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ABSTRACT

Enhancing the cultural diversity of faculty has emerged as a prominent issue in the 1990's. While Black, Hispanic, and American Indians have made small incremental gains in terms of their representation in majority institutions, they remain clustered in the lower ranks of the faculty and generally take longer to achieve tenure. Efforts to increase the representation of minority faculty have focused on intensified recruitment, with less attention paid to further career development once a minority individual has achieved faculty status. The research presented herein explores the evaluation, promotion and tenure process of a Research I university to determine the structural and ideological barriers to minority faculty advancement. The research focuses on concepts of merit, excellence, and quality that form the cornerstones of evaluation standards, and the values, attitudes and behavioral expectations that underlie those standards. Using critical theory as the conceptual framework that drives the inquiry, the findings indicate that the pervasive ideology of merit, being universalistic in nature, does not easily accommodate diversity, and trivializes racial, class, and gender issues while perpetuating a system of structured inequality.
CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The call for greater diversity among the faculty and students of our nation's higher education institutions has spawned a flurry of efforts aimed at increasing the representation of minority students and professionals on campus and has fostered the development of initiatives affirming institutional commitment to minority advancement. The need to diversify our education systems has been underscored in publications by such organizations as the American Council on Education (1988), and the Education Commission of the States (1987) that have drawn attention to the demographic changes occurring throughout the country, and the impact those changes will have on the future of our education system. While minority students are present in ever increasing numbers in our public school systems, high school graduation rates and college participation rates have increased only minimally during the past decade and, in the case of Hispanics and Black males, have actually declined (Carter and Wilson, 1991). This paucity of prospective faculty from minority populations to fill vacancies occurring through the projected retirement of nearly one-third of the
current faculty during the present decade presents a formidable barrier to the future diversification of professionals in higher education.

Efforts to increase the representation of minority faculty have focused primarily on intensified recruitment, with less attention paid to further career development once an individual has achieved faculty status. Evidence, presented below in a review of the literature, indicates that minority faculty face unique barriers to career advancement as they ascend the rungs of the professorial career ladder. Although relative newcomers to the world of academe, minorities are expected to have internalized the professional norms and values of the mainstream academic while simultaneously denying their characteristics as members of minority groups. In a profession that emphasizes individual merit and accomplishment, the universal prototype of success remains imbued with characteristics that are largely white and male.

While policy statements and administrative directives mandating faculty diversity have proliferated at a large number of college and university campuses, ultimately it is the current faculty and administrators who are the gatekeepers of their profession. Faculty comprise search committees, determine selection criteria, screen applicants, and conduct interviews (Moore, 1988). As key decision makers, administrators can play an integral role in ensuring faculty
diversity through their often utilized power to override faculty decisions in the name of affirmative action. It is widely assumed that shared norms and values permeate the academic profession and lend reliability to a system of peer review that is based on well established professional standards. In discussing minority faculty issues, a report by the American Council of Education states, "There are numerous barriers to bolstering the presence of minority faculty, but none more severe than the resistance of the faculty itself (1988, pg.11)." Resistance to diversification by majority faculty, entrenched institutional practices and policies, and adherence to exclusionary professional norms may contribute to an institutional climate that is perceived as unaccepting and stifling by minority faculty.

Inquiry into the mechanisms by which the traditional practices and policies of higher education organizations serve to impede the career advancement of minority faculty can contribute to our understanding of these problems and provide direction for institutional policies aimed at increasing minority faculty representation at all levels of the professoriate.

**Statement of the Problem**

The research and theoretical literature concerning promotion and tenure issues in higher education reveal general problems in the development and implementation of sound and
consistent policies and practices. However, the evaluation, promotion, and tenure processes of institutions as they relate to minority faculty have been shown to be particularly problematic. Empirical and anecdotal accounts have identified barriers to promotion and tenure faced by minority faculty (Brown, 1988; Garza, 1988; Menges and Exum, 1983; Reed, 1986; Washington and Harvey, 1989). However, little attention has been given to concepts of merit, excellence, and quality that form the cornerstones of evaluation standards, and the values, attitudes, and behavioral expectations that underlie those standards. The interpretive lens adopted by the evaluator in assessing quality performance, and the subjective interpretations of objective performance standards are crucial to the evaluation process and have significant impact on faculty careers. Formal inquiry that goes beyond the mere identification of problems and seeks to explain their origin and perpetuation in the system of higher education in the United States can contribute to a greater understanding of forces that lead to the stratification and alienation of minority faculty and point to the development of sound practices and policies that address institutionalized inequities.

Significance of the Problem

Minorities comprise 12.3% of full time faculty in the nation's colleges and universities. In the 1991-92 academic
year Black faculty constituted 4.7% of the total professoriate, Hispanics 2.2%, and American Indians .3% (Chronical of Higher Education, 1993). While these numbers show a slight increase over the previous two years, minority faculty continue to be concentrated in two year colleges, with 47% of all full-time Black faculty members being employed at Historically Black Colleges and Universities and 25% of all full-time American Indian faculty employed at tribally controlled colleges (ACE, 1992). Black faculty at predominantly white colleges constitute only 2.3% of full-time faculty at those institutions (Maguire, 1988). While the number of Asian, Hispanic, and American Indian faculty increased incrementally during the past fifteen years, the number of Black faculty has fluctuated from 19,674 in 1977, decreasing to 18,827 in 1983 (Brown, 1988,) and increasing by 1990 a total of 23,225 (Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 1991). Despite the small gains made during the 1980's, the presence of minority faculty on our nation's campuses remains low, even when compared to the disproportionately low numbers of minority students.

With the projected retirement of one-third of the present professoriate in the current decade (Washington and Harvey, 1989), and with current estimates that by the year 2000 one-third of our nation's population will be made up of individuals who are either Hispanic, Black, or Asian/Pacific
Islander (ACE, 1988), there exists an opportunity to remedy the present dearth of minority faculty members through aggressive recruitment efforts. Enhanced recruitment efforts, however, are undermined by a shrinking pool of potential minority faculty, and the likelihood that universities with shrinking budgets will fail to replace retiring faculty. The American Council on Education reports the following data in its Ninth Annual Status Report on Minorities in Higher Education (Carter and Wilson, 1991):

* Since 1984 there has been no improvement in high school completion rates for Blacks and extremely low high school completion rates for Hispanics and American Indians.

* Between 1976 and 1988 the percentage of Black and Hispanic high school graduates enrolled in college has declined dramatically. The enrolled-in-college participation rate for Blacks dropped from 33 percent in 1976 to 28 percent in 1988, while the rate for Hispanics declined from 36 percent to 31 percent.

* Among Black, Hispanic, Asian American, and American Indian populations, only Asian Americans have experienced a significant increase in the number of bachelor degrees awarded since 1976.

* The number of doctorates awarded to Blacks decreased from 1,056 in 1979 to 811 in 1989. The number of doctorates conferred to Hispanics and American Indians increased only minimally from 1979 to 1989, with a 4% decline in doctorates awarded Hispanics from 1988 to 1989 and no increase for American Indians.

* In 1989 Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians earned just 4.2% of all doctorates awarded.

From these data it is clear that efforts to provide equality of educational opportunity for minorities have failed to produce the trained personnel necessary to fill faculty
positions, and the dwindling number of minorities with terminal degrees choosing careers in academia magnifies the significance of the supply problem. Although the number of Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians has increased in the last fifteen years the respective shares of faculty positions held by these minorities remains unchanged (ACE, 1992), and minorities remain concentrated in the social sciences and education fields.

Supply, however, is not the entire problem, nor the primary focus of this inquiry. Minority faculty tend to be concentrated in the lower faculty ranks, and tenure rates for minorities are well below those of majority faculty (ACE, 1992; Russell, 1991). If minorities are to approach numerical equity among the ranks of tenured professors, efforts must be undertaken to analyze the ideologies and institutionally patterned meanings that underlie principles of faculty evaluation, and changes must be made to accommodate the divergent interests of minority faculty in the duties of teaching, research, and service. Concerning the need for institutional change the American Council on Education states,

If our nations campuses are to become truly reflective of the pluralism of American life, then we must examine our assumptions, structures, and priorities. It is not enough to welcome minority individuals. We need to change the culture of our majority institutions so that all members of the community contribute and honor each other's differences. As it now stands, Blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Americans and American Indians bear the entire burden of adapting to the majority culture
on campus. On a truly pluralistic campus, the burden and the rewards are equally shared (1989, pg. 12).

Minority participation has been termed higher education's most important priority (ACE, 1989). A recent survey of 35,478 faculty members at 392 colleges revealed that over half of the faculty of the universities surveyed identified the issue of increasing the representation of minority administrators and faculty as being of highest or high priority at their respective institutions (Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac, 1991). Minority faculty can play a critical role in introducing new perspectives to their disciplines, recruiting and retaining minority students, and enhancing race relations on campus (Hively, 1990, Illinois Committee on Black Concerns, 1985). In a society that espouses the importance of valuing cultural pluralism in a rapidly changing world, the problems encountered by minority faculty have assumed an immediacy that demands the full attention of those concerned with equality and diversity in higher education.

**Purpose of the Study/Research Questions**

This study examines the values and norms that underlie professional standards of faculty evaluation and determine whether those standards represent a shared consensus among the faculty or reflect primarily the values and ideology of the largely non-minority faculty and administration. The critical conceptual framework that guides the inquiry argues that the
ideology of merit, despite its claim to universality, remains largely normed on the white male experience and does not easily accommodate diversity. Moreover, the pervasive meritocratic ideology of academe provides the justification for structured inequality while and trivializing racial, class and gender differences. The two salient questions that guide the research are: 1) How do faculty and administrators interpret standards of quality, merit, and excellence for the purpose of performance evaluation, and are there discernable and consistent differences between majority and minority interpretation of professional performance standards? 2) Are there patterns in the organizational experience of minority faculty at a Research I university, encompassing both formal and informal interaction, and in their perceptions of the institutional environment and its rules and procedures, that negatively impact their professional advancement?

Theoretical Framework

Research in the realm of higher education has been dominated by structural-functionalist theories whose methodologies embrace the tenets of logical positivism. Social facts with objective reality, existing apart from the beliefs of individuals, are thought to become known through an objective, rigorous application of the scientific method by detached, dispassionate researchers. When brought to bear on
problems of social inequality, such as the underrepresentation of minorities in professional positions in the labor market, mainstream research grounded in structural-functionalism theory explains the unequal distribution of rewards, privileges, and prestige in society as the result of a natural evolutionary process in which individuals displaying the greatest talent and ability assume positions of authority and power in a highly stratified social order. Indeed, as these theorists argue, the distribution of rewards according to the merit of the individual is a functional necessity for a coordinated, integrated, and cohesive society (Davis, 1948). Because the functioning of society depends upon the adequate performance of people in different positions within it, and because an integral feature of human action is evaluation, different roles within society are evaluated according to normative standards based on commonly shared values. When applied to the arena of higher education, it this ostensible normative consensus of values that underlie standards used to evaluate the tripartite duties of teaching, research, and service of faculty in higher education.

In contrast to structural-functional theory, social scientists operating from a critical framework question the objectivity and value-free nature of scientific inquiry as advanced by mainstream researchers, and suggest that it may never be possible to observe neutral facts independent of
history, culture, and the subjectivity of the observer (Rosaldo, 1989; Tierney, 1992). Knowledge is not viewed as a neutral concept lying within the parameters of traditional disciplines, but is socially constructed, historically determined, and subject to constant reinterpretation according to the perspective of the researcher (Fay, 1987; Rosaldo, 1989; Tierney, 1991). Moreover, knowledge is imbued with power, and those groups that define, legitimate, and certify knowledge also control societal rewards, privileges, and punishments. From a critical theory perspective, social stratification results from a monopolization of the mechanisms of social and occupational mobility through control of certified, objectified, and specialized knowledge and discourse by powerful groups.

In United States society, formal education has been charged with the mission of equalizing class and gender inequalities and alleviating ethnic, racial, and religious conflicts (Larson, 1977). However, as the review of relevant literature presented here reveals, researchers operating from a critical theory perspective have provided compelling evidence that refutes traditional notions of education as the essential vehicle for overcoming racial and class inequities. As the primary site for the transmission of knowledge, the school serves to legitimate and reproduce existing societal inequities through the differential distribution of knowledge
and by promoting a meritocratic ideology that provides the justification for occupational privilege and market monopoly in broader political, economic, and social spheres. The pervasiveness of this meritocratic ideology has masked institutionalized inequities that function to maintain existing power and privilege at the expense of the powerless and disenfranchised, particularly the lower class, minorities, and women.

Although critical theorists operating from a reproduction framework have greatly expanded our vision of schools and provided powerful explanations regarding the role formal education plays in perpetuating social inequities, the vast majority of their empirical work has focused on primary and secondary education, and to a lesser extent, community colleges. While Bourdieu (1988) has applied a reproductive framework to the study of faculty in institutions of higher education in France, the application of reproduction theory to four year institutions in the United States, particularly research universities, is virtually nonexistent (Slaughter, 1991). In employing a reproduction framework in the study of faculty evaluation and promotion issues at a research university as they affect minority faculty, this inquiry assumes a position that challenges conventional notions of objective neutrality in the application of evaluation standards and will explore the ideologies that permeate the
decision making processes of those who play a gatekeeping role in academia.

Through the credentialing process of formal education, those who aspire to a career in the academy accumulate symbolic capital in the form of certified and specialized knowledge, the outward "badge" of which is possession of the terminal degree in a relevant field from a "quality" institution with appropriate scholarly activities documented in the curriculum vitae. The ideology of the academic profession generally assumes a cognitive and epistemological standardization in the transmission of knowledge that provides a minimum of shared competence and meaning among the faculty in a particular discipline such that a narrow consensus of terms can be reached in evaluating the merit of a colleague's work. The ranks of those who possess the qualifications to provide informed evaluations are further narrowed through the increasing specialization of academic fields such that a small cadre of scientific elites is formed who control the discourse of quality, merit, and excellence in regard to their discipline. The control of specialized discourse becomes institutionally entrenched in the structural formation of academic departments, and in the academic journals that serve as the measure of quality and productivity, giving those who possess the proper credentials power over the constitutive mechanisms of the field and control of the distribution of
rewards and resources. It is the contention of this study that this process operates to marginalize individuals whose cultural, economic, and ideological backgrounds differ from mainstream academics and whose academic pursuits do not conform to conventional disciplinary boundaries.

The faculty member operates in a milieu that embraces the transcendent authority of science as a knowledge system. The objective application of the scientific method to faculty evaluation ostensibly assures that the process is independent of culture, ideology, and prejudice (Feyerabend, 1975). Scientific principles of objectivity, disinterestedness, and specialized knowledge are traditionally presented as the foundation of decision making regarding the quality of one's work and hence the career advancement of the faculty member being evaluated. Protected by a body of esoteric knowledge, held in reverential awe by the laity, and safeguarded by the state through laws ensuring confidentiality and anonymity in the evaluation process, the mechanisms of judgement of the worth of the scientist's work are obscured from public questioning or scrutiny. The impenetrable nature of expert discourse and the unquestionable objectivity of the data used to support the decision making process shields the peremptory judgments of the scientific elite from intrusive perusal by the unenlightened and masks less decorous elements that may enter into the process.
Using critical theory as a lens through which to analyze the experience of minority faculty at a research university, this research advances the proposition that the decisions resulting from the application of evaluation standards are not the products of fixed, stable, and internalized professional norms but are the products of a more fluid process, in which the discourse of merit, quality, and excellence is articulated through and resonates with an exclusionary ideology that reinforces prevailing patterns of power and privilege. Whereas racial inequality has been conceptualized by reproduction theorists as a byproduct of economic divisions in society, this inquiry expands on the class determinance propounded in the literature and treats race as a salient variable. Those individuals lying within socially constructed racial categories are seen as embedded simultaneously in other categories of class and gender.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

There exists a plethora of literature concerning faculty and administrators in higher education. Studies of academic professionals have borrowed from a wide range of disciplines such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology in analyzing matters pertaining to faculty and administrators. The empirical research that has informed our knowledge of faculty beliefs, values, and attitudes has predominantly been based on national surveys (Bowen and Shuster, 1986; Clark, 1987a; Finkelstein, 1984; Ladd and Lipset, 1975; Russell et al., 1988; Trow, 1975) that offer a view of academic professionals as a widely diverse group of individuals whose interests and values span a wide spectrum. Studies that have attempted to analyze faculty "culture" have employed a large number of independent variables such as socioeconomic status, age, and influence of the disciplines and institutions in shaping faculty norms (Becher, 1987; Clark, 1987b; Masland, 1985; Ruscio, 1987; Tierney, 1988). A smaller number of scholars have begun to examine critically the nexus of social and political interests external to the academy and how they affect the work and shape the ideology of higher education organizations (Rhoades, 1989; Rhoades and Slaughter, 1991; Silva and Slaughter, 1984; Slaughter, 1991; Tierney, 1991;
Wexler, 1987).

While the aforementioned literature has provided wide contextual bases for examining faculty issues in higher education, the vast majority of studies have been silent on issues of race and ethnicity. This review of the literature will not attempt to provide an exhaustive account of the research regarding the American professoriate, but will attend to the literature that focuses specifically on the experience of Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians in higher education. The experience of these groups in the education systems of the United States will be discussed in the first section of this chapter as a way to link broader societal issues and interests with other more microlevel analyses of minority faculty that follow. The literature reviewed will provide the knowledge base from which flow the rationale and methodology used in addressing the research questions put forth in this inquiry.

**Minorities in Education**

An analysis of minority faculty issues must attend to wider social and historical forces affecting minority student performance at all levels of schooling and recognize the linkage between the experience of contemporary minority faculty and the experience of minorities in the broader social and educational context. The opening of our nation's public
schools to Black, Hispanic, and American Indian populations is a relatively recent phenomenon, bolstered by the availability of financial assistance to minority individuals for higher education through the G.I. Bill after World War II, landmark court cases during the 1950's striking down "separate but equal" schooling policy, and civil rights legislation of the 1960's. Increased access, however, brought with it a host of problems which education institutions were ill-equipped to handle. Years of substandard schooling had left minority students lagging far behind their white counterparts in terms of academic achievement, and policymakers found explanations for such underachievement in research that attributed the poor performance of minorities in public schools to their "cultural deprivation," or lack of the stimulating educational environment afforded white middle class children by their families and non-school environments (Bloom and Hess, 1965; Deutsch, 1967; Reissman, 1962; Valentine, 1968). Public policy stemming from this research focused on the establishment of programs such as Head Start, Upward Bound, and remedial education projects under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 that sought to provide resources to overcome economic and social barriers to achievement. The limited success of these programs in closing the gap between minority and white in terms of educational achievement suggested to many education and social researchers
that theories of cultural deprivation, a term found inherently unpalatable by minority scholars, failed to provide an adequate explanation of minority underachievement.

Subsequent research refuted the cultural deprivation theory by showing that minority children come from cultures that, although different from the majority culture, were nonetheless viable and functional within their particular contexts. Cultural differences in cognition, learning style, and motivation were advanced as sources of conflict in schools that resulted in failure and underachievement by minority students (Burger, 1968; Phillips, 1982). Theories of cultural conflict did not address the question of the variability in minority school performance however, and tended to reduce minority problems to individual differences which could be remedied through models emphasizing cultural assimilation and mainstreaming. Reacting to this reductionism and tendency to "blame the victim," many researchers became interested in investigation concerning the persistence of problems among some minority groups that were absent or overcome by other groups, and how societal forces contribute to the variation in minority school performance (Ogbu, 1987). Beginning with the assumption that the structure and process of schools are societally determined and represent the norms and interests of the community, the history of race relations between a minority group and the dominant culture became a salient
factor. Concerning the nature of this relationship and its effect on minority school performance, John Ogbu (1987) argues,

By comparing different minorities it appears that the primary problem in the academic performance of minority children does not lie in the mere fact that children possess a different language, dialect, or communication style; it is not that they possess a different cognitive style or a different style of interaction; it is not even that the children face barriers to future adult opportunity structure. While cultural, language, and opportunity barriers are very important for all minorities, the main factor differentiating the more successful from the less successful minorities appears to be the nature of the history, subordination, and exploitation of the minorities, and the nature of the minorities' own instrumental and expressive responses to their treatment, which enter into the process of their schooling (pg.317).

Thus research concerning minority students has expanded beyond a microlevel view of what works for whom in the classroom to an examination of broader political, economic, and social factors that influence minority school performance. The experience of "involuntary" minorities such as Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians is seen as qualitatively different from that of immigrant minorities (Ogbu, 1987); the former exhibiting a resistance to education based on historical distrust and disillusionment with education as a vehicle for social mobility, the latter accepting the fundamental belief that education provides a means to increase one's social status and personal well-being.
A substantial amount of empirical research has shown that education has failed to reduce to any considerable extent the inequities associated with social and ethnic background (Boudon, 1973; Collins, 1973; Richardson and Bender, 1987). Bias in the curriculum and standardized tests and the practice of tracking according to ability, combined with lowered expectations of minority students on the part of teachers are shown to be mechanisms that perpetuate and reproduce the social and class stratification of society (Apple, 1979; Carnoy and Levin, 1985; Collins, 1979; English, 1991; Giroux and McLaren, 1991; Ogbu, 1988; Weis, 1988; Wilcox, 1982). Based on their research in classrooms serving different socioeconomic communities, Carnoy and Levin (1985) conclude that the differential expectations of parents, teachers, and administrators impact the kind of knowledge received by students, and that the social distribution of knowledge conforms to and legitimates the highly stratified existing social order. Regarding differential socialization in the classroom, Kathleen Wilcox (1982) states,

One fundamental characteristic of adult work roles in the culture of the United States is that these roles are highly differentiated and stratified. Horatio Alger myths aside, it is a rare person in this day and age who spends substantial portions of his or her work life at drastically different levels of the stratified workforce. To be a properly socialized person in this culture, one has to be willing at least to tolerate one's place at a particular level in the work hierarchy, and to have the skills and capabilities appropriate to that level. The school becomes the institution which is
crucial in differentiating students, in allocating them to one level or another, and socializing them to perform adequately and at least minimally accept their place (pg. 271).

The educational stratification of minority students does not end after high school but extends through the undergraduate and graduate levels. Standardized college admission tests and selectivity in terms of prior academic performance serve to track minority students into less prestigious institutions. Minorities are disproportionately enrolled in community colleges and predominantly minority colleges and universities such that those institutions most accessible to minority students constitute an interlocking system of stratification (Richardson and Bender, 1987). Because the likelihood of attaining a four year degree is substantially reduced if a student begins postsecondary education at a community college, the heavy concentration of minorities in these institutions has particular implications for the educational advancement of these students (Astin, 1982). Regarding systemic factors contributing to the inequality of opportunity in student institutional choice, Orfield (1984) argues that the higher education system does not operate to equalize opportunity but has powerful institutional features that tend to perpetuate separation and inequality.

Minority students in higher education encounter the assumption that they have received preferential treatment in
the form of lowered admission standards and financial assistance (Cones et al., 1983). Alienated from their home environment and culture, unprepared for the academic rigors of higher education, minority students must endure the condescending attitudes of faculty who expect much less of them than their other students (Sedlacek, 1983). For those minority students who have advanced through the winnowing process of undergraduate school, graduate and professional schools introduce new obstacles in the form of behavioral expectations involved in the professional socialization process that define group membership through control of specialized discourse, and deference to accepted epistemological stances formed along disciplinary parameters. Informal interpersonal interaction with majority students accentuates the need to effectively assume the normative attitudes and values considered appropriate for the professional. Minority graduate students may experience role contradictions when expected to conform to behavior socially defined and sanctioned by the academic community while simultaneously being viewed as spokespersons representing their particular race or culture (Mitchell, 1982). Jacquelyn Mitchell (1982), reflecting on her experiences both in graduate school and as a minority faculty in a predominantly white institution, argues that to a large extent, the contradictions and dilemmas faced by minority graduate
students are carried on into their future professional roles.

In examining the experience of contemporary minority faculty, it is important to attend to the institutionalized cycles that have constrained equity and access and all levels of the social and educational system.

**Minority Faculty**

Prior to World War II, Hispanics were nearly invisible in academia (Wilson, 1989), and Black faculty were employed almost exclusively in Black colleges. A survey conducted in 1941 by the Julius Rosenwald Fund was able to identify only two full-time tenured Black faculty in predominantly white institutions (Educational Record, 1988). Native American and Asian American faculty were virtually nonexistent. Although the G.I. Bill grants following World War II provided the impetus for more minorities to become college educated, it was not until the late 1960's that colleges began to yield to pressure from the federal government to employ nonwhite faculty (Weinberg, 1977). In 1972, Executive Order 11246 of 1965, which called for nondiscrimination in all federal contractors and affirmative action to overcome the effects of past discrimination, was amended to apply to educational institutions. Under this legislation, colleges and universities receiving federal grants are required to follow guidelines on recruiting and hiring procedures issued by the
government. Failure to comply with federal guidelines for recruiting and hiring is sanctioned by fines, and ultimately the loss of federal financial support (Institute for Educational Policy, 1987). Although college and university leaders voiced little opposition to the passage of the amendment, many institutions and academicians have resisted changes in their procedures and practices that would encourage minorities to be considered for faculty positions (VanderWaert, 1982). Under the Reagan administration, the U.S. Office of Civil Rights, originally organized to monitor the progress of policies designed to achieve racial and gender equity, defined "reverse discrimination" as its first priority (Omi and Winant, 1986). Beginning in the 1980's, the significant shift in federal policy away from active involvement in affirmative action and minority issues as they affect higher education resulted in some institutions being less vigilant regarding the actual outcomes of the hiring process, while demonstrating only a cursory concern with recruitment compliance (Justiz and Bjork, 1987; Sullivan and Nowlin, 1990). While good faith efforts have in many instances been made to comply with affirmative action guidelines, Washington and Harvey (1989) argue that most institutions have never really fundamentally changed their traditional methods for selecting new faculty, resulting in
little progress being made in terms of significant increase in minority representation.

Traditional hiring practices that gave the faculty virtually absolute power to hire new members of the professoriate were altered by affirmative action guidelines that imposed administrative monitoring of hiring procedures. Resistance to affirmative action in the academy is often articulated in terms of its invasion into the professional autonomy of the faculty as a threat to true egalitarianism and merit:

The merit system, which has made possible the retention of those norms permitting society to function effectively, has enjoyed an especially important place within the academic community. At its best, the academic community has consistently reflected a standard of professional excellence which is truly egalitarian. The egalitarianism of excellence offered opportunity for those able and willing to compete, with countless spinoff benefits to society deriving from that excellence. Now what is at stake in affirmative action is the end of that true equality of opportunity and the end of that excellence (Roche, 1974, pp. 88-89).

While the American ideology, as articulated in official policy documents, is strongly egalitarian, White Americans appear deeply ambivalent in their actions regarding affirmative action. A majority of White citizens agree that affirmative action programs should be supported in principle (Kluegel and Smith, 1986), however Whites evidence very weak support of the actual implementation of affirmative action in terms of giving preference to job candidates from
underrepresented groups (Lipset and Schneider, 1978). Early debates in higher education concerning affirmative action centered around 1) its appropriateness to the academy, and 2) its effectiveness as a remedy for past inequities (Tickamyer et al., 1989). The pervasiveness of racial and gender discrimination in the hiring, promotion, and retention of minority and women faculty is so well documented (Abramson, 1975; Boulding, 1976; Faia, 1977; Ferber and Westmiller, 1976; Gappa, 1977) that little support can be given to the inappropriateness of affirmative action to higher education.

The actual impact of affirmative action initiatives in higher education is much less clear, however, with positive gains being noted by some researchers using percentage of change as a measure (Astin and Snyder, 1982; Green, 1984; Rickard and Clement, 1984; Rickard, 1985; Tinsely, Secor, and Kaplan, 1984; Touchton and Shavlick, 1984; Watkins, 1985) countered by other researchers interested in current status and substantive change (Etaugh, 1985; Finkelstein, 1984; Hyer, 1984; Moore, 1983, 1984; Taylor, 1986), who argue that such substantive change has been much less significant.

Commonly held attitudes and beliefs of the current majority faculty and administrators have undermined efforts to achieve diversity in faculty ranks. The single most frequently cited reason for the non-appointment of Black faculty at White colleges has been the belief among White administrators that
Black scholars are unavailable to fill vacancies (Page, 1981). While data do support the small pool of minority faculty available in selected disciplines (Blackwell, 1988), supporters of faculty diversity maintain that the data is often used as an excuse for inaction on the part of administrators and search committees. The compromise of standards of excellence, allegations of astronomical salaries demanded by minority faculty, and the belief that institutions are already doing everything possible to increase minority representation are other justifications that are often advanced for the lack of minority presence (Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin, 1988).

Currently, debates have emerged surrounding the notion of "political correctness" in relation to efforts to diversify the curriculum, the students, faculty and staff. For its foes, political correctness is defined in terms of a new orthodoxy in which the victimization of minorities and women, the inclusion of multicultural material in the curriculum, and the need to correct past social inequities are depicted as not only the unchallenged dicta of the liberal majority within academe, but represent a coercive and totalitarian invasiveness that threatens to undermine the free speech and academic freedom of its dissenters. Moreover, political correctness is linked with literary and philosophical movements that reject enduring scholastic and intellectual
standards and champion "the ideological claims of the minority victims revolution on campus" (D'Souza, 1991, pg. 184). For the scholars involved in the struggle against political correctness, the "new scholarship" advanced by minorities, women, and the political left offers a convenient route by which the racially and gender different can circumvent traditional academic review criteria and the publishing requirements for promotion and tenure (D'Souza, 1991). While broad philosophical debates regarding political correctness engage many segments of the academic community and are given ample media coverage, little empirical foundation is evident regarding its influence on policy decisions. As the White population continues to claim nine out of every ten faculty positions (Blackwell, 1988), the effect of politically correct thinking on minority hiring in the academy appears minimal.

Coupled with attitudinal barriers to minority hiring are prevailing methods of recruitment and selection of faculty that circumvent even the most aggressive attempts to ensure equity in the hiring process. Research regarding recruitment and selection of faculty indicates that the early observation made by Logan Wilson (1942) regarding the importance of an individual's personal and professional connections in gaining entrance to employment in higher education remains operant in the academy. Methods of determining the availability of minorities are subject to manipulation such that the
appearance of exhaustive recruitment efforts is given for purposes of affirmative action compliance, while the "good ole boy" network remains in effect (Steele and Greene, 1976). Despite the espousal of the merit principle in academic hiring, such factors as one's social class (Blau, 1973; Collins, 1973; Ellis and Lane, 1966; Lewis, 1975), physical attributes and personality (Hoffman, 1972), and prestige of the institution where degree was obtained (Caplow and Magee, 1958; Burke, 1988), remain significant determinants of selection process outcomes. Lionel Lewis (1975) argues against the assumption that placement in the academic world is determined more by achievement than ascription by noting that the system more closely approximates a sponsored induction in which elite status is given on the basis of some criterion of supposed merit by the already established elite. Research indicates that informal contacts continue to be the most successful means of obtaining positions in the academic world (Brown, 1988; Somit and Tannenhaus, 1964).

