higher education. She begins by emphasizing the important role that teachers have, and how white educators who have more power in higher education must take responsibility for educating their students about cultural diversity (53). Furthermore, tenured faculty (who are typically mostly white) have the duty to advocate for better diversity and equality within their institutions. This includes mentoring- one on one interactions especially between minority faculty and minority students allows an open discussion about discrimination within their institution, and makes students more comfortable in their academic environment.

Regarding the RPT process, Abdul-Raheem argues that with better representation within the process (at least 30%), underrepresented populations have a fairer chance of being judged fairly (54). This can be anywhere in the RPT process, from recruitment to evaluation. Abdul-Raheem goes on to propose solutions to enhance cultural diversity within higher education: one is eliminating hurdles and barriers that bring about feelings of inequality and tenure obtainment. This could be in the form of educating current faculty and candidates, as well as mentoring faculty. Another solution is providing all faculty events and resources that they can use and attend, which makes them more comfortable in the institution that they are in. At the same time, differences in a faculty member's culture and the institution's culture must be acknowledged.

Weisshaar, Katherine. 2017. "Publish and Perish? An Assessment of Gender Gaps in Promotion to Tenure in Academia." *Social Forces* 96 (2): 529–59. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sox052.

Katherine Weisshaar, a professor of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill explores the gender gap within the RPT process, and determines that measures in productivity contribute to the gender gap, but discrepancies arise between disciplines and must be reviewed further. She conducted a study using data from department websites, CVs, Google Scholar and NSF records, and data from the NRC's 1995 and 2006 lists of research universities with departments in Sociology, Computer Science and English. Based on those lists, she compiled names of assistant professors and looked at their productivity, based on the quantity and quality of publications, and their prestige based on where they published. She also looked at tenure over time, and when and where tenure was received.

She found that across all three disciplines, women take longer to receive tenure than men (539). She also noted several significant differences between men and women from productivity measures: In Sociology and Computer Science departments, women publish fewer articles in top journals, and receive fewer citations per publication than men (542). In Computer Science departments, assistant professors are less likely to publish as a single author than men. She also found that productivity variables in order to receive tenure are different by department. For example, publishing in a top journal and the number of journal and book publications are positive indicators of tenure-- while in Computer Science departments, the jumper of book chapters is a negative predictor (545-546). Overall, Weisshaar found that not only is there a gender gap in receiving tenure at all, but when women do receive tenure it is typically in lower ranked departments, or even in other departments. This article is very detailed in the data collection and analysis- it brings up new questions about the gender gap within the tenure process, such as how does gender bias impact the gender gap. Weisshaar Also

suggests that gender differences in visibility might also play a factor. Finally, Weisshaar suggests that more studies including more departments would improve on her work, and that interventions within departments are needed to increase women's productivity and therefore their chances of receiving tenure.

Maher, Frances A., and Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault. 2011. "Long-Term Transformations: Excavating Privilege and Diversity in the Academy." *Gender & Education* 23 (3): 281–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2010.491790.

In this article, Maher of the Women's Studies Research Center at Brandeis University and Tetreault of Portland State University conducted ethnographies of three universities; The University of Michigan, Stanford and Rutgers University-Newark in order to examine the importance of institutional frameworks over time in each one. This paper only focuses on their institutional ethnography of the University of Michigan, Maher and Tetreault studied over 100 interviews with faculty and administrators and perused a multitude of documents including formal departmental reports, newspapers and informal narratives (282). They framed their analysis with institutional phase theory that marks the process that the University of Michigan went through into phases through time. One change to the school's tenure process was how faculty could be granted tenure across departments and in interdisciplinary departments-- which encourages interdisciplinarity and less boundaries for faculty (293).

A poignant discussion that Maher and Tetreault had in their article was the evolving idea that class and race among other identities is something you do, rather than have (292-293). This can relate to Judith Butler's (1990) "Performative acts and gender constitution: an essay in phenomenology and feminist theory" where she discusses gender as a performance that is socially constructed, performed daily and maintained through social behaviors and norms. Maher and Tetreault discuss how doing race, gender etc. involves both the actors and observers or audience. This relates to diversity in academia by having new faculty with new ideas and identities that can disrupt the flow of the normal academic culture- this is both good and bad. It involves a negotiation on the new faculty member's part of merging and changing their own identity with the institutions', and it also introduces new experiences and identities into it.

I also appreciated the author's discussion of the differences between and complexities of the words excellence and diversity, and how they intersect with privilege (282). Maher and Tetreault argue that excellence can have several meanings in several contexts, but generally within academia, excellence is a single standard that all faculty must strive for and includes being the best of the best. Diversity is more complicated, and the authors believe that it is a contrast to privilege rather than excellence because it imposes the implicit idea of academic privilege over quality. Those with privilege can control the norms of an institution, and since

most institutions have a lack of diversity, there is a lack of equity of power. This article has a breadth of information and analysis, but the main point that the authors make is how institutions go through change and how each time boundaries and behaviors are negotiated more. They also point out that with their ethnography elaborating on forty years of U of M history and their institutional phase framework, changes are not additive- rather, difference phases represent changes in how people think, and how those social norms affected the university.

Settles, Isis H., Martinque K. Jones, NiCole T. Buchanan, and Kristie Dotson. 2020. "Epistemic Exclusion: Scholar(Ly) Devaluation That Marginalizes Faculty of Color." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, March. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000174.

This article is the result of an interdisciplinary effort to explore and understand the challenge of epistemic exclusion towards non-white faculty from traditional instutions in order to devalue their academic work and experience. The authors collected data as part of a larger study via interviews with 118 faculty of color from different disciplines from one majorily-white research institution. The larger study sought to look at shared experiences between faculty of color. Interviews lasted about 2 hours, and questions explored the academic environment, policies and procedures, and job satisfaction (4). In their results, the authors found themes that related to the three main questions they wanted to explore within their study. They found that the institution established formal hierarchies and informal processes connoting what types of scholarship are valuable and important to the institution (6). They also found that the quality of faculty of color's work, including any research or community work as well as where their research was published, was constantly questioned and evaluated, especially any work done on race and equity. There also was an implicit disconnect of importance between applied research and theory-driven research-- this disconnect relates to epistemic exclusion because the majority of applied, problem oriented research is helmed by marginalized individuals (6). One specific interviewee told the researchers that they don't feel valued because they don't bring in enough revenue for the department. Specifically within STEM departments, the authors found epistemic exclusion within the grant process-- those who receive external grants are valued more (6).

The authors found themes regarding how faculty deal with epistemic exclusion, including being assertive and seeking validation: these responses allow for self advocacy and potentially offset negative comments (9). From their third question regarding the consequences of epistemic exclusion, authors found that faculty of color are truly limited in what they can produce within white-led institutions (9). One consequence is faculty foregoing their research and focusing on more "mainstream" work to better align with the institution's values. Psychological consequences include feelings of isolation, unhappiness and dissatisfaction that could lead to faculty leaving (10). Lastly, the authors recommend institutional change regarding reevaluating

policies and procedures, accountability, and an acknowledgement from the institution that epistemic exclusion is a problem.

Subbaraman, Nidhi. 2020. “Grieving and Frustrated: Black Scientists Call out Racism in the Wake of Police Killings.” *Nature* 582 (7811): 155–56. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-01705-x.

In the wake of the nationwide peaceful protests supporting Black Lives Matter, Subbaraman writes about racism towards Black academics and how institutions can improve and support an inclusive academic environment. Subbaraman discusses institutions' reactions to the movement, and how current events make it even harder for faculty of color to do their jobs. In fact, some scientists are planning an academic strike on June tenth, with the goal to give Black researchers a break and to give others time to contemplate their own stance within anti-Black racism within institutions and communities. Subbaraman goes on to elaborate on institutions’ reactions to the issue, including press statements, and argues that institutions need to post their own diversity figures and ways to improve diversity inclusion. Several academics proposed several suggestions, including sharing Black researchers’ work on social media, and voting in favor of having them promoted. Social issues like the BLM movement bring up important aspects within institutions that still need to be improved.

Mohamed, Theresa. 2010. “Surviving the Academy: The Continuing Struggle of Minority Faculty on Mainstream Campuses.” *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations* 10 (4): 41–52. https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9532/CGP/v10i04/39891.

Theresa Mohamed of Onondaga Community College provides an overview of the literature on diversity within academic faculty in this piece, and provides some suggestions to increase diversity and inclusion and retain it within academia. This article is a continuation of her collection of articles that talks about “African American Failure”, and expands on the idea that academic environments are not conducive to an inclusive community. She argues that one of the main issues with the current state of academia is that it serves as a gatekeeping enterprise that serves to create their own rules for letting people in, which serves to control their advancement (41). Other issues include a lack of efforts to recruit and retain faculty of color, a lack of leadership to make change, and the negative explicit and implicit perceptions and presumptions that faculty, staff and students have of minority faculty that could lead to feelings of isolation and inadequacy. Regarding recruitment and promotion, Mohamed discusses how people of color are brought to higher standards than others-- she gives the example of how if an incompetent white person is hired, they are not seen as a representative of all white people, yet people of color are seen as the representative of their ethnic group all of the time (43).

Recruiters also look for a disqualifying aspect for a candidate of color, and tend to overlook any shortcomings of a white person. This article brings up many great points to think about and study further regarding diversity within higher education, and how every aspect of academia needs to be documented, evaluated and changed in order to improve conditions in academia.

Grapin, Sally L., and Meaghan I. Pereiras. 2019. "Supporting Diverse Students and Faculty in Higher Education through Multicultural Organizational Development." *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, Diversity and Inclusion in Education and Training, 13 (4): 307–15. https://doi.org/10.1037/tep0000226.

