

Affirmative Activism

ADE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN FACULTY MEMBERS IN ENGLISH

Affirmative action has visibly increased the presence of students and faculty members of color in English departments. Applicant pools are no longer exclusively white. A look at the racial demographics of English studies in the twenty-first century shows, however, that affirmative action can take us only so far. We are calling now for the next step, a concerted and consistent kind of action, which we call affirmative activism. Affirmative action ensured that applicants of color would be considered in hiring and admissions processes; affirmative activism changes the culture and climate of the profession.

Consider the following statistics, while keeping in mind that about 12% of the United States population report themselves as African Americans:

In fall 2003, only 6.2% of new tenure-track assistant professors in all disciplines were African Americans.

Only 3.0% of tenured faculty members at the rank of full professor in all disciplines in degree-granting, Title IV-participating, not-for-profit domestic institutions are African Americans.

In fall 2003, 57.9% of full-time faculty members at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) were African American; only 4.0% of full-time faculty members at all other institutions were African American (*IPEDS*).

Of the 40 institutions producing the most African American BAs going on for PhDs in English in the thirty-three-year period 1973 to 2005, 20 are HBCUs.

Over the last thirty years many prestigious universities have amassed very poor records of producing African American BA recipients who went on to complete a PhD in English. Cornell; Duke; Harvard; Indiana University; Johns Hopkins; New York University; Notre Dame; Ohio State; University

This report was first published in the ADE Bulletin (141-142 [2007]: 70-74).

of Maryland; University of Michigan; University of Texas, Austin; University of Wisconsin, Madison; and University of Southern California have each produced no more than six, and most have produced only one.

Of the approximately 400 institutions that have graduated African American undergraduates who have gone on to complete a PhD in English, 192 produced only one in the past thirty-three years.

As reported on the Survey of Earned Doctorates, from 1973 to 2005, 2.5% of the 52,480 doctorates in English and literature were earned by African Americans; in all disciplines the figure was 3.8% of 1,379,380 doctoral degree recipients over the same thirty-three years.

How can English departments and their faculties improve the pathways by which African Americans are invited to enter and remain in the profession of English studies? An ad hoc committee of the Association of Departments of English tackled this question in late 2005. Responding to English department chairs who report they would gladly recruit more faculty members of color if they could find them, the committee reviewed a wide range of statistics and scholarship on the question (see Steward). To make the data manageable, the ADE Executive Committee decided to narrow the present study to African Americans, unanimously agreeing that parallel research on other racial groups should follow on this project.

After reviewing the statistics and scholarship, the committee agreed that the most serious problem is the scarcity of African American undergraduate English majors who go on to earn the PhD. According to data gathered by the MLA, those African Americans who do earn the PhD in English have an excellent chance of landing a tenure-track job. Available evidence suggests that African American junior faculty members receive tenure at a lower rate than their white colleagues, but data are sparse about how these colleagues fare on the tenure track (see *Mod. Lang. Assn.* 66). We did, however, find a wealth of ideas for ways to bring more African American undergraduates through the profession's portals and to recruit and retain African American faculty members. We also canvassed those English departments with the strongest records of graduating African Americans from their PhD programs to learn what they do to support those students during their graduate studies.

Rather than merely describe and decry the current situation for African American faculty members in English, the committee resolved to produce a list of actions English department chairs can take—or encourage their institutions to take—toward serving three purposes:

- improve the conditions for and increase the numbers of African American undergraduate students making it all the way through to tenured-faculty status
- improve recruitment and retention of African American doctoral candidates
- improve recruitment and retention of African American faculty members

Not every one of these affirmative-activism steps is possible at every school. But if enough English department chairs were to follow through on just two or three of these suggested actions, the pipeline for African Americans in English studies could be dramatically improved.

RECOMMENDATIONS: ACTIONS ENGLISH CHAIRS CAN CARRY OUT IN THEIR DEPARTMENTS

For Undergraduate Programs

Participate in or establish partnerships with secondary schools to make early contact with promising African American students (e.g., through service learning, tutoring, summer courses and institutes).

Initiate a modest fund to cover one campus visit by an African American undergraduate major in your department who has been admitted to a graduate program; make contact with the graduate program on the student's behalf before the visit.

Provide opportunities for large numbers of English majors to gather in one place (e.g., lecture classes, social events) in order to make African American English majors visible to one another.

Give students research to do. Stephen Cole and Elinor Barber write, "The more heavily undergraduates can be involved in research, the greater the likelihood that they will select college teaching as a career. Programs, therefore, should be instituted that offer students the opportunity to do research" (253).

Regularly canvass all instructors of introductory English courses to identify promising African American students (or charge the undergraduate studies director to do so).

Make students aware of the McNair postbaccalaureate program that aids undergraduates on their way to doctoral programs.

Get connected with recipients and finalists of the Hurston-Hughes Legacy Award and College Language Association (CLA) Margaret Walker Creative Writing Prize as well as with participants in the Callaloo Creative Writing Workshops to let them know of graduate school opportunities.

Sponsor a few African American undergraduates each year to attend (with a faculty member) meetings with significant African American participation like CLA, Society for the Study of the Multiethnic Literature of the United States, or the African Studies Association.

Create links to diverse campus programs and organizations on your departmental Web page.

Ensure that African American and pan-African literature and culture are visible and valued in your department's curriculum and exams.

For Graduate Programs

Establish rotating recruiting teams of faculty members who annually visit some of the undergraduate institutions, especially HBCUs, that produce substantial numbers of African American English majors. The majority-white institutions that have graduated the largest numbers of English majors who are African American over the past thirty years are Stanford and Yale (11 each); Princeton and UNC, Chapel Hill (10 each); Brown and UCLA (9 each); CUNY City

- College, CUNY Queens College, Columbia, Rutgers, UC Berkeley, and the Universities of Illinois and Pennsylvania (8 each); and Georgetown (7).
- Form partnerships between African American doctoral candidates in graduate programs and African American faculty members in non-doctoral-granting institutions to expand mentoring and advising networks.
- Identify undergraduate programs that sent successful African American graduate students to your department and try to establish mentoring connections to similar students earlier in their undergraduate careers.
- Ensure that graduate admissions committees retain competitive applicants who self-identify as members of underrepresented groups to the last round of graduate admission decisions.
- Review admissions decisions to ensure equity, as is regularly done for hiring decisions. If a discriminatory pattern emerges, the chair should intervene.
- Ensure that faculty members who serve on admissions committees are well informed about colleges such as HBCUs that have historically produced significant numbers of BA recipients who have gone on to earn PhDs in English.
- Be active and visible in taking advantage of institutional programs such as visitation days for prospective graduate students.
- Collaborate with the graduate school on identifying prospective graduate students from underrepresented groups who are interested in English and on making sure they attend recruitment events on campus.
- Admit a cohort of graduate students of color into each entering class.
- Reallocate internal resources to create “topping off” fellowships for graduate students from underrepresented groups, as is commonly done in senior faculty searches or for hires in highly competitive fields.
- Encourage students to work with senior scholars in the department, particularly in fields outside their primary area of specialization.
- Share with beginning African American graduate students the current MLA statistics about average time to completion of degree and placement rates for African American PhDs in tenure-track jobs.
- Counsel African American PhD students to finish the dissertation before accepting a tenure-track job. Writing a dissertation during the first years of a tenure-track job makes earning tenure even more difficult.

For Recruitment and Retention of Junior Faculty Members

- Identify targets of opportunity instead of always waiting for candidates to surface in a national pool.
- Attend conference talks of potential candidates and talk with them about their future plans.
- Invite targets of opportunity to campus as part of regularly scheduled lecture series.
- Enrich candidates' campus visit experiences by providing opportunities for the candidates to meet with a diverse group of faculty and staff members from across the institution.
- Show visiting job candidates a wide range of neighborhoods where they might choose to live.
- Make job offers more attractive by arranging partner accommodations, facilitating cross-disciplinary contacts, and demonstrating sensitivity to candidates' special needs and situations.