Historical occupational segregation continues to be one of the most pervasive influences on present hiring patterns within the academy, such that positions previously occupied by a minority incumbent, typically positions of less power and influence, are those most likely to be filled by minorities (Konrad and Pfeffer, 1991). Konrad and Pfeffer see this as particularly troublesome given the beneficial effects the
presence of minority administrators have on the educational outcomes of minority students. Furthermore, Steele and Greene (1976), and Blum (1988a) provide evidence that once an academic department has reached its minority hiring goal, further efforts for minority recruitment are significantly diminished. Reyes and Halcon (1990) submit that the lack of minority faculty in academic departments can be largely explained by this unwritten quota system.

Once minority group members are able to overcome barriers in the hiring process and are admitted into the faculty ranks, there is evidence that they view the academic environment differently than their white colleagues (Mitchell, 1990). A recent survey conducted at UCLA (1990) found significant differences between White and underrepresented minority faculty in terms of their perceptions of the clarity of standards for promotion and tenure, willingness to be openly critical of departmental administration without fear of retribution, and distribution of time spent on the duties of teaching, research, and service. In the UCLA survey, three-fourths of the Chicano faculty and more than half of the African American faculty responded affirmatively to the statement "I often feel that I don't fit in very well socially with my colleagues." The fact that one-third of the White faculty also responded affirmatively indicates the presence of social alienation among majority populations as well.
Responses to an identical item in a survey at Stanford University, however, indicated that 46% of Blacks and 40% of Hispanics "mostly" or "strongly" agreed with the statement (Stanford UCMI Report, 1989). White and minority faculty in the Stanford survey differed dramatically when asked whether the university administration was genuinely committed to promoting racial understanding, with 75% of the White faculty "mostly" or "strongly" agreeing with the statement, and only 45% of Blacks and 33% of Hispanics in agreement. Staples and Jones (1984) found that Blacks perceived tremendous obstacles for gaining tenure and promotion in the same institutions that white faculty were of the opinion that "Blacks are doing better than ever." Elmore and Blackburn (1983) found that Blacks acknowledged a positive racial climate at the departmental level but perceived the institution as racist.

Many minority faculty believe that their work is undervalued or seen as self-serving if they choose research topics related to ethnic groups (Kushner and Norris, 1981; Mitchell, 1982; Reyes and Halcon, 1990; Valverde, 1980). Minority scholars are often "type-cast" as specialists in ethnic matters rather than legitimate researchers in their own discipline (Washington and Harvey, 1989; Reyes and Halcon, 1990). Minorities may be driven by a sense of social justice and responsibility to contribute to ethnic causes, therefore choose to engage in research related to minority concerns.
The 1987 National Latino Faculty Survey found that two out of every three Hispanic faculty in the social sciences, humanities, or education wrote doctoral dissertations dealing with their own ethnic group, minorities, or related topics (Garza, 1988). Garza (1988) states that minorities are heavily concentrated in ethnic studies areas such that "Colleges and universities have created dumping grounds for Hispanic scholars, separate from and with little connection to the rest of the scholarly life of the university." Minority research is often discounted as second-rate and considered out of the mainstream of academia (ACE, 1988; Ruiz, 1991). Mainstream refereed journals serve as conventional indicators of quality and excellence in research, and those journals held in high status by the academic community tend to emphasize studies that further the development of methodological practices and theoretical models (Mitchell, 1982). Outside of the social sciences, many scholarly journals do not have a history of publishing material related to minority concerns, and minority access to networks of scholars who influence publication has traditionally been limited, either by law or by practice (Lanoue, 1982).

The practice of requiring more and better publications as a mechanism for raising standards has been challenged as discriminatory to minorities and women, although the majority of cases litigated in the courts have exhibited a judicial
deference to academic judgements by upholding the right of
colleges to demand higher performance, when such a level of
performance had not been required in the past (Lieberman v.
Grant, 1980; Manning v. Trustees of Tufts College, 1980;
Cussler v. University of Maryland, 1977). In most cases, the
burden of proof falls upon the plaintiff to show that he or
she was subjected to different standards because of race or
gender difference. Lanoue (1982) states,

It appears that the argument of protected class
members that heightened publication standards are
discriminatory when applied to university
candidates for tenure in recent years, after more
lax standards had been applied to white males, has
virtually been eliminated because of the
consistency with which the courts have ruled in the
colleges favor (pg. 10).

Minority faculty are often overwhelmed with committee
assignments and teaching loads that leave little time for
conducting research and writing (Banks, 1984; Reed, 1983;
were more likely to engage in teaching than their research
oriented white colleagues and have comparably lower median
salaries than Ph.D.s in business and industry. In comparing
Black, Hispanic, and Asian American faculty, Brown found that
Blacks were less likely to be promoted or tenured at the same
rate as Asian Americans or Hispanics, and that Blacks and
Hispanics are primarily teachers in the social sciences,
whereas Asian Americans were more likely to be engaged in
research in the life sciences. Yolanda Moses (1989) notes
that Blacks in general have the lowest faculty progression, retention, and tenure rates in academe, with Black women concentrated in the lower academic ranks. In a 1982 survey of minority faculty in the states of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, 60% of the nontenured faculty rated their chances of being awarded tenure as "very poor" or "no chance" (National Urban League, 1982). Only half of those responding to the tri-state survey felt that the written criteria for promotion and tenure were applied fairly or were followed by peers in tenure and promotion reviews. That minorities are relegated to the bottom of the faculty ladder has been supported in other faculty surveys (Carnegie Council, 1975; National Urban League, 1982).

The meritocratic values of academe run counter to issues of equity in the hiring of minorities for faculty positions (Blackwell, 1986; National Urban League, 1982). Because minority individuals may have entered, or are perceived as having entered, faculty ranks as a result of affirmative action rather than through the traditional routes, they may be seen as less qualified than other faculty (Menges and Exum, 1983; Heller, 1988). Being perceived as less qualified than their majority counterparts often results in pressure to perform at levels beyond those expected of others in their rank (Reyes and Halcon, 1990). Despite their qualifications, many minority faculty find it difficult to be accepted by

Differing role expectations and conceptions of what constitutes a "good" faculty member may be inverted between minority faculty and White administrators (Rodriguez, 1981). Minority faculty experience pressure to be involved in the civic affairs of ethnic communities and often see that involvement as more important than publication (Mitchell, 1982; Rodriguez 1981). Because of differing research interests, role expectations, and cultural values, minority faculty may experience social and professional distance from their White colleagues and feel alienated from the institutional environment (O'neale, 1988a; Blum, 1988b).

In citing a lack of mentoring and sponsorship available to minority faculty, Exum (1983) states that "In most successful academic careers, there is an important element of sponsored mobility." Exum also argues that while publication and research are important to the promotion process, so are personal qualities of style and manner, conforming behavior, and the availability of mentors and sponsors.
Summary

Clearly, the qualitative experience of minority faculty in higher education differs from that of their majority colleagues. Historical, social, political and economic forces have contributed to a situation in which minority faculty are concentrated in the lower ranks of the professoriate and often feel alienated from the institution and their colleagues, while having their scholarly contributions judged insignificant and peripheral. The literature consistently documents significant barriers to hiring, promotion, and tenure faced by minority faculty in higher education. Research on minority faculty has provided an understanding of their experiences in the academy, yet has shed little light on the forces that perpetuate the documented inequities, and how particular patterns of power relationships have come to prevail. Survey research has not gone beyond a descriptive analysis of the status quo, and personal anecdotes, while interesting and evocative, have provide only idiosyncratic, nonempirical accounts of the experience of minority faculty. With the literature review providing a contextual basis, and critical theory providing the conceptual framework that drives the case study methodology, this inquiry will advance current knowledge by examining the ideological foundations of practices that serve to reproduce a racially stratified system of higher education.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The forces that perpetuate social inequality are not only structural but are embodied in the lived experiences of social actors (Wexler, 1987). Examining the belief systems of individuals, their interpretations of organizational reality, and how the ideology embedded in the purportedly neutral standards of performance may act to marginalize certain classes of people, requires delving into the worldview of the researched to carefully discern the meaning and constructions given concepts that drive the decision making process. Survey research such as the UCLA Campus Climate for Diversity (1991) and the Stanford UCMI (1989) have been useful in enumerating issues and problems of concern to minority faculty. However, they have not yielded insight into the forces that have contributed to current situations nor how such inequities as they describe are perpetuated in institutions of higher education. Such surveys have also failed to account for the effects of the disciplinary affiliation of faculty members on career advancement issues, an omission that lacks the contextual depth that can enhance our understanding of organizational phenomena within the realm of higher education.
In-depth interviews of faculty and administrators in their occupational setting affords the opportunity to go beyond the static representation of reality presented by survey research to examine the more dynamic aspects of the evolving nature of social and organizational order, as it is interpreted and negotiated by social participants. As a researcher embedded in the social structures I have chosen to investigate, I will not rely on conventional descriptions of research design that typify the experimental method. Rather, the qualitative methodology outlined below is consistent with the critical theory framework advanced in chapter one; and the rationale behind the selection of the methods of analysis selected is explicated.

From a critical theory perspective, a crucial task of this inquiry is to expose the ideological underpinnings that guide the decision making process as it relates to promotion and tenure. The first research question asks whether there are differences between the ideological "filters" of majority faculty and administrators and those of minority faculty in interpreting professional performance standards. The second research question asks whether there are discernable patterns in the organizational experience of minority faculty and their perceptions of institutional rules and procedures that hinder their professional advancement. In both questions, the pivotal premise flowing from critical theory is the socially
constructed nature of reality and how interpretations of that reality operate in a dialectical fashion to produce multiple understandings of the organization's rules and performance expectations. Because values and perceptions are central to the understanding of organizational reality, I rely on in-depth interviews to gather this information. I propose that the public documents produced by the university are expressions of the official institutional ideology, thus my document analysis method consists of a close reading of the University Mission Statement, promotion and tenure guidelines at the university, college, and department levels, and various planning documents that relate to faculty promotion and institutional diversity. Given this close reading of the official institutional ideology, I draw comparisons among the various interpretations provided by groups of faculty and administrators.

This chapter describes the rationale that underlies the selection of faculty and administrators for study, and the methods used in exploring the two research questions posited by this inquiry. The interview method is the primary source of data gathering used in this study. Where possible, the accuracy and reliability of interview data is cross-checked through analysis of vitae and other available institutional and departmental documents. Procedures and issues involved in
obtaining interviews and access to documents are reviewed, as well as the methods employed in analyzing the data gathered.

Research Design

Sample of Faculty and Administrators

The population of interest are full-time and part-time faculty and administrators of a large Southwestern university, categorized in the Carnegie Classification System as a Research I university. For the purposes of this study, the term "minority" refers to individuals who are U.S. citizens of African American, Native American, and Hispanic descent.

Because the numbers of minority faculty are small, and unevenly distributed across academic fields, it was impossible to achieve a precise matching of majority/minority faculty pairs who were identical in terms of rank, gender, and academic discipline. Therefore, a purposive sample of faculty were selected for interviews, representative of their distribution in the larger university population according to ethnicity, discipline, rank, and gender. While the numbers of minority faculty are small, and clustered in certain disciplines, the university population is representative of the situation in research universities across the country. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of faculty selected for interviews.
Table 1: SELECTED SAMPLE OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>On Track</th>
<th>Not on Track</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Dept. chairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Dept. Chairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Deans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University committee members*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University Promotion and Tenure Committee members, one minority male and two majority females, are not counted in disciplinary ranks for purposes of analysis.

Under an ideal research situation, there would be representatives of the three minority groups distributed equally by gender in each of the academic departments selected for study. This of course is not the case; therefore, numbers of males, especially among administrators and in certain science disciplines, greatly outnumber females. Correspondingly, the number of majority administrators greatly outnumbers minority administrators. In reviewing the list of minority faculty provided by the University office of Affirmative Action, I selected departments that had minority faculty representatives at various levels of faculty ranks.
This allowed me to obtain the perspectives of minority and majority faculty in each academic department who had gone through the promotion and tenure process and now sit on departmental committees, as well as those who were new to the process. The comparison of minority and majority faculty and administrator responses to interview questions concerning their interpretations of professional performance standards addresses the first research question posed.

Because the promotion and tenure process is one that relies on multiple levels of decision making, I felt it was important to interview individuals who currently serve on university-wide promotion and tenure committees. While many of the individuals interviewed within selected departments have also served on college-wide and university-wide promotion and tenure committees, those selected specifically for their perspectives as university committee members are not counted in the ranks of the disciplines for purposes of analysis.

Selection of Academic Departments

As indicated earlier, one of the major shortcomings of survey research on minority faculty issues is the lack of attention given disciplinary and departmental contexts. A primary reason for not examining relationships between the variables presented in survey research and disciplinary affiliation is the importance of maintaining the anonymity of the respondents. Especially with sensitive questions
regarding collegial relationships, departmental climate, and committee decisions that directly affect the career of the research participants, it becomes imperative to ensure anonymity. To address the problem of confidentiality and anonymity, as well as provide the conceptual justification for the selection of academic departments, I rely on a classificatory scheme developed by Anthony Biglan. Biglan, in several seminal studies in the early 1970's (Biglan, 1973a, 1973b) developed a method of grouping academic disciplines for comparative purposes. Biglan categorized a large number of disciplines along three dimensions: 1) those concerned with living as opposed to non-living systems; 2) concern with theory rather than application; 3) the existence of a generally accepted core of problems to be solved by agreed upon methodologies. Biglan termed those disciplines dealing with life systems as "life," those with non-life systems as "non-life." Those disciplines concerned primarily with theory are classified as "pure," while those with a more applied character are termed "applied." Biglan characterized those disciplines having solid, widely accepted paradigms as "hard" as opposed to "soft." Thus it is possible to have eight different configurations to describe and group disciplines: hard-life-pure (HLP), hard-nonlife-pure (HNP), hard-nonlife-applied (HNA), hard-life-applied (HLA), soft-life-pure (SLP), soft-life-applied (SLA), soft-nonlife-applied (SNA), and soft-
nonlife-pure (SNP). "Biglan's dimensions," as they are termed, have been validated and found useful in a number of studies for a variety of purposes, including comparing research output across disciplines, studying faculty characteristics and job satisfaction, and faculty evaluation standards (Creswell and Bean, 1981; Muffo and Langston, 1981; Roskens, 1983; Smart and Elton, 1975; Smart and McLaughlin, 1978). In presenting the findings, it is then possible to refer to individuals without compromising their anonymity by using a Biglan category; for example, "a minority (or majority) female associate professor in the SLP (soft-life-pure) disciplines." While the influence of the discipline in shaping faculty behavior and attitudes is an important variable in this study, the use of Biglan's dimensions does not imply a test of the Biglan model; rather, it is used as a device to protect the anonymity of the respondents. For the distribution of faculty interviews according to Biglan's dimensions, refer to appendix D.

The Interview Method

As a case study of a Research I university, semi-structured in-depth interviews of faculty and administrators were conducted to explore their perceptions regarding evaluation standards and procedures as well as issues affecting the status of minority faculty on campus. The
delicacy of the subject matter dictated the need to approach the interview process with caution and sensitivity. The interview schedules (see appendix) are constructed such that the least threatening subject matter, e.g. personal and professional background questions, were discussed in the early part of the interviews, leading to more potentially sensitive questioning regarding collegial relationships and perceptions of the fairness of evaluation standards.

Three separate interview schedules were developed for the populations of minority faculty, majority faculty, and administrators. While the wording of certain questions in the schedule differs according the category of the respondent, the information elicited allows for comparison across the three population categories (minority faculty, majority faculty, administrators) as well as within groups. To give coherence to the variables involved in the experience of the academic professionals interviewed, interview questions were grouped into four areas:

1. Personal Background.

The research questions presented in this dissertation call for an analysis of the part that an individual's personal, educational, social class, and cultural background plays in their formation of organizational meaning and in the interpretation of their professional role. Information regarding the personal background of majority faculty and
administrators is compared to that of minority faculty. Consistent with the critical theory framework, personal background variables, as representative of the stratified nature of the wider social context, may be linked with patterns of occupational power and privilege within the academy, especially in defining membership among elite decision making groups.

2. Professional preparation and experience.

This area of questioning concerns factors related to professional development, research interests, professional organizations, and paradigmatic propensities. How and where one has been prepared for the role of faculty has a bearing on whether they are perceived as competent professionals, and the line of questioning in this category will reveal differences in professional preparation that may exist between majority and minority faculty. The data will provide evidence of how minority faculty may differ from their majority counterparts in terms of access to and participation in professional organizations and networks, and the extent to which this may affect their professional advancement. The faculty member's research interests and paradigmatic allegiances may play a role in how his or her performance is evaluated, and how they evaluate the performance of others. Access to departmental and institutional resources for professional development such as travel money, laboratory equipment, and release time for
research may impact the research efforts of the individual, particularly if the emphasis for evaluation is placed on research.

3. Institutional Climate.

Faculty perceptions of collegial relations, and of the institutional and departmental atmosphere as accepting or alienating may bear on their professional development, advancement toward tenure, and willingness to stay with the institution. As revealed in the literature review, there may be considerable variance in how minorities view the departmental and institutional environments compared to nonminorities.


Knowledge of performance standards and clarity of the evaluation procedures were ascertained. Questions concerning faculty and administrator perceptions of the fairness and objectivity of the application of evaluation standards as well as individual interpretations of quality, excellence, and merit in relation to faculty performance are addressed in this category. The questions in this section also allow for analysis of the differences that may exist among minority faculty, majority faculty, and administrators concerning the weighting of teaching, research, and service for evaluation purposes, as well as how each faculty defines their role vis a vis teaching and research.
Interview Issues and Procedures

From the university Affirmative Action Office, I obtained a list of Black, Hispanic, and American Indian faculty. Information provided included their departmental affiliation, rank, gender, date hired, and status as tenured or nontenured. Faculty were contacted by telephone. I explained the nature of my research and requested their participation in a sixty to ninety minute interview. Assurances were given regarding the confidential nature of the information given during the interview, and I explained the method used to protect their anonymity.

Upon entering employment with the university, faculty identify their ethnicity on a form filed with the personnel office. Because the self-identified ethnicity form does not distinguish international from U.S. born ethnics, many of the faculty listed as Hispanic are actually Spanish, Cuban, or from Latin American countries. I learned upon contacting several Black faculty that they were also from foreign countries. Many of the international faculty members informed me that they did not see themselves as "minorities" in the same sense as native born U.S. citizens, nor did they particularly identify with issues pertaining to minorities in the United States. In all but three instances, I chose not to interview these individuals as my interests and conceptual framework related to indigenous minority populations, whose
experiences and perspectives differ qualitatively from international groups. In the three instances I elected to interview international faculty, I felt that the additional information and perspective gained from them would be interesting and potentially useful, both for my study and for others whose focus may be international faculty.

The majority of the faculty contacted agreed to be interviewed, as they viewed the research topic as important, and were eager to share their perceptions regarding the evaluation, promotion, and tenure process. Four minority faculty chose not to be interviewed, one stating simply that he "did not believe minority faculty should be evaluated any differently than anyone else." Another stated he did not have an hour free during the three month period I designated as open to him for scheduling an interview. Two of the minority faculty who chose not to participate were women from the same department, one of whom offers workshops to minority faculty on career advancement. No rationale was offered for their choice not to be involved in the study. In only one instance did a minority faculty member request that the interview not be recorded; in that instance I kept notes and reconstructed our conversation as much as possible immediately following the interview.

Majority faculty generally expressed no reservations about being interviewed. As with the minority faculty, in
only one case did an individual request the interview not be recorded. In two academic departments, I elected to interview former department heads, as the new chairs had little or no experience in that capacity as it relates to the responsibilities of review for faculty promotion and tenure. Two of the department chairs are minority individuals, and one female faculty was a former department chair.

At the level of college dean, I chose to interview one former dean of a college that had just hired a new dean from a different area of the country. One of the deans interviewed was newly employed at the institution, but had one semester in which to familiarize himself with promotion and tenure issues.

I felt that it was important to document the perspectives of faculty who are members of college-wide and university-wide promotion and tenure committees. While four of the faculty interviewed were former members of the university promotion and tenure committee and three were members of the promotion and tenure committee of their college, I also obtained interviews from two current members of the university promotion and tenure committee as well as the chairperson of the university committee that reviews grievances relating to faculty evaluation and academic freedom. The individual who represents the second highest administrative office approving promotion and tenure decisions was also interviewed.
Interview Data Analyses

The interviews were semistructured in the sense that an attempt was made by the researcher to maintain a conversational flow to the interview, without abruptly switching topics of discussion or disrupting what may seem the introduction of extraneous material by the respondent. In this manner, the possibility of serendipitous findings was protected. Skillful probing at appropriate points was necessary, however, in order to maintain focus and to gather the types of information that would allow for comparative analysis and for verification through document analysis.

While very few of the interview questions allowed for simple yes and no answers, it was possible in almost all cases pertinent to addressing the first research question to categorize the responses as affirmative or negative. Frequencies of affirmative and negative responses to individual items on the interview schedule were computed as a means of discerning and displaying overarching patterns, as well as laying the foundation for further qualitative analysis. Frequencies of affirmative and negative responses to questions were analyzed according to the variables of ethnicity, rank, and gender. Using the Biglan dimensions, data were compiled according to academic departments, to allow for analysis of patterns within disciplines.
With the descriptive data illuminating patterns of differences between minority and majority faculty in many areas crucial to professional development and advancement, I analyze the content of the interviews for recurring themes and patterns that offer insight into power relationships, negotiating patterns, gatekeeping mechanisms, historical antecedents of current relationships, metaphors that reveal the fluid nature of organizational decision making, and nuances of meaning given organizational phenomena. Narrative texts occur with descriptive data displays that explicate, give voice to the actors in events, and add depth and context to the complex of variables that shape decision making processes.

The interview data addressing the second research question calls for analysis of the values and attitudes that form ideologies underlying subjective judgements. Key words and phrases used as indicators and descriptors of quality and excellence are counted and patterns noted. Themes that emerge that relate to ideological differences in the interpretation of quality and excellence for the purposes of performance evaluation are explored, as well as differences and similarities in terms of defining a "good" faculty member.

**Document Analysis**

As indicated above, documents such as the university mission statement, handbook for appointed personnel, and
procedures for evaluation, promotion, and tenure developed at the university, college, and department levels are used as expressions of the official institutional ideology. In addressing the first research question, these documents were examined thoroughly and form the basis for interview questions that ask for interpretation of statements in official documents that refer to evaluation on the basis of quality and excellence in performance. In relation to the second research question, interview questions were formulated to gauge the extent to which actual evaluation practices conform to the official procedures outlined in the documents. Consistency in the formulation and application of procedures and policy, and the beliefs and assumptions embedded in policy as revealed in the document analyses provides additional material to compare or contrast with data gleaned from faculty interviews.

Faculty Vitae

As a data source, the curriculum vitae of faculty provide information which allows for comparisons of the type of research pursued by faculty within the selected disciplines, journal publications, professional affiliations, and institutions where faculty obtained their degrees. Information contained in the curriculum vitae of faculty contribute to answering the second research question by comparing the "cultural capital" in the form of prestigious institutional affiliation brought by faculty to their current
occupational setting. From a critical theory perspective, those who hold the most power over the mechanisms of occupational advancement are those who are able to amass the greatest cultural capital by virtue of their privileged position in the social strata. Using prestige of the degree granting institution as a proxy for social class, relationships can be drawn between a privileged entry into the academy via invitation or placement as opposed to competitive application. Vitae also provide an additional data source with which to validate information given in the interviews.

Access to Documents

The statewide university system of which the Research university under study is a part is a "closed" system in terms of access to certain promotion and tenure documents. While many states allow faculty access to their own dossiers, the faculty who are the subjects of this study are denied access to the notes and deliberations of committees evaluating their performance. Legal statutes prohibiting access to proceedings of peer review committees by anyone outside the process, including the faculty member under review, effectively prohibited an analysis of faculty dossiers that would have been extremely informative in this research.

Explaining the purposes of my research and its potential for improving faculty diversity efforts, I requested access to faculty promotion and tenure dossiers. My request was denied
by university officials. Upon probing for reasons behind the inaccessibility of faculty dossiers, it was revealed that, beyond the possibilities of legal suits over unfavorable decisions were the system more "open", committees would not be as candid regarding their judgments, therefore the quality of the process would suffer, and in turn, the quality of the faculty would be diminished.

The mysterious and guarded nature of the evaluation process filters down to departmental administrative assistants and secretaries who were unsure that their departmental guidelines for faculty evaluation were public information. Among those academic departments that have developed their own evaluation guidelines, three of the department secretaries would not supply a copy of their guidelines until permission to do so was granted from the department chair. Noting this, I included a reminder in my interview schedule with department chairs to request a copy of their faculty evaluation guidelines directly from them.

Summary

The two research questions posed in this dissertation are these:
1. How do faculty and administrators interpret standards of quality, merit and excellence for the purpose of performance evaluation, and are there discernable and consistent
differences between majority and minority interpretations of professional performance standards?

2. Are there patterns in the organizational experience of minority faculty at a Research I university, encompassing both formal and informal interaction, and in their perceptions of the institutional environment and its rules and procedures that negatively impact their professional advancement?

In addressing these questions a qualitative methodology consistent with the theoretical framework of this inquiry is advanced. Minority faculty in disciplines representing a broad cross-section of university academic departments are purposively selected for in-depth interviews. Majority and minority faculty within the same departments are interviewed. Key decision makers, such as department chairs, college deans, and faculty who sit on campus-wide promotion and tenure committees are also interviewed. To supplement and validate the information gathered from interviews, content analyses of promotion and tenure documents, university policy statements, and faculty vitae are conducted.

The issues and procedures involved in enlisting faculty participation, and in gaining access to pertinent documents are presented in this chapter, and the methods used to analyze the data for the presentation of findings in the following chapter are introduced.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS: PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

This chapter and those following will discuss the findings of the analyses of interviews and documents. Tables are presented in each of the categories generated from the interview analysis that illustrate patterns of responses according to gender, ethnicity, and discipline. Text is provided to add dimension and texture to the responses and to demonstrate the complex interactions of the variables involved. This chapter discusses the results of analyses of documents and interviews pertinent to the personal background and professional preparation of the faculty.

Personal Background and Professional Preparation

Respondents were asked to describe their personal background, where they received their degrees, and how they became employed by the university. Table 2 lists the numbers of faculty and administrators who were invited to apply or placed in a position in the university through a noncompetitive process, and those who responded to an advertisement and went through the traditional application process. In addition to information gathered from interviews, vitae were perused to determine the Carnegie Classification of
universities where faculty obtained their terminal degree. Column four in table 2 shows the number of Ph.D.'s in each respondent category received from Research 1 universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>INVITED OR PLACED</th>
<th>APPLIED</th>
<th>Ph.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of the eight majority males interviewed received their Ph.D. degrees from Research 1 universities. Of the five majority males who were invited to apply, all received their degrees from Research 1 institutions. Only four of the thirteen minority male faculty received degrees from research universities. Of the five minority male faculty invited to apply, three received their degrees from Research 1 universities, one was placed through an affirmative action "target of opportunity" placement but gave up his tenure status at a former institution to enter his current position, and the remaining was invited by another prominent minority male already at the university.

Of the six majority females interviewed, three were invited to apply to the institution, and the remaining responded to an advertised position without receiving
invitations from individuals within the university. In a pattern similar to the minority males, the three majority women who were invited were graduates of major research universities, two of whom came with tenure.

Two of the thirteen administrators interviewed are minority, and represent the only two who did not receive their terminal degrees from Research 1 universities. Two of the thirteen administrators did not receive an invitation or nomination by individuals within the university; one of these two individuals is minority, and both are outside of the science disciplines. All other administrators, a category which includes department chairs and deans, had access to a prior network of professional relationships that brought them to the university.

Of the ten minority females in the sample, three attended Research 1 universities; however, none received invitations to apply to their current position. While it is perhaps no surprise that minority females lack access to the professional networks of their white and male colleagues, therefore are less likely to receive invitations to apply, it is somewhat surprising that none were employed as a result of affirmative action initiatives such as "target of opportunity" placements. The prevailing mythology in the academy is that affirmative action has given minority women the advantage of being "counted twice" in terms of meeting affirmative action goals.
for women and minorities (Menges and Exum, 1983). But apparently they are not recruited.

Some minority women faculty believe that they are seen as affirmative action window dressing and as less competent than their white male colleagues. In some cases this was made explicit to them, as reflected in this statement from a first year female assistant professor in the sciences,

I've had the chairman tell me, he gets two for one out of me. And you know, going up for promotion and tenure, we have a person in our department who's on that committee right now, 'well if you're going to get her through you'd better play up that female and minority stuff."

and this from a tenured female,

The very first day I came on board as a lecturer, which I was hired as at that time, a person who is a colleague greeted me with the term, 'how does it feel to be a token minority?' and much to my astonishment, I had just met the man and this is what he said, and I looked at him and I said, 'Well, when you have the answer to that question, let me know, because obviously your situation is bothering you.'

In contrast to their administrators, the majority of whom came into the institution with tenure, none of the minority women in the sample came with tenure, and in terms of median years to tenure, took much longer to receive tenure than their male counterparts. Of the ten minority females in the sample, only three were tenured, all three having received tenure before more stringent guidelines for promotion and tenure took effect. Of the three tenured minority women, only one is a full professor, the others remaining at the associate
professor level after twenty-six and twenty-five years at the institution, respectively.

Over half of the minority women began in adjunct positions then moved into tenure track, although one has been in an adjunct position for fifteen years, and despite similar qualifications as other tenure track faculty in her department, has not been given tenure track status. Two of the women mentioned coming to the institution because of their spouses and were offered adjunct positions,

Minority men I see incorporated into the mainstream much more, although not as much; there is still a barrier there too. You are expected to do much more with much less and that's all there is to it. I was not hired in a regular position here, and it is clear to me that if I had been a male I would have been. I was hired in an adjunct position. That's the minority woman position. A lot of women and minorities are in adjunct positions who are just as qualified as those in tenure track positions, but we don't want to hire them as real faculty.