In this article, Grapin and Pereieras of Montclair State University's Psychology department apply Cox's principles of multicultural organization (MOD) to a framework that encourages diversity within higher education. They also talk about specific sr\trategies for creating and maintaining an inclusive environment within psychology graduate programs, and their larger higher institutions. MOD presumes that no institution is the same in the context of whether or not they value diversity, and see working on and eliminating individual and institutional bias as a continual process that encompasses six dimensions: Acculturation, structural integration, informal integration, cultural bias, prejudice and, discrimination, and organizational identity (308). The last three dimensions are the foci for this article because there is relatively less literature on them compared to the first three.

The authors argue that institutions need to become multicultural rather than plural (308), in order to become less eurocentric and individualistic and to welcome less traditional ideas and processes. Another focus of MOD includes acknowledging the range of knowledge from diverse faculty and students, and including their experiences within the institution. This can come in the form of culturally responsive teaching, examining procedures for evaluating students and faculty, and simply by acknowledging and respecting minority faculty's contributions (310). Grapin and Pereiras also emphasize the importance of culturally responsive and appropriate mentoring. Rather than randomly matching mentees to mentors, a better approach to mentoring would be a non hierarchical approach that encourages the sharing of knowledge that is grounded in the mentee's cultural identity (310). Education is also important when addressing diversity within higher education- the authors agree that this can come in the form of a single training combined with incorporating multicultural education within curriculum (311). Overall, Grapin and Pereiras believe that changing the hierarchy of higher education into a more collaborative environment will better the institution's inclusive environment and enrich what is produced.

Demetry, Chrysanthe, Elizabeth Long Lingo, and Jeanine Skorinko. 2019. "Increasing Diversity in the Ranks of Full Professors—for Both Tenured and Non-Tenure-Track Faculty." New England Board of Higher Education. May 28, 2019. https://nebhe.org/journal/increasing-diversity-in-the-ranks-of-full-professors-for-both-tenured-and-non-tenure-track-faculty/.

Demetry et. al of Worcester Polytechnic Institute dissect and explore diversity within higher education as it relates to the RPT process, and reflect on their own institutions overhaul of their associate to full professor promotion process in this piece. Prior to their new established system, the institution found an increasing dissatisfaction among associate professors, women and non tenure faculty about how it was run. They found three key themes that other institutions can learn from and apply in order to increase diversity and inclusion. First, Demetry et. al argue for the need for an advancement system for non tenured faculty as many women and minorities largely hold these positions. At WPI, there is such a system, but the authors find that the process and criteria are unclear and don't seem to recognize scholarly work. Secondly, promotion criteria needs to be broadened- traditional criteria is too narrow and focuses on research rather than interdisciplinary teaching and community work. It is also important to engage with faculty on implicit and explicit bias.

Lastly, Demetry et al. explain that there is an assumption within academia that once tenure is achieved, faculty are ready for full professor status-- this is not always the case. As faculty reach higher status, professional development would still benefit them. The authors also agree that enabling faculty at the higher level to focus on research falls short. Rather, a system of mentoring and continuing education for all faculty would highlight strengths and areas to improve. WPI enacted an individually personalized development plan for all faculty, and activated department heads as motivators for innovation rather than overseeing managers. The authors conclude with bringing awareness to the fact that not every institution is the same-- an evaluation of each system and making according changes will benefit the institution, faculty and students.

Sutherland, Kathryn A. 2017. “Constructions of Success in Academia: An Early Career Perspective.” *Studies in Higher Education* 42 (4): 743–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1072150.

In this article, Kathryn Sutherland of Victoria University of Wellington in New Zealand takes a social constructionist approach to her study about objective and subjective careers success in academia. She wanted to get an idea of how early career academics from three countries define success, and how that ties into their careers and possibilities for promotion and tenure. She starts her article by exploring the types of success, and how success in of itself is a social construct-- no one is inherently successful (745). She then goes on to discuss how success in academia is constructed via procedures, expectations and rules-- and the willingness or lack thereof to comply on behalf of the faculty and staff. She collected her data by conducting semi-structured interviews of 60 early career academics from 11 different universities in Canada, New Zealand and Sweden, and looked for themes on success to analyze (747).

Of her findings, Sutherland found that success relates to reputation, specifically within one’s discipline, and it increases the more one publishes articles (749). Institutions see success in numbers, how many articles and where it was published over what was actually published (751). Any other work that detracts from that, including administrative positions, teaching and community work. Many respondents also noted that research productivity increases chances of being promoted or receiving tenure, they also said that they personally value their teaching and service combined with their research (750). So, to faculty, success includes all aspects of being

an academic. Another important point made from her data analysis is that subjective career success cannot necessarily be measured, but is important to the people she interviewed: This includes jobs satisfaction, work/life balance, impact made on students and contributions made to society (751-2). This also includes the freedom to choose things like what classes to teach, to whom and at which academic levels, as well as that research to do (753). In her conclusion, Sutherland argues that terms like success and productivity need to be further defined with faculty at the institutional level in order to understand their academic community, and having everyone working together.

Rideau, Ryan. 2019. "'We're Just Not Acknowledged': An Examination of the Identity Taxation of Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Women of Color Faculty Members." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, August. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000139.

Ryan Rideau examined non-tenured women of color faculty (NTWCFs) in this piece, and sought to use critical race theory and critical race feminism to understand identity taxation. Non-tenured faculty have little job protections, and are marginalized within academia: They are also generally underrepresented within research, which is why Rideau decided to focus on them. As CRT and CRF focus on systems of oppression and Women of Color's experiences of identity respectively, Rideau interviewed 15 full-time NTWCFs from a larger study on experiences of oppression in academia, and asked questions related to racism and systematic oppression within their work (5). He also tied in questions about intersectionality and anti-essentialism, and assumed mutuality of all identities rather than seeing some as isolated or additive (5).

From his data analysis, Rideau noted three main themes related to identity taxation. The first theme is caring for Marginalized Students; Rideau found that NTWCFs have different responsibilities than non-white faculty, including mentoring and caring for all marginalized students (6). For some, caring for marginalized students took up a lot of time, and were reprimanded from their institution for a lack of focus on research. There also is a limitation of time as non-tenure faculty don't have secure employment like tenured faculty. Rideau also noted that NTWCFs are burdened with an increasing amount of institutional service, such as being in committees, solely to diversify the committee. This leads NTWCFs to believe that they are undervalued (6). The last theme is the obligation and expectation of NTWCFs to teach colleagues and others about racism. As a result of their status as non-tenured, combined with their identity as women of color, respondents felt like they had to participate in informal conversations, requests for support and any activity related to race (9). This wasn't always a negative experience, but it does detract from other faculty work. As Rideau explains on page ten, as a result of shortcomings from the institution, faculty members feel obligated and are expected to pick up the slack. This article brings issues of how systematic inequalities lead to marginalized faculty taking more responsibility regardless of their status as permanent or temporary.

Hrabowski III, Freeman A., and Peter H. Henderson. 2019. “Challenging US Research Universities and Funders to Increase Diversity in the Research Community | Issues in Science and Technology.” February 25, 2019. https://issues.org/challenging-us-research-universities/.

This article explores approaches to increase diversity in science and engineering education, and highlights the need for more diversity within doctoral students. At the current rate, an inclusive workforce will not be achieved in the United States for at least another century. In the STEM field as a whole, many students regardless of background actually succeed. The authors encourage nationwide programs such as the NIH’s Build and INCLUDES programs to provide funding to universities that need it to improve diversity. As a result of the Meyerhoff Scholars Program, UMBC has become the number two institution in the US for African-American students to go on to complete PhDs in the STEM field. This approach is based on “social transformation theory of change”, which means creating and maintaining an empowering and diverse environment and community for minority students to thrive in. This includes analyzing student data, evaluating policies, procedures and course materials, and working closely with leadership. It also includes maintaining a diverse and inclusive faculty: One that is deeply involved with their departments and institution, as well as educated on how to mentor students from underrepresented communities. Identifying, supporting and retaining diverse faculty is only one piece in having a successful workforce.

McMurtrie, Beth. 2016. “How to Do a Better Job of Searching for Diversity.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 11, 2016. http://www.chronicle.com/article/How-to-Do-a-Better-Job-of/237750.

This article discusses the lack of diversity within the academic hiring process, and how to increase it. She argues that one problem with the traditional hiring process is that the most important thing sought out for is how a candidate got where they are now, if they’re going to fit within the faculty culture, and who they know. Personal bias, power dynamics and too quick of a judgement has affected who gets hired, and therefore only those who are complicit or have the same ideas are hired. Another cause of a lack of diversity is how less than 20% of people who earned doctorates in 2014 were from marginalized backgrounds-- this leads hiring committees to hire whoever they can because the candidate pool was small to begin with. In some institutions like Oregon State, the position of “search advocate” has been created solely to question and test the ideals and ideas of a search committee. They receive two day long

training, and are asked to reflect on their own implicit biases in order to understand others'. They are also part of hiring decisions outside of their department in order to have a fresh perspective, and to ask as many questions as possible. McMurtrie argues that initiatives like this help break down patterns, assumptions and norms that lead to a reproduction of the same within academia. This also includes the production of knowledge- rather than looking at past performance, search committees should think about future possibilities.

Wood, Sarah. 2020. "Making the Grade: 2020 Most Promising Places to Work in Community Colleges set the standard when it comes to inclusive practices.." *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education* 37 (6): 22–25.