- Start building curriculum and scholarly strength in African American literature and culture, whether or not your department already has African American faculty members in place and whether or not African American faculty members you may hire will be specialists in that area.
- Make cluster hires where resources allow, with the goal of reaching critical mass for underrepresented groups in the department or college, including senior hires when possible.
- Do not give job candidates the sense that the department assumes they will serve as the sole or primary faculty adviser to students of color.
- Assign no more advising responsibilities to junior faculty members of color than to other junior faculty members.
- Be supportive of a new junior faculty hire who asks to postpone coming to campus in order to accept a postdoctoral fellowship.
- Monitor junior faculty service, informal as well as formal, and make recommendations for prioritizing. Protect African American faculty members from service overloads while respecting their ethic of service; be sure they know the fine art of saying no.
- Be aware of the double service load that sometimes comes with a joint appointment. If the junior faculty person is appointed half-time in English and half-time in another program such as ethnic studies or women's and gender studies, that person should be carrying no more than half the service commitments of colleagues with one hundred percent appointments in English.
- Where African American junior faculty members are eligible for released time to support their research, consider granting service release in place of teaching release if building the teaching record is a priority.
- Build a culture of inclusion that improves the climate for African American faculty members by inviting them to participate in team teaching, reading groups, writing groups, and social occasions.
- Give African American faculty members opportunities to teach advanced courses in their fields, whether these fields are ethnic studies or traditional areas of literature.
- Assign new course preparations to African American junior faculty members in the same proportion as to other junior faculty members, even when they have been hired to develop a new curricular area.
- Establish partnerships across disciplines and with nearby institutions through which African American junior faculty members can network with others in their research specialties and meet colleagues who share their institutional goals.
- Make sure that all senior faculty members making hiring and reappointment and promotion decisions have the Guidelines for Good Practice of the MLA Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada, available at <www.mla.org/rep_guidelines_poc> or by writing to MLA English Programs, 26 Broadway, 3rd fl., New York, NY 10004.

ACTIONS ENGLISH CHAIRS CAN ENCOURAGE ADMINISTRATIONS TO TAKE

- Join, or start, a consortium (such as the Institute for Recruitment of Teachers or the Committee on Institutional Cooperation's Summer Research Opportuni-

- ties Program) that sponsors programs for students of color who are planning to enter the professoriat.
- Find out how to put chairs in contact with holders of Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowships so that the chairs can establish mentoring relationships between graduate faculty members and prospective students of color.
- Circulate among humanities majors “a promotional brochure and a videotape in which the job of college professor is described in a favorable but realistic light” (Cole and Barber 245).
- Appoint “a staff member whose primary responsibility will be to serve as an advisor to students who are interested in careers as professors.” This staff person should be in constant touch with department chairs about students of color to contact (Cole and Barber 242).
- Require admissions officers to “be more attentive to applicants’ career plans” (Cole and Barber 240); elite schools, especially, “should pay particular attention to the freshman career interests of African American . . . students who apply for admission” (241) and should be sure to include professorial hopefuls among the admitted students.

The ad hoc committee’s research shows that at present a number of institutions are taking some or nearly all of these actions. To bring the diversity of the English faculty members of the twenty-first century closer to that of the United States population and to improve the integrity of the profession itself, many more departments and chairs must engage in affirmative activism.

Dolan Hubbard, Morgan State University
Paula Krebs, Wheaton College, MA
David Laurence, ADE
Valerie Lee, Ohio State University, Columbus
Doug Steward, ADE
Robyn Warhol, University of Vermont (chair)

WORKS CITED

- Cole, Stephen, and Elinor Barber, with Melissa Bolyard and Annulla Linders. *Increasing Faculty Diversity: The Occupational Choices of High-Achieving Minority Students*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2003.
- IPEDS Dataset Cutting Tool*. Natl. Center for Educ. Statistics. 27 Mar. 2006 <<http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/dct/index.asp>>.
- Modern Language Association. *MLA Report on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion*. Dec. 2006. 6 June 2007 <http://www.mla.org/tenure_promotion>.
- Steward, Doug. “Review of Scholarship on the Status of African American Faculty Members in English.” *ADE Bulletin* 140 (2006): 45–60.

The Affirmative Activism Project

JUANA MARÍA RODRÍGUEZ

Recently the MLA and its affiliate ADE produced two significant reports that highlight the professional challenges currently facing the profession, one from the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion and the other from the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of African American Faculty Members in English. While the MLA report focuses on the increasing demands being placed on faculty members in the tenure and promotion process, the ADE report details the particular difficulties that African American graduate students and faculty members contend with as they navigate the various stages of career development. These two issues are not unrelated. Both reports make important and concrete recommendations on how to create more diverse academic communities that foster the expansion of the field in terms of scholarly contributions and on how to promote specific institutional practices that work to ensure that the professoriat more adequately reflects the population at large. These publications provide a much-needed institutional context for understanding individual narratives of racialization and marginalization many of us witness in the profession. These reports, the result of massive effort and care, will only prove significant, however, if they are circulated, discussed, and integrated into the ongoing conversations all of us engage in about what it means to be part of the academy.

This article and the two others (by Williams and by Justice and Barker) published in this issue of *Profession* under the heading taken from the ADE

The author is associate professor of gender and women's studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

report entitled “Affirmative Activism” are three of the six papers that members of the MLA’s Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada (CLPC) produced in response to these two MLA reports. The other essays (by Chiwengo, Brady, and Quiroga) were instrumental in shaping my contribution and are cited extensively in this essay. These papers were not written as official committee statements but are rather individual responses to ongoing conversations. Collectively, they track the seams of several discussions about race and difference in the academy that have taken place at the biannual meetings of the CLPC, a committee of which I was a member and that most recently I cochaired with Ngwarsungu Chiwengo. Addressed to faculty members, graduate students, and administrators, to racialized minorities and their colleagues, our contributions offer interventions intended to help us rethink the relation between race and the academy and consider what we can all do to make the academy a more dynamic, inclusive, and diverse environment. The essays speak to very specific areas of concern that are repeatedly cited in the extant literature (and in departmental hallways) and that have consequences for faculty members of color and others who teach ethnic texts, traditions, and cultures that have been deemed worthy of academic investigation only in the last twenty years. Dana A. Williams’s essay reviews the scant literature on the relation between race and student evaluations and discusses the strengths and limitations of these studies before offering recommendations on what faculty members and departments can do to address the biases inherent in many evaluation instruments. The essay by Daniel Heath Justice and Debra K. S. Barker is directed at scholars of color and offers practical advice about navigating the tenure and promotion process. My essay serves as an introduction to the broader themes inherent in these issues. It reviews the history and mission of the CLPC and focuses on the challenges of narrating and responding to the varied ways that race and ethnicity inform our work in the academy. It goes on to offer broad-ranging suggestions on graduate student mentoring and professionalization, the evaluation of scholars working in emerging fields, and the role of service in the profession. I situate these interpretations and interventions in the larger project of the ongoing work of the MLA and the CLPC in order to foreground how race and ethnicity inflect the findings of various existing MLA reports and recommendations and to urge members of the profession to deploy these resources in their efforts to transform institutional cultures.

