

MANAGING GENDER INEQUITY IN ACADEMIA

A Guide for Faculty and
Administrators in Public Affairs
Programs

by Gina Scutelnicu Todoran

First published 2024

ISBN: 978-1-032-28071-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-28070-7 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-29520-4 (ebk)

Chapter 3

Navigating the Tenure and
Promotion Process

(CC BY NC ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003295204-3

The open access fee for this chapter was funded
by Pace University's Scholarly Research Award.

3

NAVIGATING THE TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS

This chapter discusses the tenure and promotion experiences of public affairs faculty members who are affiliated with universities of different Carnegie classifications ranging from very high research to teaching-oriented institutions. Special attention is paid to describing the tenure and promotion process and its requirements, discussing how faculty differ in meeting tenure and promotion requirements in the areas of research, teaching, and service, explaining the gender and racial differences in tenure and promotion, and offering recommendations on how administrators, faculty, and institutions could ensure the success of its faculty members and make the academy more equitable and inclusive. Chapters 3 through 6 use empirical primary data coming from two sources: an original survey administered at two different points in time (2017 and 2021) on two different faculty groups (coming from NASPAA-accredited and NASPAA-affiliated programs), and 42 interviews conducted with both women and men faculty members who occupy varied academic ranks, administrative positions, and have various cultural backgrounds. The profile of both survey and interview participants is presented in Chapter 1.

Overview of the Tenure and Promotion Process

Tenure in higher education provides job security, financial stability, and academic freedom (Coggburn & Neely, 2015) which are important incentives for faculty recruitment and retention in the academy. It is considered the gold standard among faculty members who are expected to perform at higher standards than they did in the past (Youn & Price, 2009). Today, institutions

of higher education place more importance on faculty research than on their teaching and service contributions (Marginson, 2006; Schimanski & Alperin, 2018). The high value that universities place on faculty research contributions is driven by both internal and external pressures. Internal pressures refer to efforts aimed to enhance institutional ranking and prestige (Backes-Gellner & Schlinghoff, 2010; Townsend & Rosser, 2007; Williams et al., 2014) and to address economic challenges by developing a flexible full-time faculty workforce through a reduction in the number of tenure-stream faculty and an increase in the number of non-tenure-stream faculty (AAUP, 2021). According to AAUP (2021) the percentage of full-time faculty occupying non-tenure-track positions increased from 3% in 1969 to 15.6% in 2009 and 20% in 2019. External pressures refer to the “over tenure” of faculty that happened after the elimination of the federally age-mandated retirement requirement in 1980 (Townsend & Rosser, 2007). The research standards for tenure and promotion increased at both research-intensive and teaching-oriented universities (Harley et al., 2010). Therefore, today faculty have to meet higher expectations for their scholarly contributions in addition to their existing teaching and service responsibilities.

This trend also applies to public affairs programs. Interview participants who were tenured based primarily on their teaching and service contributions indicated that they would not meet tenure requirements today, when additional publication standards were added on top of the existing teaching and service faculty workloads. These extra requirements make tenure much more difficult to earn today than in the past. The metaphor “publish or perish” is often used to describe the journey of faculty members throughout the tenure and promotion process (Bonawitz & Andel, 2009; Cogburn & Neely, 2015; Green, 2008) where one cannot be tenured without getting published.

With few exceptions universities link tenure with promotion to the next academic rank, meaning that faculty who are tenured are also promoted to the next rank (e.g., from assistant to associate professor). The typical probationary period is between six and seven years. Overall gender differences are noted in how tenure is granted. Not only are men more likely to obtain tenure when compared to women (Hesli & Lee, 2011; Thomas, 2019) but the former also spend, on average, fewer years in their pre-tenure positions because they exceed the research requirements for tenure (as reported by interviewees). Faculty members who switched universities before obtaining tenure reported spending additional time on their probationary period, and women reported spending one to two extra years in pre-tenure positions when compared to men. The gender difference may be explained in part by the lack of or minimal mentoring opportunities that are

available to women faculty when hired and during their tenure-track years (Bodkin & Fleming, 2021; Todoran, 2023). Additionally, the gender difference in the faculty career advancement can be explained by the fact that graduate and doctoral programs don't prepare women well to navigate the academic work environment (Thomas, 2019).