Sarah Wood looks at inclusive practices within community colleges in this article. Initiatives taken to address diversity and inclusion within colleges include GRCC's revamped evidence-based hiring practices, which aims to eliminate bias, and GTC's Civil Treatment Training program, which focuses on a number of subjects rooted in the idea that individuals must treat each other with respect. At Montgomery County Community College, they acknowledge that diversity work does not stop at the hiring phase-- it is an ongoing process that must be evaluated within every individual. MCCC also has a faculty diversity fellowship that allows minority faculty recruits to participate in a year long fellowship program. At the end of the year, fellows can become full-time faculty. This piece can be used as a reference for four year colleges.

Hrabowski III, Freeman A. 2014. "Diversity, Access, and the American Dream." *Trusteeship* 22 (3): 16–17.

Hrabowski reflects on the history of diversity within and access to higher education, and argues that institutions need to focus on minority student achievement and retention in this article. While access to education is better now, institutions should work on their entire college career, from acceptance to graduation. He talks about how our nation went from having only five percent of Americans with degrees, to thirty percent now, and explains why we need that number to increase (17). Hrabowski explains that more people need to be educated as requirements for well-paying jobs are increasing, and in order to compete in a capitalist economy. He concludes that institutions need to take a step back and ask questions like, "How do we educate students?", "How do we or workplaces know that students are prepared for after graduation?" (17).

Whittington, Keith E. 2019. “The Value of Pluralism in the Academy.” *Society* 56 (6): 607–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-019-00423-z.

Keith Whittington from Princeton University’s Department of Politics discusses the importance of higher education fostering an empowering community that encourages free speech and free thinking in this piece. He questions those in power, as many of those who hold positions of power want to preserve the status quo (607). He goes on to discuss how many people support only specific types of free speech, rather than all free speech. This gets more complicated when addressing free speech on campuses. universities are breeding grounds for new ideas and ways of thinking, even if they don’t work, free speech needs to be upheld(608). In the case of a university’s faculty, having tenure protections can both protect and impede faculty members’ research. Tenure can protect someone from being fired, but it is more difficult for faculty to align with the status quo or go against it (609). Faculty may self-censor in order to self-preserve, which halts the knowledge making process. Debate and disagreement challenges the status quo and creates change.

Finkelstein, Martin J, Valerie Martin Conley, and Jack H Schuster. April 2016. “Taking the Measure of Faculty Diversity.” *TIAA Institute*, Advancing Higher Education ,18.

This article examines how women and minorities fit into the new regime of academic redistribution and restructure that has swept the academic world between 1993 and 2013. Using data from The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), the authors started by looking at the number of faculty including full time, tenure, part time, and those who failed to get tenure. They found that while the number of faculty increased by 64.6%, the number of part-time faculty swelled by 114.5%, and the number of full-time faculty only increased by 32.3%-- This indicates the shift to mainly contingent, part-time faculty hiring (2). Among gender and appointment type, the authors found that the headcount of women faculty nearly doubled over two decades, and the number of tenure appointments increased compared to a decrease in men faculty tenure appointments (3). However, the proportion of women on tenure tracks has decreased, and part time appointments has increased. This says that while women have been entering the academic workforce in droves, many of them are only getting part-time positions. Among different institution types, a similar story is told with more men holding tenured positions especially in research focused institutions (5). Looking at underrepresented minorities, faculty numbers have increased by 170%, while non tenured full time and part time positions are increasingly being held by them (8). The authors conclude their article with the argument that while diversity initiatives have increased the number of underrepresented groups entering the

academic world, it is important to look at the positions they are getting, and how that has shifted the academic culture.

Hazelrigg, Nick. 2019. “Little Progress in Diversifying Faculty Ranks, Study Finds, Particularly at Research Universities.” July 2, 2019. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/07/02/little-progress-diversifying-faculty-ranks-study-finds-particularly-research. https://www.dropbox.com/s/9ijhhx37niz8jf5/2019%20ISSUE%20Heilig%201-31.pdf?dl=0

Hazelrigg looks at a study published by the Hispanic Journal of Law and Policy from the South Texas College of Law, based on federal data from 2013-2017, and argues that progress made in racial diversity of faculty has not been substantial. The study found that increases in racial diversity have increased by 1% or less depending on ethnicity. Diversity issues are major in doctoral-status and research focused institutions. Where non-white faculty comprises only about 20% of all faculty. While the study did see a moderate increase in women faculty, they still makeup only 32% of all faculty. The authors argue that more progress needs to be made.

Cantor, Nancy. 2020. “Transforming the Academy: The Urgency of Recommitting Higher Education to the Public Good.” *Liberal Education* 106 (1/2): 48–55.

Cantor Explores how higher education is set up and thought of, and how transforming it to be more inclusive and diverse will not happen overnight, but it needs to happen. One of the arguments made is that higher education needs to be thought of as a public good; non-rejectable, and one person’s consumption does not affect others’ (50). This will shift the thought away from seeing higher education as only for the few, to an actual viable opportunity, accessible for all. Cantor has four aspects that need to be transformed, one of them being to diversify students and faculty, which would improve the representation of the public within the institution (50). A more diverse faculty community would benefit a diverse student body, and will invite more ideas and perspectives into the institution’s culture. Cantor also questions how scholarship is made, what gets prioritized and who conducts it. Part of this is the promotion and tenure process, and how institutions use evaluations as these to shape who has the privilege to do what they want (51). Rather than prioritizing what the institution and faculty want to produce, Cantor argues that scholarship should reflect on the community. By

reevaluating opportunities and being inclusive rather than exclusive, institutions will thrive, which will lead to communities thriving.

Wood, J. Luke. 2019. “Four Hiring Strategies for Increasing Faculty Diversity.” Diverse Issues in Higher Education. July 17, 2019. https://diverseeducation.com/article/149878/.

Dr. J. Luke Wood, an Education Professor and Chief Diversity Officer at San Diego State University, discusses ways to increase faculty diversity through hiring initiatives. He reflects off of data pulled from the Digest of Education Statistics; the diversity of the student population has increased, while that is not reflected in the faculty where for every one Black faculty member there are 49 black students in American colleges and universities. He argues that there are four main building blocks that institutions should enact to address and increase faculty diversity: Implicit Bias Training, Certification of Applicant Pools, Diversity Advocates on all committees, and an inclusive job search criteria. If all four of these strategies are enacted, the entire hiring process will improve, and diversity will be better.

O’Meara, Kerryann, Timothy Eatman, and Saul Petersen. 2015. “Advancing Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure.” *Liberal Education* 101 (3): 52–57.

In this article, the authors argue that promotion and tenure systems are outdated and must change with the complex and ever changing nature of scholarship (52). They elaborate on ways to change the process, based on a scholarship of community and engagement. They suggest changing the policies so that it brings out a better level of knowledge sharing and agency, one that looks at the entire faculty member and their work, rather than focusing on what they produce (53). The authors talk about how the process benefits the few and excludes the many, so those involved must address this exclusion. Other suggestions to make the process better surround the idea that the community must inform scholarship, and the idea of reassessing what “counts” as experience or evidence (54-55). The authors conclude with the idea that institutions that are facilitating change within the P&T process aren’t doing enough--they must address issues that include supporting academics with their engaged scholarship, and the unconscious bias that exists in academic evaluation (56). Evaluating and changing the P&T process, the authors argue, is only a small piece within the larger goal of making a more diverse and inclusive academic environment.

Squire, Dian, Bianca Williams, and Frank Tuitt. 2020. “Some Academic Institutions Use Ideologies and Strategies from the Past to Control and Surveil Black People (Opinion) | Inside Higher Ed.” Inside Higher Ed. August 28, 2020. https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/08/28/some-academic-institutions-use-ideologies-and-strategies-past-control-and-surveil.

This article examines the similarities and differences between universities and plantations, and how they systematically disadvantage black faculty and students. The authors looked at university policies historically and found that while many adopted diversity and inclusion policies, they didn’t go far enough and change their exploitative promotion and tenure processes. This combined with a police heavy presence is attributed to “plantation politics”. In order to combat this, the authors suggest rethinking how capitalistic institutions have become for both the faculty and students. In summary, reevaluating historically marginalized policies is key in reforming higher education, including in hiring and retention.

Harris, Jessica C. 2020. “Multiracial Faculty Members’ Experiences with Teaching, Research, and Service.” *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 13 (3): 228–39. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000123.

In this article, Harris examines multiracial tenured and tenure-track faculty member’s experiences within academia. She collected qualitative data via online questionnaire and subsequent interview from 26 multiracial faculty members from 24 four year institutions around the US (231). Harris found three main themes and several sub themes, including how multicultural faculty use research as a tool for change, and how that research is often undervalued within their institutions (232). More findings include that the faculty member’s appearance was how students perceived their professor as more or less “threatening”, and that many faculty used their own experiences to teach their students (234). In her conclusion, Harris discussed how her findings reflect ideas on diversity initiatives within universities. Consistent with previous literature, multiracial faculty see themselves as “diversity tokens”, used by their institutions to increase diversity (235). She also found that once POC faculty members get into their respective institutions, they are asked to change, behave more “white” in order to fit in. Harris suggests that insitutions must challenge perceptions of non-white faculty, as well as the toxic status quo type culture within academia (236).

Lehfeldt, Elizabeth. 2019. “Faculty Members Need to Encourage Colleges to Review Their Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (Opinion) | Inside Higher Ed.” Inside Higher Ed. August 22, 2019. https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2019/08/22/faculty-members-need-encourage-colleges-review-their-tenure-and-promotion.

In this article, Lehfeldt is discussing the idea of tenure and promotion documents as moral documents. She argues that they say what is valued in that institution, and the larger society. However, many promotion and tenure documents don't actually reflect what is actually valued, and what the academic culture is within each institution. Lehfedlt argues that promotion and tenure documents need to be reevaluated and realigned to reflect actual values -- not just at the institutional level, but at the departmental level. Each department needs to look at their faculty and adjust it so that their policies support and encourage an inclusive learning environment. Lehfeldt goes on to encourage faculty members to be more involved in the tenure and promotion of process, as directly and personally affects them. Essentially, she argues that what is quantified, deemed important, is a manifestation of what is valued within that institution- what policymakers need to do is make sure that these values align with accuracy rather than misrepresentation.