The history of this committee’s name serves as an institutional record of the continuing intellectual and political discussions that have surrounded the inclusion of diverse ethnic literary traditions, authors, and

faculty members in English and foreign language programs. First formed in 1970 as the Committee on the Education of Minority Groups, the group changed its name in 1972 to the Commission on Minority Groups and the Study of Language and Literature. It was renamed the Commission (1978) and then the Committee (1986) on the Literatures and Languages of America. In 2000, the group won approval for a new name, Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada. These shifts in nomenclature speak to different historical moments that have marked the anxious process of integrating issues of race and ethnicity, and the racialized bodies of students, teachers, and scholars, into the academy. The list of scholars who have contributed to the work and vision of these variously named committees includes some of the most influential critics working in these fields: Renato Rosaldo (1972–75), Houston A. Baker (1976–79), Paula Gunn Allen (1977–80), José Saldívar (1985–88), Thadious Davis (1986–89), Joy Harjo (1988–91), Sau-ling Wong (1989–92), Norma Alarcón (1990–92), David Palumbo-Liu (1990–93), and Roberta Hill (2002–05), to name just a few. The primary focus of these committees has been strategies for seeking greater validation for the work of ethnic authors and scholars in literary studies. MLA publications that began as committee initiatives worked toward advancing those goals and included several important bibliographies and teaching guides: *Afro-American Literature: The Reconstruction of Instruction*, edited by Dexter Fisher and Robert Stepto (1979); *Three American Literatures: Essays in Chicano, Native American, and Asian American Literature for Teachers of American Literature*, edited by Houston Baker (1982); *American Indian Literature: An Introduction, Bibliographic Review, and Selected Bibliography*, by A. LaVonne Brown Ruoff (1990); *A Resource Guide to Asian American Literature*, edited by Sau-ling Cynthia Wong and Stephen H. Sumida (2001).¹ The texts engendered by those committees emphasized the value of the literature instead of directly addressing the emotional challenges that came with being in the first significant wave of scholars of color to infiltrate faculty ranks. Yet we can imagine the other, more personal conversations that were shared around MLA committee tables through the years.

While the current charge of the CLPC states as its function “[the development] of projects designed to encourage dialogue across ethnic boundaries and to promote intercultural perspectives on and comparative analyses of the literatures and languages of various ethnic groups, including African Americans, Chicanos, Asian Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Native Americans,” the actual work of the committee often seeks to address both the affective and institutional challenges faced by faculty members of color more generally, no matter what their areas of special-

ization (*Committee on the Literatures*). In that role, the CLPC published *Guidelines for Good Practice by the Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada*, and the MLA officially endorsed these guidelines in 2002. This small pamphlet remains a most useful resource; it lists concrete recommendations to help administrators and departments recruit, retain, and evaluate junior faculty members of color.

In 2000, the MLA published another committee-generated volume entitled *Power, Race, and Gender in Academe: Strangers in the Tower?*, edited by Shirley Geok-lin Lim, María Herrera-Sobek, and Genaro Padilla. In their introduction to that collection, Lim and Herrera-Sobek write:

While much has been published concerning pedagogical and curricular matters in journals such as *Profession* and *College English*, relatively little attention has been paid to the social and professional pressures on women, gays and lesbians, and people of color, who are frequently assumed to accomplish the mission of multicultural education with their appointment as faculty members. (1)

Their volume marked a shift toward opening a discursive space in the academy for more nuanced dialogue on what greater diversity has meant to faculty members of color and on the lingering impact previous debates about curricular expansion have had on a myriad of issues related to hiring, promotion, tenure, service, retention, and teaching. That these discussions are invariably complicated and affectively charged makes them all the harder to articulate in the language of traditional scholarship, statistical analysis, or departmental meetings. In their introductory comments, Lim and Herrera-Sobek frame the problem of narrating these experiences by posing the following questions: “What are the challenges, problems, proposed solutions, and transformations that face universities when faculty from traditionally underrepresented groups enter academia? What kinds of things happen when traditional outsiders move or do not move into positions of tenure and/or administrative power?” (1).

My three-year term on the CLPC has served as an opportunity to continue this history of critical questioning and productive dialogue with ten colleagues from a wide range of colleges and universities in the United States and Canada. Cloistered around a conference table for eight-hour days, we shared with one another the many ways that each of us experienced and negotiated the challenges and demands that these recent ADE and MLA reports address, our conversation often tangential to the work at hand. The common experience that committee members share is that each of us represents a demographic group (and field) designated as an underrepresented minority: Latino, Asian American, African American,

and Native American. Yet our conversations continually reveal how the particularities of race and ethnicity are nuanced by the complexities of accent, nationality, sexuality, age, teaching style, fashion style, class, color, gender, degrees of femininity and masculinity, names, size, and the subjects we teach. Sometimes the differences that seem most glaring have to do with our institutional, geographic, and even national locations. We come from Canada and the United States and from institutions large and small, public and private, elite and underresourced, rural and urban. Despite the differences among us, we share a sameness that merits noting: we all belong to the same small minority, that of English and humanities PhDs with tenured appointments. Therefore the differences that exist among us as racialized members of a profession that already treats its members in despairingly unequal ways have likewise impacted our particular experiences of racialization in unique, varied, and sometimes contradictory manners. Particularly striking, therefore, are the echoes of shared experiences that we each bring to these discussions.

These conversations, always animated and lively, generally begin with an anecdote, the recounting of an exchange between students, faculty members, or administrators that illustrates the absurd, painful, and at times humorous ways that race and ethnicity mark us as members of this community. Those stories can go something like this:

During a lecture on the Sand Creek Massacre given by a newly hired Native American assistant professor, a student interrupts and states, "I'm tired of being made to feel guilty by you people." In course evaluations, students make references to feeling "uncomfortable talking about genocide all the time"; several mention the "unpatriotic" attitude of the professor; and others fault the professor for not being able to be "objective" about the subject.

During a campus interview, a queer minority candidate with a newly minted interdisciplinary PhD is advised by one of her interviewers in an English department to publish her dissertation with a "popular press" rather than an academic one because her topic is so "interesting" and "unusual."

An African American senior scholar advises an Asian American graduate student not to pursue African American literature as a field and instead to "do who you are," adding, "it's the only way to get a job."

A fourth-generation Chinese American scholar answers the typical question of "Where are you from?" with "Maine," to the bemusement of her interlocutors. The exchange is repeated ten times in any given month.

These stories are both emblematic and incredibly particular to the storytellers. In gatherings that include academics of color, the performance of their telling will invariably generate other stories with their own ethnic

twists and departmental plot variations. While the recounting can prove a productive outlet for analyzing how racialization functions in the institutions in which we live, the stories themselves exist only as fragmented snapshots of the daily realities of our lives. As literary scholars we are also acutely aware that, in the words of Joan Scott, “Experience is at once always already an interpretation, *and* something that needs to be interpreted” (412). Therefore a frequent response we may hear to anecdotes of this sort marks these “unfortunate incidents” as isolated occurrences, the result of misunderstanding or oversensitivity. Yet, as people of color, we narrate and interpret these stories under the specter of other stories of injustice, inequity, and psychic (and bodily) violence that haunt our sense of belonging in both the academy and the civic spheres in which we live. Irritating, unprofessional, debilitating, events of this sort are part of our experience and interpretation of academic life. If nothing else, faculty members of color spend considerable energy responding to both the incidents themselves and the responses we receive from colleagues when we attempt to share these accounts, resulting in what Roxanna Harlow terms “extensive emotion management” (qtd. in Williams’s essay in this issue [169]).