The tenure and promotion process involves at least one pre-tenure step: the mid-tenure review. Most interviewed faculty indicated their universities had an institutionalized mid-tenure review process which took place at the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth year of their probationary period. The mid-tenure review is typically performed by one or a combination of the following entities/individuals: a departmental/school level committee, the department chair, the school's director, and the college's dean, and it is an acknowledgment of the candidates' progress toward tenure. Some faculty members reported their universities used a yearly faculty assessment in addition to the mid-tenure review. The annual review was conducted by the department/school committee and by an assigned mentor who was a senior colleague or a department chair. Faculty found the annual review extremely beneficial in assessing their progress toward tenure, and they reported being successful in acquiring tenure and promotion when such an annual evaluation was implemented.

The actual tenure and promotion process requires faculty members to undergo a rigorous review process that starts during the fifth or sixth year of their probationary period when candidates prepare their tenure and promotion dossier. The dossier contains statements and supporting evidence about the research, teaching, and service contributions of faculty members. Candidates for tenure and promotion are reviewed internally at different university levels starting with a faculty committee that comprises faculty members representing the candidate's department or school. Then, the candidate is reviewed by the department chair or the school director, followed by a review conducted by the college-level tenure and promotion committee that comprises faculty members who are part of the same college as the candidate, and a review by the dean. Finally, the candidate is reviewed by a committee that comprises university-wide faculty members, and by the provost. The university president/chancellor and the board of trustees are the final approvers of tenure and promotion cases. Universities have an appeal process in place for instances in which recommendations for tenure and promotion are not positive.

About half of the interview participants indicated their universities used external letters in conjunction with an internal review process. External letters were reported to be solicited by all research-intensive universities represented by interviewees, and this practice has also been adopted by teaching-oriented institutions since the 2010s to make

tenure and promotion requirements more stringent. Interview participants indicated that the number of external letters used in the tenure and promotion process varied from as few as two to as many as eight letters, and potential evaluators had to come from equivalent or aspirational institutions to ensure an equivalent review process across institutions which were part of the same or a similar Carnegie classification. Recommendations for external evaluators are made by tenure and promotion committees, chairs, and deans, but candidates have some input in the selection process by at least indicating conflicts of interest with potential external reviewers. Interviewed faculty members indicated that external reviews counted considerably in tenure and promotion decisions and even one negative letter could hurt a candidate's case. It should be noted that external letters discuss and assess almost exclusively the faculty research contribution rather than all three areas of research, teaching, and service.

Interview participants had mixed views about the transparency of their tenure and promotion process. Some indicated they had access to the feedback offered by committees at different university levels and could clarify things if needed. Others indicated the process was not transparent at all and they didn't get any feedback until after the review process was completed at all levels.

Women and faculty members from ethnically and racially underrepresented groups were identified as being more likely to be denied mid-tenure reappointments and tenure due to their inability to meet minimum publication requirements and to the negative letters from external reviewers. Faculty members who were not tenured either ended up transitioning to non-tenure-track positions moved to other universities or left academia altogether.

The remainder of the chapter presents an analysis of the research, teaching, and service contributions as reported by the survey and interview participants to better understand the gender and racial differences in how faculty members meet tenure and promotion requirements. Then, lessons learned are being formulated to offer faculty and administrators recommendations about tenure and promotion best practices.

Faculty Research Contribution

The research contribution of faculty members is considered the most important factor in tenure and promotion decisions at most universities under analysis. With few exceptions (e.g., candidates at some teaching-oriented institutions could choose to be tenured either based on their research or service contributions), most interview participants indicated that faculty

members could not acquire tenure without having refereed publications, even at teaching-focused universities.

Publication requirements vary widely among the universities under study. Some require while others expect their faculty members to have a minimum number of publications during their probationary period. At one extreme, there are research-intensive universities (e.g., R1 institutions) that consider only refereed articles in tenure and promotion decisions. These universities require/expect their faculty members to publish a specific minimum number of peer-reviewed articles during their probationary period. Interview participants at research-intensive universities reported their faculty were expected to publish, on average, two refereed articles per year. This standard can be lowered to one article per year in instances in which faculty publish their work in top journals in the field. Additionally, faculty members at research-intensive universities are expected to demonstrate they can conduct research independently (e.g., publish as sole authors) and that they can collaborate with others as first co-authors. Some universities also expect their faculty to co-publish with their students. Both edited books and research monographs count toward tenure and promotion at all universities under study, but interview participants indicated books were not typically expected from junior faculty because of the substantial amount of time and effort that was needed to write and publish books.