Knight, Wanda B. 2010. "Sink or Swim: Navigating the Perilous Waters of Promotion and Tenure: What's Diversity Got to Do with It?" *Studies in Art Education* 52 (1): 84–87.

This article examines the "sink or swim" ideology within the faculty promotion and tenure process. She discusses the issues that have arisen related to publishing, including responses from a three year discussion within a symposium titled "What's diversity got to do with it?". ONe of her points includes how mainstream academia encourages the status quo, and highlights how competition is favored over collaboration, especially among underrepresented groups (85). Knight notes that several responses from her symposium include how promotion evaluators are very skeptical on their collaborative work, especially with junior faculty members who are largely non-white. Some faculty of color also reported that while they feel a personal obligation to research topics related to diversity and community work, but they were largely discouraged from doing too much (85). Knight argues that overcoming hurdles of difference is the key in making real change in academia, and that individual and institutional aspects must be changed to improve the academic process. These considerations include avoiding projection of ones own background/opinions onto others, and broadening the definition of scholarship within tenure requirements (86). In conclusion, Knight suggests that with new ideas, backgrounds etc. coming into academia, the policy must reflect that in order to include them all.

Openness

Alperin, Juan Pablo, Carol Muñoz Nieves, Lesley Schimanski, Gustavo E. Fischman, Meredith T. Niles, and Erin C. McKiernan. 2018. "How Significant Are the Public

Dimensions of Faculty Work in Review, Promotion, and Tenure Documents?," October. https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:21015/.

Aplerin et. al sought to explore the public aspects of university faculty work and how that relates to the promotion and tenure process. To understand this, the researchers looked at documents related to promotion and tenure from a representative sample of 129 American and Canadian Universities. They incorporated Fischman, Igo, and Rhoten (2010)'s four basic dimensions of publicness in order to understand faculty's status and position within academia and the public. They found that faculty members encompass all four dimensions, and that they must navigate those dimensions while establishing their own footing as a published academic. They must navigate through publicly funded projects, faculty responsibilities including teaching, research and service, attempts at keeping financial burdens low for students and faculty, and all while maintaining their social status as a faculty member who serves the greater good and addresses social disparities (2). This status is further reinforced through publications: Aplerin et. all found that most faculty members prefer traditional publishing venues over less traditional, open domain venues because the university values traditional publishing within the promotion and tenure process, and even listed specific publishing outputs required to be considered for tenure (3,15).However, many faculty members have acknowledged the need for better community engagement within academia - this is difficult if academic literature is not readily available to the community. This negotiation of values while maintaining public engagement in order to enrich research and working towards tenure creates a complicated environment for faculty to work in.

The authors created a stratified random sample in order to have all education levels and majors represented within their research (4). They also broke their categories down further by measuring research activity within each university- this allows for better analysis. From the 864 documents obtained from 129 universities, Aplerin et. all analyzed them through QSR's International NVivo 12 qualitative analysis software, and began by searching for keywords "public" and "community", and the most frequently used words surrounding them, in order to understand to what extent the public is talked about (7). They found that instances of the word "public" typically were accompanied with the word "service", which the authors concluded encompasses any sort of work separate from research. Instances of the word "community" are accompanied by words like "university", "service" and "professional", which led the authors to believe that the terms "public" and "community" refer to different aspects of faculty work. They also found that instances of the word "research" are mentioned less than half as much when accompanied by keywords, which indicates that public service is separate from research (8). Breaking up results by academic level, Alperin et. all found that Master's Colleges and Universities mention the concept of public and/or community engagement more than any other academic level. An explanation for this phenomenon could be that many Master's programs focus on applying what was learned in a student's undergraduate career.

Other findings include the varying interpretations that institutions have regarding "engagement" and "impact". The authors found some universities defining engagement as collaborating with other academics within one's institution in order to conduct research (13). Some defined engagement as a direct connection with the community, that research should reflect the community: in representation, and in what social issues specific to the community

must be addressed. “Impact” is mentioned a lot in connection with promotion and tenure, especially at the Doctor’s degree level (16). Interestingly, impact is mentioned in regards to how much impact a tenure candidate has made on the field of study, and that is used to measure a faculty member’s ability to obtain tenure, rather than how their research has impacted the community.

In their discussion, Alperin et. all found that while there was a high incidence of the terms “public” and “community” in the documents that they looked at, which could indicate how faculty members need to be aware of the “publicness” of their work, the language is vague regarding what that publicness should look like. Furthermore, there is a generally negative light on open access formats of publication (25). The majority of institutions looked at require traditional publication formats, and look down on any sort of open format of publication. This limits how public and open research could be, possibly involving the community more if articles were more readily available. Overall, the authors believe that clear alignment of metrics and incentives of a faculty member’s publicness is needed, and that engagement with the public and the community needs to be supported more by the promotion and tenure process. This will in turn allow for better localized and personalized research, and for better engagement with the community.

Mathews, Kiernan. 2018. “Growing Our Own: Cultivating Faculty Leadership.” *Change* 50 (3/4): 88–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2018.1509617.

Mathews, the Principal Director of the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (a research association based at Harvard University), explores faculty leadership within academic institutions, and the ever evolving roles of those working within academic institutions. From his research, his main argument is that institutions have gotten better with increasing diversity within their faculty community, but in order to improve the institution and the faculty groups, work needs to be made to improve leadership skills of faculty members. Focus must also be put on the retention of faculty rather than the outsourcing of contingent faculty, including focusing on the tenure process (89). Specifically, faculty should be put on more administrative or organizational roles in order to further understand and be included in the RPT process- which has historically been resistant to change (89). Mathews argues that those in higher positions in academia become acquainted with relevant research that their faculty are doing in order to become more involved with the knowledge producing process. These suggestions, Mathews argues, will better the success of their faculty.

Helgesson, Karin Svedberg, and Ebba Sjögren. 2019. “No Finish Line: How Formalization of Academic Assessment Can Undermine Clarity and Increase Secrecy.” *Gender, Work & Organization* 26 (4): 558–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12355.

Helgesson and Sjögren of Stockholm University’s Business School and Department of Accounting examine how the formalization of promotion criteria and policy in Academica influences clarity and transparency within the assessment process. Their main driving force for

this study is that there are gendered differences in career opportunities, especially in advancement (559). Women's talents and work experiences are still being undervalues within academic advancement. Helgesson and Sjögren examined the operation of a new tenure track system within a Swedish institution-- they chose a Nordic institution because that area of the world has been deemed as most gender progressive. However, the authors noted that a "Nordic paradox" has occurred within this institution, which means that women are still underrepresented and undervalued (559). The new tenure track includes explicit criteria in all aspects of academic work including teaching, research and service, and a more formalized evaluation process (560). Ther methodology included studying previous research on gender equality within academic assessment and tracing the new tenure system through internal documentation from the past five years.

Among their findings, the authors found that institutions seek out "ideal workers", who are considered valuable will be able to be completely committed to it (560). Helgesson and Sjögren also found from their literature review that the functioning of assessment criteria is to benefit men, specifically when teaching and service (typically seen as having low promotability) is not evaluated or valued as high as research. Societal stereotypes also play a part in the assessment process, where women's weaknesses are inflated over their strengths, benefiting men over women in terms of funding and promotion (561). There also is an over emphasis on vaguely defined terms such as "excellence", which creates an illusion of a gender neutral process. The authors noted that many academic institutions have some form of gatekeepers, in the form of senior academics and/or evaluators that dictate who is "worthy" enough to be promoted, or sets the values that academics must adhere to for that specific institution (561).

From their study of documents from an institution, they found that ranking faculty's competence and contribution to teaching, service and research resulted in power imbalances between faculty and evaluator (571). Within five years, procedures became more vague and open for interpretation in some aspects including service and teaching. However, the requirement for research became more structured, and included rules such as a requirement to publish in a minimum number of prestigious institutions-- this rule has been shown to negatively affect women faculty (565, 572). The top tier in research also requires faculty to be "employable", another term open for interpretation. Other gendered effects of this system include how evaluators became a small group that held the power and secrecy, and how vague words such as "excellence" and indicators increased especially for service and research create a gendered system of gatekeepers determining what is worthy or good enough for the institution (572). Through these explicitly gendered metrics and a "formalized" system of gatekeeping, Helgesson and Sjögren concluded that institutions need to be more careful in shaping evaluation criteria and eliminating secrecy in order to eliminate implicit gender bias.

Jones, LaMont, Jr. 2019. "Endless Exodus: Faculty of Color Leave the Academy in Search of Fulfillment." *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, no. 11: 46.

In this piece, Jones writes about how many faculty members of color are leaving the academy and why. This is important because the number of people of color in academia is already low. This has increasingly become a problem within majority white institutions: Reasons for leaving include lack or denial of tenure, tokenism and isolation, inability to create change

within the institution, and lack of personal and professional fulfillment (47). Recruitment is also an issue- those who are in charge of hiring are typically going to hire people like them. Those who do get recruited usually encounter a hostile environment. As a result of the ambiguous institutional P&T processes, and the major focus on irrelevant research, many find that they can do more faster outside than on the inside (47-48). Jones suggests that a better understanding of the tenure process, combined with examining and investing in the faculty culture will help get rid of the revolving door that many people of color encounter.

Swanberg, Stephanie M., Joanna Thielen, and Nancy Bulgarelli. 2020. "Faculty Knowledge and Attitudes Regarding Predatory Open Access Journals: A Needs Assessment Study." *Journal of the Medical Library Association* 108 (2): 208–18. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2020.849.