If the emotional negotiation involved in these professional exchanges is complicated for faculty members, we can imagine that it is all the more troubling and vexed for graduate students. José Quiroga, a CLPC member, is currently working with the Committee on the Status of Graduate Students in the Profession to develop a set of guidelines for graduate students of color. In his essay on the subject of graduate students of color, he writes:

Ethnicity, gender, sexual difference, and race cannot simply be isolated as different segments of unrelated issues, but rather need to be assumed as parts of a whole. Careful evaluation of what it means to have a diverse community has to be part of a broader departmental conversation that includes fostering a climate of inclusiveness in terms of minority representation. (1)

In his consideration of how these mutually constituted vectors of difference affect graduate students of color, Quiroga reiterates the existing scholarship on the subject, which articulates the need for mentoring that is sensitive to how questions of difference inform career development. His essay goes further, citing the need for all members of departments to remain attuned to the effect that race and ethnicity can have on teacher education, professional training, funding, and placement. He also discusses the benefits of cluster admissions; pedagogy training that addresses how race, gender, and sexuality influence classroom dynamics; curricular expansion; and the widespread dissemination of professional reports and publications relating to race and ethnicity in the field. He writes, “A

change in the student body has to correspond to a change in faculty and research lines” (2).

The correlation of graduate students, their mentors, and their fields to professional success, however, is never a simple matter. Quiroga adds, “Graduate students of color often find themselves having to explain their choice of research fields to faculty members who are not necessarily validating the fields they work in. At the same time, it is important to understand that graduate students of color do not necessarily have to, or want to, specialize in fields related to their own identities or ethnicities” (4). His recommendations to graduate students emphasize their need to actively seek out constructive advice from all faculty members, not just those of color; to keep themselves informed about how institutions work; to proactively seek out resources and potential mentors from a wide range of sources; and to participate in or develop informal networks with other graduate students in other departments or institutions who are interested in similar issues.

Chiwengo, in her essay for the CLPC, stresses how mentoring remains a key issue, even as a faculty member moves through the ranks:

To improve the chances for faculty members of color to obtain tenure and promotion, a great number of studies encourage mentoring them. But these articles on mentorship tend to address institutions, departments, and not individual scholars and graduate students. . . . While numerous documents theorize the status of faculty members of color and provide recommendations to institutions, very few address the faculty members directly and guide them through the tenure and promotion process. (3)

She goes on to reiterate the recommendation formulated by the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion that “[d]epartments and institutions should practice and promote transparency throughout the tenuring process” (6). She states that it is crucial for individual faculty members to inform themselves of what is expected in their home institutions, educate themselves about what constitutes an effective dossier, and “develop a map toward tenure through early preparation and achievement in scholarship, teaching, and service” (4). Justice and Barker’s essay in this issue of *Profession* echoes these suggestions and offers other concrete strategies for developing such a map, toward not just institutional success but also professional happiness.

The anxieties and uncertainties of the tenure and promotion process can be forcefully exacerbated for faculty members working in emerging fields, as is often the case for scholars of ethnic literatures and cultures. The definition of what constitutes inclusion in this category may vary widely from institution to institution, but in some departments, faculty

members of color are not just integrating the institutional corpus but also transforming what is understood as legitimate and valuable scholarship. Whether it is the first Chicano literature specialist hired in a Spanish department at a small liberal arts college or the first scholar specializing in technology and urban subcultures at a large state institution, being the first poses its own institutional and emotional challenges.

In a presentation delivered at an ADFL seminar in 2006, Mary Pat Brady, another current CLPC member, made several salient recommendations to those involved in the evaluation of work in what she terms untraditional fields. She stated that it is important for departments to educate themselves about an untraditional field before and during the hiring process as part of their “commitment to responsible knowledge” (10). She insists that if scholars in such fields are deemed desirable hires, then their work should be supported and its value to the institution upheld from the point of hire through tenure and beyond. She stresses that scholars in these areas are often working with methodologies and archives that are unfamiliar to those who work in more established fields and that this difference should not be used as an excuse to challenge the intellectual merit of their research. “Challenges to the validity of the archive,” the accusation of “the thinness of a new field,” or the dismissal of the “quality” of the literature can often mask individual, departmental, or institutional entrenchment in existing paradigms and established disciplinary investments (4, 9). She adds:

[F]aculty members in new areas are often not simply writing about new kinds of texts and questions, they are also doing it without a lot of professional support apparatus we’ve come to take for granted: there may be few to no specialized conferences or associations where they can meet other scholars regularly and engage in rigorous debate. Similarly, unconventional faculty often don’t have a network of tenured faculty to whom they can turn. (9)

Brady encourages evaluators to consider the “labor of developing a field” (8) and to weigh the “ingenuity, tenacity, and in some cases, courage” of these scholars as a means of countering the misperception that “because the field is small, unconventional scholars have received special treatment or have not had to struggle amidst rigorous competition” (10). For the tenure review of scholars working in untraditional fields, just as of scholars working in the still-emerging fields of ethnic literature, it is imperative that their work be evaluated by people whose areas of scholarship demonstrate an intimate understanding of the field and its internal debates and trajectory. As was recommended by the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion, outside reviewers

should be selected on the basis of their expertise in these specialized areas rather than on the stature of their home institution.

Even in institutions where diversity and curricular expansion are actively sought and encouraged, the labor that increased inclusion entails often falls disproportionately on faculty members of color. It is no wonder that the repeated refrain from so many of us narrates the additional service burdens we bear in our endless participation on committees where we are often the only nonwhite faculty member present, the pressures of departmental service as we try to assist our colleagues in creating a more diverse community and curriculum, and the increased mentoring demands placed on us as we advise not only the students with whom we share academic interests but also those students who seek us out for emotional and professional support. Our task is therefore magnified: we educate our students and our colleagues, intervene in scholarly conversations and institutional planning, and do intellectual and emotional labor that often goes unrewarded if not unmarked.

The MLA Commission on Professional Service report, released in 1996 and titled *Making Faculty Work Visible: Reinterpreting Professional Service, Teaching, and Research in the Fields of Language and Literature*, serves as an invaluable resource for assessing the service faculty members of color perform for their departments, their institutions, and society at large. The report's authors define two areas that need to be rethought as central to the work of the profession: "intellectual work" and "academic and professional citizenship." Their report argues that intellectual work "is not restricted to research and scholarship but is also a component of teaching and service" (2). For faculty members of color working in ethnic literatures, this intellectual labor is often manifested as new course development, departmental or campus-wide curricular expansion, bibliographic acquisition, interdepartmental or intercampus research initiatives, and outreach to nonuniversity community sectors. The report states that "[i]n evaluating intellectual achievement, institutions and professional organizations should include not only discipline-based work and work addressed to specialized audiences but also the broader work of so-called public intellectuals" (3). It defines academic and professional citizenship as "encompass[ing] the activities required to create, maintain, and improve the infrastructure that sustains the academy as a societal institution" (3). In this historical juncture, where institutions of higher education invariably emphasize diversity, multiculturalism, and education in a global context as central features of their academic mission statement, the service functions carried out by faculty members of color need to be recognized as essential to meeting the public mandate of the institutions we serve.

It is not true that we racialized members of the academy want to be treated differently or preferentially; the reality is that we are already being treated differently. We are often singled out by our colleagues and institutions and asked repeatedly to justify our choice of subject matter, our place at the seminar table, and our discomfort with an institutional status quo that often sees our presence and our contributions as tangential to the process of knowledge production rather than as central to the formation of an educated and informed civil society. As is frequently the case, the recommendations put forward in these reports and the essays of this issue benefit all members of the academic community, not only racialized minorities. The interventions proposed in these essays are not a call for special treatment that singles out people of color; rather, they ask for greater attention to how bias and emotions affect student evaluations, for increased sensitivity to how graduate student mentoring affects professional development, for greater accountability in how scholarship is evaluated and rewarded, and for a reconsideration of the role of service. The reports and essays also ask that the different ways we racialized members of the profession are already being treated become acknowledged, that the additional burdens we bear be recognized and valued as being in the service of creating a more vibrant and inclusive educational community.