Other universities are more inclusive in their definition of scholarly contributions and allow their faculty to count not only refereed articles but also other publications (e.g., book chapters, technical reports) and scholarly activities (e.g., grants, applied research projects, conference presentations) toward tenure. Some institutions have a point system in place to evaluate the overall faculty research contributions by ranking the quality of publications, with refereed articles counting the most toward tenure. Other universities require or expect a minimum number of publications of their faculty members without ranking their quality. Teaching-oriented universities expect their faculty to have as few as two to three publications during their probationary period, with an average of one publication per year. Overall, interview participants indicated that the quantity of publications was a standard indicator in tenure and promotion decisions whereas the quality of journals mattered only in instances in which candidates published below the minimum expected standards. These findings are in line with the few existing studies in public affairs that report that publication quantity is valued over quality in tenure and promotion decisions, and pre-tenure faculty members are expected to publish one or more refereed articles per year (Coggburn & Neely, 2015). It should be noted that in tenure and promotion decisions publication quality refers to whether a

publication is refereed or not. Other measures of publication quality and impact such as the journal impact factor, the number of citations, downloads or altmetrics garnered by publications are not expected in tenure and promotion decisions but they can help a candidate whose number of publications falls below the minimum publication standards.

Publication Output

Data from the original survey administered to faculty members affiliated with NASPAA member schools indicates that a higher percentage of women (64%) considers research productivity to be extremely important for tenure and promotion when compared to men (56%), but the former’s research productivity is significantly lower than that of the latter. Summary statistics of publications by faculty gender are presented in Table 3.1. Over their academic careers academic women publish at a significantly lower rate than that of men. On average, women reported publishing refereed articles at approximately half the rate of men (52%), standardized refereed articles per five years at 62% of the men’s rate, book chapters at 68%, books at 56%, non-refereed articles at 52%, and other publications at 39% of the men’s rate.

When considering the median, women seem to publish at a lower rate than men across all publication types. Notably, half of women reported publishing refereed articles at half the men’s rate, standardized refereed articles per five years at 57% the men’s rate, book chapters at 67%, non-refereed articles at 50%, and other publications at 50% of the rate of men. About a quarter of women seem to narrow the gender publication gap in terms of standardized refereed articles per five years (women

TABLE 3.1 Summary Statistics of Publication Type by Faculty Gender

<i>Publications</i>	<i>Mean</i>		<i>Q1</i>		<i>Median</i>		<i>Q3</i>	
	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Refereed articles	23	12	5	3	12	6	25	14
Standard refereed articles	7.1	4.4	2	1	4.6	2.6	8	6
Book chapters	5.3	3.6	1	0	3	2	6	4
Books	1.6	0.9	0	0	0	0	2	1
Non-refereed articles	9.8	5.1	0	0	2	1	7	3.1
Other publications	8.9	3.5	0	0	2	1	5.8	4
Total	300	209	300	209	300	209	300	209

Source: Created by the author.

publishing at 75% of the men's publication rate) and other publications (women publishing at 67% of the men's rate).

These statistics suggest that, over their academic career, women have a significantly lower research productivity than men, especially in terms of publications that matter the most in tenure and promotion decisions such as refereed articles and books. Women narrow the gender publication gap when they publish book chapters and when refereed articles are standardized over five-year intervals.

Table 3.2 presents summary statistics of publications by the faculty member's race. Given the small number of the faculty members who identified their race, summary statistics for all faculty from under-represented racial groups are reported in aggregate. Over their academic careers faculty from under-represented racial groups reported lower publication rates when compared to white faculty, but the racial publication gap is much smaller than the gender one that was described before. On average, faculty from under-represented racial groups reported publishing refereed articles at 74% of the rate of white faculty, standardized refereed articles per five-year intervals at 90%, book chapters at 61%, and books at 53% of the rate of white faculty. The average publication rate of non-refereed articles and other publications is lower for white faculty than that of faculty from racially under-represented groups. Specifically, white faculty reported publishing non-refereed articles and other publications at lower rates than faculty from racially under-represented groups (at 61% and 59%, respectively). When considering the median, the first and the third quartiles, the racial publication gap narrows significantly, and racial publishing parity can be noted for book chapters, books, and other publications.