In this article, Swanberg et al. examine faculty perceptions and knowledge of open access (OA) journals, and the differences between legit and predatory, for-profit access journals. Knowing the difference could impact the research being published, and can have negative implications for the researchers. They collected data via a twenty item survey that included both qualitative and quantitative items, divided into sections regarding knowledge of and experience with OA journals and how institutions can assist in the publication process (209). Of the Oakland University faculty, 220 responses were collected for analysis. Swanberg et al. found that only 22 respondents were formally educated on OA journals, and several respondents were unsure about characteristics of predatory OA journals (210). Respondents were also asked to identity OA journals: only 60% correctly identified them as predatory (211). Regarding the P&T Process, a majority of respondents agreed that predatory journals must be addressed, especially in tandem with the expectation to publish a minimum amount of articles in order to be eligible for promotion (213). Swanberg et al. illuminate the issue that all disciplines have been dealing with, and shows the delicate balance between open access and validity.

Bales, Stephen, David E. Hubbard, Wyoma vanDuinkerken, Laura Sare, and Joseph Olivarez. 2019. "The Use of Departmental Journal Lists in Promotion and Tenure Decisions at American Research Universities." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 45 (2): 153–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.02.005.

This article talks about the use of journal ranking lists, and how they inform the P&T process. Authors used a cross-sectional survey, and received 714 responses from administrators, deans and heads of departments of research intensive universities (156). Of their findings, the majority of respondents believed that research is the most important work within institutions, including within the P&T process, and that teaching was the least important (156). They also found that the majority of the institutions did not have standardized journal lists

although where an article was published was taken into consideration within promotion policies (158). This type of behavior, whether formal or informal, infringes on academic freedom, and creates a non-inclusive environment. The authors recommend that P&T committees reduce the emphasis on research, and broaden their scope of the types of publications allowed- this will create an empowering and diverse research community, and improve access to research (159).

Vandette, Emily E. 2015. "Who Gets a Vote in Departmental Decisions?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 2, 2015. https://www.chronicle.com/article/Who-Gets-a-Vote-in/190499.

In this web article, Vandette, an associate professor of English and associate chair of the department at the State University of New York at Fredonia discusses her department's experiences with having an open and inclusive academic environment and how it almost came back to bite them when searching for an assistant professor. This article can be used to reflect on the balance between openness and inclusivity and having a more traditional and closed up hiring process and academic culture. Within Vandette's institution, there was a more egalitarian culture- department meetings were open to all faculty members, except departmental hiring meetings which were restricted to members of that department that had a higher rank than the open position. In this instance, a non-tenure track faculty member with friends from all over the institution was up for it- which raised questions about who gets to vote on P&T decisions. Such discord led to a failed search. Vandette argues that in the search for inclusivity, there is a lack of professionalism, increased conflicts of interest and, rather than focusing on better benefits and equal share of responsibilities for both non-tenured and tenured faculty-- not to mention the qualifications of job candidates--the spotlight is put on who has power, who has a say. She concludes by proposing that institutions evaluate their policy decisions, reflecting on past policies and incorporating inclusiveness--but maintaining a balance between the two.

Strunk, Kamden. 2020. "Demistifying and Democratizing Tenure and Promotion." Inside Higher Ed. March 13, 2020. https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/03/13/tenure-and-promotion-process-must-be-revised-especially-historically-marginalized.

In this article, Strunk argues that the traditional tenure process needs to become more humanized and transparent. He is a professor of educational research at Auburn University, and his work focuses on social justice and equity in education. His analysis of the traditional tenure process, especially the faculty hearing, discussion and vote, is secretive, vague and complicated. It starts once the faculty member is hired, regardless if they want tenure or not. However, pre tenure faculty receive unclear guidelines, and are expected to tick each box in order to even be considered for tenure. Before the process begins, many tenured faculty have preconceived ideas, the expectation is for faculty up for tenure to prove their worth to the

committee. Strunk challenges this notion- he asks what the process would look like if we get rid of it, if the process is less like a trial and more like a celebration of a faculty member's work how would that change the culture of academia? Unspoken rules and procedures keep out scholars of marginalized communities, and therefore limits whose ideas are allowed into institutions. Creating a less hierarchical, more democratic and transparent academic culture will benefit students as well as faculty.

Bond, Sarah E., and Kevin Gannon. "Public Writing and the Junior Scholar: How should we count public writing and service for tenure and promotion?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 17, 2020, A38+. Gale In Context: Opposing Viewpoints (accessed August 21, 2020). https://link-gale-com.proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/apps/doc/A613341120/OVIC?u=umd_umbc&sid=OVIC&xid=83b0eab0.

This article examines the effect and value of public service and writing for an early career academic. This article comes after a recent article published by The Cronicle that talks about what types of scholarship and writing are valued within each stage of academic careers, and what should be the focus regarding tenure. The authors argue that while this argument is valid, it is important to note that not all institutions focus on research, or have funding for it. Public writing is very important especially early in an academic career the authors write so that a person's impact could be measured and valued. It is also important to look at the differences between research focused institutions and smaller institutions-- can scholarship be accessed? What is valued in the tenure process? Scholarship itself should be defined by and reflected from the current climate and trends in higher education, is the scholarship relevant, rather than a box ticked in the long list of tenure requirements? Another important aspect that the authors talk about is accessibility; is published scholarship accessible to the general public?

Smith, Shannon B., Ann Hollerbach, Annemarie Sipkes Donato, Barbara J. Edlund, Teresa Atz, and Teresa J. Kelechi. 2016. "Streamlining Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures to Promote Early-Career Faculty Success." *Journal of Professional Nursing* 32 (5): 334–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2016.01.011.

This article explores ways in which institutions have put in place policies that outline the process from instructor to tenured professor. It focuses on nursing faculty, but this article can provide a great example of how academia is guiding new graduates through the faculty process. The inquiry started in 2013, when an informal assessment of a nursing program in the southeast was conducted. The college's RPT committee expressed how muddled and misleading the RPT

process was, so they sought out to develop a plan to evaluate the current RPT process, and put policies in place to improve openness and clarity, as well as easier access to promotion as ones career continues (335). The committee believed that there are a plethora of factors involved in faculty success- they created a framework around curating and helping faculty become as successful as they can be (335). In the end, the model of define, measure, analyze, improve and control (DMAIC) was used in order to look at problems within the RPT process, and turn them into separate goals (336). Policies implemented including providing an Assistant Professor Criteria Checklist form to thoroughly explain what is expected in the RPT process (337). After the project was implemented, faculty were interviewed about how effective it was. The authors found that the RPT process was no longer obscure, and the more streamlined process led to higher faculty satisfaction and retention (338). They conclude their article with the argument that transparency, proper mentorship, and systematic approaches help the most when addressing RPT processes (339).

Equity

Gadd, Elizabeth, and Himanen, Laura. 2019. “Introducing SCOPE – a Process for Evaluating Responsibly.” *The Bibliomagician* (blog). December 11, 2019. https://thebibliomagician.wordpress.com/2019/12/11/introducing-scope-aprocess-for-evaluating-responsibly/.

Elizabeth Gadd, a research manager at Loughborough University, and Laura Himanen, a research specialist at Tampere University discuss a new model for doing research evaluation in a responsible way called SCOPE. They argue that research metrics are like highway rules: it tells us how to drive on a highway but does not provide a map to our destination (Gadd and Himanen, 2019). The first stage of SCOPE is START with what you value, which describes the importance of evaluating what you value most, and the pitfalls of many researchers including measuring what others value and only measuring data that is readily available. Next is CONTEXT considerations, which represents how researchers need to consider and understand the context of what you're measuring: who is being measured and why? It is also to keep to your parameters once they are established.

The next stage is OPTIONS for measuring; Researchers should examine all options for assessing one’s values within a prescribed context. This includes using caution when using quantitative indicators for qualitative ideas like impact and quality. The fourth stage is PROBE deeply: according to Gadd and Himanen, five key questions should be asked when probing. These questions include Who does this discriminate against, How might this be gamed, What might the unintended consequences be, Does the cost of measuring outweigh the benefit and does measuring research actually make the research better? With these questions researchers should be able to establish truly meaningful research. Lastly is EVALUATE your evaluation: This

includes reviewing the process of evaluation, the outcomes and the evaluation approach itself. Gadd and Himanen developed SCOPE in order to take a step back before researching anything so that they can better evaluate responsibly.

Pooley, Jefferson. 2020. “Read-and-Publish Open Access Deals Are Heightening Global Inequalities in Access to Publication.” *Impact of Social Sciences* (blog). February 21, 2020. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2020/02/21/read-and-publish-open-access-deals-are-heightening-global-inequalities-in-access-to-publication/.

In this piece, Jefferson Pooley, Professor of Media and Communication at Muhlenberg College, talks about Plan S: a movement from European funders to push for open access scholarly publishing, and the resulting global inequality due to open access deals in certain parts of the world. Open Access “read and publish” deals involve institutions paying a subscription fee to get access to articles. This increases access for readers, but raises barriers for authors. Pooley argues that as a result of wealthy countries and institutions getting involved with open access deals, the effect is that authorship rights are granted selectively, with most authors coming from the western hemisphere. So, those who can afford paying for open access like universities are in essence paying for their scholars to get published in the open access database. Pooley’s point in this piece is that the way that open access is now limits access on behalf of the author. It has become a privilege to publish in open access journals, even if an article is also published in a free journal.