These reports and the conversations they have generated point to the need for further investigation of how race is experienced and interpreted in the academy. We know, for example, that the challenges faced by African American faculty members are quite different from those experienced by Asian Americans, where the stereotype is of privileged members of a model minority that overpopulates the academy, even when statistically Asian American faculty members remain underrepresented in the humanities. Furthermore, national and generational differences that affect specific groups such as Vietnamese, Native Hawaiians, Chicanos, and United States–born Puerto Ricans become erased in larger statistical data about Latinos and Asian Americans. More troubling still is the minuscule, statistically marginal number of Native Americans and First Nation Canadians in the profession. For example, in 2003–04, there were only four graduates of United States and Canadian English PhD programs who were identified as Native American out of a total of 751 graduates who were identified by race or ethnicity in the MLA's survey of PhD placement (Steward). While all four gained professional employment, only one was hired on the tenure track. The situation was no better in foreign languages. A study of the status of specific ethnic groups at the various stages of career development, from graduate admission to advancement to full professor, needs to be undertaken to provide a more

nuanced framework for interpreting how race and ethnicity influence the various milestones of the profession.

In the introduction to the ADE report “Affirmative Activism,” the authors delineate the difference between what has been understood as the function of affirmative action and the necessity of a new commitment to the work of affirmative activism. They write, “Affirmative action ensured that applicants of color would be considered in hiring and admissions processes; affirmative activism changes the culture and climate of the profession” (150 in this issue). The insights and recommendations offered in this small cluster of essays are intended to open a space for scholars, students, and administrators to constructively engage questions of how race, ethnicity, and difference continue to inform the workings of the academy, as they suggest concrete strategies for generating productive change that benefits all members of the profession. Even as more stories are circulated, more data amassed, and more recommendations offered, these alone cannot serve as substitutes for the daily work of changing the institutional and professional cultures that surround us. That labor falls on all of us as we try to make the academy a place where the expressive vibrancy and political challenges of the ethnically diverse worlds around us are reflected in the vision and practices of the institutions in which we live and work.

NOTES

The author wishes to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of Ngwarsungu Chiwengo, Mary Pat Brady, José Quiroga, Rosemary Feal, Doug Steward, and all of the other members of the CLPC with whom I have served. This essay would not have been possible without their insights and inspiration.

1. All authors mentioned have been members of the CLPC or one of its earlier incarnations; the list of texts generated by these committees is meant to indicate a sample and is not inclusive.

WORKS CITED

- Baker, Houston, ed. *Three American Literatures: Essays in Chicano, Native American, and Asian American Literature for Teachers of American Literature*. New York: MLA, 1982.
- Brady, Mary Pat. “Faculty Members in Untraditional Disciplines.” Plenary Session 4: Assessing Student Competencies, the Curriculum, and Faculty Members in New Research Areas. 2006 ADFL Seminar West. U of Wisconsin, Madison. 1 July 2006.
- Chiwengo, Ngwarsungu. “The Status of Faculty of Color in Academia.” Unpublished essay, 2007.
- Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada. *Guidelines for Good Practice by the Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in*

- the United States and Canada*. 27 Sept. 2006. MLA. 19 June 2007 <http://www.mla.org/rep_guidelines_poc>.
- Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada*. 1 Jan. 2007. MLA. 18 June 2007 <http://www.mla.org/governance/committees/comm_professional/comm_color>.
- Fisher, Dexter, and Robert Stepto, eds. *Afro-American Literature: The Reconstruction of Instruction*. New York: MLA, 1979.
- Lim, Shirley Geok-lin, María Herrera-Sobek, and Genaro Padilla, eds. *Power, Race, and Gender in Academe*. New York: MLA, 2000.
- MLA Commission on Professional Service. *Making Faculty Work Visible: Reinterpreting Professional Service, Teaching, and Research in the Fields of Language and Literature. Profession 1996*. 1996. 22 June 2007 <http://www.mla.org/rep_facultyvis>.
- Quiroga, José. "Graduate Students of Color within Academic Programs in the Humanities." Unpublished essay, 2007.
- Ruoff, A. LaVonne Brown. *American Indian Literature: An Introduction, Bibliographic Review, and Selected Bibliography*. New York: MLA, 1990.
- Scott, Joan. "The Evidence of Experience." *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. Ed. Henry Abelove, Michele Aina Barale, and David Halperin. New York: Routledge, 1993. 397–415.
- Steward, Doug. "Placement Outcomes for Modern Language PhDs: Findings from the MLA's 2003–04 Survey of PhD Placement." *ADE Bulletin* 141-142 (2007): 75–102.
- Wong, Sau-ling Cynthia, and Stephen H. Sumida, eds. *A Resource Guide to Asian American Literature*. New York: MLA, 2001.

Examining the Relation between Race and Student Evaluations of Faculty Members: A Literature Review

DANA A. WILLIAMS

The assertion that scholarship is limited on the relation between ethnicity and student evaluations of faculty members is perhaps an understatement. While there is a wealth of scholarship on the relation between gender and student evaluations of faculty members, little has been published on how ethnicity (of both faculty members and students) informs students' rating of teaching effectiveness. Throughout research into issues specific to minority faculty members there are passing references to the sometimes unfair use of student evaluations to determine faculty tenure, promotion, and merit pay; but these references do not and cannot serve as pertinent scholarship on how a faculty member's ethnic background creates biases that reveal themselves in those evaluations.

In one of the few essays that address the relation between ethnicity and evaluation, Heidi J. Nast explores, among other things, "student resistances to multicultural teaching and faculty diversity [and] the risks that derive from problematic institutional deployment of student evaluations as a means of judging multicultural curricular and faculty success" (103). Nast's essay is especially revealing in the following articulations. First, "students use evaluations to register anger and disapproval at having to negotiate topics and issues in a scholarly way which conflict with heretofore learned social values and assumptions." Second, the likelihood of negative evaluations increases when faculty members "curricularly address issues of homophobia, racism, classism, misogyny or heterosexism"

The author is associate professor of English at Howard University.

(104). Third, the problem of racially motivated negative evaluations does not end with racist students; it is an institutional problem, as colleagues and administrators are often unequipped and unwilling to recognize and to deal with racism. Nast speculates that the fear of negative evaluations and the lack of institutional support to combat racism lead faculty members to assume defensive postures with regard to evaluations. Those who fear, she argues, are more likely to be lenient with students, to administer evaluations strategically, and on occasion to plead with students before an evaluation. All these actions, especially the last two, compromise the accuracy of the evaluations. The most effective strategies for decreasing the potential for racially specific negative faculty evaluation, she argues, must begin at the institutional level, so that sensitivity to evaluative biases can be properly addressed.¹ One strategy that faculty members of color might find useful is to structure supplemental evaluations that are connected to course content and that help students develop analytic skills that make them aware of their biases. An evaluation might have a prefatory section that, first, describes how the evaluation will be used and how it is valued institutionally and that, second, warns students about “the potential *emotional* impact of education” (109).²

Nast’s argument is not based on quantitative research, nor is its framework theoretical. It presents qualitative comments from anonymous sources. These comments are revealing but not particularly useful in theorizing ways to improve the evaluative process. Similarly, Roxanna Harlow’s essay offers revealing qualitative comments that speak to her examination of “how and to what degree race shapes professors’ perceptions and experiences in the undergraduate classroom” (348). While the article does not speak directly to evaluations, it does identify specific ways that race compels black faculty members, first, to negotiate a devalued racial status and, subsequently, to engage in “extensive emotion management”; both strategies affect students’ evaluation of faculty performance and competence.³