TABLE 3.2 Summary Statistics of Publication Type by Faculty Race

<i>Publications</i>	<i>Mean</i>		<i>Q1</i>		<i>Median</i>		<i>Q3</i>	
	<i>Non-White</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Non-White</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Non-White</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Non-White</i>	<i>White</i>
Refereed articles	14.3	19.3	3.8	4	8	10	20	20
Standard refereed articles	5.5	6.1	1.1	1.5	4	3.8	6.5	7
Book chapters	3	4.9	0	0	2	2	4	5
Books	0.8	1.5	0	0	0	0	1	1
Non-refereed articles	11.9	7.2	0	0	0.9	2	3	6
Other publications	10.2	6	0	0	1	1	4.2	5
Total	83	424	83	424	83	424	83	424

Source: Created by the author.

These statistics suggest that, during their academic career, faculty from racially under-represented groups reported a lower research productivity than white faculty for some but not all publication types. Notably, the average racial publication gap is more pronounced for books and book chapters than for refereed articles. Faculty members from racially under-represented groups are more productive in publishing non-refereed articles and other publications when compared to white faculty.

When gender intersects with race, faculty productivity shows some interesting trends, as described in Table 3.3. Women from racially under-represented groups reported the lowest research productivity throughout their academic career and across all publication types. On average, this group of women reported publishing refereed articles at 88% of the rate of white women, at 67% of the rate of men from racially under-represented groups, and at 44% of the rate of white men. When considering the median, it can be noted that half of white women reported publishing six and fewer refereed articles throughout their career, followed by half of men from racially under-represented groups who reported publishing seven and a half or fewer refereed articles, half of the women from racially under-represented groups who reported publishing nine or fewer

TABLE 3.3 Summary Statistics of Publication Type by Faculty Gender and Race

<i>Publications</i>	<i>Men</i>					<i>Women</i>				
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Q1</i>	<i>Med</i>	<i>Q3</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Q1</i>	<i>Med</i>	<i>Q3</i>	<i>Total</i>
Non-white faculty										
Refereed articles	16.2	3.8	7.5	20	32	10.9	3.3	9	14.8	51
Standard refereed articles	6	1.5	4.5	6.5	32	4.6	1	3.5	7.3	51
Book chapters	3.5	1	2	5	32	2.2	0	1.5	3.8	51
Books	1	0	0	1	32	0.4	0	0	0.8	51
Non-refereed articles	16.8	0	1	4	32	4	0	0	2	51
Other publications	14	0	2	4.2	32	4	0	0	4.7	51
White faculty										
Refereed articles	24.5	5	12	26.2	249	12.3	2.9	6	14.1	171
Standard refereed articles	7.3	2	4.5	8.3	249	4.4	1	2.5	6	171
Book chapters	5.6	0	3	7	249	3.9	0	2	4	171
Books	1.8	0	0	2	249	1	0	0	1	171
Non-refereed articles	8.4	0	2	8	249	5.4	0	1	4	171
Other publications	7.8	0	2	6	249	3.5	0	1	4	171

Source: Created by the author.

articles and half of the white men who reported publishing 12 or fewer articles.

The publication gap narrows when refereed articles are standardized by five-year time periods, with women from racially under-represented groups achieving parity with white women, and each group of women publishing at 76% of the rate of men from racially under-represented groups, and at 62% of the white men's rate. The values of the median of standard refereed articles suggest that half of the women from racially under-represented groups narrow the gender publication gap with both groups of men whereas half of the white women lag behind everyone else, trailing white men and both men and women from racially under-represented groups.

Further, women from racially under-represented groups reported the lowest productivity for book chapters and books. Specifically, they reported publishing book chapters at 63% of the rate of men from racially under-represented groups, at 57% of the rate of white women, and at 39% of the rate of white men. Women from racially under-represented groups reported publishing books at half the rate of white men and at 36% of the rate of men from racially under-represented groups and white women. Somewhat similar publication trends are present for non-refereed articles and other publications, with women from racially under-represented groups reporting the lowest average publication productivity and men from the same groups reporting the highest publication productivity.

To further understand the gender publication gap of faculty members at different career stages, Table 3.4 describes the summary statistics of faculty publication patterns by academic rank. Men and women differ significantly in their publication rates at the assistant and full professor ranks but not at the associate professor rank. Specifically, men reported publishing significantly more refereed articles than women at both assistant and full professor ranks. The gender publication gap is similar for assistant (61%) and full (62%) professors. When the publication productivity for refereed articles is standardized by five-year time periods, the gender publication gap becomes narrower, with women assistant professors publishing at 68% of the men's rate and women full professors publishing at 64% of the men's rate.