Niles, Meredith T., Lesley A. Schimanski, Erin C. McKiernan, and Juan P. Alperin. 2019. “Why We Publish Where We Do: Faculty Publishing Values and Their Relationship to Review, Promotion and Tenure Expectations.” Preprint. Scientific Communication and Education. https://doi.org/10.1101/706622.

As academic publishing increases, the evolving expectations of educators must be evaluated. In this article, Niles et. al sought to understand priorities and deemed importance within academic publishing decisions related to the promotion and tenure process. The notion of “publish or perish” is alive and well according to Miles et. al, and argue that caution must be used as quality and reliability of publications could be lacking as institutions value quantity over quality (2, 12). As part of a larger project on RPT processes (Alperin et. al), Niles et. al obtained RPT documents from a representative sample of institutions in the US and Canada, and then stratified it based on institution type. From those documents, 1,644 faculty were chosen to participate in an online survey that explored their perceptions on what is valued during the RPT process, and factors in deciding where to publish their research (4). 338 people (22%) from 55 institutions responded to the survey, with the majority (66%) of responses coming from institutions focused on doctoral programs (i.e. research focused).

Niles et. all compiled their data into Stata 15.0, and performed appropriate statistical tests in order to analyze disparities between variables, and then construct ordered logistic regression models across 10 chosen publication factors (as on the survey) with multiple independent variables including demographics, total number of publications by those who participated in the survey, and perceived values by respondents in the RPT process related to publishing academic work. From their findings, respondents perceived that the total number of publications, the number of publications per year and the name recognition of the journals that faculty members publish in were the most valued in the RPT process (7). The authors also found correlations between age and perceived values: according to their data, older faculty and tenured faculty members are increasingly valuing non-traditional forms of publications including blogs, performances and open access journals in the RPT process more than younger and non-tenured faculty (8). This finding could suggest a shift in traditional values. While intersections between demographics and values are important to analyze, the authors concluded that perceptions about the RPT process are linked to faculty publication decisions more frequently than demographic or institutional factors (11).

Kayes, Pauline E. 2006. “New Paradigms for Diversifying Faculty and Staff in Higher Education: Uncovering Cultural Biases in the Search and Hiring Process.” *Multicultural Education* 14 (2): 65–69.

Written in 2006, Pauline Kayes president of Diversity Works, Inc writes about how many attempts at increasing diversity within higher education faculty have fallen far short of expectations, and argues that many people overlook the importance of diversity within the recruitment and retention process of diverse faculty and staff. An important point that she makes is that while many presidents, department chairs, deans etc. advocate for better faculty diversity, what is usually overlooked within search committees- Diversity may not be even discussed before searching for candidates (65). So, it is critical for academic leadership to advocate for diversity, but it must come down the pipeline. Another important argument that Kayes makes is the difference between recruitment and retention. While initiatives to recruit and diversify faculty are important, if internal institutional culture is not addressed, then faculty will not want to stay (65).

Other important ideas included in this piece include Dovidio’s (1997) term aversive racism, Bennett’s DevelopmentalModel of Intercultural Sensitivity (1993), and Turner’s (2002) idea of dysconscious racism. These ideas are included in Kayes discussion of how search committees implicitly choose hiring candidates that align with them in experience, background and skills (66). She also writes about Helm’s“Stages of Racial Consciousness Among Whites” (1985), and ties it to the hiring process: In this process, white folks see themselves as individual rather than part of a culture, and then experience dissonance when they realize that they are part of a racist culture. As a result, they may avoid hiring minority individuals because they feel

personally responsible. The next stage involves becoming defensive about their own culture. This process can happen within the academic hiring process, and addresses the issue of individual culture over institutional culture. While this article is about academic hiring in general, this applies to the RPT process in that all aspects of it must be addressed in order to improve diversity and inclusion within academia.

Monk, Pamela E., E. Jane Irons, Nancy Leffel Carlson, and Carlo Walker. 2010. "Mentoring: A Safety-Net for Retention and Tenure for Faculty in Institutions of Higher Education." *National Social Science Journal* 33 (2): 126–32.

In this piece, Monk et. al of Lamar University discuss the history of faculty mentoring, and emphasizes the evolving importance mentoring has in regards to the RPT process. From their literature review, they found that mentoring is more complex than a higher status person mentoring a lower status person, and that mentoring new faculty is especially important in gaining understanding of the institution's culture (128). Monk et. al sought to understand perceptions of the mentoring process, so they conducted a study consisting of an online survey consisting of open ended questions about mentoring were sent to the Counselor Education and Supervision Network (CESNET) and New Faculty Interest Network (NFIN) list servs. 1300 surveys were sent out, and only 86 completed surveys were sent back. Four areas of mentoring came up in the responses: Research, service, teaching and collegiality.

In the area of research, more than half of respondents worked with a mentor, while about half of respondents were discontent with the lack of any sort of mentoring or support in the area of research (129). In the area of service, respondents had a positive experience with their mentor, including getting leadership positions or avoiding burnout. As far as teaching, around 80% of respondents received some sort of support from their mentor about teaching. The last area, Collegiality brought some insightful responses: only 39% of respondents reported not having a mentor, while more than half of respondents felt comfortable talking about anything with colleagues inside and outside of their department, including department chairs and deans (130). Monk et. al concluded that mentoring is beneficial especially for retaining non-tenured faculty. Improvements need to be made in the realm of research and publication, as well as understanding the intricacies of mentoring new faculty.

Barrow, Mark, and Barbara Grant. 2019. "The Uneasy Place of Equity in Higher Education: Tracing Its (in)Significance in Academic Promotions." *Higher Education* 78 (1): 133–47. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0334-2.

Barrow and Grant, faculty members of the Department of Education and Social Work at the University of Auckland in New Zealand, wrote this piece to explore and explain the current context of ideas about equity within government and institutional policies-- specifically how equity is understood within the faculty promotion process. They sought to understand the extent to which promotion processes require any sort of equity related behavior for their applicants.

They analyzed institutional documents from an (undisclosed) research intensive university in New Zealand, and interviewed four key informants including three Faculty Staffing Committee Chairs and the Director of Staff Equity (141). In their study of documents from the university, they found that they describe improving access and success of underrepresented students from a set of "equity groups" including indigenous groups (138) as a result of governmental policies. Much of their documentation focuses on students, and that faculty and staff must work towards an equitable environment. They also found that some of the documentation implicitly elaborates that equity bolongs in certain spaces of the institution, rather than all spaces (138).

Switching over to faculty, the authors find from their study that the word equity was not mentioned, rather equal opportunity, in past documents regarding guidelines for promotion. The new academic standards for promotion do mention equity, but it is less defined and referenced (140). This could mean that faculty possibly look over equity work in their preparation of getting promoted. The new standards do however have clearly defined guidelines for research, teaching and supervision (141). This shift to focusing on legal frameworks and institutional authority is still not understood.

From their interviews, Barrow and Grant found that equity is not required for promotion, and seen more as a service (143), and that equity work sometimes isn't even mentioned within applications, and in the evaluation process (142). Equity work can also be seen as supplemental for an applicant who hasn't been research-active. This ambiguity of "equity" suggests that equity is not as important as research, service and teaching. They also found that the majority of equity work done is by equity marked bodies. This cultural taxation (145) on equity marked bodies means that there is an extra expectation of them. This study illuminates the ambiguity of equity within institutions, and the different attitudes about equity between students and faculty.

Butterwick, Shauna, and Jane Dawson. 2005. "Undone Business: Examining the Production of Academic Labour." *Women's Studies International Forum* 28 (1): 51–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2005.02.004.

In this article, Butterwick and Dawson consider their own experiences as feminist academic laborers, and reflect on how performativity and emotion combined with various theories, including Dorothy Smith's idea of institutional ethnography, affects and influences academic culture, specifically the tenure process. They recorded conversations with each other about the academic environment in order to piece out and map out their struggles with the tenure process, and how they navigate through those struggles (54). One of their points made is how as an academic researcher, there is not a set of rules of how to do their job but once they start the lengthy tenure process, there are a set of implicit and explicit rules and expectations that must be met

before being considered for tenure (55). There is a negotiation of what daily tasks take importance, and tenure related tasks take paramount importance. Expectations are so high that the authors are forced to say “yes” to everything, and spread themselves out to the point of mental breakdown (56). This leads to a decrease in productivity in favor of what matters in the tenure process, prestige and status over students and community, and a possible decrease in the quality of their work.

Another important aspect of this study is incorporating Stephen Ball’s work on audit culture, which is described as the process of monitoring and controlling the production of information (57). The two aspects of audit culture, performativity and fabrication affect how knowledge and information are produced and shared within the academic community (57). As a result of all ideas above, the authors conclude that there is a constant sense of being judged, while trying to navigate what criteria are important to the institution without any guidance or consistency. The authors write, “Appearance and impression are more important within regimes of performativity than substance and truth” (58). In their conclusion, Butterwick and Dawson suggest that more academics become more self-reflexive, and document their personal reflections. By bringing out corridor talk from the dark, we as researchers can further look into the mechanisms of power within institutions.

Kelly, Bridget, and Kristin McCann. 2019. “Women Faculty on the Tenure Track: The Compounding Role of Being the Breadwinner.” *Journal of the Professoriate* 10 (1): 73–109.

In this piece, Bridget Kelly of the Higher Education, Counseling and Special Education Department at the University of Maryland and Kristin McCann, the Associate Dean of Students and Executive Director at the University of Chicago Medical Scientist Training Program apply a critical feminist lense to their study of women breadwinner tenure track professors in order to understand and examine their experiences within academia. This study was originally part of a larger longitudinal study, but the authors found recurring themes surrounding breadwinner tenure track professors including leaving the tenure track early, and sought to understand why (80). They interviewed ten participants every year of their tenure track for five years, including one year after tenure or after they depart the institution.