Unlike Nast’s and Harlow’s essays, Kristin J. Anderson and Gabriel Smith’s offers an important balance among a qualitative, a quantitative, and a theoretical approach to the relation between ethnicity and students’ evaluations of faculty members. In their attempt to address the lack of studies that examine students’ perceptions of ethnic minority faculty members and the interaction of such perceptions with “course content and the impact of these perceptions on student evaluation of instruction,” the authors examine “the interactions of gender, ethnicity, and teaching style on students’ perceptions of professors teaching a politically charged social science course” (185).⁴ Their findings are based on an experimental

comparison of student ratings of Latino and Anglo professors.⁵ The strength of their study lies in the use of multiple variables to hypothesize the efficacy of student evaluations and in the quantitative results that the authors present. For instance, they investigated the ways the combination of course content, gender, and ethnicity affect students' perceptions of a course and a professor; and they conducted three five-way between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs) to measure their findings. The most revealing findings are: "[R]atings of professor warmth and availability for Latino professors appear to be contingent on their teaching style, whereas the rating of Anglo professors' warmth is less contingent upon teaching style" (196); "Among women professors with strict teaching styles, Anglo women were rated as more capable than Latinas with the same teaching style. . . . Lenient Latinos were viewed as more capable than strict Latinos, whereas Anglo professors' capability was not contingent on teaching style" (197); Anglo men, more so than any other group of students, judge women professors and Latino professors as having a political agenda (198); and "Latino students rated Anglo women professors as more capable than Latino professors, and they saw Anglo women professors as more capable than did African American students. Also, Latino students saw Anglo women as more capable than Anglo men" (199).

Like Anderson and Smith, Jeannette M. Ludwig and John A. Meacham conducted an experimental study, creating fictitious instructors and syllabi to facilitate their analysis.⁶ The purpose of their study was "to assess the impact of instructor gender and race on student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, particularly when courses include controversial content" (27). Interestingly, their findings did not support their main hypothesis, that students are apt to give low evaluations of teaching effectiveness for women and for minority instructors when the course content is controversial. But the findings did suggest that an instructor's characteristics (as revealed in a short biographical sketch) influence students' evaluations of which course material is considered controversial (36). In short, controversial course material alone does not appear to be detrimental to positive evaluations of teacher effectiveness. But Ludwig and Meacham point out that because their study was experimental, they could not factor in two key variables: the fact that a syllabus alone cannot include specific content that arises during the semester and the fact that only during the semester can students really feel the challenge to their beliefs of controversial course content (35). These findings and this literature review show how important it is for scholars to conduct additional research on this issue.

Yet even though the extent of scholarship on the relation between race and student evaluations of faculty members is limited, the little available

to us is both revealing and informative. It supports the following observations and recommendations:

Student evaluations are used primarily in four ways: to provide feedback to faculty members, to offer guidance to students in their course selections, to assess teaching effectiveness for purposes of promotion and tenure, and to justify or deny increases in pay based on merit.

Evaluations are in need of improvement. Those that claim to measure teaching effectiveness must have some grasp of teaching and learning theories. Measurement of evaluations must be quantitatively informed and sufficiently sophisticated to be useful. Variables such as time of day, teaching style, instructor ethnicity and gender and sexual orientation (if the instructor has made that orientation explicit to students), nature of the course (requirement or elective), and course content should be factored in. Numbers alone reveal little. An evaluation often tells more about a student's opinion of a professor than about the professor's teaching effectiveness.

Department chairs should offer faculty members of color institutional support that acknowledges and works to combat racism and discrimination by creating an environment in which grievances can be articulated openly and addressed seriously. Chairs should also ensure that student evaluations of faculty members are constructed in such a manner that they reveal racially specific or racially motivated bias. As a supplement, faculty members of color should construct their own evaluations that are course-specific and designed to encourage students to reflect on the possibility of students' racially specific bias.

In addition to studying how race intersects with students' evaluations of faculty members, researchers should construct normative questions that reveal racially specific bias and that departments and faculty members can use to limit the impact of discriminatory student evaluations on the promotion and tenure of faculty members of color.

Increasing the accuracy of student evaluations of faculty members of color increases the integrity of the academic experience not only for faculty members of color but for all faculty members and for students as well.

NOTES

1. Her argument moves along these lines: "institutions need to confront more honestly the limitations of student evaluations" (108); department chairs must read student evaluations carefully, paying careful attention to subtle clues to bias; "institutions can proactively prepare and educate students about meaningful assessment procedures" and uses; and institutions should "conduct systematic, systemic studies of racism, homophobia, and sexism" to understand the pressures on faculty members who carry out multicultural or diversity projects (109).

2. Nast hypothesizes: "In some courses, controversial social issues such as racism, sexism, religious and ethnic conflict, and homophobia are discussed, which may cause emotional discomfort because they carry with them difficult questions."

Sample questions include but are not limited to the following: “Were controversial topics raised in this class . . . ?” “Did you feel upset about the fact that the issues were raised?” “Do you feel that . . . the controversial topic caused you to consider the course in a negative light?” (110). Note that all the comments of obvious racial bias that Nast cites are written, not revealed through multiple-choice selections.

3. Harlow conducted fifty-eight in-depth interviews with twenty-nine white and twenty-nine African American faculty members at a predominately white (91%) state university. The faculty members were then matched by similar gender, rank, and department or area of study and questioned about “their anxiety on the first day of class, their teaching style, the level of students’ energy in their classes, students’ opinions of the respondents, how they would like to be viewed by students, and other subjects” (350). Interestingly, Harlow’s findings suggest that although black faculty members were clear about racially specific stereotypes and felt that racial inequality was still an issue in society today, almost half were “reluctant to claim that their race mattered to students, or that race influenced their classroom experience in any negative way” (351). They seemed to acknowledge race on the macro level but were less inclined to acknowledge it personally. This notwithstanding, Harlow’s research revealed that while only 7% of white professors felt that students questioned their qualifications, 76% of black professors felt that students questioned their qualifications. White professors seldom considered that race might influence students’ professional evaluation of them. White women, when asked how race or gender affected students’ views of them, tended to focus on gender alone (354). For further commentary on the relation between race and students’ perceptions of professor credibility, see Hendrix, who effectively engages this issue as it relates specifically to African American faculty members.

4. See Coren on how course content influences students’ perceptions of instructors’ biases. Coren is more interested in student evaluation of an instructor’s racism than in the influence of race on students’ evaluation of professors. But Coren analyzes “fundamental attribution error” and the “halo effect” as two basic psychological errors that weaken the credibility of standardized student course evaluation forms that are developed specifically to assess an instructor’s racism, sexism, and sensitivity to multicultural issues. Students cannot separate the message from the messenger when dealing with course content that is politically unpopular, and “negative opinions about an unpopular instructor who does not teach well are likely to be generalized.” The result is the attribution of racist and sexist views to that instructor (201). Anderson and Smith characterize teaching styles as strict or lenient. They note that “[t]eaching style varied according to the language each professor used on the syllabus. The styles were modeled after the coding scheme used by Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky (1992) in their meta-analysis of studies on gender bias and leadership” (190).

5. They “examined the impact of professor and student characteristics on students’ perceptions of professors. The characteristics of the professor examined . . . were teaching style . . . , professor gender, and professor ethnicity (Latino and Anglo). Student characteristics examined were student gender and ethnicity (Latino, African American, and Anglo). A syllabus was constructed for a social science course called *Race, Gender, and Inequality*, and versions of the syllabus varied according to teaching style, gender, and ethnicity. [They] asked undergraduate respondents to read the syllabus and rate the course and the instructor on dimensions such as warmth, availability, knowledge of the topic, preparedness and capability, and lack of objectivity and

political bias" (188). By using the experimental method, the writer-researchers were able to control the course—the content, lectures, requirements, and time of day; the gender and ethnicity of the professor; and the professor's teaching style.