As will become evident in the information presented below, minority females are disadvantaged not only by their lack of access to prominent universities and networks that facilitate entrance into the academy, but by their conspicuous absence in the science disciplines, in which faculty are more likely to have made an auspicious entrance into their current positions. The following section provides an analysis of faculty entrance into the academy by examining the academic disciplines they represent.
Analysis by Biglan Category

As illustrated in Table 3, individuals in the hard science disciplines are more likely to have been invited to apply, and interviews with faculty in these fields reveal the advantage of post-doctoral work that allows individuals to establish a line of inquiry and record of publication as well as develop a network with other researchers in the field. As mentioned above, only two of the minority males who were invited or placed were in disciplines other than the sciences. Of the 23 faculty and administrators representing the hard sciences, only 9 were not issued invitations by contacts inside the university to apply. Of the 24 respondents representing the soft sciences, 14 applied in response to advertised position openings, without receiving invitations. The picture that emerges from this analysis is the much higher probability of having access to hiring networks if one is a white male in the sciences. This finding becomes particularly compelling when viewed against the backdrop of majority faculty beliefs regarding the privileged position of minority faculty in the hiring market. These beliefs are examined in a later chapter of this research. An additional factor perhaps influencing the likelihood of those in the hard sciences to be courted by the university is the goal of the administration to achieve national prominence as a research university.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIGLAN CATEGORY</th>
<th>INVITED/PLACED</th>
<th>APPLIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

It appears that efforts to recruit the "best and brightest" and to establish the university as a top research institution has resulted in seeking out and hiring individuals with credentials from prominent institutions. Furthermore, those who have the greatest access to resources that influence hiring, promotion, and tenure in the institution, e.g. deans and department heads, are the most likely to have been invited or placed and to possess credentials from institutions of similar prestige. These findings are consistent with other studies that indicate that the prestige of the doctoral granting institution is a major factor in hiring decisions (Long, 1978; Reskin, 1979; Youn, 1981). Because of their underrepresentation in prestigious universities, minority individuals are less likely to receive a doctorate or hold a position at such institutions. As such the hiring preferences at research universities may act as an unconscious selector of the privileged, mirroring and reproducing the larger social stratification system. With the considerable backlash against affirmative action hires mounted by those who advance merit based hiring as the only fair and democratic basis of hiring decisions, it is increasingly important that we scrutinize hiring practices that may contribute to de facto racial discrimination. It is quite plausible that increases in tuition rates at many universities due to fiscal duress
combined with the declaration of race-based scholarships as illegal may serve to deter minorities from attending the type of institution from which research universities recruit, thereby heightening the stratification effect.

While minority males in this population have made inroads in terms of accessing the pool from which faculty are hired at research universities, this same access has not been extended to minority females. Even when minority females hold credentials from prominent institutions, they are much less likely than their male counterparts in this sample to have access to the hiring and referral network. Because national demographic trends show an increase in the number of Hispanic, Black, and Native American females completing the Ph.D., with a corresponding decline in completions among males of those populations (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1992), research universities in particular must begin to examine their hiring patterns to determine reasons underlying the underrepresentation minority females even when their numbers in the availability pool are increasing. If minority faculty in this sample are less likely than their majority male colleagues to have been placed within the institution or invited to apply, do they feel accepted and welcome in the environment of their department and the institution? The following chapter explores the perceptions of minority faculty of the "atmosphere" of the institution and department, and
compares their opinions with those of their majority colleagues.
CHAPTER V

INSTITUTIONAL ATMOSPHERE

Introduction

As indicated in the literature review, faculty surveys have reported a significant number of minority faculty with feelings of alienation from the institutional environment. Under the assumption that it is unlikely that faculty will remain in an environment in which they feel they are not accepted or welcomed, minority faculty were asked questions regarding their perceptions of the institution and academic department as accepting venues for minority scholars. Majority faculty were asked if they felt their department and the institution were accepting of minority faculty. The rationale underlying this question is that attempts to change the environment to make it more hospitable to minority faculty will be unlikely if it is viewed as accepting of minority faculty. Moreover, if minorities are seen as making unique contributions to the academic environment of the department and institution, their presence will be valued by their colleagues in the department, and the efforts of the institution to enhance faculty diversity will be perceived as worthwhile. Thus this chapter also reports the results of faculty opinions of the unique contributions of minority faculty.
Campus and Departmental Climate

Faculty and administrators were asked if they felt the climate of their department and of the university was accepting of minorities. As Table 4 indicates, while all majority faculty felt that their department offers an accepting climate for minority faculty, a significant number of their minority colleagues did not see the department as accepting.

Table 4: Does the department/university offer an accepting climate for minority faculty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>DEPT. ACCEPTING</th>
<th>UNIV. ACCEPTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half of the minority faculty interviewed felt their departments were not accepting of them. Among minority women there was nearly an even split in the numbers that felt the department was not accepting of them, and three out of the thirteen minority males saw their departments as not accepting. Whereas majority faculty indicated that the university climate was congenial and accepting of minorities, minority faculty opinion differed. Majority faculty and administrators tend to view their department and the university as providing accepting environments for minority
faculty. Analysis of the interviews of majority faculty revealed two prominent themes in response to the questions of campus and departmental climate: 1) the small pool of minority candidates available for faculty positions; and 2) the egalitarian or "colorblind" nature of the academic environment.

**Small Pool**

Of the 18 majority males responding to the questions of departmental and campus climate, 10 (5 faculty and 5 administrators) spoke of the difficulty of recruiting and retaining minorities. Majority males described minority faculty as rare in most disciplines, therefore "highly marketable," able to secure employment easier in a tight job market, and commanding higher salaries than majority faculty. Administrators felt their departments are doing all they can to recruit minority faculty, however are hampered by their lack of numbers and lucrative offers by competing institutions. A typical response of administrators cited the competition over minorities who enjoy a "special status" in terms of hiring preference that makes it difficult for the university to bid against more prestigious institutions who will pay "extra for people because they are minorities,"

We're sure trying to recruit them but it's hard to get them. For one thing, our college and our university don't pay extra for people because they are minorities and when you locate a good one, other places will pay more for that and since we don't, we don't get them. We try, but why would
you come here if you've got this special status when you can go to Harvard, for example, where one of the people we were recruiting went. There aren't enough of them out there and there is a real demand for them.

To illustrate the contrasting opinions that can occur within academic departments, the following vignette is taken from a department in the hard-life-pure sciences:

A majority faculty male and the department chair spoke of their efforts to recruit minority faculty. The department chair stated that "since 1986 we've done four faculty searches and to my knowledge we've never had a single minority apply for one and that's probably running close to 1,000 applicants." A tenured majority male faculty in the department also stated that their searches proved unsuccessful in hiring minorities:

Our department is absolutely accepting of minority faculty. If we could find more to recruit. You know we've reviewed 700 applicants in the past two years, about 300 applicants for each job we've had, and in that period of time the entire output of Hispanic Ph.D.'s in the areas we recruit in totaled 7. I think there were two Native Americans. I can try as hard as I want to include Hispanic faculty, but it doesn't do me any good. I do all the affirmative action things, and advertise and talk with every person in the country, but the people just aren't there.

In contrast to his majority colleagues, a tenured minority male in the same department offered his perspective, sounding the common theme of finding his departmental associates accepting of him as an accomplished scholar, but uncomfortable at times with his social background that may
"shock" them if they become too close. While he characterizes his department as accepting of his work, he questions its commitment to increasing the numbers of minority faculty, and sees the overall environment of the university as ambivalent in its quest for faculty diversity:

KP: Do you find your department accepting of you and of your work?

LM: Yes. I feel that I've been an integral part of the department and always have been. I've never felt left out. There are people who, if we get close enough, really don't understand me because we come from very different backgrounds, socially and economically. You go out for a drink on an afternoon and somebody's trying to see 'what are you really like?' and there are experiences that I've had that they can't relate to. And sometimes I shock them. That's when the street comes out, I try to keep it buried.

KP: What about campus-wide, do you have a sense for that, is this an accepting environment for minority faculty?

LM: I don't think it is. I really don't. There are certain departments that have tried very hard to make a change. But the general atmosphere, especially in the hard sciences is 'gee, we can't get any minority faculty, there aren't any out there,' which is bullshit. I know that and when I serve on search committees I say that, but nonetheless it still happens that the next hire will be a white male or white female, and I just know that. I'm on a search committee now for my department and I doubt we'll select a minority candidate even though I will call faculty members around the country and say 'send me some names' but you know, it just never happens. You hear over and over again that 'they just aren't there' and it's absolute bullshit. The perfect example is the Thomas hearings. Here sitting in front of the entire nation are all these black professionals trained at Harvard and Yale, and it didn't matter what you believed or what they were saying or which side you were on, it was clear there were a whole
lot of very intelligent Black people in this country who were highly trained. And you can't sit there and say you can't find any, obviously they are there. I can come up with a list of names tomorrow of Black faculty members in my discipline if somebody wants them. I have contacts in Washington and around the country that can get me a list tomorrow, people who are ready to move.

Similar patterns existed in several departments in which majority faculty and administrators felt that their department and the university were sincere in their efforts to increase the numbers of minority faculty, while their minority colleagues saw the departmental atmosphere as accepting of them as individuals, but complacent in their efforts to promote faculty diversity. Such complacency is manifested in a tendency to rely on arguments relating to the small pool of minorities available to fill positions rather than vigorous and aggressive recruitment strategies. While the shortage of minority candidates for faculty positions in the sciences is a reality, the university is in a state that ranks among the top five in the nation in terms of percentage of minority citizens, and has average salary levels comparable to those of other research universities. Thus it should provide an attractive venue for minority faculty and be competitive with its peer institutions in recruiting minorities.

Colorblindness

For many majority faculty, the "special status" of being minority gives those individuals certain advantages in terms of hiring possibilities, salary, and career mobility. Other
majority individuals, primarily administrators, see the academic environment as "colorblind," in which one is hired and evaluated on the quality of their performance rather than political expediency. According to those expressing such an egalitarian and individualistic ideology, minority faculty are hired and evaluated as individuals, not as members of any particular ethnic group. Administrators see their role as ensuring that all faculty are treated equally in terms of hiring and promotion. A dean in the applied sciences acknowledged elements of "what I say could be reverse discrimination," but added that "we're going to make darn sure that no minority is going to be looked at any differently than anyone else." As the following dean in the soft-life-pure sciences states, all people are considered equal in his eyes, therefore questions of acceptance of minorities seem "foreign" to him:

We actively seek out minorities here and I don't think of them as being minorities, I think they're people, they're my equal. I'm a Norwegian, so what? I don't know how to react to your question because it is so foreign and I grew up in a town where there were no Blacks, Hispanics, or American Indians.

As with other questions regarding the judgment of quality in research and the fairness of the evaluation process, the objective nature of science itself is seen as providing an environment described as "colorblind":

Rather hard to know the answer to that (question of acceptance of minorities) because we've had so few.
We have one black woman in our department as an instructor, I think she's been treated fairly but she's not on tenure track. A very unusual case. I would certainly hope so. We try very hard to recruit them but they're hard to find. I would certainly be disappointed to find out if they came here that they were not accepted. I think science can be somewhat more colorblind than other areas. It's somewhat easier to make judgements about quality in science. I don't think it's a problem in our department, but I can't speak for the rest of the university.

In the view of the above administrator, the objective neutrality of the scientific endeavor precludes racial, gender or class bias and makes the process of judging the worth and work of the scientist "easier" because of the recognized and accepted canons of the scientific method. According to many scholars in the sciences, political, racial, and gender differences dissolve in the atmosphere of the laboratory, where there are clear cut ways of approaching scientific inquiry. The belief in the objectivity of the scientific method, with its provision of "hard data" on which decisions are based, reinforces an ideology that diminishes the importance of group differences in favor of individual ideosyncracies, and provides the rationale by which racial and class based inequities are deemed nugatory. Although only a small percentage of the faculty university-wide engage in highly theoretical "pure" science, the image of colorblind judgements based on untarnished objective data transcends disciplinary boundaries as a theme echoed in academic departments across campus.
Among those who felt that the department and university offered an accepting atmosphere for minority faculty, a spin-off of the colorblind theme emerged in which majority faculty identified themselves as minority in any number of ways. Just as the dean in the above example identified himself as Norwegian, another dean in the soft-life-pure sciences described himself as a "lefthanded Jewish person" from the midwest, therefore a minority; a tenured professor as the only person in his department from a Big Ten school; and a department head as a first generation American who was less assimilated than the minorities in his department. Thus majority faculty appropriated the posture of minorities by claiming uniqueness in their own right, which trivialized the importance of racial or ethnic differences, and gave credence to their belief of colorblind acceptance in the academic environment. The following majority male in the hard-life-pure sciences expressed his view that minority individuals in his department are not distinguished from anyone else, and in fact, that he had as much claim to minority status as others in his department. Within his department are one Native American, one Black, and one Hispanic:

Our department is very much accepting of minority faculty. We have, I haven't even counted the number of minority faculty members, three or four, but I don't think anyone really even thinks about what sex or ethnicity that particular faculty is in a professional setting. We have one Black faculty member and one woman is Hispanic, but there may be somebody else. I don't think we have any Native
American faculty members. I guess I may be closest to it and I'm some small part Cherokee, that was my great grandmother, but as far as acceptance of minorities, nobody gives that a thought. They are amalgamated, assimilated, and they fit in just like everybody else.

The insensitivity to the history of racial discrimination experienced by Black, Hispanic, and American Indian racial minorities in the United States was evident among many majority faculty, and found expression in their idealistic views of the academic arena as providing a level playing field for all and in their trifling of minority concerns. For example, the following department chair alludes to reverse discrimination in hiring while lumping other ethnic groups with racial minorities:

We were discriminatory toward minorities in the early days of getting women here and now this Hispanic lady I have, it's stupid to call her a minority. I'm a first generation, considered an Anglo, but God knows how many generations she is. But by her last name she is considered minority. However the term is not deserving because she is one of the best students I've seen, and you know, if you have a Jewish name, you can't be considered a minority, so it's a problem of the definition of minority. Applied to nonsuccessful ethnic groups, for whatever reason. The Irish were minority back in the early part of the century, they're no longer minorities.

By virtue of being a first generation American, the above administrator feels that he has as much right (or more) to claim minority status than the indigenous minority female to whom he refers, obviously a member of an 'unsuccessful' ethnic group. The statement of the administrator exemplifies the
distancing of the colorblind academic milieu from other social, political, and historical events and institutions, whereby the concerns of racial minorities in the academy are muted.

Minority Descriptions of the Institutional Environment

The colorblind theme and reference to a small hiring pool were dismissed as myths by a tenured minority faculty member in the hard sciences who found them a source of frustration during his service on several search committees:

The myth persists for a variety of reasons, and then there's the colorblind story too. We just want the best person, we don't care whether he or she is minority, we want the best person. And to be doing this for any other reason, obviously, is a mistake intellectually. Okay, so if you sit there and you say, no, we ought to favor minority faculty, we really need them, well what does that have to do with (the discipline), what does that have to do with research? We just want the best. So this colorblind story feeds into this 'we can't find any of them' idea. And sometimes you just have to get nasty with people if you're on a search committee, which is what I do. Then I don't get invited on any more search committees.

Minority faculty describe the atmosphere of the university as "disjointed," "impersonal," "crowded," and uncaring. Efforts in increasing diversity, while well publicized, are seen as superficial and cosmetic. When commitment went beyond the rhetoric of diversity into the realm of resource allocation, this minority department head encountered resistance on the part of other administrators:

I'm on the (diversity committee), which sounds like the thought police, but it's not at all. I'm very
pessimistic about the climate and efforts that have been made by previous administrations. They give a lot of lip service to affirmative action but when push comes to shove in terms of committing funds, in terms of making appointments, in terms of putting some money and raw force behind what they said, it wasn't there. I held a workshop for department heads and chairs of search committees for 13 faculty lines to teach cultural diversity as part of the general requirements and the resistance was horrible. It was a horrible experience and so discouraging because I became aware of the resistance on the part of the search committees towards proactive affirmative action and towards a commitment to diversity. It was like digging in your heels and the same kinds of old formulas that we had been hearing for 20 years, 25 years, 'we don't hire women and minorities in science because they aren't any' or 'we can't find them' or 'we're not going to hire inferior candidates just because they're minority.' You know, just very discouraging. The central administration simply has not defined an agenda to actively and aggressively promote diversity.

It may be argued that disciplinary and departmental structures are most important for advancing faculty status, therefore minority perceptions of the department as accepting should be conducive to advancement in the promotion and tenure process. Equally plausible, however, is that institutional contexts exert a powerful influence in defining what type of activities in relation to the production and dissemination of knowledge receive the most attention. Minority individuals may choose not to endure the lengthy promotion and tenure process in institutions where they feel the overall environment is hostile or at the very least, indifferent. Because those in powerful decision making positions tend to perceive both the department and the institution as being
accepting venues for minorities, it is likely the status quo in terms of commitment to faculty diversity will prevail, and unlikely that any sustained critique of the relationship between promotion and tenure policies and faculty diversity will be deemed worthwhile.

The literature concerning minority faculty indicates that they may make unique contributions to the institution not only by contributing to an institutional climate that embraces the value of diversity, but by bringing unique perspectives to their academic disciplines. Thus it is that the following section explores the question of the unique contributions of minority faculty, and whether their contributions can in fact contribute to an atmosphere conducive to minority professional advancement.

Unique Contributions of Minority Faculty

Respondents were asked if minority faculty contribute anything to their discipline that may be unique because of their minority status. Table 5 illustrates the responses to this question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority males</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority females</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority male faculty and administrators are evenly split over the question of minority faculty's uniqueness in relation to their academic work. Although it is evident that minority faculty and majority women are much more likely to feel that minorities make unique contributions to the disciplines because of their ethnic background, it is instructive to examine responses using the Biglan categories. Table 6 illustrates a pattern in which faculty and administrators in the "soft" disciplines are much more likely to affirm that minorities bring unique approaches to their work than those in the "hard" disciplines. What also stands out is the contrast of opinions of minority faculty with those of their colleagues within the academic departments that comprise the "hard" academic disciplines. Thirteen faculty in the hard disciplines gave a negative response to the question, while eight gave an affirmative response. Of the eight faculty in the hard disciplines who felt that minorities made unique contributions, only one was majority.

While an individual's social background and unique idiosyncratic experiences can directly affect the type of research chosen or the preference for one academic activity over another in the soft sciences, majority faculty in the hard sciences see scientific research as immune to personal differences. Majority faculty expressed the belief that
social, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds dissolve in the scientific environment, and only surface during informal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6: MINORITY UNIQUENESS BY BIGLAN CATEGORY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HLP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HNA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HNP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HLA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
social interactions. As such, minority viewpoints or contributions are confined to the social or collegial contexts, and the canons that define the limits of acceptable intellectual exploration in the hard sciences remain impervious to group or individual ideology.

In the Hard-Life-Pure discipline, majority faculty resonated a similar theme concerning the objective nature of their work. As one majority faculty member stated, "We really do basic research here and I doubt very seriously whether a rat or a fruitfly or an insect cares what color you are." The head of the department responded,

If you sequence a gene, if you're a minority faculty or an Anglo faculty, the gene has the same sequence, independent of who does the work. I know some people argue that there's a sociology of science and all sorts of questions are influenced but I have a hard time accepting that. I just simply do not find that notion.

A majority female in the department agreed with her male colleagues:

I think that where the work is concerned, there really is no difference. (The field) now has become really quite diverse. When I first started there weren't very many women or minorities and that's really changed over the years. When I go to meetings now I don't have to look around to see many women and minorities. As far as being a woman in this field I've never felt out of place or unusual or that kind of thing. In the lab I feel just like a (scientist).

In contrast to his colleagues, a minority male in the same department spoke of the need for a social conscience and a greater awareness of the impact that research has on
society. The social implications of scientific research are much more apparent to ethnic minorities who are often defined as "at risk" populations in terms of various social problems which society has defined as worthy of scientific investigation. For this individual, his minority status has affected a change in the way he approaches the discipline:

KP: Do you think that minorities or racially different people bring anything in particular to the discipline that might be unique because of their background?

UR: Years ago I would have said no. Currently I think yes. And the reason I say that is because I think that my field is becoming aware that it has to have a social conscience. The AIDS crisis has brought that really to the fore, and other things like genetic engineering, treatment of genetic diseases, and so forth. Suddenly we're thrust into a place where decisions are being made about research which have an impact on society and I noticed that my colleagues who are from the white majority population, in particular those whose life experience was very sheltered, aren't really that sensitive to what it means to be thought of as an at-risk population for genetic disease. So I would say now is the time that people of color, those with the minority experience in this country, are needed to stand up in meetings and say 'oh, wait a minute, no, it's not simply the science that you're talking about but you're actually talking about real people.' And there is an impact that you're not aware of. I bring that to my lectures to undergraduates when I talk about these topics now. So the situation has changed. It's not an esoteric discipline that can sort of ignore the people issues any more.

Minority faculty feel that the emphasis placed on personal relationships in their cultures adds to their effectiveness both in the classroom and with students in one-to-one advising or mentoring. Hispanic faculty spoke of the
way in which their cultural values impacted their teaching performance:

There's no question about it. I think Hispanics make much better teachers than the general population and this is our department's experience. We have a lot of teaching assistants from Mexico and invariably they are the best. I think one of the reasons is that we know how to talk to people. We're not afraid to make social contact with them, physical contact with them, pat them on the back, you know. So I think that being Hispanic can be a real plus in academia.

In addition to the research topics chosen by minority faculty, the teaching materials and methods they employ may also reflect cultural influences and their desire to preserve their cultural ways:

I've noticed that people that are ethnic minorities bring into their teaching and research a desire to keep their culture alive and they bring a lot of their culture into the class. For example, they use a lot of audiovisual material, a lot of music, a lot of visual aids to help students relate to whatever it is their culture is all about. And even in their own research they tend to become totally focused on their own ethnic minority literatures and cultures and go so much into the cultural stuff that it becomes an integral part of their research. I think that is unique. I don't see the mainstream people doing that so much. It comes from a sense of pride in preserving one's own culture, I think.

Analysis of faculty vitae indicate that only two of the minority faculty in the hard sciences pursued research directly related to minority concerns. While such research is not overtly discouraged, neither is it explicitly encouraged nor viewed as important or unique. From the data gathered, it is clear that in the hard sciences, majority and minority
faculty do not share similar perceptions concerning the capacity for minorities to introduce new perspectives in the disciplines that are reflective of their unique racial and ethnic backgrounds. Such is not the case in the soft sciences, where majority and minority alike agreed that an individual's unique experiences have a direct effect on their academic work. With the extremely small numbers of minorities in disciplines comprising the hard sciences compared to those in the social sciences and humanities, it remains speculative whether the increasing the representation of minorities in hard science disciplines will engender a change in their majority colleagues' attitudes concerning their unique contributions to the discipline.

Summary

A pattern of contrasting opinions on the part of majority and minority faculty regarding the atmosphere of the department, the institution, and the unique contributions of minorities to those environments was documented in this chapter. Majority faculty tend to see both the departmental and institutional climate as accepting of minority faculty but downplay or deny the unique scholarly contributions that minorities can make. When the contributions of minority faculty are noted, they are generally framed in terms of their collegial and social contexts rather than in scholarly or
intellectual terms. In contrast, minorities point to the influence their cultural backgrounds have on their approaches to research, teaching, and service. However, if their research deals with minority topics it may be devalued or not encouraged, and their unique teaching capabilities as well as service contributions to their minority communities is of little advantage to their professional advancement.

One of the great anomalies of higher education organizations is the pivotal role they have played in social movements as bastions of liberal thought while remaining essentially conservative organizations with traditions that change at a glacial pace. The guildlike nature of the faculty resists hiring those whose economic, social, racial, and intellectual characteristics do not resemble their own. It is much easier to disclaim or downplay the influence of race, class, and gender on scholarly inquiry than to critically examine how racism and sexism may be embedded in the nature of our organizational structures and intellectual pursuits. Only recently have the culturally and gender different been able to break down traditional lines that have separated various disciplines and challenge conventional theory and methodology that has largely studied minority populations as social deviants. As minority scholars continue to expand into areas of the sciences in which they are tremendously
underrepresented, their contributions may be felt beyond those made already to the social sciences.

From the findings presented in this chapter, it is clear that minority faculty feel ambivalent about the academic environment of the institution. The following chapter explores whether this ambivalence is apparent in attitudes toward the policies and procedures regarding promotion and tenure in the institution.
CHAPTER VI
PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

Fairness of the Evaluation Process

Faculty and administrators were asked if the evaluation process employed at the university was fair, equitable, and effective. As Table 7 indicates, minority faculty are more likely than majority to perceive the process as unfair, and only in the case of majority males and administrators was there a clear majority who felt the process was fair. Responses of faculty who were new to the university or felt that they didn't have enough experience in the system to evaluate it as fair or unfair were placed in the "don't know" category.

TABLE 7: IS THE EVALUATION PROCESS FAIR, EQUITABLE, AND EFFECTIVE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among those faculty and administrators who perceive the process as fair, very few did so without reservation. Most could cite cases in which individuals were granted tenure under questionable circumstances, however few mentioned cases where individuals were denied tenure when it should have been
granted. The most common response conceded the fallibility of human judgement, in which mistakes will inevitably be made, however most felt the process to be reliable and virtually identical to that used at most institutions. A college dean in the soft sciences described the process as subjective yet reliable:

The actual performance of a faculty member may be judged in a very subjective way, so there's always subjectivity involved in it. But hopefully that subjectivity is quite reliable in view of the fact that they are evaluated by their peers and secondly by external referees. And between the two, hopefully, you come to an evaluation that has reliability. Until something better comes along we'll take what is here. Within any process that involves subjectivity there's always room for human error and in that regard the system doesn't work perfectly. It's a fairly universal system that is used here, not so much different than other places. So we try to improve the system and try to bring more humaneness at the same time as we bring more careful policing of our resources.

Subjective yet fair decisions are described as undergirded by professional ethics, the reflective exercise of informed opinion, and the application of impersonal performance standards. Those who see the evaluation process as fair link the professional discretion of faculty to academic freedom and the possession of credentials to make qualified, autonomous judgements regarding the performance of their peers. According to many respondents, the increasingly codified system along with multiple levels of decision making increase the reliability of the process and decrease the likelihood of individual bias playing a determinative role in
decisions. As a department chair in the hard sciences states, the layers of decision making enhance the probability of a fair evaluation:

I think there are so many layers at the promotion and tenure level. There is the departmental committee, the department head, the college committee, the university committee, Vice Provost, then the President himself. The point of all these layers is to make sure that people get a fair shake, not just one person's decision. I think most people would agree that it's a fair, subjective evaluation.

Many felt that academic departments have a tendency to be more lenient with their own faculty, thus saw the college and university-wide committees as providing a system of checks and balances that add an element of impartiality to the process. While conceding that as cases move away from the department level, up through the various levels of decision making, the less likely it is that committee members are able to make substantive comments on the quality of a faculty member's work, most did not see this as problematic, as it is the role of the departmental committee to assure that the proper procedures have been observed in determining the quality of work presented by the faculty under review.

The primary method of guarding against the overprotectiveness of the department is the system of peer review, in which outside experts are solicited to provide impartial evaluations of the quality of research produced by the faculty member. In light of the increasing specialization
and fragmentation of the disciplines, faculty and administrators expressed a heavy reliance on the peer review process in determining research quality. A system of "blind" reviews in which the person being evaluated may suggest individuals to serve as peer reviewers but are not given the name of the evaluator, is seen as a satisfactory method of eliminating bias in the peer review.

Administrators at the dean and department chair level expressed considerable faith in the system of checks and balances offered through peer review and external review. Minority faculty, however, did not echo that same faith in the system. The prestige of the faculty member and the recognition he or she brings to the department, as well as the external resources in the form of grants and contracts garnered by the faculty were seen as important factors in favorable promotion decisions. A minority faculty member in the applied sciences spoke of his lack of faith in the process, yet conceded he knew of no better system:

It's all prestige and numbers. They are important and that is a downfall of how we are evaluated. They don't know anything about my field once it leaves the department committee. When it gets to the college and university promotion and tenure committees, at that point it becomes a numbers game. How would a musician know anything about my field? How would that person know anything about how to evaluate me? How would I know anything about how to evaluate somebody even just a little bit removed from my field as far as understanding that they are doing quality work? I don't think it's terribly fair or equitable or effective because I am certain there are people who fall through the
safety net in the system. It is a highly uncertain process. Kind of proceeds in a herky jerky way and I am certain there are good people who deserve to be promoted who are not promoted. I think most people would cover their behinds by saying, 'well, we hope there are enough checks and balances in which there aren't mistakes made,' but I don't believe that is absolutely true. I think there are mistakes made. But another thing I can say, I don't know of any better system. I haven't thought about it hard enough.

One of the two administrators who did not feel the process was particularly fair agreed with his colleagues that the procedures are virtually the same as used in other places, however expressed an entirely different view of its effect on faculty morale:

The process is the same as anywhere else. It's the people who make the difference. There's not a good feeling now, not a healthy set of feelings at (the university), I think regarding faculty issues and faculty/administrative relationships. So I think a lot of people don't like the process. Whether they think it's unfair or not, I don't know, but it's not an upbeat environment for doing promotion and tenure. I don't really think it makes a difference what the damned rules are, as I told you before, it's a set of norms the really govern the process. It's a culture and its the people who do it that make a difference. In order to do it well, clear rules or not, these people have to be relatively trusting of each other, they have to show a common regard and respect. They have to play within the boundaries of the game. There's less of that here than anywhere I've been. And consequently I would say that, is the P&T process fair? I don't know. It isn't healthy, okay?

Analysis of information provided by the Affirmative Action Office appears to support the allegations made of departmental leniency. From the information contained in Appendix E, the levels at which the most votes against faculty
promotion and tenure decisions are made are at the University Committee and Provost levels. In decisions made effective in the year this study was conducted, department level committees forwarded 86 decisions in favor of promotion and tenure and 6 decisions against (there were 6 actions in which no review took place and 1 split vote). However, as those cases moved to the University Committee, 71 were forwarded with favorable decisions and 23 were given unfavorable recommendations. At the Provost level, 75 were given favorable recommendations and 21 were not (3 were withdrawn at that point). Final actions on those cases most closely resembled decisions made at the University Committee and Provost level rather than the department level, with 75 approved and 19 denied (3 were withdrawn and 2 were pending). For the 9 minority cases, 8 favorable recommendations were made at the departmental committee level with 1 unfavorable decision. However at the Provost level, favorable recommendations were made in only 7 of those cases, again with the final actions mirroring decisions at the Provost and university committee levels.

Top level administrators point to the higher percentage of favorable decisions concerning minorities in promotion and tenure decisions as evidence of the fairness of the process. Indeed, given the fact that minorities are promoted and tenured at the rate of 87.5% compared to the majority rate of 79%, it appears that minorities are more likely to receive
favorable promotion and tenure reviews. In order to understand these rates in context, however, it is necessary to examine the representation of minorities among the total faculty. Because of the extremely small numbers of American Indian, Black and Hispanic faculty, percentage rates do not provide a meaningful comparison to majority faculty rates. For example, in the above data that shows 7 out of 9 minority faculty receiving favorable actions, no disaggregated data is available concerning the ethnicity of the faculty. As shown below, disaggregated data for minority faculty reveals nearly half of the faculty listed as minorities in the institution are Asian American, and well over half of the tenured minority faculty are Asian American:

Table 8: MINORITY FACULTY REPRESENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINORITY GROUP</th>
<th>TENURED</th>
<th>ON-TRACK</th>
<th>ON-TRACK</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/Pac. Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of percentages with such extremely small numbers of minority faculty presents a distorted image of reality. This image is further distorted through the use of aggregated data that combines other minority groups with Asian Americans, who as a group are overrepresented among faculty ranks, particularly among tenured faculty. Even though the use of
percentages in reporting faculty tenure rates and change in minority faculty representation presents an overly optimistic picture of an otherwise dismal situation, official university documents, which provide a glimpse of the official institutional ideology, persist in their use. Perhaps more importantly, the numbers fail to show how faculty feel about the promotion and tenure process. While the official report issued by the Affirmative Action office boasted an increase of nearly 4% in minority faculty in the on-track category from the previous year, a document not released to the public indicated 24 minority faculty (Black, Hispanic, American Indian) terminated from the university. This number is significant considering there were only 116 faculty members representing these groups.