At the assistant professor level, the gender publication gap for refereed articles seems to be driven by white women who are underperforming not only when compared to men but also when compared to women from racially under-represented groups. More specifically, white women who are assistant professors reported publishing refereed articles at nearly half the rates of women from racially under-represented groups (53%) and white men (54), and at 60% of the rate of men from racially under-represented groups.

TABLE 3.4 Summary Statistics of Publication Type by Gender and Academic Rank

<i>Publications</i>	<i>Men</i>					<i>Women</i>				
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Q1</i>	<i>Med</i>	<i>Q3</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Q1</i>	<i>Med</i>	<i>Q3</i>	<i>Total</i>
Assistant professors										
Refereed articles	9.6	4	7	12	54	5.9	2	5	8	54
Standard refereed articles	6.6	3	5.5	8.9	54	4.5	1.2	3	6	54
Book chapters	2.1	0	1	3	54	1.3	0	1	2	54
Books	0.3	0	0	0	54	0.3	0	0	0	54
Associate professors										
Refereed articles	9	2	5	11.5	81	7.8	2	5	12	82
Standard refereed articles	3.5	1	2.3	5	81	3.2	1	2	4.5	82
Book chapters	2.6	0	1	3	81	2.1	0	1	3	82
Books	0.4	0	0	0	81	0.4	0	0	1	82
Full professors										
Refereed articles	35.7	12	21	40.8	138	22.3	6	14	25.6	58
Standard refereed articles	9.2	3.1	5.3	10.7	138	5.9	1.9	3.8	7.1	58
Book chapters	7.9	2	5	10	138	7.5	2	3.5	9.8	58
Books	2.9	0	1	3.8	138	2.1	0	1	3	58

Source: Created by the author.

It should be noted that women from racially underrepresented groups who are assistant professors reported publishing, on average, the highest number of refereed articles. Similarly, the gender publication gap for assistant professors who publish book chapters is also driven by white women who publish book chapters at 39% and 46% of the rates of men and women faculty from racially under-represented groups and at 57% of the rate of white men.

White women who are full professors are the least productive faculty group, publishing at a slightly lower rate than women from racially under-represented groups. On average, the publication gap remains significant along gender lines, with both groups of women who are full professors publishing refereed articles at somewhere between 59% and 66% the rates of their male colleagues. Similar trends can be noted for books. White men and women who are full professors are more productive in terms of book chapters when compared to their colleagues from racially under-represented groups (a publication gap of 60–61%). It should be noted that men from racially under-represented groups who are full professors are,

on average, the most productive faculty group when publishing refereed articles. These statistics should be interpreted with caution due to the low representation of faculty from racially under-represented groups at each of the three academic ranks.

Data presented in Table 3.4 also indicates that women who are assistant professors publish book chapters at 62% of the men's rate whereas women who are full professors almost achieved parity with their male colleagues by publishing book chapters at 95% of the men's rate. Additionally, results suggest that women who are associate professors seem to close the gender publication gap.

Taken together, these statistics suggest that, overall, *women publish refereed articles and books at half the men's rates*. Further, women from racially under-represented groups have the lowest overall research productivity but half of these women are excelling in their scholarly contributions. Among assistant professors, white women are the least productive faculty group as they are not only under-performing when compared to both groups of men but also when compared to women from racially under-represented groups. The gender publication gap can also be noted for full professors with men from racially under-represented groups being the most productive faculty group in terms of publications. No gender publication differences were reported by faculty members who are associate professors. These statistics are consistent with existing views about gender publication gaps in the public affairs field (Knepper et al., 2020a; Sabharwal, 2013; Scutelnicu & Knepper, 2019; Slack et al., 1996), but they expand the discussion by incorporating into the analysis data about faculty race and the intersection of gender and race.

The views of the interview participants support the statistics derived from the survey. The former reported not only gender differences in publication productivity, but they also discussed the consequences of such differences for faculty career advancement. Due to their high research productivity men are more likely than women to apply for tenure and promotion early and they are supported in such decisions by their colleagues and supervisors. Therefore, their advancement in the academy happens faster than that of women. This trend was also noted when comparing men who had young children with women who weren't caregivers. While it is not clear why this happens, some explanations for these discrepancies may be that men are better at managing their time, and they are more successful in prioritizing research over teaching and service (Bernstein, 2017).