6. Students were given booklets that presented fictitious instructors who were proposing new courses. The cover page of the booklet suggested that the professor was proposing a new course for undergraduate students and that a committee needed students' assistance to evaluate the course before it was taught. A brief description of the professor was offered, and students were asked to examine the biographical sketch closely. The descriptions identified the professor by name, race, rank, place of education, specializations, and publications. The package also included a sample syllabus, which was characterized either as "high-controversy" (presenting topics that concerned racism and sexism) or as "low-controversy" (presenting topics that concerned more general social problems).

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, Kristin J., and Gabriel Smith. "Students' Preconceptions of Professors: Benefits and Barriers according to Ethnicity and Gender." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 27 (2005): 184–201.
- Coren, Stanley. "Student Evaluations of an Instructor's Racism and Sexism: Truth or Expedience?" *Ethics and Behavior* 8.3 (1998): 201–13.
- Eagly, A. H., M. G. Makhijani, and B. G. Klonsky. "Gender and the Evaluation of Leaders: A Meta-analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 111 (1992): 3–22.
- Harlow, Roxanna. "Race Doesn't Matter, but . . .: The Effect of Race on Professors' Experiences and Emotion Management in the Undergraduate College Classroom." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66 (2003): 348–63.
- Hendrix, Katherine Grace. "Student Perceptions of the Influence of Race on Professor Credibility." *Journal of Black Studies* 28 (1998): 738–63.
- Ludwig, Jeanette M., and John A. Meacham. "Teaching Controversial Courses: Student Evaluations of Instructors and Content." *Educational Research Quarterly* 21.1 (1997): 27–38.
- Nast, Heidi J. "'Sex,' 'Race,' and Multiculturalism: Critical Consumption and the Politics of Course Evaluations." *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 23.1 (1999): 102–15.

*Deep Surveillance:
Tenure and Promotion Strategies
for Scholars of Color*

DANIEL HEATH JUSTICE AND DEBRA K. S. BARKER

Given the myriad difficulties faced by scholars of color in the academy, there is clearly no single strategy for success in achieving tenure and promotion, as much depends on the specific strengths of the individual scholar, the particular home department, and the larger institution. Common to all situations, however, and the proactive focus of this essay, is the importance of an emphasis on informed participation. Many of the struggles faced by scholars on the tenure track involve unspoken or assumed knowledge on the part of the department or institution and expectations of full transparency on the part of the faculty member. This is a formula for frustration and, occasionally, crushing disappointment when a scholar's strong work does not receive the acknowledgment or recognition it deserves. Toward that end, the "deep surveillance" suggestions below (we appropriate the phrase from today's national security lexicon) are intended to help tenure-track scholars of color better inform themselves about institutional expectations, their professional and personal relationships, and their priorities to ensure, as much as possible, a clear-eyed and empowering understanding of what is still too often a rather esoteric system. These recommendations may also help scholars better articulate their accomplishments and strengths to a tenure or promotion committee that may be unfamiliar with their methods, field, or intellectual goals.

Daniel Heath Justice is associate professor of Aboriginal literatures at the University of Toronto. Debra K. S. Barker is professor of English and American Indian studies at the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire.

KNOW THYSELF

Understanding oneself as a scholar, teacher, department member, and citizen of the academy is not a transparent process, especially for those who are first-generation academics—a not uncommon situation for many scholars of color. Understanding the function of tenure and promotion in any particular institution begins with understanding one's relation to the academy. To that end, we recommend the following.

Honestly evaluate your areas of potential strength and improvement. Think particularly of your personality, teaching, scholarship, and both personal and professional commitments and priorities. Understand how these might be interpreted by others. For example, if you're an introvert by nature, does this come across as thoughtfulness, shyness, or arrogance? How might you enhance the positive aspects without cynically adopting another personality? If one of your priorities is to have an active family life, you may need to be creative in your time management to ensure that neither your professional nor your personal commitments are neglected. If your priority is your career, look for ways of creating community outside the academy to ensure balance and a support network beyond the department.

Similarly, be honest with yourself about the institution in which you work. Is this a place that you really want to be your intellectual home for the next five years, for a decade, or for your whole career? Not all institutions fit the needs or priorities of all scholars, and not all scholars are appropriate for all institutions. If you are professionally oriented toward teaching but are presently in a department that emphasizes publishing, your obtaining tenure is likely to be quite difficult. Being pragmatic and realistic about your relation to the institution can help you avoid such difficulty. That said, your first choice of school may not be realistic, either—not everyone can teach at a Research I university. Understanding the market and being able to adapt to another kind of institution is also important if you find yourself someplace you didn't expect to be but where you could nevertheless find professional and personal happiness.

Every few years, sit down and think about the future, first by yourself and then with friends or family. What are your goals as a human being, a member of the department, a faculty member of the institution, and a scholar in your field or discipline? Do you have a vision for the next year, the next five years, the next decade, retirement? Think of ways to realize these goals in the context of your work as a faculty member.

Understand how your personal relationships relate to your professional life. You may need to compromise on some of your dreams to make room for those of your loved ones, and vice versa. As many faculty members of color have expectations from nonacademic constituencies as well as from those within the academy, these expectations should be considered in the context of your professional vision.

DEEP SURVEILLANCE

Because most colleges and universities operate by a mix of explicit guidelines and implicit traditions, new faculty members have a steep learning curve in understanding their institutional home. Scholars of color often have the added challenge of being one of few people of color in their department and thus encounter a range of expectations that may add pressures not shared by other incoming faculty members. One way of negotiating this tangle of customs, expectations, and rules is to engage in deep surveillance, familiarizing yourself with a broad range of information about the people, relationships, power structures, and history of the institution and its environs. Though strategic, such knowledge is not cynical. Instead of emphasizing knowledge for the sake of advancement, think in terms of making yourself a more informed academic citizen and thus becoming better able to do your work sincerely and fully, while building personal, collegial, and intellectual relationships with as little anxiety as possible.

Be proactive, and be professional. You are your own best (or worst) advocate.

Be a dependable colleague first and a friend second.

Familiarize yourself with the faculty handbook and the institution's expectations of its faculty. Know what's expected of you and what you can fairly expect of the institution. Be aware of what documents are circulated at various levels of the tenure process; some materials may circulate only within the department, others may circulate at the institutional level, and still others may be submitted to external reviewers.

Be informed about all the deadlines involved at various stages of the process. A well-meaning but unorganized chair can present a problem if you do not have the proper materials submitted in a timely manner.

Develop your trajectory in relation to the institution's stated mission.

Know your department. What is its recent history? Is it a largely collegial department or one that is fractured along generational, ideological, pedagogical, or methodological lines? How are departmental resources allocated? What are the department's relations to others in the institution?

Know your institution. What is its history, its hierarchical structure, its distribution of resources? What are the current demographics, concerns, and priorities? Does the institution value different ways of knowing? If your work extends beyond traditional research methodologies in the academy, how might you articulate a positive relation between these established traditions and newer scholarship? Again, understanding the mission statement will help you better understand your role and purpose at that particular school. Find out, too, what resources are available at your school to help sustain your scholarship. In other words, how might the institution provide funding, course reductions, or other resources to help you attend conferences, write and publish in your field, and enhance your teaching?

Know your field (or, if your work is interdisciplinary, fields). What is its history? What are the current issues and debates? What are the essential texts to know, and who are the leading scholars? What is the relation of this field to others in

the academy? This is particularly important when you need to submit names of outside reviewers for tenure and evaluation, particularly for areas in which your colleagues may have few contacts or limited expertise. Try to cultivate relations with leading scholars throughout your career, through professional meetings, publication contacts, and social networks.

Though such knowledge is not generally essential in a tenure bid, for the sake of your own well-being beyond the institution, know your community. Understanding the relation of the college or university to the neighborhood, town or city, state, and region will help you understand how outside pressures can affect day-to-day operations in the institution. For example, if legislators cut funding for higher education, you can expect cuts at the department level, which will lessen the availability of money for conference or research travel. Having some understanding of these issues can help you make alternative funding plans and avoid having a particular project derailed by unexpected shifts in the political landscape outside your institution.