The Judicial Metaphor

Analysis of the rhetoric used by those who felt the system was fair revealed a consistent likening of the promotion and tenure process to the court system, in which the best possible "case" for promotion and tenure is presented by the departmental chair serving as "attorney" with the departmental committee providing the best possible "evidence" for promotion or tenure. The following is from a second year majority assistant professor in the applied sciences:

I guess probably it is fair most of the time but I think there are these pockets of things, there are cases that are very unfair. You can't blame the university because they basically get a case a lot
of times like it's in court. The case has to do with your lawyer. If you have a good lawyer lots of times you win. If you have a bad lawyer you lose. What I've learned is that when you come up for tenure, you have to be very careful about who presents your case. You want to make sure it's the right guy, because if it's the wrong guy it can do you a lot of damage. So if I have a complaint of the system it is mainly because it just depends on who prepares your tenure case. I think for the most part it's based on quality, but I think there's a lot to be said about interpretation and the person who prepares your case. So you have to be careful about it.

The judicial metaphor was also used by a department chair in the social sciences, who acknowledged the element of subjectivity involved despite the increasingly formalized criteria:

I guess I start with the premise that almost all evaluations have a significant element of subjectivity involved. The promotion and tenure decision is no different in that sense, because even though we have very formal criteria, over a period of time in this institution they have become much more specific. The procedures are much more delineated. Clearly there is still a lot of room for interpretation because people look at the same pieces of information and arrive at different conclusions, but basically as individuals, people bring to this kind of process some consensus about what the 'abstract standards' should be. But then they have a whole variety of different interpretations about what are the indicators of those standards. And in some cases personality comes into play. When in fact this is supposed to be a more objective kind of process, it's never totally absent, but it should not be a central factor. It's sort of like you live with somebody for six years or whatever, it's harder to divorce them. It's like a court case where the witness says something and the judge tells the jury 'you didn't hear that, ignore that.' You can't take that into consideration in your deliberations, but it's hard, sort of, to totally remove that.
Use of a judicial metaphor suggests a reliance on a heavily codified system in which the foundation of fairness rests in the professional ethos of highly qualified peers. While acknowledging that elements of race, class, gender and personal bias may be present, such concerns are purportedly counterbalanced through the judicious application of consensually established indicators of quality and excellence by a professional community of scholars. The following quote from a dean in the soft-life-applied science makes reference to a "professional community of scholars" upon whom the academic professional places his confidence. Normative expectations come into play in which the culturally different may be at a disadvantage:

There is a profound notion of what it means to be an educated human being, and that notion includes concepts of conduct as well as concepts of scholarship. One needs to be fair minded, forgiving and compassionate. One has to have a regard for evidence. There are intellectual and moral virtues that mark a well educated human being and presumably one of the criteria for admission into the community of scholars is that one is a well educated human being. Now if that's the case, I can entrust my professional career to my colleagues in the same way we acknowledge that the courts can have the final word on the disposition of certain aspects of our conduct that have to do with the law. We establish our academic courts, if you will. And they make mistakes, things go wrong. In the case of Native American, or Mexican American or Asian Americans, they may have a set of cultural characteristics, a conduct different from the norms, and now we ask does that conduct disadvantage that individual from participation in the community of scholars. And I think that on occasion it does. That's one of the mistakes the academic courts make in this process.
Of the eight instances in which the judicial metaphor was invoked, in only one instance was it used by a minority individual, who in this case is one of the minority administrators. As the above dean states, there is an underlying normative basis for judgements in which behavioral expectations for professional conduct play an integral part. Because minority faculty are concentrated in the junior ranks, it can be safely assumed that their "jury of peers" consists largely of white males, upon whom the "intellectual and moral virtues that mark a well educate human being" are normed.

Because college and university promotion and tenure committees pay particular attention to the mechanics of the process at the departmental level, the "case" for promotion or tenure presented by the departmental committee and chair assumes paramount importance. Experience in promotion and tenure committee service, and in the preparation of successful and convincing dossiers for promotion candidates provides the department chairperson with knowledge of the ingredients and rhetoric necessary for expediting the process. This element of "packaging" the candidate, to portray her or him in the best possible light was noted by a former department chair in the sciences:

I think the process is pretty fair. I've been here 24 years, I guess, and I don't know of any cases where people were denied tenure that I didn't agree with. I do know some cases where tenure was granted where I thought it shouldn't have been granted. I think that maybe there's been a
tendency to be a little more lenient than necessary. So I think it probably has worked about as well as it could have. It's an imprecise judgement. I think the people I know on those committees take it very seriously. I think it's a frivolous activity in many ways, but it's difficult, always difficult, to judge people. I think the committee can be helped if the department does a good job of putting the packet together. They have only the package to look at. They don't know these people. I think it's the department's responsibility to put each of their faculty candidates into the best possible light.

As the above statement indicates, the role of the department chair and the departmental committee is crucial in preparing the faculty's case in the academic courts. The curious aspect of this process is the reliance on the professional judgement of peers at the committee level who are most likely to be able to provide qualified judgements, yet the suspicion of those at other committee levels of overprotectiveness and "packaging" at the department level.

Disciplinary Favoritism

Among those who felt the evaluation process was unfair, respondents described it as "traumatic," "bruising," "arbitrary," "deceitful," and "dehumanizing." Minority faculty felt that the process was weighted toward the hard sciences, with committees overrepresented by those from the sciences, and upper level administrators prone to giving preference to disciplines in the hard sciences. The following is from a tenured minority female:

Favoritism toward certain disciplines is articulated by the administration. For example, I
am going to be very honest and say I get a little
tired of presidents talking about what's happening
in the (hard sciences) but never talking about what
happens in the (soft sciences). It's almost as if
these are the only entities that are important and
the rest of you are doing a job we don't really
value. In terms of complaints and/or suits within
a university by a faculty, we rank in the top 5% in
the nation. Now, something is wrong. Something is
terribly wrong and what this says to me is that you
can't say there are just a few people who are
feeling miserable and are not getting their way,
it's campus-wide. That report came out three
months ago. Now, are all these faculty just
spoilsports and ogres that bellyache at the drop of
a hat or is there really a problem? What is it and
what are you going to do about it? What I'm really
saying is that this institution has yet to prove to
me a system of fairness to its faculty in general
and its minority faculty in particular, and I speak
from 25 years of experience.

A similar dissatisfaction with the overemphasis on the
sciences was noted by a nontenured minority male:

I'll give you an example, something that strikes me
because I just made reference to it a couple of
hours ago. I was walking along the mall and we saw
a new building that's going up. That's our third
chemistry building. I doubt if you'll find another
university in the country that has three chemistry
buildings. Why? Our last two presidents were
chemists. What has happened to this university is
that for the past twenty years it's been run by
scientists. Now the scientists have a different
perspective of scholarship than do people in the
natural or social sciences and the humanities.
Since they have in essence been running the
university, their perception has been the one that
prevails. I think the fact that we were run for
twenty years by essentially a hierarchy based on
the scientific model, we became essentially not
second class citizens, but third class citizens in
relation to the administrators and applied
scientists.

The administrations' "different perspective of
scholarship" noted by the above faculty involves a heightened
concern for institutional prestige, which filters down to faculty performance by emphasizing scientific breakthroughs and advances in high technology, which they equate with quality performance. This definition of performance excellence as interpreted by administrators is expanded upon in a following chapter of this dissertation.

As relative newcomers to the world of academe, minorities enter a system in which the procedures for promotion and tenure have recently become heavily codified, and in which competition for spots among the ranks of the tenured has intensified dramatically. Concurrently, state allocations to higher education have diminished, forcing institutions to seek external resources in the form of grants and contracts, with the bulk of those going to disciplines that emphasize science and technology. Minority faculty in this study are representative of the national population of minorities in academe in that they have greater representation in disciplines that are not as highly rewarded as the hard sciences. Thus historical and structural forces combine with a meritocratic ideology that denies the impact of race, class, and gender differences to place minorities in a disadvantaged position in terms of promotion and tenure. While minorities are quick to sense their disadvantage, majority faculty continue to view the promotion and tenure process as flawed in small and insignificant ways, and of no particular
disadvantage to minority faculty, whom they perceive as doing better than ever.

**Clarity of Criteria, Procedures, and Expectations**

Faculty were asked if the criteria and procedures for the promotion and tenure evaluation process were clear to them, and if the performance expectations held of them by their peers and administrators were understood. Administrators were asked if they felt the criteria and procedures for the evaluation process were clear to the faculty. Responses to this question are categorized as "clear" "unclear" or "equivocal." The latter category was used when responses were either highly contradictory or distinctions were made between the criteria used at different levels of the process: departmental, college, or university. Table 9 illustrates the distribution of responses to this question by gender and ethnicity of the faculty, and the distribution of responses by administrators.

**Table 9: CLARITY OF PROCEDURES, CRITERIA, AND EXPECTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
<th>UNCLEAR</th>
<th>EQUIVOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, faculty were evenly divided on the question of clarity of performance expectations, criteria, and procedures used for evaluation. The greatest contrast occurs between minority females and their department chairs and deans, suggesting a lack of communication and sharing of information between them. All three tenured minority females indicated that changes in administration, both at the departmental chair and higher, were problematic for them in terms of shifts in expectations. Often these changes and shifts in emphasis were not made explicit:

I think you have to put this in context because of having been at this university for a long time, we were literally told that you were hired to teach and that's what you will do. In fact, I was specifically told that when I went to my then chair and asked about some research I was interested in and if I could get it funded, would I get some release time, would he support it etc., but that's the way the college was in those days. The focus was on staffing classes and developing programs, with the expectation that a very limited few would engage in research...the support system for research wasn't there, in fact it was discouraged. The change came about, I think, in a rather undercover way, because over time it had been implicit, that we're making a shift and in the shift we have these expectations, in fact we never as a faculty really sat down and talked about what does in mean to be a member of the faculty in the College.

Another tenured minority female discussed how the system had changed over time, from a much more informal promotion process to one in which publication became paramount. Ironically, the greater formalization and codification of the criteria and process of evaluation has not resulted in greater
clarity and specificity. Changes that filtered down from the university president, to the dean, and to the department chair were not made specific despite a statement in the Handbook for Appointed Personnel that requires the departmental chair to meet with individual faculty to discuss changes in the process and to clarify performance expectations:

When I came up it was 1972 and in those days, believe it or not, there were no departmental committees and no dean level committees. What happened when you came up to your fifth year was that the head of the department was supposed to inform you, 'yes we will reappoint you for six years' and then you come up for tenure and he, usually it was a he, wrote a letter to the dean, and you got your tenure and that was it. Now when I came up in 1972, just that year became president and things started to change. The dean had changed, and for the first time they wanted records, so the head of the department apparently sent my CV and record of my publications and a letter, but then I was turned down. The dean thought I didn't have enough publications...I looked around in the department and there were people who were promoted that year or the year before who had less time in rank, less time since the Ph.D., less publications and they were promoted fine, and when it came to me they turned me down...the head had never given me a letter saying 'you're going to be considered for tenure' so I got tenure by default. Then what they did, they demoted me to lecturer instead of promoting me to associate professor.

After exhausting all routes available within the institution, the above instance was remedied only through a grievance filed with the Office of Civil Rights. Redress was made and promotion granted after the lapse of a considerable amount of time.
Of the three equivocal responses given by minority females, two took the form of distinguishing between levels of evaluation. These responses were not in agreement, however, with one respondent indicating clarity at the college level but not at the department level, and one indicating clarity at the department level but not at the college level. Both of these individuals were in different departments of the same college:

KP: Has your department head discussed performance standards with you?

HF: Not in tremendous detail. It's difficult to get administrators to be specific about what they want, although after being in the system for a while I have learned what is required.

KP: So when you go under review, the criteria are not vague?

HF: Not in my department, no. At the college level, God knows.

KP: So there are differences at the college level and at the departmental level?

HF: Yes, there are extreme differences, because there are differences in the disciplinary background that people will have in any college of _______. Committee people will use criteria that may fit their discipline well but do not necessarily fit your discipline or specialty.

The minority female for whom the college wide criteria were clearer than the departmental criteria cited the failure of the department chair to explain and clarify the evaluation criteria:
KP: Have the procedures and criteria for evaluation for promotion and tenure been explained to you? Are they clear to you?

AV: Oh yeah, they have. Not in my department necessarily, but they do that campus wide. They have meetings and say these are the requirements and this is what is expected.

KP: But not within your department?

AV: No. I think they have a committee in the college--I'm trying to remember. The department chair is supposed to review expectations with you but that doesn't happen. Basically the department head calls you in and says 'It's time for you to go up, are you going up?' Without really saying what all is involved. That's basically what happens.

The remaining minority female who gave an equivocal response was a first year assistant professor who indicated that the criteria were clear on paper but, "I guess I may change my mind when it comes to the moment that I have to actually go through it." Further probing on the exact criteria and standards used, and how the process worked in her department indicated a great deal of uncertainty and unfamiliarity with the process.

The role the departmental chair plays in clarifying criteria for evaluation and performance expectations varies greatly among departments. A minority female expressed her satisfaction with the level of communication between the chair and herself concerning performance expectations,

The department chair wrote me a letter way in advance to let me know exactly what was going to happen, explained how to put together my dossier, gave me the names of people who had gone through the process in the recent past and everybody was
just really nice. Then I met with the committee and they asked me a few questions about what I wanted to do and some of their concerns. So everything was very clear to me.

Conversely, a female minority professor in the sciences found her department head to be much less helpful:

KP: The Handbook for Appointed Personnel states that department heads should meet annually with tenure-eligible faculty to review promotion and tenure criteria and answer any questions you might have. Is that your experience?

RR: In reality that doesn't happen. I mean the only reason I saw my chairman in early November was because he was supposed to have done a letter in July to say whether or not he was going to retain me on tenure track, that I am one of twenty people in this department who haven't seen him for evaluations from the prior year, so I mean these things seem to be sort of tenuous and put together at the last minute. Whether or not he sits down with individual faculty members and outlines guidelines, I don't know, but for myself he just sort of said, 'yeah, well you're doing some good research, keep up the good work' so I think some people may be more independent that others, I don't know.

That the majority of department chairs and deans view the process as very clear and feel their faculty understand the evaluation criteria and performance expectations stands in contrast to the experience of majority faculty to a certain extent, but to minority faculty in particular. When questioned regarding the clarity of procedures and criteria, very often administrators refer to the rhetoric of organizational rules and structures to display the rational character of their activities. Using the department of the minority female quoted in the previous example, I will first
give the response of a majority tenured male in the same department when asked the question regarding clarity of procedures and criteria, and follow that with a statement made by the department chair. This from a majority tenured male professor in the sciences who also has served on a university wide committee:

KP: Is it clear, within your department, what those performance expectations are?

PA: Well I can answer for my department. I would say that quite frequently the level of productivity is not well understood by junior faculty people. Nobody sits down with them, unless I happen to do it, and says 'look this is a reasonable level of productivity or it isn't.' I don't want to be too negative in that because our chairman does sit down and has a review with each faculty member on an annual basis, so called annual review, and discusses this so if somebody is falling behind course he'll let them know. I think sometimes he's not always up to date on what is required for promotion and tenure. They're just not up to date because it changes all the time. Every year it's different. The bottom line is a lot of people don't get any counseling whatsoever and the counseling they do get from the chairman is often times, often times, limited and not really right.

The department chairs response:

KP: Do you involve your faculty members in the planning of evaluation criteria? Do you sit down with individual faculty and say 'this is what you're going to be evaluated on' so that it is clear?

DC: Yes, we, my own department, we have an annual evaluation. That's required by the board of regents. Every department head must sit down with every faculty member, every year and we have an evaluation sheet that's several pages that the faculty member fills out first, and then that department P&T committee fills out second, then I as department head fill it out third. Then I sit
down with each faculty member every year, in fact I'm in the midst of doing that now.

KP: So when you sit down with them you talk about formal reviews but you also plan ahead for the next year?

DC: Yeah, we talk about what progress he's made in the past year and we talk about what he's currently doing now. We talk about his strengths and weaknesses--or hers.

KP: Is it your sense then that it is clear among the faculty, what they're being evaluated on, what the criteria are, what the standards applied are?

DC: Yes. In fact they sign the document, I sign the document and I put comments down myself, hand it to them and if they want they can put down comments too.

The principal reference to male faculty, with females added as an afterthought, may reflect the fact that the minority female is the first female to enter the faculty ranks in this department, and all other females are adjunct or nontenure track faculty. According to the female professor, she continues to be treated as 'one of the gals' (nontenure track) which may explain why the chair seems to have overlooked her in meeting with his faculty to discuss and clarify performance expectations.

In this department, two minority males saw the criteria and guidelines used for evaluation as being clear, although when probed on exactly what they were, and how teaching was evaluated, one of these individuals responded that he did not know, nor did he know the weighting the department puts on the three primary duties of teaching, research, and service. In
contrast to the minority female, the males indicated that information regarding performance expectations was shared through informal collegial networks.

Of the three administrators who indicated that clarity of procedures and criteria was a problem, one was a former department chair, one a former dean, and the other a new dean. The one equivocal answer among administrators was also given by a former dean. It may be that the status of being a former administrator allowed a degree of candidness not found among current administrators. None of the current administrators saw the clarity of evaluation criteria and procedures as being a problem. Most pointed to the plethora of written guidelines at the university, college, and department levels as evidence of the abundance of information available to faculty regarding performance expectations, and the involvement of faculty in developing the guidelines for evaluation. Department chairs occasionally may acknowledge clarity of procedures to be a problem in other departments, but not in theirs. For example,

KP: So that faculty coming in generally will know what is expected of them, and it's clear to them on what basis they will be evaluated?

RM: In this department I think that's quite true. I think, I wouldn't say that's universally true on this campus. But in this department I think people do know what is expected of them. We have yearly evaluations. I meet with the faculty and tell them in writing what they are doing or not doing, and again this advisory committee also provides written evaluations, because I think there's very little excuse for a faculty member not to know what is expected of them.
Faculty who have served on university wide promotion and tenure committees cite the unevenness of the process among departments. Some department heads are quite conscientious about making sure evaluation criteria and procedures are clear to their faculty, while others do not communicate this information. Three of the five majority females interviewed had served on university wide committees, and provided their perspectives of the situation in the university overall. A high ranking female university official describe the unevenness in information sharing among departments:

KP: Do you have a sense for how clear the expectations and performance standards are to the faculty?

SN: Well, they should certainly all have access to those records. All those criteria have to be written down at various levels and they have to be made available to the candidate. The question is whether that tells them what they need to know and I would say that it varies a lot. Some of the criteria are very specific. They say things for example like 'a successful candidate for tenure will be expected to have at least one book published and additional things such as articles, editorships' and things of that kind. In other cases they're much more vague, they just say 'excellence in performance' and they really don't say what that involves. Typically what should happen in those cases is that senior members of the department have talked with the candidate about their status along the way, about what that really cashes out to mean, does it mean nine articles, does it mean twenty articles, what are the best places for them to try to publish, what kind of articles should they publish, etc. The extent to which that is done would be hard for me to say. Some departments are very good about it and some departments, I think, are not very good about it...there are some departments that don't even do
any evaluations at all, and when we find out about it, we make sure they do.

Table 10 illustrates the diversity of opinions that exist within academic departments regarding the clarity of evaluation criteria and performance expectations. In only one of the departments, in the Biglan category of "soft-nonlife-pure," did individual faculty indicate complete consensus regarding the clarity of procedures and expectations. It was expected that both majority and minority junior faculty would indicate that they were less clear regarding performance expectations and evaluation criteria. For the most part pattern was true. However in two departments, the "soft-life-pure" and the "soft-life-applied" junior minority faculty indicated that they were clear regarding their performance expectations and criteria for evaluation, while their tenured colleagues, those who will be evaluating them, were not clear regarding these same criteria. In the SLP discipline, the junior minority male faculty was one of four junior faculty hired the same year, and all were given an orientation to university wide evaluation criteria as well as given information by their departmental chair. In the SNA category, the minority female who indicated clarity was a Latina who immigrated here at age seventeen and became quite successful in her profession, moving to the University after nine years in a part-time position at another institution. She was very wary of my request to interview "minority faculty" and seemed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>CLEAR</th>
<th>UNCLEAR</th>
<th>EQUIVOCAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to have a preconceived impression of the type of information
I sought,

I know what questions you're asking me to some
degree. You're asking all the obvious questions as
well as superficial, when you're talking. I mean
if you're interest is the fairness of the process
perhaps and how any kind of minority status enters
in, we're talking subtle. I mean we all know it's
against the law to discriminate and obviously very
few places would dare. I'm not sure in my personal
experience here I have found any single case of
obvious discrimination. Everybody has been just
wonderful, here in (the university) in particular.
People are more open-minded, really relish the

variety of views that are very cultural. Faculty
and student body alike. I know other (minority
faculty) have talked about this sort of affirmative
action backlash and resentment. But a lot of
conservative minorities are now starting to feel
that perhaps the whole idea of affirmative action
should be thrown out the window because it would be
really nice to be just judged by one's own values
and on one's contributions and not one's color or
one's culture.

Thus the tone was set, and throughout the interview her
responses painted a picture of complete acceptance and
collegiality, with absolutely no problems related to her
minority or female status. Her view stands in contrast to a
tenured white male faculty, a colleague who will be involved
in her evaluation. This person, chosen at random, would not
allow the interview to be taped and described the evaluation
process as "peculiar" in which one is judged more on their
ability to get along with other colleagues than their actual
performance. From his viewpoint, majority faculty have no
choice on whether to hire minorities as they are "jammed down their throat" whether or not they are the best candidate.

Another minority female colleague in the same department, reared in the United States, also held a vastly different view of the clarity of the evaluation process from her colleague, and compared the university with her previous institution:

At (another university), I had the opposite experience; they had an openness to cultural diversity, the university appreciated cultural differences. Coming here I thought it would be the same flavor but I was really appalled at the lack of sensitivity and the closedness...our written standards were supposed to be clear and we were supposed to vote on them. But they didn't include me. That was par for the course. We do have written standards. They're minimal, and I'm really unclear as to how they weigh what I've done. What I've done seems discounted.

In the aggregate, minority faculty are much more likely than their majority colleagues to see the criteria and procedures for evaluation as unclear or ambiguous. When disaggregated by gender it is apparent that minority females are particularly uncertain how their performance is judged. Although university personnel policy requires annual meetings between department heads and faculty, this procedure is not uniformly followed, and when it is, information is not imparted in a consistent manner.

As indicated by faculty who have served on college and university-wide evaluation committees, as well as administrators, a great deal of variation exists among departments regarding the manner in which evaluation criteria
and performance expectations are communicated. In many departments, vaguely stated performance standards are interpreted according to the professional discretion of senior colleagues and communicated through informal mechanisms that may exclude minority and gender different faculty. In the following section, I explore the nature of the informal communication of performance standards, to gain an understanding of the role they may play in the decision making process.

**Unwritten Criteria and Rules**

Whereas written guidelines regarding the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure represent the institutionalized and bureaucratic mode of regulating work activities and rewards, unwritten criteria and expectations are a means of self-regulation of the profession. Standards for the proper execution of the academic role, internalized through the professional socialization process, are communicated and perpetuated through informal collegial networks. The questions asked in this section deal with the more particularized and individualized modes of work definition and regulation, and how faculty and administrators perceive these as operating within the organizational context.

Table 11 illustrates the response rates to questions regarding unwritten criteria and their influence on decisions
concerning promotion and tenure. Responses are categorized as affirmative (yes); negative (no); or contradictory. Contradictory responses occurred when individuals responded in the negative, yet in later conversation, gave evidence of criteria used in evaluations that did not exist in written guidelines. Two first year faculty, a minority male and a minority female, responded "I don't know." Those two responses are not categorized. Written guidelines for promotion and tenure, both university-wide and for individual departments, were used to verify responses concerning the written or unwritten nature of criteria used in decision making.

Table 11: UNWRITTEN RULES/Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>CONTRADICTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority Males</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Females</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the majority of faculty and administrators acknowledge the presence of unwritten rules and criteria that are factored into decisions concerning promotion and tenure. The significance of this for the experience of minority faculty lies in what these criteria are, how they are communicated, and whether they may impact minorities differently than their majority colleagues. Several
categories of unwritten criteria emerge from the analysis of the interview data: (1) Self-Promotion; (2) Departmental Citizenship; (3) Maturity; (4) Departmental Politics; and (5) Allocation of Effort.

Self-Promotion

Among many of the faculty interviewed, the element of publicizing and promoting one's accomplishments among their colleagues is seen as advantageous to advancement in the organization. Becoming known in one's field entails a certain amount of gregariousness, and the ability to advance one's scholarly contributions as important to the discipline and to the department in which one is housed. The following are comments from a department head regarding the entrepreneurial nature of faculty and how this effects the way one's contributions are viewed:

GS: Well, you look at faculty as sort of individual entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurial in terms of promoting your own research, promoting the value of your work and contribution. We're always concerned about status in your own field or discipline, I mean a lot of that is not purely by enlightenment, but it's a very conscious selling of one's self, one's doing, and it's very entrepreneurial. So you've got an organization that builds a certain amount of loyalty but in fact it's a very loose organization, so that you've got this sort of individual entrepreneurial hustling for themselves...

KP: So self-promotion gets to be important?

GS: Yeah, along with the egos and how you feel you're evaluated, looked upon, or how your contributions are seen, reflects sort of your
status. If it's not the case, then you'll have really strong sense of unrest or uneasiness.

Another department chair indicated that the ability to "get along" with other faculty in the collegial sense or to socialize is not as important as bringing one's work to the attention of his or her colleagues. According to this chair, good work has to have an effect and an impact, and that impact is enhanced by one's ability to promote their accomplishments among their peers:

A person who is a loner very often will not make as big an impact on the (disciplinary) community as a whole as a person who is somewhat more aggressive, or not so either aggressive or just more gregarious. Because people will know more about what he's done if he shares it with people and calls attention to it, so that's an indirect way a person who is very quiet or likes to keep to themselves may not be evaluated as highly in the long run as someone who is more gregarious. In a sense that is consistent with what I said before, because we're in with people having an impact and we want their work to be good. There's no absolute way of saying this is good, sort of all by itself. It has to have an effect, and if a person is working all by himself in the corner and nobody ever hears about what he does, then it doesn't have an impact. So there is that way in which a person's sort of affability, gregariousness, whatever, can come into effect. But in terms of actually, 'we don't like him because he doesn't socialize enough,' something like that, none of that.

Self-promotion and entrepreneurism is deemed necessary, even in a system that espouses meritocratic principles and professional norms of disinterestedness and impersonal service to the profession. The inconsistency between the merit
principle, professional norms, and the need for self-promotion was noted by this department chair:

KP: Let me ask you a general question. It seems in higher education there is this sort of meritocratic notion in which individuals who do the quality work are rewarded for it. In your estimation, does that work? Do the best people get promoted and rewarded?

LA: I would say yes, subject to this caveat: that if a person who promotes himself or herself might go further than a person who doesn't. That there is this element of self-promotion which can be helpful to somebody.

KP: How does that notion of self-promotion mesh with professional norms, or the scientific search for truth?

LA: Well, they are somewhat inconsistent. I think it's just human nature. You've got two people who've done something good and one person broadcasts the fact and the other doesn't. The one who broadcasts it is going to be more recognized and more people are going to be interested in what he did and try to follow up than the person who just sits and doesn't do a thing about it, you know. If you've got someone who has done something really astounding and very quiet versus somebody who is mediocre and promotes himself, I think the really outstanding person is going to get the recognition and the mediocre person isn't. But when you have two people approximately equal, the self-promoter will go further.

KP: And how is that self-promotion done?

LA: Well, within a department, it's done by just making friends. Go to meetings and make friends at meetings. Cultivate acquaintances, send your papers to them, you give talks wherever you can.

Sharing information in formal and informal settings, and networking with other colleagues, a measure of collegiality, also serves as a means to promote one's work, and certainly
personal attributes of gregariousness and congeniality are advantageous to acknowledgement within the profession and advancement within the structure of the organization. But not all ethnic cultures value the outgoing personality, and self-promoting behavior may be interpreted differently among those reared in cultures different from mainstream America. This point was raised by a tenured female Hispanic, who also made it clear that her view may not be shared by other subgroups of Latinos:

I don't know if I've become a little cynical about this. I think sometimes it (promotion) is a function of the aggressiveness and how much you're willing to present yourself and sell yourself, you know. What I find is that not many, at least in my experience in this department, not many women and Hispanics are that aggressive in presenting themselves. We're sort of more laid back. Sometimes I think it's cultural, we're not that entrepreneurial in selling our product. But, mind you, I shouldn't say cultural but subcultural in the sense that this is not the case for Latin Americans. Boy, they're self-promoters. What I mean is the ethnic minorities here in this country, It's a different ballgame altogether.

Mexican-American and Native American faculty generally expressed their discomfort with the need for self-aggrandizing entrepreneurship. As one Native American female responded, "You have to want it, you have to put yourself in the limelight in order for you to be recognized. I don't have time for that, that's not necessarily a goal. But for some people it is." That the type of self-promotion seen as advantageous to career advancement continues to conflict with
the cultural values of some ethnic subgroups suggests that those values remain important despite the strong pressures to internalize professional norms exerted during the professional socialization process in graduate schools and during the first years of employment in the profession.

Departmental Citizenship

Overlapping with the networking and "grandstanding" necessary for self-promotion is the unwritten criterion of being a good departmental citizen. Among the respondents in this study, departmental citizenship was characterized as being a good colleague or "team player"; contributing to and participating in departmental affairs; and loyalty to the department.

Several administrators mentioned that while departmental citizenry is not a legitimate criteria for evaluation, it is a reality when dealing on a daily basis with other members of the department. Departmental citizenship is often characterized as a "necessary but not sufficient" component of performance evaluation, that may tip the scale in either direction for borderline cases. The theme of balance is resonated in this statement by the Dean of a college:

KP: So contributions to the department, being a good departmental citizen is important?

IV: I think it's much more significant at the department review level because if you're not a solid citizen, my experience tells me that people have ways of coloring their perceptions. If they're a solid citizen in the department then they
tend to inflate sometimes their value and if you're not a solid citizen they tend to deflate it by finding fault in another category, so it's a balancing act. So that even though citizenry is not a legitimate criteria for tenure, it's the reality of the place, so if you don't deal with your colleagues appropriately they'll find ways to see you as not a contributing member. I think there were several cases in this year's tenure where promotion was requested to be delayed because there was not significant contribution to the university or department. So there's a balance there, it's very critical.