The authors found that the reality of being a woman combined with being the breadwinner of the household presents a lot of challenges that hindered their ability to obtain tenure (84). Having Breadwinner status added an additional layer of pressure to be successful in their careers. Related to the participants' agentic behaviors, the authors also found that they felt stuck in their position due to financial constraints, and unable to maneuver certain challenges within their personal lives due to an unsupportive institution and lack of

family leave policies (84). They also were forced to change their behavior to fit gendered norms, such as playing down their successes to their partners. Having Breadwinner status within their family combined with being a tenure-track professor led to making sacrifices, including postponing having another child, limiting their work outside of the institution, and reducing their time on research in order to maintain tenure status (89). When reaching out to their institution for assistance, many participants could not access their institution's services because they did not have tenure (91). As far as positive experiences, participants found support in their partners and families for what they are doing, and they appreciate the flexible nature of their position (96). Finally, Kelly and McCann suggest that addressing the culture within institutions is needed to improve not just breadwinners and women, but all intersections of identity (100). Policies that can improve it include paid parental leave, partner job support, childcare and summer work. Furthermore, institutions need to listen to their faculty and staff in order to understand their experiences and fine tune their academic communities.

Skewes, Monica C., Elizabeth A. Shanahan, Jessi L. Smith, Joy C. Honea, Rebecca Belou, Sara Rushing, Kristen Intemann, and Ian M. Handley. 2018. "Absent Autonomy: Relational Competence and Gendered Paths to Faculty Self-Determination in the Promotion and Tenure Process." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 11 (3): 366–83. https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000064.

This article is the result of an interdisciplinary project helmed by faculty of Montana University. For their study, Skews et. al use Self- Determination Theory and Feminist theory to examine self determination of faculty from their STEM department within the Promotion and tenure process. They interviewed 13 men and women from their STEM department, which included all six women in the department, and 7 faculty that closely match the women (371). They asked open-ended questions related to Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness- pillars of Self-Determination Theory.

From their results, the researchers found that there are gendered paths to self-determination. Women tended to seek out their competence needs through relationships with others, including obtaining feedback and informally shared information from colleagues, while men tended to seek competence through formal documents and established rules (378). The authors then suggested that the current promotion and tenure process forces women to act like men, in that they are forced to seek out their own information and help when none is given to them (379). In their conclusion, Skewes et. al emphasized the need to treat the promotion and tenure process as flexible and malleable: that facilitates a self- determined experience, while providing faculty with as much information as they can.

Melaku, Tsedale M., and Angie Beeman. 2020. “Academia Isn’t a Safe Haven for Conversations About Race and Racism.” *Harvard Business Review*, June 25, 2020. https://hbr.org/2020/06/academia-isnt-a-safe-haven-for-conversations-about-race-and-racism.

In this piece, Melaku and Beeman discuss their own experiences as academics of colro within white institutional spaces, and examine barriers and possible solutions to institutional inequity. They explain invisible labor and inclusion tax, which is the additional labor that marginalized groups are required to do to prove their existence within the white spaces, and the extra resources spent in order to adhere and conform to them. This extra work the authors explain, is devalued within promotion and tenure decisions, and it takes away from being engaged within departments. However, the authors explain that when discussions about racism do happen, white people want to run the conversation, and are quick to jump on the “bandwagon” in order to feel superior. Another act of white supremacy happens when white faculty devalue faculty of color regarding their identity, and then their research. They are then discouraged to talk about this harassment. Going forward, Melaku and Beeman suggest that we need to define what it means to be an ally and who gets to be an ally, in order to evaluate assumptions and biases that reinforce racial inequity within academia.

Hrabowski, , Freeman A., III, and Mavis G. Sanders. 2015. “Increasing Racial Diversity in the Teacher Workforce: One University’s Approach.” *Thought & Action*, January, 101–16. http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=eric&AN=EJ1086971&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Hrabowski and Sanders explore the student-teacher diversity gap, and give examples of improvement within the state of Maryland and UMBC. They start by looking at diversity across the nation and across history, noting that the diversity gap has decreased only slightly in the past quarter century, it hasn’t gotten better at all for people of color (103). There are many reasons for this, including lower graduation rates for minorities which translates to a reduced pool of teacher candidates of color, expanded career options for minorities, and the greater challenges that teachers of color face. As a “teacher import” state, Maryland institutions need to be aware of who they are hiring, especially since there is a considerable diversity gap between teachers and students in the state (105). There also has been a decrease in diverse graduates of education programs in Maryland, which further accentuates the need for programs and policies that promote diversity and inclusion (106). Hrabowski and Sanders talk about UMBC’s Meyerhoff Scholars Program for students, and how it can be used as a framework for diversity programs nationwide (110), including UMBC’s Sherman Scholars program for those studying teaching. The authors conclude that all educational institutions need to evaluate their hiring processes and pools by analyzing the environment and situation, having focus groups involving students and faculty, and providing support for minority students and teachers (113).

Hub Staff Report. 2019. “University Wide Committee Would Bring Consistency to Faculty Tenure Decisions.” The Hub. April 2, 2019. https://hub.jhu.edu/2019/04/02/faculty-tenure-advisory-committee-message/.

This report provides an example of an attempt at bringing diversity and inclusivity to tenure decisions in Maryland. In 2019, Johns Hopkins revamped their tenure decision process to include an advisory committee, consisting of a multi-disciplinary group of faculty. This committee would standardized the institutional tenure processes, which were helmed by each department rather than the whole institution. Having the committee would also honor the institution’s goals for shared governance. It is also important to note that JHU talks about teaching and service along with research as pillars of academic excellence that could lead to tenure.

Park, Sanghee. 2020. “Seeking Changes in Ivory Towers: The Impact of Gender Quotas on Female Academics in Higher Education.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 79 (March): 102346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2020.102346.

Sanghee Park from the School of Public Service at Bowie State University explores the impact that gender quotas have on gender equality of faculty within higher education. Using South Korean data on faculty in higher education from 2001-2017, Park found that gender quotas have a positive effect on gender representation at all levels of tenured and tenure track positions,but not for those in leadership or administrative positions such as Dean or president (1). Park explains that the effects of gender quotas must be looked at within the scope of the institution- are there other policies accompanying the gender quota? What does a gender quota mean? Some literature demerits gender quotas because they hinder traditional merit based systems that universities use, and they may isolate women by treating them as special cases (2). Other literature argues that academia is not gender neutral-- they are directly influenced by social constructs and norms, including gender inequality (3).

In South Korea’s case, their national and public institutions follow traditions and norms from a male-oriented and Confucian patriarchal society, which has resulted in less than 20% of their faculty being female (3). Park’s findings illustrate the importance of increasing gender representation at early career positions, but another aspect is added since many areas of study such as STEM have large gender disparities (4-5): So, it is a matter of educating enough women in order to fill those spots. Park also found that as initiatives are being created in order to increase female participation in academia, efforts are being made to hire more men at the

same time (7). This study shows how difficult and labyrinthine the process is to improve diversity in academia- single initiatives like gender quotas are simply not enough.

McKiernan, Erin C., Lesley A. Schimanski, Carol Muñoz Nieves, Lisa Matthias, Meredith T. Niles, and Juan Pablo Alperin. 2019. "Use of the Journal Impact Factor in Academic Review, Promotion, and Tenure Evaluations." e27638v2. PeerJ Inc. https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27638v2.

In this article, McKiernan et. al look at Journal Impact, specifically the Journal Impact Factor(JIF), and how it has become a metric used in the RPT process. Their study was a part of the larger study (Alperin et al, 2019) in which RPT documents were collected from universities and analyzed. They found that over eighty percent of institutions were supportive of the use of the JIF in RPT documents, sixty percent of institutions associate the JIF with quality, and over forty percent associate the JIF with impact, importance or significance, especially among research intensive institutions (6). One problem with relying on the JIF is that many institutions don't specify what is measured with the JIF: This grey area could cause confusion within academia (11). Since there is also little no evidence that the JIF determines research quality, McKiernan et. al draw attention to DORA and library-led initiatives that seek to educate scholars about making better decisions considering the JIF in terms of metrics (16). How can evaluators effectively assess a candidate's research in a way that is inclusive and equitable? The authors focus is on better educating academics about relying on Journal factors to determine quality and success.

COVID-19 Related

Hunt, Katie. 2020. "How Female Scientists Are Losing out during the Pandemic and Why It Matters." *CNN Wire*, June 18, 2020. Gale In Context: Opposing Viewpoints. http://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A626939172/OVIC?u=umd_umbc&sid=zotero&xid=a1832972.

This article talks about underrepresentation of female researchers within COVID-19 research. Hunt points out that any gender differences in symptoms of the virus can be better coaxed out if there are more females doing the research. Of the 1370 research papers published, only 34% of them involve female authors. This was pulled from research done by Ana-Catarina Pinho-Gomes, who also emphasizes that a lack of representation within research could lead to a lack of understanding of the virus itself. She also researched the number of all

research papers published during the pandemic, and found that only 29% of published articles had female first authors, and 26% of female last authors-- this is worse than before the pandemic. Fewer author credits affect promotion and tenure prospects, as well as grant and fellowship applications. Hunt goes on to talk about gender bias within COVID-19 research, that both men and women need to be studied rather than choosing male mice because of the assumption that female animals produce inconsistent results. Lastly, Hunt argues that data must be made public about COVID, and should include breakdowns by sex and other intetersectional identities. Without published data, we will understand less about the virus, and women could suffer as a result in more ways than one.

Matthews, David. 2020. “Pandemic Lockdown Holding Back Female Academics, Data Show.” Times Higher Education (THE). June 25, 2020. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/pandemic-lockdown-holding-back-female-academics-data-show.