MENTORSHIP AND COLLEGIALITY

A good mentor can be a career saver; a bad mentor can sink a tenure bid. Depending on a single person for guidance is always a bad idea, as one person cannot provide all the information you need for career development, and you will be in a vulnerable position if that individual is isolated from the power structure of the department or institution. More mentors mean more guidance. And although collegiality is a controversial category in evaluations for tenure and promotion (see *Profession 2006* for a discussion of the issue), there is no doubt that your participation in departmental culture affects, either explicitly or implicitly, how other members of the department view you. Blind obeisance and fawning agreement are as unwelcome to most of your colleagues as stiff-necked intransigence and arrogance. Having a firm sense of your priorities and being able to articulate them fully without being aggressive or self-aggrandizing go a long way toward creating a positive view of your contribution to the larger goals of the department.

We make the following suggestions.

Be a professional and respectful departmental citizen.

Seek out mentors from both inside and outside your department. Do not rely on just one or two people; the more information you can compare, the more you will be able to distinguish between the helpful and the less helpful. Find out who has a reputation for effectively guiding junior scholars through the process, and seek out such people for advice, especially advice on how to balance your work and the many requests for committee work that may distract you from necessary scholarship and teaching. (In other words, find out which work you can politely refuse and which committees will require your participation.)

As you become more established and begin to navigate the institution, be a good mentor for younger faculty members.

Be open to unexpected allies across political, intellectual, and disciplinary differences. Respect across difference can create many good relationships and make the campus a more productive and positive place without diluting your priorities and commitments.

Pick your battles carefully. Diplomacy and professional courtesy go a long way toward keeping little problems from becoming big ones. You can stand strong for an intellectual or ideological position without becoming confrontational.

TENURE DOSSIER

The tenure dossier is the physical expression of your contributions to the institution and the academy; as such, it is a rhetorical document that requires a significant amount of thought and self-awareness. For scholars who work in underrepresented areas or utilize unconventional or community-based methodologies, the content and structure of the dossier are of particular importance, and unusual care is required to ensure the dossier's fair and unbiased reception by readers. This, too, is an area where a mentor can be helpful; if you don't have a mentor in your department who is familiar with your work or area and can provide the necessary guidance, find one at another institution.

Begin organizing your tenure dossier from the first year of appointment. It should be well organized and respond directly to criteria listed in the faculty handbook. Take advantage of the rhetorical opportunity to represent yourself in the discourse of the tenure and promotion process by creating a clear narrative of intellectual, pedagogical, and professional development, along with plans for further growth.

Keep detailed records of your accomplishments. Not all the service you perform may merit a line on your c.v., but the self-assessment that often accompanies a tenure review is an appropriate place to list the informal service work that you do on campus and in your community. You can also list invitations for talks and reviews and requests that you have not accepted; these help establish the fact that you are a sought-after scholar in your field.

The teaching section of your dossier should include handouts, assignments, documents related to curriculum planning and assessment, peer evaluations, and materials across the grade spectrum. It should demonstrate self-awareness and show an evolving teaching philosophy. Take advantage, too, of institutional teaching resources that could help develop this section of the dossier, such as inviting peers to informally or formally evaluate your classes, attending teaching seminars, and providing midterm evaluation opportunities for student feedback.

If you have any problematic teaching experiences, you must address them directly in the dossier. Demonstrate that you are self-reflective and that you have worked toward addressing problems through mentorship, teaching assessment, new classroom strategies, and so on. If you experience racism or

other forms of bias in student evaluations, try to respond as you would to a pedagogical challenge.

When preparing for tenure, ask the administration, the departmental personnel committee, and trusted senior colleagues to assess the suitability and viability of your candidacy. The more advice you get from as many sources as possible, the greater the likelihood of your success.

Use the clout of professional organizations such as the MLA and the ADE to help support your case. Make your department and institution aware of publications such as the recent report from the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion, the *Guidelines for Good Practice by the Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada*, the Statement on Indigenous Languages of the World in the College and University Curriculum, and the report of the ADE Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of African American Faculty Members in English. These references are particularly useful in addressing issues such as external reviews, the value of translation and language teaching, service demands, bias in student evaluations, electronic publishing, community participation, and the evaluation of scholarship in emerging fields—issues that have particular resonance for faculty members of color.

CRACKING THAT GLASS CEILING TO FULL PROFESSOR

A positive tenure decision not only marks an achieved level of success in the academy; it also puts a faculty member in a position of relative stability. But one would do well to recognize that tenure is only a stage in the trajectory of an academic career: too many people find themselves not becoming complaisant, exactly, but perhaps experiencing a feeling of stasis. Attending the benefits of promotion are increased responsibilities of departmental and university-wide service, particularly if one's institution requires faculty members of color to be visible. With tenure comes the additional burden of having to evaluate the tenure cases of junior faculty members, review an increasing number of journal articles and manuscripts, and otherwise perform service to the profession at large that exceeds institutional commitments. Moreover, it is at this point that expectations of scholarly production may become even greater—on top of the usual expectations of excellent teaching and participation in service and faculty governance.

Cracking the glass ceiling between associate and full professor is an endeavor in some respects more demanding than that of simply securing tenure, because the stakes are higher and because one's informed participation in the process must be even more vigorous. Below are suggestions that reaffirm and extend the strategies already presented.

Investigate the process of posttenure review and educate yourself on the criteria for advancement to full professor. Make sure you understand how scholarly activity is defined and assessed. If you are working in an emerging field, it

is your responsibility to educate your personnel committee members, your deans, and any other people in a position to veto your bid for promotion.

Maintain surveillance of your department, your institution, and your field. Stay abreast of changes in your institution, particularly changes in university leadership. If you have the opportunity to serve on a search committee for a higher-level administrative position, seize it. It will enable you to sound out potential future policy makers at your institution, and you will also help shape the culture of your institution.

As you look forward to promotion, you may expect that you need to establish a sustained record of excellent scholarship as well as a national or international reputation in your discipline. Institutions appreciate it when their faculty members gain increased visibility in the academy.

Many institutions expect faculty members to engage in community service or outreach, so be proactive in seeking out ways to build bridges between your institution and its surrounding community, as well as between your area of expertise and the general public. Such bridges will help you share the benefits of your hard-earned knowledge and promote cross-cultural understanding.

Keep your dossier organized and up-to-date. It will serve you well as a repository of evidence you can draw on during periodic performance reviews, when you apply for grants and sabbaticals, and during your review for promotion to full professor. Remember to ask respected colleagues both in your institution and in the greater area of your field for the names of potential recommenders who can provide informed and persuasive evaluations of your contributions to the field.

There will be factors over which you have little or no control, yet take responsibility for your productivity and contribute to shaping a supportive environment in your institution for scholars of color. Although the period between associate and full professor may feel inordinately demanding, at the same time it can be a time of intense growth as you develop your potential as a scholar and citizen of the academy. The greatest reward comes when you secure the goal of promotion and can use your success to give back, to support and nurture tenure-track faculty members of color who are seeking to find their own roles and voices in the academy.

Although systemic reform is the ultimate goal, making the academy more inclusive of difference in the larger framework of intellectual rigor, the short-term priority is to give scholars of color and their mentors a range of strategic options to help them find a place of empowerment in the academy. Some institutions offer more challenges than others, but any place can be an intellectual home if both the individual scholar and the home institution understand and respect their shared commitments and their responsibilities toward each other. Such a mutually attentive relationship can only enhance the larger mission of the academy and make it more relevant and responsive to its various constituencies in an ever more globalized—and increasingly fraught—public arena.