Significantly, of the respondents who framed departmental citizenship in terms of contributions to the department, the majority were department heads or deans. When referring to departmental citizenship as an aspect of unwritten criteria, faculty were more likely to refer to collegiality and sharing within the department. In discussing the qualities of individuals looked for in hiring, this department head stressed the importance of hiring someone who will contribute to the department:

KP: What sorts of things do you look for in your hiring that might tell you that this person will fit in?

WH: It's hard to predict. The most important thing is that people have to be outgoing enough and interested in what other people are doing. If they're interested in their own self-interests and their own little world that they're working with, they may do very well but they won't contribute to the department and this person may be extremely good, may be internationally known for what they do, but if they don't contribute to the department what benefit is it to have them in my department? So I look for people who are interested in what other people are doing and have a broad interest in science, that's probably the single most important thing. So many exciting things going on within the
department in general that if the faculty is not interested in that, then they're not going to contribute to our department.

Loyalty to the department was also a theme that was brought out by both administrators and faculty as an unwritten criterion factored into the evaluation process. A demonstrated commitment to the goals of the department is seen as important, especially in times of fiscal austerity. Loyalty as an aspect of good departmental citizenship is demonstrated through representation of the department to the university community at large, and contributing to harmonious relations within the department. The person who refuses to participate in departmental affairs, and does not act in the best interests of the department when representing it in the larger academic community becomes obvious to both fellow faculty and administrators. Demonstrating uncooperativeness or speaking out against departmental policy may not serve one well during evaluation.

By far the most dominant theme in reference to departmental citizenship was that of collegiality. Collegiality differs from both departmental contributions and loyalty in terms of reference to peer relationships within the department rather than participation in the administrative workings of the department or university at large. One tenured majority faculty in the soft-life-applied disciplines indicated that his department placed the expectation to be a
"team player" as paramount, even over the written criteria for research. In this instance the written record presented by an individual up for promotion is "ignored" while the committee looks at the "real facts":

AJ: Being a team player is probably right now more important than being a researcher, in my department. In the whole college, I don't know, because, of course we've got a new dean and with a new president everything will change in relation to this college to the university. But team player is real heavy in my department. I've seen people fail to get rewarded, is a way I'll put it, for promotion and tenure and at merit time, for their lack of being a team player. And in that case a lot of it is not spending enough time with students. In my department you are punished for not spending enough time with students. We do care about that.

KP: How is that quantified? Do you keep anecdotal records?

AJ: No. We have committees who get together to make recommendations about promotion and tenure and they know who the names are of the people who aren't available, who say they're available and we kind of ignore the record and look at the facts. We know who's here. If you want to check in an hour, look up and down the hall and see whose door is open, do that five days in a row, three weeks in a row and you can pick out who we would punish and who we would reward and it would be right.

With few exceptions, faculty and administrators alike value the good department citizen and the good colleague, and take that into account for purposes of promotion and tenure. Differences occurred only in the degree in which it is taken into account, some seeing it as extremely important while others stating collegiality only came into play in extreme cases, and one's personality was secondary to the quality of
their scholarship. While there were no apparent or systematic differences between responses of minority and majority faculty in terms of the importance of collegiality, other unwritten criteria such as self-promotion and maturity may serve to disadvantage them vis-a-vis their white colleagues. The norm of collegiality, however, places the burden on minorities to integrate into the organizational culture by suppressing differences in cultural customs as well as gender and class based differences. As will be more fully discussed below, minorities see these differences as barriers in the promotion and tenure process.

Maturity

To illustrate the means in which one's maturity in terms of both chronological age and time in the organization are seen as important factors, especially for tenured gatekeepers who sit in judgement of their younger peers, quotes will be taken from three individuals within one department in the applied sciences; the first a majority male department head; the second a tenured minority male; the third a first year minority female assistant professor.

The response of the department head to a direct question concerning unwritten criteria was classified as contradictory because of the negative answer given to the question, yet contradicted himself later in reference to the importance of maturity, both in one's work and age:
KP: Are there any unwritten criteria that one goes by in evaluating a faculty member?

RA: I don't think so. Oh well, you know, let's say style. We all have various personalities. Sweet guy here, low fuse guy there, but you don't write that too much, but where it effects teaching then they must be called on the carpet. Maybe even the sweet guy not being critical enough, or the low fuse guy in being too critical, and so it's my responsibility to make sure that there's a certain evenness without stereotyping everybody, that would be a big mistake, and I've always just tried to make sure people work hard, have fun, and make a living. If I can do that, I'm satisfied.

And later in the interview,

KP: What's generally the reason given for those (p&t) decisions being overturned?

RA: Too frequently, unfortunately, it's prematurity of time in a particular title. Like if you're an assistant professor and somebody's absolutely outstanding, this university has an up and out rule, six years you've got to be promoted or you get out, and there's no question that an outstanding faculty member who comes up in their second or third year is frequently turned down, versus the same credentials of a sixth year gets through. It's a fact of life. It's kind of like life, you kind of have to pay your dues and I think that prevails to some extent that someone has to be an assistant professor longer. There's some justification for that I think because a certain thing like maturity, that one gets with age, with a few more years, so I'm not sure it's all bad, but I've had a lot of faculty turned down that were outstanding second or third year assistant professors that would not be promoted until their fourth or fifth year.

A tenured minority male in the same department was also asked whether there were any unwritten criteria and responded, "I think there are. I'd be less than honest if I didn't say so. I mean I think you have to put in your time, pay your
dues, know the people around you and stuff like that." The minority male interviewed here had a substantial record of research in industry and also had spent a significant amount of time as an associate professor in another research university.

The minority female in this department is the first tenure track female, and the only assistant professor in a department with two associate professors and fifteen full professors. Although she is on tenure track, she is assigned many of the same duties as those in the nontenure track, the majority of whom are women. Much younger than her male colleagues, and unsure how guidelines for promotion and tenure are interpreted and applied, she feels that she has to work much harder to be as productive as her male colleagues because of the different duties that are assigned. On the basis of her remarkable research effort, she is a candidate for tenure in her second year, although her chairman states "no one has ever been promoted in our p&t committee in their second year," and when reminded of his earlier statement regarding the need for maturity, he responded, "Yeah, that's a tough one, but it's real."

It is important to note that the woman in this department feels that her gender is a much more salient factor than her race in terms of barriers to promotion and acceptance in the department, a theme that was echoed by several of the minority
women interviewed and will be returned to in following sections of this study that deal with departmental climate. As relative newcomers to the world of academe, and concentrated in the lower levels of the faculty hierarchy, many minorities lack the experience, defined here as "maturity," that time in the discipline or in the organization allows, and have not "paid their dues." While it may be argued that their experience does not differ from that of majority junior faculty, minorities in the population of this study felt it much more difficult to achieve the degree of camaraderie among their colleagues that allows for "learning the ropes" in terms of unwritten performance expectations.

**Departmental Politics**

While elements of politics and power are intrinsic to all decisions regarding hiring and promotion of university personnel, the politics referred to here are those perceived and articulated by the respondents themselves, rather than a construct employed by the researcher in interpreting text.

Maturity in the discipline, when defined as years in the department, was often equated with deference to an accepted methodology. The history of the department, and the longevity of its faculty, may impact the definition of important topics for scientific inquiry, and methods of conducting research. Faculty in several departments referred to the "generational split" in their departments, often couched in terms of
departmental politics. These statements are from a department chair in the Soft-Nonlife-Pure disciplines:

The university and Board of Regents policy requires you to appoint to those committees faculty who are tenured and in this department, with the exception of one or two, they're all senior professors, and by virtue of being senior professors have been here for a long time. They're older, so in a way, my hands are tied. It's all politics of the department. It's their department, they've been with it, seen it develop, contributed to its development. Normally one should be able to assume they're professional, that they're operating in good faith, and that they will be sensitive. Sometimes it happens and sometimes it doesn't.

And regarding the introduction of new methodologies,

...the older faculty tend to react negatively to that, probably because they are threatened and therefore they define it less than valuable or even detrimental to undergraduates and graduates, so we have vast differences. I anticipate that I'll get a few of these comments on research that have very little to do with what I consider recognized, written criteria concerning good teaching and research, and a lot more to do with generational differences of what an assistant professor should be doing and how they should be doing it, whether that's in the classroom or in publications.

A minority female candidate for tenure in the above department felt that the "friction between older faculty and younger faculty and between male and female faculty" affected the collegiality in the department, and that collegiality made a difference in terms of promotion and tenure decisions.

The element of deference to those in powerful decision making capacities, be they tenured professors or administrators, was defined as political by many junior faculty. In some departments this meant an unwritten
expectation not to "rock the boat" or directly and publicly oppose those in power. For those already tenured, the result could be receiving less departmental resources. The following tenured minority male found that political problems surfaced after he achieved tenure and began participating more in departmental affairs, which in his case meant challenging the status quo:

KP: Are the evaluation standards applied fairly and objectively?

VT: Well, you know there's always political problems, I mean I had political problems with my department head. I mean I opposed him on certain things and he screwed me out of a raise. I'm positive of it.

KP: Those kinds of things, like not making waves, do they figure in to evaluations?

VT: Oh gosh yes. However that only happened after I got tenure and started contributing to the department. Then you start stepping on toes.

Rewards in terms of teaching awards, merit raises, and release time for research were seen by some as political decisions that affected advancement. A good relationship with powerful decision makers is seen as key to receiving rewards, and those rewards extend to ostensibly meritocratic decisions concerning promotion and tenure. As one Native American female stated, "This university is extremely political regarding promotion and tenure. It's who you like. I find the department at large accepting, but in the closer group, it's all very political."
Allocation of Effort

Written guidelines for promotion and tenure among departments range from vague references to "excellence in performance" to quite specific measures regarding numbers and types of publications expected per year, detailed procedures for teaching evaluation, and relatively precise weighting of the duties of teaching, research, and service. However, many faculty made statements such as, "the written criteria mean nothing, the unwritten criteria mean everything," and "what's on paper is not really what matters," in reference to what is given the most weight in promotion and tenure decisions. How one should allocate their efforts, and on what aspects of their work one should place emphasis, are unwritten rules that regulate the daily activities of the professoriate.

In terms of how faculty spend their time, and what aspects of their activities receive most recognition in terms of reward, it is clear that student related activities of advising and mentoring receive little recognition, regardless of what the written guidelines or administrators say regarding the importance of such activity. What faculty see as important activities for promotion often is at odds with what administrators say "counts" during evaluation. The following example is from a minority male assistant professor in the Soft-Nonlife-Applied disciplines, speaking of the importance of working individually as a mentor to students:
SR: That's looked down upon, a wasted effort, wasted time. I've stopped doing it. I mean I was doing what they call independent study with a lot of students because it would give me a little one to one basis, I could go to the studio, sit down and talk with them. We could meet in my office, they would show me their work and discuss it. And now I've stopped doing it. There's no reward for it. So I started cutting students off, I said, 'I'm sorry, my teaching, the fact that I'm working with graduate students doesn't count anymore' so I told my students, 'I'm cutting this stuff out, I'm not volunteering to come see you people anymore.' And they says 'Why not?' Because I've been told that my research is of A-1 importance, my teaching is second and my volunteer work with students and committees third, so that's how it rolls, that's the game I have to play, and that's the game I'm going to play.

KP: Are those written guidelines?

SR: From what I understand they're kind of unwritten guidelines. It's like, this is what I've been told.

The department chair of the above faculty, to the contrary, stated that "we have a lot of faculty who value spending a lot of time with students, and we do a lot of mentoring and advising, I think that's real important."

Although written guidelines exist at department, college, and university levels, and in spite of the fact that department chairmen are required to clarify performance expectations, what "really counts" is imparted for the most part from senior colleagues, as this minority female assistant professor indicates:

KP: You mentioned your colleagues, was that the advice you got, 'don't put too much time in teaching'?
BD: Yeah, I remember one of my first get togethers that I attended here on campus was, you know, somebody had just published a book and I was amazed. I said how could you write a book while teaching, and that's when the senior professor told me, you will very quickly learn to put your students at the bottom of the ladder. And I was shocked and it must have shown on my face, and he said well it might sound cruel, but he said exactly, 'if you're an excellent teacher and you have no publications nobody will look at you. But if you are strong in publications and a lousy teacher, people will be willing to close an eye.' These are the words he said and at that time I felt that was very cold, but I can see it, I can understand it better now, you know.

As may be expected in a research university, unwritten rules regarding the allocation of one's efforts centered around the need to publish and perform research, although a major theme among administrators was that teaching was now being taken much more seriously, as the institution had made public pronouncements about the importance of undergraduate education. Along with what they perceived as clear and unambiguous written criteria, administrators often stressed the importance of mentoring and informal sharing of information. Only two of the departments had a formal mentoring program in place, and the perceptions of how well those functioned varied among faculty and administrators in the same department. A college dean spoke of the importance of mentoring in terms of faculty learning how to present themselves:

KP: It seems that the mentoring process is pretty important in terms of learning the ropes and unwritten expectations.
BC: Not only that. It's important to work with people to have them know how to present themselves. The biggest mistake when a non-mentoring system is in place is that faculty either inflate themselves in their resume and make people angry or they put things in there that are less significant and they should learn to skip over. As you mature in this business what you learn to do is edit out things of less significance...the way in which you not only turn in your resume once a year but the way in which you shared that informally with people in power within your department, who influence and interpret, so if no one can serve as your interpreter on the P and T committee then you're at a loss, so there are certain skills I think people can be taught by a department head.

A department head under the college of the above dean talked of their formal mentoring program and it's importance for minorities:

Our department as a whole has successfully pushed for hiring of women and minorities. Once they've been in we've tried very carefully to mentor those people and really help them. I know just in one case a minority individual was helped to publish. (The college) is a model for mentoring programs for the rest of them.

But this view of the success of mentoring is not shared by minority faculty in this chair's department. This from a second year minority male who first spoke of his unfamiliarity with the hiring process and the need for faculty to negotiate in that process, then the lack of informal sharing of information in his department:

KP: You weren't thinking at the time that you would be able to negotiate?

PL: No. I mean, I was never told that to be hired at a good salary or get raises here you have to show that someone else wants you. Ohhhh, so that's it. So see there's a lot of stuff, in my first
year, no one said anything to me. Nobody said ______ let me take you by the hand.

KP: You didn't have a mentor?

PL: Nobody. Nobody told me about travel, travel grants, small grants, nobody told me anything, you know if you didn't read it in a memo. So now I write notes to myself 'I'm supposed to be doing research', supposed to be in my studio working. My first year here I never got a chance to go to my studio, I would get off work, go to a committee meeting until ten o'clock and I was like, ahhh!

And this from a minority female in the same department:

CA: The review system here is capricious, reviews are totally subjective, and there is no merit pay.

KP: How was that system explained to you?

CA: It wasn't.

KP: You didn't have anyone to advise you when you came in?

CA: The opposite was true. I had two people who really wanted to get rid of me badly. So I spent my first two years trying to avoid them.

In the other college and department with a mentoring program, the perceptions of the effectiveness of mentoring as a method of learning unwritten expectations followed much the same pattern, with administrators viewing their department as a model for mentoring, but minority faculty holding a divergent view of its effectiveness. While majority faculty quite often mentioned the department chair or a senior faculty as being their mentor during their early years, minority faculty generally felt that although their departments were accepting of them, there were no mentoring relationships or
Effective sharing of information concerning unwritten expectations. The exception to this was the rare minority "superstar" who came with tenure.

Among those departments without a formal mentoring program, the dominant feeling on the part of senior faculty and administrators was that faculty should already know what is expected of them by virtue of their graduate training and assumed familiarity with their role as faculty at a research university. Particularly in the sciences, where the norms of research were thought to have been inculcated in graduate school and the post-doctorate, mentoring was not seen as important to "learning the ropes." Minority faculty mentioned the need to be aggressive in getting the information they need, which for many meant exposing their unfamiliarity with the role and, in a sense, their vulnerability. This from a minority male associate professor in the applied sciences:

OD: This is my fourth year and I must say this is the first year in which the department chairman has made it very clear what was expected...In fact, it wasn't made clear to me at all, I had to seek it out for myself. I guess it was just assumed that I knew. Frankly the department head that hired me thought, 'look, we hired you because you're smart and if you're not smart enough to figure out what the ropes are then you're not as smart as we thought you were, so you figure it out.' I really believe that was his attitude. He never really told me what the ropes were.

KP: How did you come to learn what was most important?

OD: Asking our present chairman, who at the time was a senior faculty member on the college
promotion and tenure committee. I asked him how many publications do I need, what is important, because what is said to be important in fact is not. In other words, can you give me a more direct reading, rather than what is written down because I think actually a lot of people give lip service to certain things that in fact when it comes right down to it don't amount to a hill of beans. And yeah, I actually thought I was smart enough to figure that out, but now I can see other young minority faculty in my department who are less experienced, they're much more tentative, they're much more unwilling to open their door and talk to people.

Summary

Majority faculty and administrators who view the promotion and tenure process as fair rely on the professional judgement of their peers in the academic "courts" and may cite as evidence official documents that show percentage rates of minorities seeking tenure as higher than those of majority faculty. Considering the small numbers of minority faculty, however, these data are vapid. Those who see the process as unfair cite favoratism that exists toward the sciences that disadvantages those in other academic areas.

While university policy states that department chairs must meet with faculty each year to clarify expectations, this practice is not always followed. For minority women in particular the procedures and expectations remain unclear, whereas majority faculty and administrators maintain all performance expectations are made quite explicit to the faculty.
The informal communication of the unwritten rules of promotion and tenure are seen by many faculty as more important than the written criteria. Factors such as learning how to best allocate one's time, promote oneself among colleagues, being a good departmental citizen, and learning the politics of the department represent mechanisms that shape the role behaviors of faculty. The ambiguity of the evaluation process is particularly felt by junior faculty, where minority faculty tend to be concentrated, and for them the promotion and tenure process is particularly debilitating. A new faculty member may "learn the ropes" simply by being around long enough or may take part in a formal mentoring program. While the effectiveness of mentoring is controversial among faculty, it is plausible that by imparting unwritten rules to their colleagues, mentors may play an unwitting role in perpetuating patterns of power and privilege.

The written policies and procedures regarding the promotion and tenure process, as well as the unwritten "rules", are often inadvertent impediments to the professional advancement of minority faculty. As a means of further exploring what both minority and majority faculty view as barriers to promotion and tenure for minorities, faculty and administrators were asked to specify the nature of those
barriers. The analysis of that question is discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER VII
BARRIERS TO PROMOTION AND TENURE

Introduction

The literature concerning minority faculty points to a number of barriers to professional advancement experienced by minorities. What sets this study apart from other surveys that list barriers to promotion and tenure for minority faculty is that comparisons are made herein between majority and minority faculty and administrators regarding the existence of such barriers, and perceptions of the specific nature of the barriers experienced by minority faculty.

Faculty and administrators were asked if they felt that minorities may experience any barriers in the promotion and tenure process that are different from those faced by their majority colleagues. Responses were categorized as yes or no. Table 12 illustrates the distributions of responses to this question.

Table 12: Barriers to Promotion and Tenure for Minorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a tremendous gap between minority perceptions of the barriers they face to promotion and tenure and the perceptions held by their majority counterparts regarding the minority experience in the P&T process. If categories were collapsed into majority and minority, 20 of the 25 minorities (including two administrators) would see themselves as facing barriers to promotion and tenure that are different from majority faculty, whereas 16 of the 24 of the majority respondents do not think minorities face any unique barriers.

That majority faculty perceive minorities as doing very well in terms of professional advancement while minorities are much less sanguine regarding their experience is consistent with other research comparing Black faculty attitudes with whites (Staples and Jones, 1984). Majority faculty tend to see themselves as informed, sensitized individuals who have transcended the biases of the unlettered, and are able to judge the academic worth of individuals regardless of racial or gender differences. Outright discrimination, in the words of one respondent, is simply not "nineties behavior" befitting professionals operating in a characteristically liberal milieu.

Two of the majority faculty who sit on university-wide committees for promotion and tenure described minority status as an advantage in the evaluation process. A majority female stated in regard to promotion and tenure decisions involving
minorities, "We tend to go the other way. If anything, we give special consideration" to their cases. The following is from a majority male who sits on a university-wide committee:

KP: Do minority faculty experience any barriers to promotion and tenure that might be different than the majority faculty?

GL: I think it's probably the case that it's a two-edged sword in very small instances. In other words if you go looking for racism and sexism hard enough you're going to find it one way or another. Let me just say this. If somebody is a minority in this department, actually that's a plus when their packet goes to the P&T committee because everybody is sensitized on that committee. Whether it's departmental P&T committee, College committee or university P&T committee, the fact that we have a very small representation of Hispanics, Native Americans, and Blacks is actually a plus for them. That will probably get your packet looked at in a little more favorable light. The most subtle forms of racism and sexism, that is in me and you and all of us, will sometimes pop up and influence things but as far as influencing it adversely in a promotion and tenure process specifically, I rather doubt it.

A department chair described the minority advantage not in terms of special treatment, but as having added attention given to their cases, to make sure that the evaluation process is carried out in the proper manner:

KP: In your experience, do minority faculty with whom you've been acquainted experience any particular barriers to promotion and tenure that differ from their majority colleagues?

SC: As a matter of fact I think they have a little bit of advantage.

KP: How so?

SC: I think they have an advantage because the committees generally bend over backwards to make
sure the minority is not discriminated against. Now, is that a heretical statement? I don't know. But I really believe that is the case. I don't think any of them are given any special treatment but I think that people go overboard to make sure that they do the right thing, you know. And that it is very carefully evaluated and that they have every chance in the world of presenting their best foot forward, you know. I think there is a tendency for the committees to say 'wait a minute, we've got to make sure this person gets every due right. And that's the way it should be for everyone, they also toe the mark like everyone else.

Majority faculty in this sample believe that minorities are given the "benefit of the doubt" in most cases because of their minority status and their potential to claim discrimination if the evaluation process is not properly conducted. As this majority female suggests, the university's eagerness to promote minority faculty may actually disadvantage White males:

Once we've hired a minority faculty member, I don't think the tenure issue is as great as it is for the White male in the department. The university is so eager to promote them, rightfully so I think, because we don't have enough minority faculty. I suspect if you have two people who are equal, and they're real close to getting tenure and there might be a slight question whether to go one way or another, I have a feeling that the minority or the woman would be more likely to get it and the white male might not in many instances.

For other faculty, being minority held no particular advantage or disadvantage as the evaluation process is seen as impartial, with judgements based primarily on the quality of one's work. The values of the academic meritocracy are deeply ingrained in the norms of the faculty, both minority and
majority. While the question regarding barriers to promotion and tenure was phrased consistently in all of the interviews, many faculty made the inference that the question implied the need for different or "watered down" criteria for evaluation to be used for minority faculty, and expressed resistance to that notion. Resentment can be felt by those who perceive that others are given a break because of their minority status or among those minorities who sense they are being given special consideration. A general pattern emerged from the analysis in which those who felt there were not unwritten criteria that entered into the decision making process were also those who felt that being a minority made no difference, as all were treated equally. For example, the following department chair said there were no unwritten criteria involved in evaluations and responded to the question of barriers in the process by talking of the need for equal treatment for everyone, with an emphasis on quality scholarship:

It's commonly said, but I don't have any direct experience to bear this out, that minorities often suffer from a lack of network, and lack of a mentor. That's not so true of women in (the sciences) now because there are a lot more women than there have been in the past. It is still true for minorities, but on the other hand there are some serious philosophical and political issues dealing with this. I've talked both individually and as a group to the women faculty in my department. They are extremely resentful of the notion that they would be treated any differently than anyone else. They are bitter about this. Some of the radical feminists on campus--our
faculty are not supportive of this. So if I appointed more women to my search committees, I would have less women in my final pool of candidates because they want to be sure that they are not given any special break. They want to be treated and evaluated solely on their merit. So I hope minorities will find the support they need to just realize what it takes to be in an academic environment. But it's not obvious to me that those matters have to be of the minority factor, I mean I actually resent enormously the insinuation that I can't teach a Hispanic student as well as I can teach a White student. So I think the most important thing is to be evaluated on the basis of merit, and once you stop doing that, which there is a real tendency to do, I think you've introduced the university to a very, very difficult time. I find it difficult to see that if minority members are promoted because they're minority, how they can serve as a role model to other minorities. But I think at this level it's important to assure that people are evaluated on the same criteria.

Of the minorities responding that they did not perceive any barriers to promotion and tenure, some cited the need for evaluations based only on merit, as this statement from a minority male in the hard-nonlife-applied sciences:

KP: As a minority group member, do you perceive any barriers to evaluation and promotion that differ from your majority colleagues?

HM: No, none, zero. The fact that I'm a member of a minority group in my department is a non-issue. I view it in this way and I think it's true because I've asked people. We have very high expectations of people and we've been fortunate enough to hire just the very best. On occasion I will view it from the point of view of, and this may sound cynical, 'well, if I'm going to get in trouble probably being a minority will help.' But frankly I don't think I'm in trouble and I don't really think I'm ever going to use that crutch. And I would hope that all my minority colleagues would think the same way. I don't want to use that as a crutch, I want to rely on my own merit and
hopefully I'll end up in an organization that views me strictly on my own merits.

Among many of the faculty who saw no barriers for minorities, the nature of their disciplinary work was cited as contributing to the objectivity of the evaluation process. For faculty and administrators in the hard sciences, the assertion was made that less ambiguity exists in discerning quality performance, and that quality performance exists apart from extraneous social factors. Table 13 illustrates the differences among disciplines in responding to the question regarding barriers for minorities. As is evident from the table, the hard sciences (Hard-Life-Applied; Hard-Nonlife-Applied; Hard-Nonlife Pure; and Hard-Life-Pure) are the disciplines that contain the most individuals with negative responses to the question. In these disciplines, faculty and administrators tend to view their work as highly technical and guided by methodological canons that allow for impartial judgements of quality. However, as Table 13 also indicates, minority faculty in these disciplines have a different perspective. In the Hard-Nonlife-Pure department for example, the department chair responded negatively to the question thus, "Certainly not in (this department). No. Not at all." A tenured majority male faculty in the department responded, "I don't think the minority member would be looked at any differently than a majority member. In think the answer is no. It's in the nature of (the discipline)."
Table 13: BARRIERS TO PROMOTION AND TENURE BY BIGLAN CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, all three of the minority faculty interviewed in this department held views that contradicted those of their
colleagues. An Hispanic associate professor spoke of the huge advising load of minority students he was responsible for and the impact that had on his research:

One of the things that happens to minority faculty is that they get sucked into trying to help minority students. We have lots of people doing advising but they just don't care enough about the students. You know it might be that those minutes spent advising are well spent in terms of the career of a young individual, but the problem is it's just eating me up. I'm supposed to be writing a book and I was supposed to have the first chapter done by September 31 and I didn't so I'm in a shitload of trouble.

And later in the interview he talked of community and family commitments:

Half of (the community) are my relatives. Every week we have a wedding, a baptism, a birthday party or something. I'm a handyman, I've rebuilt our house. I build furniture. I don't have the time, you know, these people (his colleagues) are going out for hikes and going backpacking, and I'm over to my mother's house working on the plumbing or going to my sister's house to fix her couch or tutoring one of my nieces. I've been a very very busy person, so when I'm telling you I'm so busy, I'm ignoring the fact that as a human being I have tremendous social commitments to the community and that is something these academics don't have. I mean they come here, they're isolated and some of them can't do the work. I mean I just work my ass off being a (faculty member), raising a family, and being at all the social functions at the schools. I was president of the summer swim League, I mean I gave myself to my family and not just academics. I wonder what would have happened if actually I would have gone away somewhere, gotten my Ph.D. at a great place and then moved away. I could have actually been an academic. I mean who knows what I could have done.

The Hispanic female in this department is a first year faculty, one of two females, the other of whom was on
sabbatical. Working in an area that is dissimilar to the research of her colleagues, she is required to seek individuals outside of her department to serve on her evaluation committee. The barriers she perceives to promotion have more to do with her research being out of the mainstream of her discipline and her lack of collaboration with her colleagues. The other minority faculty, a Black male on a nontenure track noted a lack of encouragement among his colleagues:

I've got to believe that in as much as I think the numbers are so small, that there is not enough effort to encourage minorities to become qualified and tenured as there might be. Now, if the university can show that there's specific reasons that these people have not met the criteria, then I think that's valid. But I don't believe they're looking and saying 'this person is not meeting the criteria, how can we help him?' There's none of that. There may be some for majority people, I don't know.

Whereas none of the administrators in the Biglan categories of "hard" sciences thought that minorities encountered any unique barriers to promotion and tenure, administrators and minority faculty in the "soft" disciplines were much more likely to cite what they felt to be barriers. Numbers of minority faculty in these disciplines greatly exceed those in the hard sciences, and the "soft" disciplines tend to exhibit greater diversity in terms of methodological approaches involved in research and subjects that deal directly with minority concerns. Administrators in these
departments tend to be much more familiar with minority faculty concerns and have more direct experience dealing with them. The influence of disciplinary affiliation in affecting minority research interests is strong, and as will be discussed below, the devaluing and marginalizing of research concerning minorities emerged as an often mentioned barrier to promotion and tenure.

From the analysis of the affirmative responses by both majority and minority faculty and administrators, three categories of barriers to promotion and tenure emerged: 1) workload; 2) research differences; and 3) cultural differences. As with many of the variables explored in this study, these categories overlap and interact in complex ways that defy analysis as discrete variables. For example, cultural value differences may lead to placing emphasis in teaching or service dimensions of the academic role, and to research endeavors that differ from what is considered mainstream in a certain discipline, which may result in less emphasis placed on one's research. Differing emphases in aspects of the workload combined with research differences and lack of social networking with majority faculty may be factors in the feeling of isolation and powerlessness expressed by some minority faculty. Thus, the separation of these aspects into categories is not intended to imply distinctly discrete aspects of the minority experience.
Before proceeding to a discussion of the three categories considered by minorities as barriers to promotion and tenure, it is necessary to explore aspects of the relative weighting of the tripartite faculty duties of teaching, research, and service for the purpose of performance evaluation. The importance placed on each of these areas of evaluation will provide the context for further discussion of areas considered problematic by minority faculty.

**Weighting of Teaching, Research, and Service**

Because the setting for this study is a Research I university, it is not surprising that the large majority of faculty indicated research to be the most heavily weighted aspect of their performance. As illustrated in Table 14, respondents overwhelmingly feel that research is given the highest consideration for the purposes of promotion.

**Table 14:** What is the most heavily weighted aspect of the tripartite duties of the faculty for purposes of evaluation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT</th>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
<th>VARIES</th>
<th>EVENLY WEIGHTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The service element is omitted from this table because no respondents felt that it was heavily weighted. The heading
"varies" refers to responses indicating that the relative weighting of teaching and research varies by academic department, and the "evenly weighted" heading refers to responses indicating that teaching and research are given equal consideration in their department.