This article articulates the limitations that female academics have been dealing with during the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown. Data pulled from another study shows that the proportion of accepted research papers where the first female is female has declined steadily since March. This is only part of the data as research is still ongoing, but it shows that school closures affect women researchers more than men. Reasons for this include the theory that women bear the brunt of the increased domestic workload as a result of the lockdown, and the suggestion that female academics, having just broken into academia, have small children. Matthews concludes the article with proposed directions that institutions could go moving forward. One researcher proposed that schools not require teaching evaluations from this spring as part of hiring or promotion materials, but Matthews points out that this could eliminate individual stories. A solution to this problem would be to have academics self report on how the pandemic and lockdown has affected them. There are initiatives in the Netherlands and Spain already assessing the pandemic’s impact on female researchers that could be looked at and applied in the states.

Weissman, Sara. 2020. “Diverse Webinars Explore New Questions Facing Higher Education Amid Covid-19.” In *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, 37:26–28. Cox Matthews & Associates Inc. http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=a9h&AN=143203240&site=eds-live&scope=site.

This article explores the new challenges that institutions have to address as the COVID-19 pandemic has spread worldwide. They include maintaining inclusive online learning environments for students and faculty, the need for better faculty diversity even during hiring freezes, and retaining minority faculty and students. From a series of webinars held by *Diverse,* several educators from around the US shared their experiences and challenges of going

completely online. One suggestion is in response to racism within virtual classrooms-- universities should create protocol in response to issues like Zoom Bombing, and encourage faculty to take steps to prevent them including creating password protected Zoom Sessions (26). Webinar panelists also suggested that university's address the effects of the pandemic on minority students and faculty (27). The pandemic could also prove to allow institutions to reevaluate their policies.

Regarding faculty hiring and promotion, many departments don't know if they will or can hire new faculty members in the fall (28). Nevertheless, faculty members believe that institutions can take this time to evaluate their hiring practices, and for prospective faculty members to evaluate their "personal brand" (27). Having remote policies during this time could be beneficial in hiring a more broad pool of applicants since there is no cost for travel. This also includes hosting online sessions for faculty in order to retain them (28). One of the bigger points in this article is that communication is key during this uncertain time- keeping communication open between institutions and faculty and students keeps everyone up to date and reassures faculty and students that institutions care about them.

Aviles, Gwen. 2020. "The Coronavirus Is Threatening Diversity in Academia." NBC News. 2020. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/coronavirus-threatening-diversity-academia-n1212931.

This article examines how Covid-19 is affecting hiring and diversity practices in higher education. The pandemic has been felt at all levels as budgets become restricted and policies are adjusted, but the brunt of the problem is felt within academia's "underclass". Aviles essentially sees adjunct faculty groups, which are majorly composed of women and people of color, as "gig workers". Those without stable and secure positions are over-relied on by institutions, and are being laid off in this uncertain time. Layoffs combined with hiring freezes runs the risk of dismantling any hopes of a diverse and inclusive environment- Aviles fears that the pandemic might cause institutions to revert to traditional upper middle class ideals and students. Many efforts to diversify academia, from ethnic studies departments to diversity initiatives in traditional universities like Harvard have been postponed indefinitely: What are the implications? In order to combat the effects of the pandemic, Aviles explores how students and faculty have started petitions and campaigns to bring this issue to the forefront.

OMIT

Gewin, Virginia. 2020. "The Career Cost of COVID-19 to Female Researchers, and How Science Should Respond." *Nature*, July. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-02183-x.

COVID-19 poses a real threat to any progress made in increasing diversity within the academic research community. In this article, Gewin sought out academics, funders and journalists and asked them what could be done to alleviate the threats that women researchers have been getting in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. One suggestion made was in reaction to the lessening of social interaction due to the pandemic, communication between higher ups and faculty/researchers has weakened, so simply communicating and sharing experiences would inform administrators about what people are dealing with during this time. Another related point made is the fact that more and more people are having to become caregivers, and we must normalize it. Putting the spotlight on those who care for others may trigger institutions to address stigmas, and therefore policies that affect them. From all of the suggestions made, the common theme for increasing gender equity during this difficult time is to address, improve and maintain access and accommodations: This can be in the form of changing evaluation criteria, setting gender quotas and making virtual events free. These efforts will further empower women and other marginalized groups to have all of the tools they need to succeed.

OMIT

Whitford, Emma. 2020. “Coronavirus Pandemic Worsened Higher Ed’s Biggest Challenges, New Survey Shows.” Inside Higher Ed. June 24, 2020. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/24/coronavirus-pandemic-worsened-higher-eds-biggest-challenges-new-survey-shows.

https://www.aplu.org/library/how-covid-19-changed-everything-and-nothing-at-all/file

A survey conducted by the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities explored the biggest challenges facing higher education, and provides insight into how higher education is handling the COVID-19 crisis. College leaders were surveyed, and they recognized that government funding, student mental health, diversity and inclusion, and affordability as the top challenges facing academic institutions. The number one challenge, government funding, comes with the decline of reputations of institutions, and a weakening in the belief that a public education benefits the public good. It also includes how many institutions refunded many fees to students, which reduces budgets for programs addressing other challenges like student mental health. The study authors describe that many institutions need to broaden their mental health services to include more than suicide prevention.

Regarding diversity and inclusion, 67% of respondents rated it as a big challenge, while 7% of respondents believed that it was not a problem at all. Survey

researchers foresee that due to the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on communities of color, there will be dramatic reductions in the number of minority students coming back to university. They also hope that with the COVID crisis and the increasing awareness of inequality in the US, the spotlight will be put on improving diversity and inclusion in all aspects of society including higher education. Although the survey was conducted late 2019 through early 2020, the results show what institutions thought of as important just before the pandemic hit.

OMIT Marcus, Jon. 2020. “How Higher Education’s Own Choices Left It Vulnerable to the Pandemic Crisis.” NBC News. August 4, 2020. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/education/how-higher-education-s-own-choices-left-it-vulnerable-pandemic-n1235458.

This article explores how colleges and universities are faring as a result of the COVID-19 crisis. Missouri Western State University has had to cut almost a third of it's faculty and over 98 majors, minors and concentrations as a result of overspending on faculty hiring while enrollment plummeted in the past ten years. Marcus uses this institution as an example of what is happening- schools are being exposed due to decisions being made pre-pandemic and are left vulnerable. The pandemic also uncovers decades-long policies and procedures that could have been evaluated before, and possibly could have led to a better footing for institutions now. Other downfalls include how college enrollment has steadily decreased while faculty hiring has increased, which leads to unbalanced financial input vs output. In all of the chaos that is happening, one good thing about revealing long standing problems within higher education could force real change.

Brooks, Siobhan. 2020. “Black Tenure-Track Faculty Members Face Challenges Looking for Housing near Their Colleges | Inside Higher Ed.” Inside Higher Ed. July 16, 2020. https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2020/07/16/black-tenure-track-faculty-members-face-challenges-looking-housing-near-their.

This article explains how many tenure-track Black faculty members face challenges when looking for housing, especially during the covid-19 crisis. Brooks argues that Black faculty members and Ph.D. students experience more financial difficulties than white faculty members, and that they hold more debt after obtaining their degrees; these difficulties combined with racial discrimination has hindered Black faculty from finding secure housing. Brooks goes on to give examples of faculty facing housing challenges, including instances where the faculty member's institution was informed and no action was taken. Some faculty members notice that if their name and voice sound "white", they will receive better housing offers. With the covid-19 crisis, Black faculty members have had to take on more responsibility as caregivers-- which combined with how black people have been disproportionately affected by the crisis has led to greater insecurity. Many faculty members that Brooks talked to told them that universities need to step up and support their faculty members more in the form of relocation funds and resources to find housing.

Malisch, Jessica L., Breanna N. Harris, Shanen M. Sherrer, Kristy A. Lewis, Stephanie L. Shepherd, Pumtiwitt C. McCarthy, Jessica L. Spott, et al. 2020. "Opinion: In the Wake of COVID-19, Academia Needs New Solutions to Ensure Gender Equity." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117 (27): 15378–81. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2010636117.

This article examines the ways in which the covid-19 pandemic has affected women academics, and proposes solutions to mediate that. Regarding promotion and tenure, the authors argue that the global pandemic has amplified the limitations women academics face, including receiving recognition and success (15379). Many faculty positions are being eliminated (many low level courses typically taught by women), and many retirement contributions are being slashed, which further emphasizes the gender pay inequity. Women are typically overloaded with courses, and women of color have additional responsibilities related to diversity and inclusion- this needs to be acknowledged especially as women have taken on more responsibilities due to the pandemic (15380). The authors emphasize the need to change promotion and tenure requirements, like the importance of research and publishing, and the need for institutional policies to explicitly address inequity rather than being gender neutral (15380).

Connolly, Joy. 2020. "COVID-19 Demands a Reconsideration of Tenure Requirements Going Forward (Opinion) | Inside Higher Ed." Inside Higher Ed. April 9, 2020.

https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/04/09/covid-19-demands-reconsideration-tenure-requirements-going-forward-opinion.

In this article, Connolly explains that the tenure process needs to be evaluated in the light of the COVID-19 pandemic. This comes after Twitter became alive with calls to extend tenure clocks, and a statement by the ASA and the MLA calling for a review of the tenure process nationwide. Connolly asks and explores if simply extending tenure clocks is the solution. The pandemic has proved to be a new and challenging frontier for both students and faculty, and current tenure policies force faculty to focus on making deadlines and producing scholarship rather than learning remote technologies and helping their students during this time. What Connolly suggests is adding flexibility to the tenure process, including rethinking what counts as knowledge. Institutions can do this by listening to their faculty and students-- what do they need in this uncertain time?