As a category of respondents, administrators were more likely to respond that the weighting of teaching and research varies by academic department or are given equal weight in their department. Deans and former deans in particular mentioned the variation among departments, as this statement from a former dean reveals,

In the general case I would say that virtually no weight at all is given to service. Largely because I as dean encourage many departments to clear out the decks for the junior people to spend their time doing teaching and research, and I think it's later that faculty members are expected to make conspicuous kinds of contributions. I think that's only reasonable. There's only so many hours in a day and days in a week. In any place that I've ever been, teaching and research have been recognized as paramount and so the junior faculty member who spends a great deal of time, energy, and effort doing service work is doing so at his or her own peril. With regard to the balance of teaching and research, obviously it varies from department to department. Some departments are not conspicuously research oriented, at least in the way it's understood in the rest of the (college). The perspective I tried to take and encouraged departments to take is that we need not be choosy, if presented with someone who was a fine scholar but a terrible teacher, they need not promote that person, and if presented with a person who was a fine teacher and not a very good scholar, they need not promote that person either. But the university has developed to the point where we can demand excellence on both sides and overall I think that's what we're getting. I saw extremely good
Researchers turned down for promotion, precisely because they didn't have the kind of balanced package that we could afford to demand.

Administrators spoke not only of variation among departments, but of the need for tailoring evaluations to the strengths of the individual faculty member. Rather than monolithic and uncompromising, standards of performance are seen as malleable, and subject to change on a yearly basis. This view does not reconcile with the opinion of others, primarily majority faculty, who maintain that one set of standards should be applied to all. In the following quote, a college dean indicated the need to personalize the criteria:

In my home department, it could be ranked research, teaching, and service. I tried to say to my performance review committee, 'look at what was agreed to last year and evaluate on that basis,' to some people it might be research, some teaching, and service. To others it might be teaching, service, and research, or any combination. I mean if you look in the college there are a number of us who have put in a lot of service for the university and have done good service. But it will vary from year to year. This year I wrote down 'okay, this is what you're expected to do and this is what you will be evaluated on,' rather than say everybody has to be the same mold.

Administrator's statements regarding the need to tailor evaluations to individual strengths, so that those who excelled in teaching would be properly rewarded, contrasted with the perceptions of their faculty, who overall felt that teaching was only of symbolic importance. Rhetorical analysis of language used by the predominantly majority male administrators and faculty who argued for more personalized
evaluations revealed the use of masculine metaphors in describing the variation of talent among the faculty. Chief among these were sports metaphors, such as the following from an administrator in the applied sciences:

You have some faculty that are better teachers than others and so in a P&T process in a department like mine it's a little difficult because the head evaluates the entire program and so when I have the person whose primary skills are service, and maybe much lesser skills in research, then I have to defend that faculty member, as this is where his emphasis must be. I need someone emphasizing service and teaching, not so heavy on research. Whereas in the other extreme, I may have another faculty member who stars in research and I need that too. The day of the football player who runs, passes, and kicks in an excellent manner are over, there's not too many people who can do that. So I think there are few faculty who can run fast, pass, and kick at the excellent level.

And this from another department chair in the pure sciences:

If I'm going to be a leader of a department I have to show sprints in service, teaching, and research. It's kind of like a baseball team or a football team, some people are good punters and some people good running backs. Some people are good blocking backs, and without a team effort the department can't go forward.

References to "triple threat quarterbacks" and academic "free agents" reveal that while the gatekeepers of academe may argue for the need to personalize and individualize the evaluation system, the universal prototype to which one is compared remains masculine and imbued with attributes that are consonant with those of their largely majority male departmental teammates.
Two of the departments in this study published guidelines for promotion and tenure that were quite specific concerning the number and type of publications listed as required for purposes of promotion. In one department the weighting was specified as 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. However a minority female in this department had the following comment regarding the written criteria:

Supposedly it's 40-40-20. This is what is in the guidelines for our department. Actually what it is if you don't have any research, forget it. You can be the best teacher in the world and not get tenure. If you do a lot of service it might count if you also do the research, but if not, forget it. If you're a great researcher and you have a lot of publications, and you are just a so-so teacher, then you're going to get it even if you do little or no service. The women in the department complain that the senior men don't get all the assignments we get, and they don't have to do all this stuff. And it's true when you look at how women are picked for a lot more service. I don't know if that's a function of the fact that we say no less often or that we're not as aggressive at telling the head to leave us alone. We've been socialized into thinking we need to help, you know. In this department women get put on a lot of committees.

Another department chair in the soft-life-pure discipline echoed the difference between the written criteria and reality, and expanded on the results of various combinations of teaching and research abilities present among faculty, a common theme among all respondents:

Research, teaching, and service, in that order. The question again is whether even though on paper research and teaching share an equal weight, in reality they don't. But the issue becomes how unequal it is. You know, if you're talking
percentages is it 50-50, 60-40, or is it 70-30. I'd probably say it's closer to 60-40 research to teaching. But another way of reporting it is that he can be an excellent researcher and an adequate teacher and more likely get a favorable tenure decision. Or if you're an adequate teacher and an adequate researcher you may not get tenure, as well as an excellent teacher but poor researcher would not get tenure. So there are those ranges, you know, if you're a lousy teacher and an excellent researcher you may end up getting it. All those combinations come into play. Service is sort of a pragmatic afterthought, nice if you do it, not particularly harmful if you don't.

In almost all departments, many faculty acknowledged a greater attention given to teaching in recent years. Some attribute this to a change in administration; the past President wishing to increase the national ranking of the university, and the recently hired President responsive to public pressure for greater attention to undergraduate teaching. The degree of the shift toward teaching varied greatly among disciplines, however. A finding with implications for further research on disciplinary variation is that among the "hard" science disciplines that traditionally stress research, faculty felt a change toward greater emphasis in teaching, whereas in the "soft" disciplines, most notably in the discipline most closely associated with pedagogy and curriculum development, the shift was unanimously indicated as away from teaching, toward greater research and publication. It is plausible that in the latter disciplines, the drift toward greater prestige, both intranstitutionally and as compared to similar disciplines in other universities, is a
powerful driving force in shaping the work of the faculty. Although many faculty do discern an effort to give more weight to teaching, it remains a distant second in decision making regarding promotion and tenure. In the words of one tenured minority male in the hard-nonlife-pure sciences who has served on various promotion and tenure committees:

There is a change there. But still teaching doesn't count worth a damn at this university. It is more difficult to get promoted if you're not a good teacher, but if you're a tremendous researcher no one gives a damn about your teaching. So teaching is really far down the line. When I came here it was all research. Now we see more concern about teaching but nevertheless if you're going to be promoted, it's all research.

It is not surprising that the faculty and administrators of this Research I university would see research as playing the dominant role in decisions regarding promotion and tenure. Such findings are predictable and perhaps pedestrian. However, when placed within this context, the experiences of minority faculty stand out in sharp relief, and the pressures placed on them to perform in areas of little recognition and reward assume an importance that warrants greater attention. Having established that teaching is secondary to research for purposes of evaluation, and service ranked a distant third, we now return to the three categories of barriers to promotion and tenure as indicated by those who affirmed the existence of such barriers.
Workload

By far the largest number of affirmative responses to the question of barriers to promotion and tenure dealt with the differential workload of minority faculty. Overloads in committee work, student advising, and community service are seen as major impediments to the timely completion of research. While administrators acknowledge the need to protect junior faculty from overloads in committee work in order that they concentrate on their research agenda, more than half felt that the service commitments of minorities were no different than those faced by other junior or senior faculty. In contrast, nearly more than 2/3 of the minority faculty interviewed felt their service commitments to be greater than those of their colleagues, with minority females in particular indicating a heavier service loads. Despite a policy statement from the Provost regarding the need to consider the service requirements of minority faculty during evaluation, many minorities felt their service overloads persisted and were not given adequate consideration. A nontenured minority faculty in a discipline that stresses public performance as a measure of research expressed a lack of consideration of his service commitments:

The frustration comes because one of the things I was told last year at my evaluation was that, yeah, I had good service, good teaching, but I had not been going out and my national visibility had slipped. And I thought, well why wasn't it said that 'It was perhaps because of...' and it didn't
say that, so that was a concern for me. I'm not denying that it slipped, because it has, but somebody reading that, and unless they take the effort to really find out the reason why it slipped, like saying 'I can see where that person's research area is a concern because God, look at the committees' but that's assuming that someone's going to take that extra step. I mean, someone at the university committee level, and if they are dealing with 800 tenure packages, they're not going to and so I thought there needed to be an explanation of why my research was of concern.

Beginning minority faculty who have not been apprised of the weighting of the duties of teaching, research, and service, either through written standards, advice of the department chair, or through informal collegial networks may see the invitation to serve on a committee as an honor bestowed upon them and may be unaware of the impact this has on time budgeted for the more heavily weighted research expectations. A second year minority male describes his initiation into the process:

QR: I served on, let's see, five committees last year. And we met once or twice a week with each committee.

KP: And how did that count for evaluation purposes?

QR: Just part of your job. When you're hired you serve on graduate committees. A graduate student comes up to you and says 'would you be on my committee?' I say, sure, what an honor. And that counts as part of your service. It's like third, on the level. Way down there.

KP: Were the performance expectations and how the whole evaluation process works explained to you, was it clear to you what the criteria were?
QR: Oh, now it is. Now it's clear because I wasn't sure at first how I was being evaluated. I was out there in the world and doing things. I was on (lists several university and community boards and committees) but when I found out that those things were third priority, I cut that off now. When I dropped it, the (public) committee couldn't believe I resigned. Why? Because it doesn't count, it doesn't do me any good. It gets in the way. So I really eliminated stuff, and everybody would laugh, oh, you volunteered to do that. But my first year I thought everybody had to do that. You know, somebody would call me up and say, 'we want you on this committee' and yessir, I'll be there. Now it's like I don't have time.

The lone majority male who felt that minorities face unique problems in promotion and tenure, a tenured professor in the hard sciences, spoke of the unfair expectations put upon minorities to serve on various committees, explaining this as a disservice promulgated primarily by campus affirmative action policy. Unlike the other majority males in this sample, he viewed the overburdening of minority faculty as a function of their minority status rather than a function of rank or simply the routine expectations of all faculty:

KP: You mentioned the potential for minority faculty to become overinvolved in committees that detract from their research time. Are those kinds of things more a function of their junior status?

WM: No, it's the fact that they're minority, and the university requires every committee to have one flavor of each kind on them. If you've got one Hispanic in your department and your department has to have ten university committees, and every one of those committees has to have a Hispanic (scientist) on it then your going to burn that Hispanic (scientist) out. It has nothing to do with the faculty members themselves, what it has to do with is the rules and regulations of the university and it's somewhat myopic view of affirmative action.
The biggest disadvantage of the affirmative action system, I think, is it doesn't take into account what it's doing to the minority faculty. The system is set up, I think, by these unreasonable expectations that make it much more difficult for minority faculty.

While the minority faculty in this population feel overburdened in the service arena, teaching loads are not deemed excessive and the greater number of faculty feel that their teaching loads are equivalent to those of their colleagues. Only 2 out of 13 minority males felt their teaching loads exceeded those of their colleagues, while 3 out of the 9 minority females indicated heavier teaching loads. Although the numbers of minority faculty who feel that their teaching load is excessive may be small, it is noteworthy that none of the majority males interviewed felt their teaching loads exceeded those of their colleagues in their respective departments.

Research Differences

Minority faculty in this population who choose research topics related to minority issues run the risk of having their research viewed as peripheral and inconsequential, as it is seen as affecting relatively small subpopulations. Not only is their research trivialized, it is held open to questions concerning the objectivity of the researcher, who is too "close" to his or her subject, therefore cannot achieve the degree of dispassionate objectivity that is the hallmark of
good science. Although a laboratory scientist working on the most minute aspects of an extremely specialized research area is able to globalize the importance of his or her inquiry, minority issues are rarely given such status, particularly if conducted by a minority researcher. A tenured Native American professor in the soft-life-pure discipline described how his research is devalued by his colleagues:

KP: In terms of your duties now in teaching and research, do you see yourself as more of a teacher than a researcher?

RO: Well, right now I like to think of myself as more of a teacher. I've been involved with an ongoing project for the last five years on (Native American related research) although it's not much recognized around here. I get letters of invitation from various groups and also travel to Washington a lot.

KP: How is that research viewed by your colleagues?

RO: Oh, God. Let's see. As a very small topic. That's the best word I suppose. Most of my colleagues would say that it is not all that important, particularly if it's about Indians. I've had people call and ask 'why are you doing this?' because to them it's a real insignificant population. I'm the top guy in the most insignificant research area (laughter). Way out of the mainstream. I'll tell you about (one of his former American Indian colleagues). He probably knows more about (American Indian related research topic) than anyone in the world. And the topic was considered so peripheral around some of our colleagues, and the word was that 'well, he's not really a scholar, he's a polemicist.' I heard that filtering through I don't know how many times. Then my research I hear isn't real research or something like that. You're always being considered on the periphery of real scholarship. No matter what kinds of things that you do and who you know. Unless it's a White man's argument,
presenting an Indian topic, then it's much more acceptable. I've noticed this all the time and I've been asked, 'how can you do this topic since you're so close to it?' That's why we're always called polemicists rather than scholars when we do our own research.

In the above faculty's discipline, the top journal has not published a minority-related article in the past twenty years, even though the discipline deals with both domestic and foreign public policy.

A recurrent theme among minority faculty was their colleagues' opinion of their work as "trendy," as it rode the waves of public opinion and sentiment, with the media playing a role in occasionally drawing attention to issues and concerns that involve various minority groups. The relatively recent introduction of journals specific to minority concerns draws minority faculty to publish where their research can reach those who find interest in minority scholarship. A Hispanic professor in the soft-nonlife-pure discipline recounted his experience in publication and research:

Another area of mine is popular culture and I edited journals. Well, popular culture in the minds of many is something kind of trivial and kind of trendy. It's not serious scholarship. Well in fact it is serious scholarship and I've had to fight that battle as well, to sensitize and educate colleagues as well as administrators on the value of my research. So that battle certainly sensitized me that if you choose to go in a specific research direction, one has to anticipate resistance along the way because people don't know better. I mean if you're being evaluated... Our (names a high ranking administrator) comes out of (the natural sciences) and I'm telling him I'm writing this book on (minority research topic). He
laughs. That was an actual occurrence, and you know in my efforts over ten years to educate this man about my research and the developing methodology, it has been to no avail. He's already formed his opinion.

The element of trendiness may work in favor of the minority scholar for a period of time, as one Hispanic assistant professor stated regarding his research, "It's working for me now, but how long is that going to last? What if it ends before it's time for me to go up for tenure? Uh-oh." But as a minority female stated, "even when we're in fashion, or in vogue, we're still considered some kind of illusory thing."

In addition to minority scholarship being characterized as trendy and insignificant, those minority academics who are recognized as contributing scholars are often seen as one-dimensional, and become typecast as spokespeople for their ethnic or racial group. Being characterized by their majority colleagues as exemplary scholars representing a particular racial group may be perceived as deprecatory by minority faculty, and they are often introduced with a racial qualifier as a "Black sociologist," a "Native American artist," or a "Hispanic physicist." A college Dean considered this a problem in terms of how research done by minorities may be evaluated for purposes of promotion and tenure:

The biggest problem with minority faculty is that they often have difficulty in the identity of minority faculty. A lot of them don't want to represent the Black group, they want to represent
(scholars), you know. So the problem is that some people when you first start to identify them or whatever, typify them in their role as minority. Nobody typifies me as French. They typify me as the dean and that's a different thing. But if you were on the faculty, they would say 'oh, you're a Native American (scholar)', but you get this other qualifier which some people resent. So when you can abolish that and still call it in when you need to, but recognizing that you do not really represent all of Native Americans' opinion, that you represent your own opinion. You don't feel like every time an issue comes up you have to be the representative. But sometimes you're always the one that has to antagonize over advancing minority issues. And, unfortunately that spills over into the research arena, where one is identified as only doing work that impacts a small segment of the population.

While the research of a minority faculty member may typecast the scholar, or is seen as trendy and insignificant, in some cases it is neither recognized nor understood by colleagues within the department or the university. A number of minority faculty felt that their contributions received greater recognition in other professional venues than within their home department or the university. A minority female who has been at the institution for twenty-three years without being promoted to full professor stated that "I do my own thing out there and so I'm known more out there than in here." One of her colleagues in the department concurred, adding that much of what she was recognized for in the professional community external to the university was counted as service rather than research. When she presented her research to her
colleagues, there were difficulties in having it accepted as bonafide scholarship:

For many years, every year, I wrote proposals which were accepted and I spoke at national conventions. I stopped doing that so much because it really wasn't valued in my evaluations. They sort of ignored that. As far as my research, my colleagues basically don't understand it. Initially I would get peer reviews like "you need to develop a line of inquiry," and I would go through the whole thing, spelling it out the next time around. The next time it would be the same, "you need to develop a line of inquiry." This time I finally tried a different tack and wrote it up differently and they accepted the fact that I had a line of inquiry. But the comment was I needed to broaden my focus, I was too narrow. Which said to me they've accepted the fact that I have a line of inquiry but they still don't understand what it's about even though I went to a great deal of effort to try to spell it out in as much depth as I possibly could. I think we have to recognize that we read from our biases, we interpret from our biases, and it's not unusual in the professorship for people to place value judgements and weights on research that is biased by their own preferences.

In the social sciences, humanities, and in some professional schools, the issue of paradigm differences becomes an important factor that impacts the evaluation of minority research. Ethnic and gender studies in particular are criticized as not having a distinct and established methodology, nor a recognized body of theory and literature that distinguishes them from the more traditional disciplines. The tendency of minority faculty to engage in applied research that impacts their ethnic or racial groups in practical ways was noted by a female faculty member who has sat on university and college-wide committees for a number of years:
An issue that I think is important is the issue of paradigm differences. It tends to be minorities who are doing such work, they're doing applied work for their own people. Some people can't realize that you can do research on applied work. I mean we have these arguments between ethnographers and the hard experimental types that just keep pushing and they say 'how can you call that research, what data do you collect?' And even knowing what evidence is or data is depends on what you believe knowledge is all about. When minorities working from different paradigms conducting applied research are evaluated at college or university wide levels there may be sociologists or psychologists who can't appreciate some of the things they are doing and they decide that it's applied work and not 'real work.' I mean I was on one promotion and tenure committee where research on composition was considered non-research because it was remedial and there is no place for remedial work at the universities. When you have one or two people on the promotion and tenure committee who feel this way they can sway the whole committee because they can lead the discussion toward 'let's look at this person's research and let's see what paradigm they're using, and is this really research.' When somebody starts the committee discussion in that vein, they can sway a whole committee.

While faculty and administrators acknowledge the difficulty of evaluating teaching performance, many majority faculty and administrators feel it is relatively easy to judge quality research. Scientific contributions and the impact of ones research on their field are objectively judged through peer review, and especially in the hard sciences, ones race, gender, or class has no bearing on their research. As one department head stated, "We really do basic research here and I doubt very seriously whether a fruit fly or an insect or a rat cares what color you are." Such opinions were abundant
among faculty in the hard sciences, where basic research is viewed as separate from political or racial ideology. This theme was discussed in depth in a previous section that deals with the uniqueness of minority contributions to the academic profession.

Cultural Differences

Differences in cultural values may impact how one defines their role as faculty and the importance they place on aspects of teaching, research, and service. Hispanic professors pointed to the importance of the family, and how familial relationships are sometimes carried over into relationships with students, especially students from the ethnic community. A female Hispanic spoke of the importance placed on human relations and classroom teaching, describing minority faculty as "professors for their people,"

I've seen a lot of minority professors give a lot of weight to student interaction. In being devoted to students, helping students, especially if the students are from their own ethnic community. I'm speaking specifically of people in the department who are working with Hispanic, Chicano, and Latino students. When minority scholars become the teachers of these people they feel such an obligation to be more than teachers, to be mentors, to be helpers, almost relatives. They attend a lot of community functions because they feel this strong link with the community and they set up a good role model. But unfortunately their scholarship suffers. They have had trouble with the process of promotion and tenure because in their eyes this service that they are rendering is the real thing that they're supposed to be doing. The scholarship is fine and good but it doesn't have the human quality of connecting with humanity. They see themselves as professors for their people.
I've seen at least three cases where they really got into trouble because that's not what the expectations are from the mainstream.

Family obligations weigh heavily on some minority faculty as their responsibilities involve caring for members of their extended family. One of the two minority administrators pointed out how cultural values can impact the workload of minority faculty, particularly minority women:

I found that with Hispanic women, not universally, but in most cases, it is the heavy family obligations and family orientation. A heightened sense of responsibility toward child rearing, but also care of the extended family, caring for the grandmother, for example. I find this among the students, by the way too, that choices have to be made and that those have to be taken into consideration. You know, we don't function in the professional arena only. We function as members of families, as members of communities, and you have to schedule work around those things. For the indigenous Hispanic, the heightened sense of family obligation has to be taken into consideration. I'll use a Hispanic assistant professor in my department as an example. I don't know if it's the nurturing or sense of dedication to students or what, but this person is an excellent teacher. She's the best teacher we have. But she's way behind on her research because she puts so much time into teaching. I don't penalize her for that but simply try to make it that she has a research semester, say take a semester, no teaching, and get your book written. So you have to work around those personal or family priorities, and I think they emerge larger with ethnic faculty.

Differences in culture can contribute to a feeling of isolation among minority faculty, who may not share either the social or professional interests of their colleagues and have very little interaction with them on an informal basis. As a nontenured Black female explained, she did not play golf or
tennis nor choose to participate in departmental politics, but saw her family concerns as paramount. Despite long years of schooling, preparation, and socialization into the profession, cultural values remain intact for many and clash with mainstream values and expectations. A minority female of Hispanic and Native American descent talked of being only "partially assimilated,"

Well, it's just a very different kind of system and I'm already partially assimilated. I'm sort of betwixt and between, and that's a common experience. You really don't fit in anywhere. I mean I couldn't go back to my old neighborhood. I'm not the same as I was then. Although I must say that my family is pretty cool, I mean most Mexican American families are. No matter what you do you're o.k. But it's not the same culturally. I think there is real agony. My own intuitive hunch is that it goes back to the Native American part of Mexican American, think that's the most problematic culture blend. I think for African Americans poverty is more of an issue, I think their culture is more compatible with the anglo culture than Native American is. I think there's a real clash there. There's just a real different way of thinking, a real different value system. I mean I just haven't been able to give up this business about valuing people as individuals, you know, but in mainstream society you just don't get ahead that way. I spend a lot of time with students, and even though my classes are large, I spend time with them. But I don't publish as many papers as I would if I didn't do that. I think there are things that are really different because of values. I mean it bothers me that the University doesn't value older people, we just throw old people away, they're worthless, dispensable. That really bothers the hell out of me. And I think that's cultural, 'younger is better' and I don't believe that, and it affects my work. I don't like the people in my field, they're nasty and snooty, interpersonally rude. They treat people terribly. It really bothers me. I just don't agree with the way people treat other people.
From these and other similar statements it is apparent that many minority faculty feel strongly about these cultural differences and the effect they have on their professional work. For these individuals culture is not an abstraction, but a part of their everyday lived experiences that directly impact how they approach their role as academic professionals, and what they deem important. Conversely, majority faculty minimize the importance of cultural background and its effects in the academic arena, where performance is evaluated solely on the basis of its scientific merit. Research differences, cultural differences, and differential workloads affect the professional advancement of minority faculty in ways that differ from their majority colleagues, yet majority faculty continue to minimize such differences.

**Summary**

The minority faculty in this sample point to differentiations in workload, and differences in research interests that present barriers to advancement in the professorial ranks. Differences in the type of research pursued by minorities, especially in the "soft" science disciplines, may be based on preferences for studies related to their ethnic backgrounds. Often these types of studies are not published in mainstream journals or accorded the stature of more traditional disciplinary research. Cultural
differences also impact the way in which minority faculty define their professional roles, and the emphasis they place on their functions as teachers, role models, and community leaders detracts from their research activity, which is the most heavily weighted facet of the performance evaluation.

Interviews of majority faculty revealed that most do not feel that minorities encounter any barriers to promotion and tenure that are different than majority faculty. On the contrary, many feel minorities enjoy an advantage in promotion and tenure because of their special status as protected groups. An equally common perception is that the nature of the scientific enterprise acts to neutralize racial and cultural differences in the academic environment, where the application of impersonal standards and the uniformity of procedures ensures that the evaluation process is untainted by extraneous influences.

Clearly the organizational experience of minorities differs in distinct ways from that of their majority colleagues. In the following chapter, I explore questions regarding the definition of quality performance for purposes of promotion and tenure, and whether systematic differences can be noted in those definitions.
CHAPTER VIII

INTERPRETATIONS OF QUALITY AND EXCELLENCE

Quality and Excellence in Academic Performance

The literature on faculty diversity, and the rhetoric of many of the conferences and professional meetings held on the subject of recruiting and retaining minority faculty, often argue for an expanded version of quality and excellence in gauging academic performance that allows for the diverging interests of culturally and racially different faculty. While such rhetoric abounds, very few glimpses are offered of a landscape in which minority faculty are empowered to the extent in which their visions of quality become integral in determining the worth of their professional performance. Statements in the literature pertaining to minority faculty's differing interpretations of quality and excellence in academic performance lead to the first research question posed in this inquiry: How do faculty and administrators interpret standards of quality, merit, and excellence, and are there discernible and consistent differences between majority and minority interpretations of professional performance standards?

Faculty and administrators were asked how one determines quality and excellence in their respective disciplines for purposes of evaluation for promotion and tenure. A word count
of responses was conducted in which nine categories were constructed. The categories are presented in order of response frequencies in Table 15, and the ranking of responses is illustrated for each category of respondent.

TABLE 15: INDICATORS OF QUALITY AND EXCELLENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANKING</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>ADM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Refereed Journals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Consensus of peers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Scientific contributions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reputation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Research Attributes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collegiality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (tie) Student development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WM= majority males; MM= minority males; MF= Minority females; WF= majority females; ADM=administrators

In Table 15, the scientific contributions category includes references to advancing the field, innovation, original research, and actual discoveries. Productivity refers to the number of papers published and grants secured, and in very few instances, number of courses taught. The category of reputation includes references to international and national recognition and prestige. Consensus of peers includes peer review of research as well as committee and collegial consensus regarding the quality of a faculty member's work. References to quality teaching include
statements concerning good teaching, dissemination of knowledge, preparation of course material and peer review of teaching. Research attributes include statements describing qualities such as accuracy and balance, and descriptions of research as interesting, exciting, and informative. Student development refers to producing quality students, helping students develop, and acting as a role model. The category of collegiality includes statements concerning shared norms of the academic community, willingness to contribute to the department, cooperativeness, and good interpersonal relationships. The remaining category of publication in refereed journals is self-explanatory.

Overall, faculty were more likely to speak of "productivity" as the predominant measure of quality for purposes of promotion and tenure. The top six indicators of quality and excellence in performance, and seven out the ten determinants of quality most often mentioned, relate to research activities. The most frequently mentioned indicators of excellence are interrelated, as publication in refereed journals requires peer review of one's work, and productivity is measured by the number of publications in top journals as well as the number of successful peer reviewed grant applications. Among majority faculty, no mention of the teaching function occurred during the discussion of
excellence, while only scant mention of teaching excellence was made by administrators.

Administrative interpretations of excellence

Among administrators, the discourse of quality and excellence was dominated by discussions of "advancing the frontiers of knowledge" and of making "impact" on selected fields of inquiry. Impact was generally referred to in relation to original scholarly accomplishments that, according to the following administrator in the hard sciences, are not difficult to distinguish:

The most important component of excellence in performance is evidence of original scholarly accomplishment and that is manifested in the sciences by publication, by national recognition, by invitations to national meetings, but more importantly, what you've actually discovered. Our criteria for excellence is really scholarly accomplishment. And in the sciences that is reasonably easy to assess because there are reasonable measures of the quality of journals. You can evaluate with reasonable fairness whether someone has made a genuine contribution.

According to administrators, significant and meaningful contributions to scholarly pursuits are recognized by experts in the field, and the recognition of experts brings an element of prestige to an academic department. As indicated by the rankings in Table 15, administrators, more that any other group, are concerned with the reputation of the faculty member, which is manifested in the recognition they receive from others in the field. Presumably, the recognition and
prestige of an individual faculty member can increase the prestige of the department in relation to others within the institution, thus putting it in better position to vie for scarce institutional resources.

In terms of productivity as a measure of excellence, administrators were more concerned with sustained engagement in scholarly pursuits over time than other categories of respondents. Reservations were expressed regarding faculty who exhibited a flurry of publications prior to tenure review, then leveled off after tenure was granted. A dean of applied sciences stated his expectation in terms of continued productivity:

My feeling is that for any person who is hired we anticipate that person will make tenure, and I tell all my candidates that we will not hire anyone if we do not think that person will make tenure. There's a lot of responsibility with that person. If you don't work hard, you don't get tenure. I think the promotion and tenure process is one in which, as I tell all my candidates, the first year of the six year period is just as important as the sixth year. And the reason I say that is that one of the gauges is evidence of continuing success. It's always a little bit of concern to me if I see someone that has been rocking along and as the deadline approaches all of a sudden there is this groundswell of interest and this tremendous output. Because that does suggest that the person hasn't been looking at the issues continually, and there's the danger that a person may say 'well I'm over that hurdle, now I can really relax.' That of course is something we're all concerned about because we want people to be as productive as they possibly can be.

Although administrators are concerned with continuous and productive scholarship, the majority admit that colleagues
sitting on evaluation committees and department chairs rarely read the work of the faculty under review. Rather, the number of publications in reputable journals serves as "concrete" manifestations of excellence:

It's clear in a Research I university that faculty members are to be continuously and productively engaged in their profession, and that specifically means that you engage in creative scholarship which is manifested in writing books and articles. It also means of course that you are doing an excellent job in the classroom. I'm not certain we've devised very good ways of monitoring the performance in the latter regards, but on the other hand, I'm not sure we've devised very good ways of monitoring performance in the former regards either. There are concrete manifestations of excellence in research, you can count up someone's articles, or see where they were placed. But I think it's a rare faculty member that sits down and reads something one of his colleagues or her fellows has written, which in itself is a sad commentary on academia. But again, I think that the continuous engagement in scholarly pursuits is to me the key to promotion and tenure.

That both faculty and administrators find it difficult to articulate the meaning of quality and excellence was remarked upon by a dean in the soft-life-applied disciplines. While the "community of scholars" often communicates the norms of scholarship in implicit ways, the administrator translates excellence in terms of sustained engagement in a problem of "educational significance" as defined by his or her peers:

KP: The Handbook for Appointed Personnel says that faculty are be evaluated on the quality of their performance and promise of continued excellence. How do you determine quality and excellence in performance?
DA: Well, that's an interesting question in the sense that, if one has to put in writing what it means, the specifics, then you've lost a piece of what we mean by the academy. Which is this idea of shared norms and notions of scholarship that have become part of the culture. And that culture is communicated in much the same kinds of ways as culture is communicated in the macroenvironment. By families and communities. Presumably you have a community of scholars, and that part of the work of earning a doctorate is the communication of culture, of norms of scholarship. That's part of acquiring the discipline, and if that's not done, then I think that one's graduate education was neglected. Today there is a loss of professional family in the same way there is a loss of personal family. When I meet with faculty going up for promotion and tenure, part of my job as dean is to translate some of that Handbook of Appointed Personnel into specific actions. But I never feel you can get fully descriptive of it because if you had to, then that meant that some of the norms were gone and the culture wasn't communicating as it should. But essentially I believe that over a period of time an individual is engaged in a sustained way on a problem of educational significance, and approaching and contributing to the solution of that problem in ways that one's professional colleagues regard as useful, informative, helpful, exciting. But the idea is that you're engaged in inquiry in a sustained way, on a worthwhile problem, with results that one's professional peers find useful. That's my notion of translating the idea of academic excellence.

The assumption made by the above administrator is that socialization into the culture of the discipline instills shared norms and beliefs that permeate the actions and behaviors of the faculty, such that organizational interpretations of quality and excellence in performance become mutually interpreted and understood. The model put forth is of a professional family bound together by a set of
common ideals that transcend individual and particularistic forces that are harmful to the "community of scholars."

As the official interpreters of institutional ideology, and the gatekeepers to the upper ranks of the faculty hierarchy, administrators are held accountable to the general public, who have shown increasing concern for the productivity of the faculty. In emphasizing continued research productivity while giving lip-service to teaching and student development, administrators ignore an entire range of faculty contributions. Hence the specific contributions that minority faculty may make in terms of acting as role models, increasing the cultural diversity of the faculty, and bringing new viewpoints to traditional disciplines are of no particular advantage to their professional advancement in the academy.

Faculty interpretations of excellence

Overall, minority faculty descriptions of quality and excellence in performance paralleled those of their majority colleagues. References to productivity, publication in refereed journals, and consensus of peers consistently dominated the discourse of all faculty. Majority females made more references to peer consensus of quality than the other three categories of respondents, and made much less reference to productivity, in terms of numbers of publications, as a measure of excellence. Noticeably absent from the discussion of quality performance among majority males and females were
references to quality teaching, although quality teaching received few references among minorities as well. Differences in what was considered quality in research fell along disciplinary lines. Among those in the hard-nonlife-pure sciences, actual discoveries and scientific breakthroughs are seen as the embodiment of quality performance:

You become known as excellent in your field if your work leads to a breakthrough. You get to be known as making original and important contributions, and that's what I would call quality work.

Because of the connection to technology and industry, faculty in the applied sciences tend to emphasize grant funded research as a measure of quality. Not only do research grants provide discretionary money to the department by way of overhead costs, they provide funding for research assistants and lab equipment. For purposes of evaluation, the supposedly "blind" nature of peer reviewed grants serves as a surrogate measure of recognized excellence:

They basically count publications in our department. Publications and research grants. I think its more true in (the discipline) because they expect you to make money, and if you don't have research grants, they don't look on that very kindly. They want research dollars. They're not going to deny tenure, especially if you have quality publications, but they're not going to hold you very highly unless you bring money to them.

In the soft-nonlife-applied disciplines, creativity is equated with excellence. Faculty in those disciplines felt that the university operated on a research model that emphasized the hard sciences, making it imperative that
university review committees have representation from their college. A majority female faculty member articulated the need to distinguish between the scientific model and the model for creativity used in the disciplines of her college:

I think each person is so different and particularly in our department we have very many different fields. I served on a review committee for a number of years and it became clear to me that my understanding of what scientists do in terms of publications was similar to a scientist's understanding of what we do. In other words we really don't understand. It became very clear to me in looking at the difference between evaluating scientific research and creative research that there were several differences. We don't get big research grants, so when I make a large piece of sculpture that costs me five to ten thousand dollars to make, that's out-of-pocket cash. I don't get a research grant for that. Art shows or musical performances are different kinds of research. Spending three or four years on a art piece is like doing a book. So there are different criteria that we have to look at. There are also interesting nuances in terms of minorities' work in that they often don't have enough history and background in their work for the evaluation process, because the history and tradition of the discipline play large roles in defining excellence.

While categorizing and counting the references made in relation to quality and excellence illuminated differences in priorities and attitudes between faculty and administrators, the method of analysis shed little light on any systematic differences that may exist among minority and majority male and female faculty. In asking the question of how quality and excellence are determined in their respective disciplines for purposes of promotion and tenure, faculty responded most often in terms of the structure and mechanics of the process rather
than in substantive statements describing what they consider excellent work. Thus, indicators of excellence tend to be consistent, e.g., peer review, publication in refereed journals, and measures of productivity. Differences in measures of productivity, such as numbers of grants, publications, and performances, were more reflective of the variation in disciplinary and departmental norms than of racial, class, or gender differences, which suggests that disciplinary socialization and organizational context play a powerful role in defining quality performance. While minority faculty acknowledge that quality, for the purposes of promotion and tenure, is defined in terms of research productivity, their preference for research topics, as elucidated in the previous chapter, are often at odds with what is considered valid subject matter. Because minority faculty articulate performance quality and excellence in terminology indistinguishable from their majority colleagues does not imply a consensus in judgements concerning the quality of the outcomes of productivity. In terms of the outcomes of productivity, minority faculty feel their contributions are undervalued. Perhaps more importantly, it is the majority faculty, through enforcement of the disciplinary boundaries of scholarship, and administrators, through their articulation of the research ideology, that control and frame the discourse of quality and excellence.
The apparent contradiction of minorities feeling that their research is devalued, and placing more emphasis on service and teaching dimensions of their performance, while simultaneously defining quality in terms of research productivity is a reflection of the powerful manner in which discourse is constrained and controlled by disciplinary and institutional forces.

The imperatives of the research institution permeate the discourse of administrators and provide evidence of what the institution considers the integral role of faculty. For faculty, becoming socialized into the institutional culture entails learning what is important to professional advancement in the institution, while the disciplinary socialization provided in graduate school has instilled the norms of the academic discipline. Disciplinary and organizational socialization are not necessarily consonant, however, and may operate in a dialectic fashion. Evidence of this is provided by responses to the question of whether faculty members define their primary role as teachers or as researchers. The influence of one's discipline is apparent in Table 16, which illustrates the response to this question by discipline.

Clearly, most faculty in the soft disciplines define their primary role as a teacher, whereas the majority of faculty in the hard sciences see their role as researcher. Three minority males in the hard sciences defined their roles
TABLE 16: DO YOU SEE YOURSELF PRIMARILY AS A TEACHER OR RESEARCHER?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>RESEARCHER</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>majority males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as primarily teaching, but no majority males in the hard sciences defined their roles as teachers. Paradoxically, faculty in the soft disciplines define their primary role as lying in the area that counts less in terms of occupational
advancement and is admittedly the most problematic in terms of
evaluation, yet articulate excellence in terms of the role
they see as secondary. The pressures of the institutional
reward structure therefore place constraints on the discourse
of excellence and quality by skewing rewards, both pecuniary
and occupational, toward those whose primary role is
consistent with institutional values. Because of their
alignment with those disciplines in which individuals define
their primary role as the transmission of knowledge, minority
faculty are not accorded the rewards and privileges of those
whose primary role is the "discovery of knowledge."

The finding that both majority and minority faculty
acknowledge the overall importance of research productivity in
determining excellence in performance, and define the
indicators of quality performance in common terms, does not
imply a normative consensus in terms of defining excellence.
On the contrary, as explicated in the following section of
this chapter, very little consensus seems to exist in terms of
defining quality work.

Consensus of Quality

Faculty and administrators were asked if there was a
consensus of what is considered quality performance in their
departments. Table 17 illustrates the response to this
question.
Table 17: Is There a Consensus of Quality in Your Department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority males</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority females</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the groups interviewed, only administrators had a majority responding that a consensus exists within their department regarding quality work. The increasing specialization of academic work emerged as a major theme in responses to this question. As a minority male in the applied sciences states, the narrowness of his specialty makes it difficult to determine quality work:

In my research field, there's only a thousand people who really give a damn about anything I would do. You know, that's really a small number of people. Then in the universities, my fellow professors in my department, we all work in our own little research groups. There's only one or two people in my department who would know anything about what I'm doing in research. So how do you form a consensus about whether you think one of your colleagues who is not in your field is doing quality work? Gosh, that's a tough one.

According to the department chair of the above faculty member, however, judgements need not be made on a personal understanding of an individual's work. In a response common among administrators, reliance on peer review and reputable journals becomes the measure of quality even though one's immediate peers in the department may not understand the work of the person they are evaluating:
Our P&T committee will represent a number of departments, and they have to judge on the basis of the dossier that is developed, including letters of reference and the background of the referees. So they don't make personal judgements in terms of whether they understand everything about that individual's work. But if you put your stuff in journals, it's before God and everybody. And in every case there are people who have commented on the research, and the author responds. So you put your stuff out there and people say 'hey, that's a great idea,' or 'that looks very good.' Or in some cases they might say, 'we don't think you've considered this, this, and this.' So we put things out for evaluation and it goes to everybody that subscribes to that particular journal.

In many cases faculty and administrators rely on refereed journal publication and the evaluations of external peers in judging the quality of a colleague's work, rather than reading the documents submitted by the faculty under review. As a tenured faculty member in the hard-life-pure sciences states, one needs good reviews by prominent people in the field, and unless a departmental committee has experts in the field of the faculty under review, the evaluation committee does not read the papers submitted:

KP: How does one judge quality and excellence when evaluating a faculty member?

MC: Well, it's by publications and the opinions of prominent researchers in one's field. It's possible to have a small publication record and be rated as excellent provided some really big names have looked at this work and evaluate it as outstanding work. I think either you have to have very good reviews by prominent people in your area or else you have to have a very big publication record.

KP: Does the evaluation committee normally read those publications?
MC: They don't read them unless the committee has an expert in that area available. A non-expert on the committee would not attempt to make an evaluation. Outside letters are requested from experts in the field, international experts, in this area. One goes pretty much by what they say as a group.

The department chair of the above faculty concurred with the need to go outside of the department when expertise does not exist within the committee to determine quality:

In terms of evaluations, we're looking for people who have a good record or have done good work in the past. They indicate they can make significant contributions to their area which are recognized by other people in the area. In an area that we are not familiar with, we ask other people in the specialty to do the evaluation. When major questions about a person come up regarding promotion or tenure, we go external.

In one of the departments in the soft sciences, a three member faculty committee is charged with reading all of the papers submitted by the faculty member up for promotion or tenure. As the department chair states, even in this instance, it is difficult to escape the biases that may exist in terms of what the reviewers deem as quality publication, as particular journals may be rated higher by some than others:

There's not really a consensus now. In some respects an implicit heirarchy of journals remains. Obviously the three person committee will make a first pass, saying 'ok, this person has done x number of pieces, so many are in these kinds of journals, so many in those' but they are also expected to make a comment, to evaluate the quality irrespective of where they are published. But still people will have biases in that they perceive a hierarchy of journals and if your articles are not in the accepted ones, it raises questions about whether it can be really that good, because if it
were really that good it would be published somewhere else. So you try to control it somewhat by having people address the issue of quality directly, but every individual is going to have their particular biases about what's good and not good on what basis.

Although the above administrator acknowledged the issue of personal biases in determining quality, administrators overall were much less likely than faculty to acknowledge spurious elements that enter into decision making. The composition of the committee can make a tremendous difference on the outcome of the evaluation. As a majority female in the soft sciences states, judgments are not always made on the basis of quality work and the criteria for quality can shift according to the makeup of a committee:

In my department, I don't know. I think, in other departments I would say yes, there is perhaps a consensus. In my department I think we have to look at the other factors that are involved. I don't know if work is always assessed on the basis of its quality, but I would like to think that it was. I would have to say that some of my colleagues are not as open and fair as the department head. I think other factors come into play, like petty jealousies. There's a lot of pettiness. So unfortunately I can't say that some work would be judged on consensus of quality, I think depending on who is on the committees it would make a difference. I think the criteria can shift. Because they know you, they might hold something against you. Unfortunately these things may exist. I don't think they're right, I don't like them, but I think it happens. So I think we like to talk about quality and want to talk about judging a candidate according to the quality of his or her file, but I don't know if others would judge me as fairly as I would judge them.
The lack of consensus exists at all levels of the evaluation process and is particularly evident in administrators' interpretations of excellence in performance, which more closely resembles the official institutional ideology with its emphasis on the advancement of knowledge through research. Judgements of quality are subject to shifts in criteria and committee makeup, or the makeup of external evaluators. Contradictions abound in the statements of faculty and administrators who find it easy to judge good work, yet admit that the work submitted by faculty is often not read, and they must rely heavily on external evaluators. Even though faculty within departments rely on external peer review to judge quality, and make the best case for promotion at the departmental level, most promotion and tenure cases are denied at the college and provost levels, which are the furthest removed from actually making first hand judgements of quality research.

Despite the similarity in terms used to define quality performance, most faculty admit that there is no consensus in determining quality work. While acknowledging the prominence of research in determining quality, minority faculty feel pressured to perform in areas other than those most equated with performance excellence, thus they are placed in a tenuous position in terms of professional advancement. Moreover, as we have seen, the unwritten rules of faculty promotion play a
large role in career advancement, regardless of the awareness that exists in terms of the indicators of quality performance.

Definitions of a "good" faculty member

In describing the difficulties inherent in studying the values and beliefs of faculty, Kenneth P. Ruscio (1987) notes that asking academics what they value is different than asking them what they do. The device suggested by Ruscio to gain insight into the values of academics is to have them construct a model of an outstanding academic. In this study, respondents were asked to describe the attributes of a "good" faculty member.

Of the 46 respondents asked the question "What constitutes a good faculty member?," 38 of the respondents (82%) responded in terms of teaching responsibilities, or some combination of teaching and research, with teaching the primary emphasis. Only six respondents described aspects of collegiality, and only two faculty responded that good research was the primary mark of a good faculty member. The following are typical responses:

I think the most important thing is teaching. That is the reason for being here. You have to be a good teacher not only in terms of giving the students what they want, but be challenging, exciting. (nontenured minority female)

Your teaching should be first priority. Your research responsibilities are often a little more flexible, so you can delay those, but everything has to work around teaching and scheduling, so I think that's basically the way it should be. (nontenured majority male)
For starters, you have to say a good faculty member is a good teacher. That really is a distinguishing element of being a faculty member. Connecting with students at their own level, conveying information with a sense of elation and appeal, rather than simply presenting stuff in front of them. Anyone you would call a good faculty has to have that talent. (majority male department chair in the hard applied sciences)

One who leads his or her students, goes with them every step of the way and helps them solve various kinds of problems. Maybe he develops in that person a quality of humaneness which may be lacking. This is a great attribute, a great quality to have, humaneness in teaching. (majority male dean in the soft-nonlife-applied fields)

Just as those who described the good faculty member as a good teacher fit no single profile, those who emphasized collegiality were representative of different disciplines, and no pattern existed along racial or gender lines:

I think good faculty have a sense of organization and a some very strong loyalties. They're hard workers and they put in long hours. They care about their work and the work of others. (dean in the soft-life-applied disciplines)

A good faculty member is one who puts the interests of the university and the department ahead of his or her own. One who makes contributions to the department and the university as well. (tenured minority male)

When you say good faculty member, something comes up for me that is different than say a good professional. A good professor is a good teacher, willing to play along, be collegial, come to faculty meetings. A good professional is one that really lends service to the profession. Some people are very good scholars but not necessarily good faculty members in the sense of not being good team members, not good members of the community. (minority female nontenured)
The responses concerning faculty and administrators' description of the good faculty member are the reverse of their descriptions of what constitutes quality performance for purposes of evaluation. Research productivity was rarely mentioned as a primary attribute of a good faculty member, yet in evaluating faculty for the purposes of promotion and tenure and in describing quality academic performance it assumes a supreme position. This finding is a corollary of the observation by other scholars of faculty culture (Boyer, 1990; Clark, 1987; Roskens, 1987) who find it paradoxical that faculty spend most of their time in classroom teaching, which is not the activity most rewarded by the institution nor most valued by academic community at large. In the setting of the research university, where research productivity assumes a prominent role in faculty promotion and definitions of quality, it remains an anomaly that most faculty define their roles as teachers, state that teaching is the most important attribute of a good faculty member, yet focus on research as the vehicle for professional advancement.

When visions of excellence are interpreted through an institutional ideology that imposes impersonal and universalistic standards on faculty performance, the imperatives of the research institution combine with administrative interpretations of quality to contribute to the dissonance that exists between faculty definitions of quality
performance and definitions of a good faculty member. Stated another way, the performance expectations of the institution and its administrators are often at odds with values and norms that faculty hold as members of the academic profession; however by virtue of their control of the resources needed for occupational advancement and by imposing institutional definitions of performance excellence, those in positions of power effectively frame the discourse of quality. Albeit of no particular value to career advancement, individual faculty retain notions of what it takes to be a good member of the academic profession, but are relatively ineffectual in asserting a collective mandate that defines and rewards their work in the institution.

Summary

It is plausible that the professional socialization process experienced by minority faculty and the tendency of research universities to select those most likely to conform to longstanding institutional structures and practices act to constrain minority efforts to find a voice in articulating their vision of excellence. Thus, the minorities in this sample could speak only in frames of reference provided by those in power, and in so doing contribute to the perpetuation of existing power relationships and reaffirmation of the status quo.
It is against this backdrop of conflicting ideologies that minority faculty go about their daily work, the least represented among the faculty who remain, as a whole, weakly represented in terms of institutional policy making. While no systematic evidence emerged from the interviews that would indicate that minority faculty define the attributes of a good faculty differently than majority faculty, or describe performance excellence in different terms than their majority colleagues, it is clear within the context of other facets of this inquiry that they believe that their academic contributions remain devalued, that their cultural uniqueness is trivialized, and their common concerns as oppressed groups marginalized in an organizational culture that emphasizes competitive individualism and meritocratic advancement.

Richard Chait and Andrew Ford (1987) conclude that, "Meritocracy based on the meticulous examination of a professor's work is at the core of academic tenure." Because the concept of merit is a overriding principle guiding faculty professionalism, Chapter 9 explores faculty beliefs regarding the concept of merit, and whether minority faculty hold different conceptions of the merit principle.
CHAPTER IX
THE MERITOCRATIC IDEOLOGY

Introduction

The modern university is traditionally characterized as a meritocracy, in which scholars exhibiting excellence in the common ideals of scholarship and teaching are rewarded and recognized in a number of ways, both pecuniary and nonpecuniary. Inherent in the concept of merit is the assumption of an open reward system in which individuals assume their rightful occupational position based on their natural skills and abilities which in turn affect their level of productivity and achievement. In an academic setting, the norms of science provide a rational foundation for decisions regarding the worth of a scholar's work and legitimate the allocation of benefits to her or him, including salary increases and occupational advancement.

The question posed to faculty and administrators in this study was as follows: "Higher education organizations are often characterized as meritocracies in which those individuals exhibiting quality and excellence in their work are recognized and rewarded for it. In your estimation, does the merit system work in higher education?" The purpose of the question was to explore the subjects' beliefs regarding the concept of merit, and to determine whether any systematic
patterns existed in the response to this question. Table 18 illustrates the responses to this question.

Table 18: Does the merit system work in higher education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT CATEGORY</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority males</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority females</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority females</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 2/3 of the respondents indicated they did not believe the merit system worked in higher education. Only among administrators was there a majority of affirmative responses to the question. It became apparent during the first interviews that respondents immediately referred to the system of merit increase in salary rather than merit in principle. Even when rephrasing the question to separate the concept of merit from that of merit pay, responses inevitably made reference to the salary reward system. In this regard a major theme emerging from this line of questioning was the faulty reward system in the university under study. Tied to the faulty reward system are a number of subissues: the lack of an incentive structure; the importance of "pedigree"; differential rewards for the duties of teaching, research, and service; and merit vs. market based salary advancement.
Lack of incentives

I had my first year meeting and that's when I was informed that I received a rating of low/outstanding. They had high/outstanding, low/outstanding, high/excellent, excellent, and low/excellent. I said 'I'm above high/excellent huh? I'm low/outstanding?' My chair says 'yeah, with low/outstanding you would get merit pay, but we don't have merit pay.' What a cruel joke this is! Why even tell me I rank merit pay, but we have no merit money? I walk out of there with my head hung low, you know, I deserve merit but they don't have merit pay. So what do I tell my wife? 'Honey, I almost got a raise!' I'm going to get a 5% discount at Safeway because, hey, I almost got a raise! I'd rather have people tell me, 'here's your rank, ok, get out of here'.

--first year minority assistant professor.

For most faculty in this study, the concept of merit is inextricable from the system of economic rewards and incentives. The most tangible way of recognizing and rewarding excellence is through salary raises, but in times of fiscal austerity, salary raises may be so small that their use as incentives are negligible. Other forms of incentives require some creativity on the part of department chairs, who serve a primary role in the allocation of rewards. As indicated by the following minority administrator, a dilemma is created when those individuals who are meritorious tend to be those whose services become most valued to the department, thus they are relied upon for further contributions to the department, while less may be expected of other faculty:

KP: Let me ask you a question about merit in principle, not just merit pay. I think it's fair to say that in higher education there is a merit principle which implies that if one does quality
work, their performance is recognized as such and they are rewarded for it. In your judgement, does that work in higher education?

GS: Ahh. Better in principle than in practice. Because it has to do so much with rewards. Right now the reward system basically is in economic terms. If there are increases in a given year, then by virtue of your performance you should be expected to get increases, and also the more meritorious you are the more increases you get. The problem we have is that in most cases you're talking about relatively limited amounts so that the differentiation in a practical sense between your highest rated individual and your other individuals who are less meritorious may mean the difference of 200 bucks. There's a certain creativity about how else you reward someone in terms of recognizing their merit, and that's a tougher one. I mean do you give somebody more pencils and pads or whatever or release time internally. There are a number of things you can do but unfortunately much of the emphasis on the whole merit system is that it is directly tied to economic rewards, or in a negative sense, sanctions. But it's also looking at how you value that individual independent of economic rewards that may or may not be allocated. That's a tough one. Tough one in the sense that whatever happens it's not unusual that people who are meritorious give back to you sort of the characterization of what makes a good faculty, the kind of individuals you want to involve more in the affairs of the department. Which means that it's like someone who's less a good faculty gets off the hook. So in that sense there are certain ironies involved. I'm not quite sure, I haven't figured out a way to overcome that yet.

The question of how to provide incentives and rewards for meritorious work in an atmosphere of increasing performance expectations and decreasing budgets was pondered by the administrators who felt the merit system was problematic. A majority department head feared that the lack of incentives and reward could lead to a "uniform mediocrity":
It (the merit system) doesn't work here because of there's never any incentive or reward. I mean the whole notion of a merit system involves two parts, you set out criteria for meritorious achievement and then you reward. And we don't do that. I mean we can set out the criteria and we are actually expected as department heads to rank people on the basis of that, but there's never been any money to reward faculty, so it doesn't work, obviously. It's very hard to encourage people to do above and beyond the average by taking them to lunch and buying them flowers. A tangible way to give a person a pat on the back is to give them some extra money, but that hasn't happened, and I think that's unfortunate. It certainly has the potential to lead to what I call a uniform mediocrity. If it doesn't make any difference if you publish one paper or ten papers, or have one grant or three grants, then maybe it becomes less important to go that extra mile. I don't see that among my faculty but I have seen it among other faculty at the university.

Although most faculty acknowledged that they did not enter the profession because of the economic rewards, and the majority of faculty interviewed denied that the low salary level and lack of systematic salary raises effected the quality of their work, they did agree that one of the only ways to increase their salary was to demonstrate their marketability by receiving offers from other institutions.

**Merit vs. Market**

Given the lack of economic incentive and reward for quality performance, faculty seeking to increase their salary must demonstrate their worth in the marketplace through offers from competing institutions. If individuals are successful in increasing their salary by proving their worth in the market, inequities may arise among their colleagues who have not
received incremental salary adjustments. Salary equity reviews may then be conducted to raise the salary of individuals who have similar credentials but are not on par with colleagues who have received market adjustment. Economic restraints imposed on the higher education institution have given rise to a market driven system of salary adjustments, as stated by this department chair,

Because of tight budgets for a number of years, higher education institutions have not been able to reward individuals financially for doing good work. So what happens is you get a situation where an individual who feels underappreciated or not rewarded says, 'look, if there's no incentive structure here maybe I ought to test the market and see how I'm valued outside my own institution, whether I necessarily want to leave this institution or not.' Then the institution might respond in those situations. Right now that's about the only way you can get any type of increase, I mean there's no other pot of money to respond to.

Inequities may also arise when new faculty enter lower ranks with salaries equal to or above those of higher ranked faculty. A common perception among majority faculty is that minorities are highly marketable because of their small numbers, and are able to negotiate higher salaries. However, comparisons of salary levels in the academic departments involved in this study showed that minority faculty generally have lower salaries than their department average. Table 19 illustrates the salary of the minority faculty interviewed in this study compared to the department average in their rank.
Table 19: Salary Levels of Minority Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSOR RANK</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>ABOVE/BELOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Assistant</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>49,230</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Professor</td>
<td>53,980</td>
<td>69,899</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Assistant</td>
<td>30,550</td>
<td>32,993</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Assistant</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>32,993</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Assistant</td>
<td>31,350</td>
<td>32,993</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Associate</td>
<td>52,565</td>
<td>44,161</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Assistant</td>
<td>35,550</td>
<td>38,769</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Associate</td>
<td>45,118</td>
<td>48,328</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Associate</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>40,540</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Associate</td>
<td>40,403</td>
<td>40,540</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Professor</td>
<td>38,570</td>
<td>51,990</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Assistant</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>31,333</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Associate</td>
<td>50,787</td>
<td>44,658</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Professor</td>
<td>64,484</td>
<td>56,803</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Assistant</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>36,635</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Professor</td>
<td>47,430</td>
<td>60,804</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Assistant</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>34,354</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Associate</td>
<td>39,635</td>
<td>42,958</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLA*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Assistant</td>
<td>47,079</td>
<td>48,756</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Assistant</td>
<td>21,584</td>
<td>48,756</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Professor</td>
<td>35,034</td>
<td>77,472</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two males in HLA category have undetermined salary amount from other sources.

In the Hard-Life-Applied department, the male assistant professor who is $800 above the average came from an industrial position in which his salary was substantially higher. The female assistant professor who earns an above average salary in the SNA category holds a Ph.D. from a prominent university and spent 7 years in a part-time capacity
in a former position; the above average male in that department gave up a tenured position his former institution and does not now hold tenure. Of the three minority faculty who earn above average salaries in the SNP category, two have been on the faculty for over twenty years, and have previously held administrative positions.

Thus, while 1/3 of the minority faculty earned salaries above the average of their department, very little support is given the assertion that the difference in salary is due to their minority status. As is evident in Table 19, 2/3 of the minority faculty interviewed earned below average salaries. In the instances where salary compression is an issue, it is under circumstances that have no relation to the minority status of the faculty. Of particular importance is the fact that virtually all of the minority faculty in the hard sciences have salaries below average for their rank, which is counterintuitive to the assumption that they receive high salaries according to their great demand in those areas.

The myth of higher salaries for minorities persists, however, as a department chair in the Hard-Nonlife-Pure field expressed the belief that minority faculty receive high salaries with less teaching loads, yet the two minority faculty interviewed in his department earned salaries well below the average departmental salary for faculty in their rank and were of the opinion that they had higher teaching and
advising loads than their majority colleagues. A tenured minority male in the department, who has subsequently left the university, expressed his dissatisfaction with the market based system:

These stupid equity reviews we've had, you go through all this crap, for what? For one percent increase in salary. Give me a break, you know. So as a matter of fact, I'm thinking of leaving. I made a tremendous mistake when I came here, and that was that I wanted to be here, I thought this was the place. So I turned down invitations to apply to other places, instead of accepting it, getting an offer, going back and negotiating. I thought at the time, and still think, that's dishonest. I still wouldn't do that but what I might do is actually leave. So because I never tried to go anywhere, my salary is stagnant. I'm not the lowest paid professor, but I'm the second lowest. The amount of work I do here is really incredible and I really have an impact on the (ethnic) community here, so when I leave it's going to be a real strain.

The above individual is now employed outside academia at a salary much greater than that offered at the university. Such options are more available to individuals in the hard sciences, particularly in areas most closely associated with high technology. As is evident in Table 19, average salaries for those in the hard sciences can be much greater than those in the soft sciences because of their tie to external markets. As such, salary differentials are more closely associated with external market forces than the demands of minority faculty or the academic merit of one's work.

In discussing the market system vs. academic merit, faculty described a system in which bargaining, negotiating,
and strategizing becomes much more important in terms of receiving rewards than strictly demonstrating the scholarly merit of their work. When discussing the three aspects of their performance that evaluations are based upon, they spoke of the differential rewards accorded the tripartite duties of the faculty.

**Differential Rewards for Teaching, Research, Service**

Both majority and minority faculty decried the fact that the reward system is skewed toward research rather than what many see as the primary duty of teaching. Meritorious work is much more likely to be equated with research than teaching or service, and the prolific researcher may be rewarded even though he or she is not strong, or perhaps even lax, in other areas.

Those units with strong ties to external markets are much more likely to have higher faculty salaries and to be successful with market adjustments for their faculty. Minority faculty are underrepresented in units that tend to have higher salaries, such as the applied sciences. A department chair in the hard-nonlife-applied sciences reflected on the importance of research in determining salary, as the research in his discipline is highly marketable:

I think salaries probably reflect research more strongly than the other performance aspects. And the reason for that is that research is marketable, and when salaries are designed to seriously reflect market conditions, research plays a very large role. That's interesting, isn't it, now that I
think about it? But I think it's real. I think that most faculty recognize the power of the marketplace and that a faculty member who can be depended upon to generate several thousand dollars in research contracts will be paid more than a faculty member who generates none but is a very good teacher. I am surprised at reflecting on this issue how different my perception of salary is than my perception of promotion and tenure. But I think it's a fact of life. Now in (the discipline) I think on the whole (scientists) tend to be more conservative, so they're prepared to accept the notion of the marketplace as a determinant of salary.

A nontenured minority professor in the same department as the above chair had a similar opinion of the centrality of research in determining economic rewards, but also saw the situation as constraining the type of research one pursues, resulting in an imposed conformity:

I think by and large merit does accelerate a person's career in university life. I want to add a caveat that in order to rise to the top of an academic profession a person has to be brilliant and demonstrate that brilliance in different ways. There is an implicit downside to that in that a person might elect to do a phenomenal piece of research but if he does so in a field that isn't currently fashionable he's lost. The difficulty in that is the adherence to fashion means that new starts and new directions may not be undertaken. As a result, universities can be quite conservative about things they actually work on. University life imposes a certain conformity on the kinds of questions that would be asked and therefore you're going to miss a lot, and the fact is that universities miss a lot. Still, this is a meritocracy and the cream does rise to the top provided that cream decides to do the things that cause it to rise to the top. In other words you won't get a phony or a dunderhead rising to the top, but you won't necessarily get an adventurer or a maverick either.
As the above quote indicates, the determination of merit in many units of the university is tied to shifts in fashion and the whims of the marketplace. While advancing the frontiers of knowledge is widely proclaimed as a major goal of the modern research university, those conducting narrowly defined sponsored research for external agencies are often rewarded to a greater extent, both in terms of salary and promotion, than those conducting less marketable research. Although the system of awarding grants is based on peer review of the scientific merit of the research, the credentials or "pedigree" of the researcher is seen as a definite advantage to competitiveness in the grantsmanship arena.

Importance of Pedigree

Many minority faculty felt that the prestige of the institution in which one received their Ph.D. as well as the reputation of the individuals who were their graduate mentors are important factors in being accepted into an "old boy" network. The more one's "pedigree" is held in high esteem by their colleagues, the easier it becomes to garner the resources needed for activities that lead to career advancement. As the following minority male in the hard sciences states, even in the granting system, where the principle of merit is held as a guide to decision making, displaying a distinctive pedigree is a definite advantage:
I would like to say the meritocracy works and perhaps in some cases it does. Especially in the hard sciences it's a meritocracy, clearly if you publish you get research grants, you run a big lab you get things, okay? And that's a meritocracy. But there is still, and I'm not sure it will ever end, an old boy school that exists. It argues that because you have a certain pedigree, the you will get something, sort of by virtue. That's not an meritocracy, that's an aristocracy. It exists in terms of which universities get research dollars, it exists in terms of which researchers get research dollars, and which researchers get invited to meetings. Therefore it doesn't work in that sense. If you're good and you're not part of that aristocracy, you're going to have to fight like hell to make yourself known, then you may be included in that aristocracy. There's a lot of that flavor, even in the granting system, and I've worked in that system for eight years and know it intimately. It's not a meritocracy, I wish it were.

Because of economic disadvantage or culturally prescribed family obligations, the greater number of minority faculty interviewed did not have the opportunity to attend the type of prestigious institutions that contribute to later advantages in career advancement. However, not until they were admitted into the ranks of the faculty did many come to realize the degree to which this affected later career development. As one minority male commented, this is a lesson that he passes on to his minority student advisees:

The meritocracy works if you're truly outstanding or your pedigree shows a degree from Harvard, you know. That helps a great deal. And that is also a big mistake that I made; I didn't realize that you should go away and get a Ph.D. at a name place and that's what I tell my advisees. I will not recruit minority students to our department for a Ph.D. because I think I'm doing them a disservice.
Better to go to Columbia or Berkeley or Harvard or someplace. Nobody told me that.

In response to the question on merit, all nine of the faculty who mentioned the importance of one's professional preparation and social background to occupational advancement were minorities. The tie between traditional indicators of academic excellence and broader socioeconomic factors that tend to screen out certain categories of individuals was rarely made by majority males in this sample of faculty. Majority faculty pointing to weaknesses in the meritocracy were more likely to speak in terms of the structure for rewards and incentives and the need to demonstrate marketability than of social structures that prevent access for the racially and ethnically different to the resources that are propitious to professional advancement. Minority faculty, however, having experienced the racial tension involved in their entrance into an occupational category that was previously denied either by custom or proscription, saw the issues of meritocratic advancement as directly linked to their minority status, and provided a social context absent from the comments of majority faculty.

The linkage between conventional measures of academic merit, such as publication in refereed journals, and the favoring of a homogeneous scholarly elite was remarked upon by the following minority department chair:
What is excellence in determining merit? Is it one standard by which it is measured? The old traditional one--the refereed journal, the best journal. If you're a sociologist and you haven't published in the top two or three journals you don't get tenure. Now that's destructive. That's elitist. That's meritocracy at it's worst. The whole system, the whole culture, is weighted against certain categories of people rising to the top, or only allowing certain types to rise to the top, in terms of educational opportunities.

Among the groups interviewed, nowhere was the concept of merit more divorced from social, political, historical, and racial implications than among administrators. The next section discusses administrative views of the principle of merit and the meritocratic organizational ideology.

**The view of administrators**

Administrators were the only category of respondents in which a majority felt the merit system functioned well in higher education. For those individuals who proclaimed the system to work well, education is equated with societal progress, and a free market system which fosters open competition provides the fairest basis of determining who shall be allocated the greatest rewards. In this regard it is the responsibility of the university to provide society with sanctioned and credentialed individuals who are equipped with the expertise to define the standards by which the competence of their academic colleagues is judged. As the following
administrator explains, schooling becomes the agency for meritocratic selection and judgment of quality performance:

I think for the most part, the meritocracy works. I think if we're going to be a progressive society, how do you define the people that go out in it? We have to train these people through an educational process, and how do you define progress in an educational process? We've defined it through creativity or research, which is necessary for progress in society, and I think for the most part it has worked. The whole thing is based on the free enterprise system. The better you do at something, measured by a certain criteria, the more rewards you get, be they monetary, ego-satisfying, or prestige-wise. The university is caught right in the middle so we have P&T committees, promotions, etc. And we're no better or no worse than other universities of comparable size.

By linking the educational process to societal progress in a "free enterprise system," the above administrator minimizes the role of the state, which of course is the primary subsidizer of the institution. The role the state plays in advancing an ideological agenda that equates merit with equal opportunity and places both in opposition to such policies as affirmative action is thereby obscured. In contrast, minorities challenge the assumption that a perfectly competitive free market exists when historically the preconditions for a free market, e.g. equal access to resources and information, have never been present.

In the rhetoric of those who espoused a meritocratic ideology, the concerns of identifiable racial groups were subordinated to other factors such as individual motivation and competitiveness, which are seen as much more salient to
achievement and success. Although acknowledging that the meritocracy of higher education may not work well for certain classes of people, the following high ranking administrator would not trade it in favor of a different system:

I think by and large it does work. If you just looked at the white males, for example, I think you would have to say that it works pretty well. The question would be are there categories of people for whom it doesn't work well, and minority and women would be specific categories, but there are others too. For example, obese people may have a harder time, even if they're white male, so there are those kinds of prejudices as well that one could probably find. I wouldn't want to give up a meritocracy and go to some different kind of system because there are certain categories of people who haven't fared as well under the meritocracy as other categories of people. I think the way to fix that is to try and make sure that those categories of people are fully integrated into the meritocracy and that it treats them justly. But to give up a meritocracy in favor of some wholly different system would be really damaging to higher education, so the thing is to remedy the wrong in the system rather than give up the system and go somewhere else.

For the above administrator, there are many ways in which bias may exist in a meritocracy, and the race, gender, or ethnicity of a faculty member is not seen as an element affecting their experience any more than being (in the example given by her) placed in a category because of obesity. By ignoring the influence of a racial group's historical relationship to the dominant culture and subordinating the common concerns of the group, it becomes easier to argue the case for individual merit, and to attribute inequalities in rewards and privileges to inequalities in individual
motivation and ability. The concern for individual privilege over group concerns is a central tenet of the meritocratic ethic, and as those charged with maintaining organizational equilibrium, the tendency of administrators to define problems in terms of lack of individual competitiveness and technical competence deflects attention from the ways in which the organization disseminates an ideology that reinforces practices of allocating different resources and knowledge to different groups of people. Moreover, by harkening to a 'broader perspective' in terms of judging the worth of the scholarly activity of a faculty member, administrators imply that universalistic rational criteria are significant determinants of the decision making process, and solidify their place in the institution as those acting in the best interests of the institution and society. As such, the key players in the decision making structures ensure that certain value systems will prevail.
The hiring pattern of the institution in this study mirrors not only the social stratification of the larger society, but the intraorganizational hierarchy as well. Those who were invited to apply or placed in positions without going through the competitive process are those who had access to institutions of equal or greater prestige or had worked under prominent researchers in their field. Moreover, administrators as a group and individuals in the hard science disciplines are much more likely to have been invited to apply and to have come to the institution with tenure. This finding demonstrates the relationship between institutional research imperatives and hiring practices, where the stated intentions of administrators to emulate the practices of top ranked research institutions privileges those whose academic interests and expertise lie in the hard sciences. While minority males have more of a chance to be invited if they are in the sciences, none of the minority females in this sample were invited to apply, and over half were originally hired in adjunct positions. The finding in this study that minority females remain "outsiders" in the research university and have not yet become a part of the informal information sharing networks is borne out by the linkage between their
inauspicious entry into the academy and the alienation they feel both within departments and in relation to the institutional environment, whose rules they find vague and contradictory.

Despite the espousal of the merit principle in hiring, clear linkages exist between ascriptive characteristics of socioeconomic status and likelihood of being hired at the institution under study. This finding parallels other studies (Crane, 1969; Caplow and Magee 1973; Finkelstein, 1985; Lipset and Ladd, 1979) that show social class to be an unintended, unconscious selector for positions in higher education institutions. While studies by reproduction and social stratification theorists have confirmed the relationship between social class and hiring patterns in higher education, they are largely silent on the ascriptive factor of race. This aversion to viewing race as a salient category in the academy exists even though racial differentiation has been a major dimension of U.S. economic stratification, and differentiation in achievement levels among racial groups has long been a topic for inquiry at the elementary and secondary levels. Numerous surveys have documented the inequities that exist between majority and minority faculty; however, racial inequality continues to be theorized as a byproduct of economic divisions in society. By focusing on class issues, attention is deflected from the long history of
exclusion of people of color in U.S. society, and the probability that the experience of racially different people is qualitatively different at all levels of education and occupation than that of the white lower class or white women. By attending to historical relationships between racially different groups and the dominant society, explanations of existing inequalities may be enhanced and expanded beyond economic reductionist theory by introducing such elements as the role of the state and the part that human agency or choice play in changing or perpetuating the status quo. For example, those minorities who can be described in a term borrowed from John Ogbu as "involuntary minorities" have historically been denied access to the mechanisms of social and occupational advancement, and when equal access to education became law in relatively recent times, it meant access to an education that was qualitatively unequal. As evidenced by the sample of faculty in this study, minorities have not evolved the cumulative advantage in the form of "cultural capital" that has provided majority faculty with a background that facilitates entry into and advancement within the research university.

Historical and sociopolitical forces have combined to steer minorities away from the disciplines that are most rewarded by the institution, and minority faculty remain dismally underrepresented in the hard sciences. Among
majority male faculty in the hard sciences, statements expressing the belief that the cultural background of an individual makes no difference in the work setting is grounded in an ideology that advances the impervious nature of scientific work to external sociopolitical forces. The assumption of equality of opportunity and the denial or trivializing of racially based differences provides the justification for the status quo by those who control the resources for entry into the academy. However, minority faculty in the hard sciences see the relationship of their work to broader social issues, as evidenced in the statement of the minority scientist concerning the social implications of his work as a member of an "at risk" population. The unique contributions that minorities may make is more likely to be acknowledged in disciplines that value and reward creativity, and display a wider variety and acceptance of differing methodological approaches. The implications of this finding lie in the lack of attention given disciplinary influences by conventional survey research on issues of campus climate and faculty diversity, and in global statements in the diversity rhetoric regarding unique approaches brought by minority faculty that fail to account for the disciplinary and organizational contexts. Clearly the organizational context must be a major consideration when attempting to understand and explain issues of faculty diversity.
Within the confines of their academic department, most minority faculty feel accepted and valued as colleagues. In the larger institutional environment, however, they feel alienated and marginalized. Majority faculty to the contrary describe an institutional environment in which minorities are given "special status" by virtue of their small numbers, ability to play the market in order to command higher salaries, and potential claim discrimination if they are not accorded privileges commensurate with their status as members of a protected group. In this way minorities are seen as enjoying an advantage over majorities in terms of advancement in the institution; and to be provided an advantage based only on racial characteristics rather than meritocratic virtue violates the most venerated norm of professional academics.

Most faculty feel the promotion and tenure process is fair and rely on peer review as the primary means of assuring objectivity in the evaluation. While not denying the subjectivity involved in many aspects of the evaluation process, most feel that the multiple levels of decision making decrease the likelihood that personal bias will effect the outcome. The use of a judicial metaphor in describing the process harkens to a Eurocentric sense of justice in which what is just is what is "reasonable to reasonable men," and what is fair (or excellent) must be so because the democratic consensus of colleagues believe it to be so. The minority
women faculty, however, differed from the other groups in terms of how they view the fairness of the evaluation process. Minority women noted that the prestige of the faculty member, based primarily on past institutional and collegial affiliation, was a major factor affecting promotion decisions, as well as the individual's ability to attract external sources of revenue by way of grants and contracts.

Minority women are also the most likely to state that the criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure are unclear, whereas other categories of faculty were evenly divided on the question of clarity of criteria and procedures. Only among administrators was there near consensus that the criteria and procedures for evaluation were clearly understood by the faculty; among the three administrators who indicated problems were a former dean, a former department chair, and a newly hired dean. The picture emerging from this line of questioning was one of shifting expectations, and great variation in terms of how and by whom information regarding the process was imparted. Whereas formal mechanisms of communication were ineffective and inconsistent in most cases, those outside the circles where information was informally imparted, i.e. minority women, remained unclear.

The written guidelines assume a uniformity in procedures that does not reflect reality. The large majority of faculty and administrators interviewed agreed that informal, unwritten
"rules" impact the decision making process. Faculty must be willing to sell themselves and to promote the value of their academic work. Despite official rhetoric concerning the importance of teaching in the evaluation process, it was largely acknowledged that one's publication and research was the primary determinant of successful promotion or tenure. Being astute in the politics of the department in terms of not directly opposing those in powerful positions in the department, be they administrators or senior faculty, meant a greater likelihood that one would receive a share of departmental resources in the form of release time for research, merit raises, or more equipment. One is expected to display a certain amount of "maturity," defined primarily as years in service to the profession, before becoming a serious candidate for tenure. Additionally, being a good departmental citizen by serving on departmental committees and helping maintain a collegial atmosphere are elements that weigh favorably in promotion and tenure reviews. Many of the unwritten "rules" of successful promotion and tenure work against minority faculty, as exemplified in the value clashes they encounter in engaging in self-aggrandizing behavior; their interests in service aspects to their ethnic communities; and their tendency to be junior faculty, therefore not displaying the "maturity" of more seasoned faculty. While some departmental administrators touted the
formal mentoring of junior faculty as a way of "learning the ropes," many of the minority faculty did not see mentoring as an effective means of learning the unwritten rules of the organization.

Minority faculty perceive themselves and other minorities as experiencing unique barriers to promotion and tenure. They pointed to differences in workload, especially in teaching and service appointments, to cultural differences that conflict with certain role expectations, and differences in research interests that many majority view as unimportant or peripheral to mainstream research. To the contrary, majority faculty view minorities as having advantages in the evaluation process. In instances where minorities were seen as having neither an advantage or disadvantage, it was believed that the highy technical and impartial nature of the scientific endeavor precluded considerations of race, culture, or gender entering into the evaluation of a faculty member's performance.

Among all faculty in this sample, productivity is seen as the hallmark of quality and excellence in academic performance. The number of peer reviewed papers published in reputable journals defines one's work as quality. Teaching performance, and service to the institution or the community, received little mention by the faculty when they spoke of excellence in performance. In this regard there were no
discernable differences between majority and minority faculty interpretations of quality. The patterns that emerged fell along disciplinary lines, with those in the hard sciences describing quality as evident in "scientific breakthroughs" and discoveries, and those in the soft sciences speaking of creativity and the diversity in theory and methodology. Disciplinary differences in the interpretation of excellence in performance would seem to call into question the reliability of college and university-wide committees, whom many in the soft science feel are "stacked" with hard science faculty.

Administrative visions of excellence emphasized the advancement of knowledge and evidence of original scholarly accomplishment. The element of prestige brought about by the recognition of peers and peer institutions receives much stronger emphasis among administrators, to whom the comparison of their departments, colleges, or universities with others is a paramount concern. More than any other group, administrators are concerned with sustained engagement in significant problems over time, and are wary of faculty who show bursts of productivity just before tenure or promotion review. As key players in the promotion and tenure process, and as the primary guardians and bearers of official institutional ideology, administrators embrace an ethos of
individual and institutional competitiveness that drives the quest for excellence in the research university.

Paradoxically, while descriptions of performance excellence were equated with the research and publication aspects of the faculty role, both faculty and administrators described the "good" faculty member as being first and foremost a teacher. The drive of the research institution toward greater prestige by emulating the top ranked institutions has placed greater emphasis on one aspect of their academic performance, yet faculty maintain the image of the good professor that was engrained in their professional socialization.

The faculty's ambivalence regarding the efficacy of the meritocracy of higher education is based on perceptions of a reward system that is skewed toward the research and publication aspects of their performance, a lack of systematic salary adjustments that fail to provide incentives and force faculty to demonstrate their worth in the marketplace, and the advantages of prior access to prestigious institutions that provide privileges serving to facilitate later occupational advancement. Because the concept of merit is inextricable from the system of rewards within the organization, most faculty responded to the question of merit in reference to the lack of pecuniary rewards for meritorious work. Minority faculty are viewed by many majority as enjoying a particular
advantage in the market driven system by virtue of their small numbers and the competition among institutions to hire minorities; however, the belief that minorities are able to demand higher salaries was not borne out when salaries were compared by rank and discipline within the institution. Salary differences were more likely to reflect the relationship between an academic department and external sources of power and influence. Under this scenario, market becomes a de facto measure of excellence.

Only among administrators was there a preponderance of belief in the merit system. Administrators described higher education as an open system in which an individual's natural talents and abilities allow them to rise to their proper level within the organization and assume the rewards and privileges associated with that level. Factors related to race and gender were not seen as barriers to occupational advancement within the institution, and whatever inequalities may exist are attributed to individual characteristics of motivation and ability. The meritocratic ideology of administrators allows them to justify and rationalize decisions made under the guise of universal standards of excellence, as such they play a powerful role in perpetuating institutionalized inequities.
Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the social arrangements, underlying structures, beliefs and attitudes that form the professional and institutional ideologies of professional academics to determine the role they may play in marginalizing and alienating Black, Hispanic, and Native American faculty. Specifically, I chose to focus on the promotion and tenure process as it relates to minority faculty in a research university because it is a topic of little systematic research (Menges and Exum, 1983), and because it is this arena that most impacts the occupational advancement of minority faculty.

The first research question I posed is: How do faculty and administrators interpret standards of quality, merit, and excellence for the purpose of performance evaluation, and are there discernable and consistent differences between majority and minority interpretations of professional performance standards?

In exploring this question, I found that interpretations of quality, merit, and excellence did not conform to groupings of "majority" and "minority," and I encountered a complex web of meanings in which disciplinary socialization, race, class, gender, institutional context, and external sociopolitical forces exist in a state of dynamic interplay at any particular period in time, with meanings and interpretations in a
constant state of flux. While there were no consistent differences in defining quality and excellence in performance between the three racial groups I classified as minority and the majority group, it became apparent that those who exercise the most control over the rewards and privileges of the profession effectively frame the discourse of quality and reinforce conformity by adhering to a mechanistic application of written procedures, policies, and standards of excellence. The ideology of administrators articulates the institution's goal to become a top research university by emphasizing "advancement in the frontiers of knowledge," although the type of knowledge that is most highly rewarded is defined in a large part by external market forces that accentuate high technology and favor elite values and status. The connection between broader power structures that reinforce the status quo within the institution highlights the socially and politically constructed nature of standards of excellence, which although advanced as apolitical and self-evident, come to serve ideological purposes. While it is widely assumed that the layers of decision making add a degree of objectivity and provide a system of checks and balances such that no particular individual or group's agenda is allowed to dominate the process, university-wide committees often serve to legitimate the decisions of administrators whose mandate is to act in the best interests of the institution.
The exercise of power in relation to promotion and tenure decision making does not, however, exist solely in the discursive and institutionalized practices imposed and reinforced by those who control rewards and resources, nor do the means by which social inequities are reproduced work in uniform and monolithic ways. That most minority faculty define excellence in the rhetoric similar to that of their majority colleagues is evidence that disciplinary socialization and institutional traditions play strong roles in providing the context for interpreting evaluation standards and reinforcing existing procedures. This finding brings into question whether a diversity in judgements or decisions would automatically flow from placing these traditionally underrepresented individuals in positions of power now held in the large majority by white males. Owing partly to the intragroup diversity existing among the three groups defined as minority in this study, it is apparent that these underrepresented groups have not yet found a unified voice through which to interpret their vision of excellence in a manner that would initiate change in the promotion and tenure process. Until minorities are able to provide alternatives to the prevailing discourse of quality and excellence, it is unlikely that conventional notions of excellence provided by disciplinary, institutional, and external market forces will be displaced.
The first research question posed is a subset of the second more general question that encompasses the formal and informal interaction within the organization that negatively impacts the occupational advancement of minorities. From the research presented herein, it is clear that the organizational experience of minorities differs qualitatively from that of majority faculty, and that despite the diversity of opinions and perceptions that exist among and within minority groups, there are overarching patterns that are common among the three racial groups vis a vis their majority colleagues. The common concerns of minorities, and their quite different interpretations of organizational reality, are muted through an ideological rationalization that sees them either as insignificant outliers, or as protected groups accorded special privileges and benefits. The inequities that do exist are not seen as systemically induced, but resultant of individual and idiosyncratic shortcomings.

Understanding how the social and organizational structures and ideologies of the higher education institution in this study constrain the discourse, actions, and advancement of minority faculty does not imply a static model of the organization nor a simple oppressed/oppressor dichotomy of its agents. On the contrary, the complex nuances of interaction that recreate power relationships in organizations that are central to knowledge production are themselves nested
in dynamic sociopolitical contexts in which meanings and values are constantly contested and reconfigured. At the heart of existing power relationships in the academy are constellations of agents that define, legitimate, and reward knowledge that embodies specific interests. Minorities may themselves become active agents in the reproduction of power relationships by being coopted into positions that reinforce the prevailing meritocratic ideology and narrow views of performance excellence in their respective disciplines. How such minority faculty and administrators, existing simultaneously as gendered and classed individuals, handle the tensions between the needs of lower class individuals and the vagaries of the institution is a subject of which we know little and with which both functional and critical theory have not yet adequately come to terms. Current events such as the nomination of Judge Thomas to the Supreme Court, the Rodney King trial, and subsequent Los Angeles riots demonstrate that minority needs are by no means homogenous, and the significance of race as a factor in explanations of social inequity is not declining, but becoming evermore complex and important. By bringing to light the dialectic nature of the relationships between micro and macro levels of issues of race, class, and gender in higher education, and understanding the multiple realities that exist within higher education organizations, minorities may be empowered towards a
transformation in which they are no longer second class citizens, but esteemed and valued colleagues in an increasingly diverse environment. Such a goal is not just the idealistic rhetoric of the politically correct, but given the changing demographic makeup of U.S. society, has become a pragmatic necessity.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: MINORITY FACULTY

1. Tell me something of your personal background (where reared, educated, how you chose higher education as a career).

2. How did you hear about the position opening at the University?

3. In terms of the duties of teaching and research, do you see yourself as primarily a teacher or a researcher?

4. What types of research are you involved in?
   --how is your research viewed by your colleagues?
   --have you engaged in collaborative research with your colleagues?
   --what professional associations do you belong to?
   --what journals do you publish in?
   --do you now or have you had a mentor or sponsor at the university?

5. Is your teaching load approximately equal to, greater than, or less than that of your colleagues?
   --have you engaged in collaborative teaching with other faculty?

6. What types of service commitments do you have? Assigned or voluntary? Equal to, greater than, or less than colleagues?
   --does your service receive consideration in promotion and tenure decisions?

7. Have you ever served on promotion and tenure committees?

8. In your judgement, what makes a "good" faculty member?

9. How does one evaluate "excellence" in your discipline, what does "quality work" mean to you? Is there a consensus among your colleagues as to what constitutes quality work?

10. Have the procedures and criteria for evaluation for promotion and tenure been fully explained to you? are they clear to you?

11. Are evaluation standards applied fairly and objectively?
   --how important are nonacademic factors (affability, personality, appearance)
   --are there other "unwritten" criteria?
12. What is the extent of your involvement in the planning of performance expectations and objectives?

13. As a minority group member, do you perceive any barriers to promotion and tenure that may differ from you white colleagues?

14. What is your chance of being awarded tenure? (for those without tenure)

15. Do minorities bring anything to your discipline that may be unique because of their minority status?

16. Are you provided sufficient opportunity to meet with your chairperson to discuss performance expectations, promotion and career considerations?

17. Do you feel the university offers an "accepting" climate?

18. Are you aware of any professional distance between you and your colleagues?
   --do you feel you "fit in" with them? with the campus environment?
   --how has this affected your career development?

19. Is your present salary less than, equal to, or greater than the average of your colleagues?

20. Does the merit system work in higher education?

21. Is the promotion and tenure process fair, equitable, effective?
APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: ADMINISTRATORS

1. Tell me something of your personal background
   --professional background, where educated, how long at
   university, how you chose a career in higher education.

2. According to the University Handbook for Appointed
   Personnel, faculty are to be evaluated on the basis of
   "excellence in performance" and "promise of continued
   excellence," what do those phrases mean to you?
   --how do you evaluate quality scholarship?
   --are the standards for evaluation generally acknowledged
   and agreed upon? Is there a consensus as to what
   constitutes quality work?

3. In decision making regarding promotion and tenure, how
   would you rank the importance of the three elements of
   teaching, research, and service in your department?
   --How is service defined in your department?

4. Do you involve faculty in the design and evaluation of
   performance expectations?
   --do you review performance expectations with your
   faculty?

5. How important are informal collegial relations?
   --How much informal interaction do you have with your
   faculty?

6. How do ensure objectivity and fairness in faculty
   evaluations?
   --Are there any unwritten criteria?

7. Have you had any promotion or tenure decisions overturned
   at other levels of decision making?

8. On what basis are most faculty denied tenure?

9. What makes a "good" faculty member?

10. In your judgement, is your department accepting of
    minority faculty?

11. Do minority faculty in your department have similar
    professional interests as majority faculty (research, teaching, service)?
12. Do you perceive any barriers to the promotion and tenure of minority faculty that may be different from their white colleagues?

13. Do minorities bring anything to the discipline (teaching, research) that may be unique because of their minority status?

14. Does your department have any policies or programs in place to address the retention of minority faculty?

15. In your estimation, does the merit system work in higher education?

16. In your opinion is the promotion and tenure process at the University fair, equitable, and effective?
APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: MAJORITY FACULTY

1. Tell me something of your personal background (where reared, educated, how you chose higher education as a career).

2. How did you hear about the position opening at the university?

3. In terms of the duties of teaching and research, do you see yourself as primarily a teacher or a researcher?

4. What types of research are you involved in?
   --What professional associations do you belong to?
   --What journals do you publish in?
   --Do you now or have you had a mentor or sponsor at the university?

5. Is your teaching load approximately equal to, greater than, or less than that of your colleagues?
   --Have you engaged in collaborative teaching with other faculty?

6. What types of service commitments do you have? Assigned or voluntary? Equal to, greater than, or less than colleagues?
   --Does your service receive consideration in promotion and tenure decisions?

7. In your judgement, what makes a "good" faculty member?

8. How does one evaluate "excellence" in your discipline, what does "quality work" mean to you?
   --Are the standards for evaluating quality in your department generally acknowledged and agreed upon?
   --Does the merit system work in higher education?

9. Have the procedures and criteria for evaluation for promotion and tenure been fully explained to you? Are they clear to you?

10. Are evaluation standards applied fairly and objectively?
    --How important are nonacademic factors (affability, personality, appearance)
    --Are there other "unwritten" criteria?

11. What is the extent of your involvement in the planning of performance expectations and objectives?
12. In your judgement, is your department accepting of minority faculty?

13. Do minority faculty in your department have similar professional interests as majority faculty (research, teaching, service)?
   --Have you engaged in collaborative research with your minority colleagues?

14. Do you associate with your minority colleagues off campus?

15. Are you aware of any professional distance between you and your minority colleagues?

16. Do you perceive any barriers to the promotion and tenure of minority faculty that may be different from majority faculty?

17. Are you provided sufficient opportunity to meet with your chairperson to discuss performance expectations, promotion and career considerations?

18. Is your present salary less than, equal to, or greater than the average of your colleagues?

19. In your opinion is the promotion and tenure process at the university fair, equitable, and effective?
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEWS BY BIGLAN CATEGORIES

HARD-LIFE-PURE

1. Black female, nontenure track
2. Hispanic male, tenured
3. Majority female, tenured
4. Majority male, department chair
5. Majority male, department chair

HARD-NONLIFE-PURE

1. Majority male, department chair
2. Black male, adjunct professor, nontenure track
3. Hispanic female, assistant professor, tenure track
4. Hispanic male, tenured
5. Majority male, tenured
6. Majority male, dean

HARD-NONLIFE-APPLIED

1. Majority male, department chair
2. Hispanic male, tenured
3. Hispanic male, assistant professor, tenure track
4. Majority male, dean, former university committee member
5. Majority male, assistant professor, tenure track

SOFT-LIFE-PURE

1. American Indian male, tenured
2. American Indian male, assistant professor, tenure track
3. Hispanic male, department head
4. Majority male, tenured
5. Majority male, dean

SOFT-LIFE-APPLIED

1. Majority male, department head/associate dean
2. Hispanic female, assistant professor, tenure track
3. Majority male, tenured professor
4. American Indian female, associate professor, tenured
5. Black female, associate professor, tenured
6. Majority male, associate professor, tenured
7. Majority male, former dean
APPENDIX D (CONTINUED)

SOFT-NONLIFE-APPLIED

1. Hispanic female, assistant professor, tenure track
2. Black male, tenured professor
3. Hispanic male, assistant professor, tenure track
4. American Indian female, assistant professor, tenure track
5. Majority male, department head, music, former U committee
6. Majority female, former department chair, art
7. Majority male, tenured music
8. Majority male, dean

HARD-LIFE-APPLIED

1. American Indian male, professor, tenured
2. Black male, Assistant professor, tenure track
3. Hispanic female, assistant prof, tenure track
4. Majority male, tenured
5. Majority male, department head

SOFT-NONLIFE-PURE

1. Black female, assistant professor, tenure track
2. Hispanic male, tenured, former dept. head, associate dean
3. Majority female, tenured
4. Minority male department chair
5. Hispanic female, tenured

OTHERS

1. Majority female, tenured, CAFT chair
2. Hispanic male, member of U p&T committee
3. Majority female, tenured, college p&T, former U p&T
4. Majority female, vice-provost
APPENDIX B: PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS

ACTIONS EFFECTIVE IN 1990-91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>con</td>
<td>pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>n/a:6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>n/a:1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>n/a:5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Univ. Comm.</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>con</td>
<td>pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>abst:1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minorities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>abst:1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Appeals</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Reversed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minorities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Assoc. Professor w/Tenure</td>
<td>yes 33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pending 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>withdrawn 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Prof. with tenure</td>
<td>yes 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Prof.</td>
<td>yes 29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pending 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>withdrawn 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>yes 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention after 2nd or 4th Year</td>
<td>yes 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>withdrawn 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Non-Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Associate w/Tenure</td>
<td>yes 33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pending 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>withdrawn 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Professor w/Tenure</td>
<td>yes 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Professor</td>
<td>yes 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pending 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>withdrawn 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>yes 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention after 2nd or 4th yr. Review</td>
<td>yes 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>withdrawn 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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