Interviews revealed that, in addition to publications, other research contributions that mattered for tenure and promotion were conference presentations, external grants, and applied research projects. Most faculty who participated in interviews indicated that tenure-track faculty were

expected to present their research at one to two conferences a year. This is consistent with the study of Coggburn and Neely (2015) who reported that 55% of NASPAA-accredited MPA directors indicated candidates for tenure and promotion at their institutions were expected to present their research at one or more conferences annually. Support for conference travel was found to range from \$800 to \$4000 or more annually, with a typical annual amount of \$2000 being reported by the majority of interviewees. External grants are not considered a requirement for tenure in public affairs programs, but they can help a candidate’s case in instances in which one doesn’t meet the minimum expected number of publications. For instance, some faculty reported that one major grant could count as one publication in tenure assessments. Finally, applied research projects are also considered in tenure and promotion decisions of faculty members who work at teaching-oriented institutions.

Research Effort

To better understand the gender publication gap Table 3.5 presents summary statistics about the research effort of faculty members based on gender and academic rank. On average, men and women reported having similar overall research efforts (44% and 45%, respectively). Half of the men reported they dedicated at least 40% of their work time to research activities and half of the women reported having at least a 45% research effort. However, there are notable gender differences in terms of research effort based on faculty rank. For assistant professors not

TABLE 3.5 Faculty Research Effort by Gender and Academic Rank

<i>Faculty Rank</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Q1</i>	<i>Median</i>	<i>Q3</i>	<i>Total</i>
Assistant professor	46%	30%	45%	60%	90
Men	50%	33%	50%	70%	46
Women	42%	30%	40%	60%	44
Associate professor	43%	30%	40%	50%	151
Men	40%	25%	40%	50%	74
Women	46%	30%	50%	60%	77
Full professor	46%	30%	50%	60%	188
Men	46%	30%	50%	60%	132
Women	46%	30%	50%	60%	56
Overall	45%	30%	40%	60%	444
Men	44%	30%	40%	60%	264
Women	45%	30%	45%	60%	180

Source: Created by the author.

only did women report a lower average research effort (42%) than their male colleagues (50%) but they also reported a lower research effort for the first (30% vs. 33%), second (40% vs. 50%), and third (60% vs. 70%) quartiles. Conversely, associate professors show opposite patterns. Women who were associate professors reported having a higher average (46% vs. 40%), first (30% vs. 25%), second (50% vs. 40%), and third (60% vs. 50%) quartile values of their research effort when compared to men. There are no gender differences for the research effort of full professors.

When faculty gender intersects with race, the following results are found. Overall, men from racially under-represented groups reported having the highest average research effort (51% of their work time), followed by women from the same groups and white women who each reported dedicating an average 45% of their work time to research activities and white men who reported spending on average 43% of their time on research.

For assistant professors, men and women from racially under-represented groups reported having the highest research effort among the four faculty groups. Notably, men reported spending on average 70% of their work time on research and women reported spending nearly half (49%) of their time on research. White men who are assistant professors reported spending on average 45% of their time on research whereas white women reported spending slightly less than that (42%).

White women who are associate professors reported having the highest average research effort (47%), followed by women (43%) and men (42%) from racially under-represented groups, and white men (39%). It should also be noted that half of the white women who are associate professors reported dedicating half and more of their work time to research activities whereas all the other faculty groups had a median research effort of 40%. Although gender differences are not statistically significant for full professors, men from racially under-represented groups reported the highest average research effort (54%) compared to 50% average effort of women from the same groups, 47% average effort of white women, and 45% average effort of white men.

These statistics suggest that while overall, men and women faculty have, on average, similar research efforts, women who are assistant professors reported spending on average 8% less time, and women associate professors reported spending on average 6% more time on research activities when compared to men. The higher research effort of men who are assistant professors seems to be driven by the high research effort of men from racially under-represented groups. Once

TABLE 3.6 Faculty Research Effort by Gender, Race, and Rank

Faculty Rank	Mean		Q1		Median		Q3	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Assistant professor	46	43	46	43	46	43	46	43
Non-white	70%	49%	65%	39%	70%	45%	77%	61%
White	45%	42%	30%	25%	40%	40%	60%	60%
Associate professor	85	76	85	76	85	76	85	76
Non-white	42%	43%	23%	30%	40%	40%	50%	51%
White	39%	47%	25%	33%	40%	50%	50%	60%
Full professor	122	57	122	57	122	57	122	57
Non-white	54%	50%	50%	50%	60%	50%	60%	50%
White	45%	47%	30%	30%	50%	48%	60%	60%
Overall	264	179	264	179	264	179	264	179
Non-white	51%	45%	35%	30%	50%	45%	70%	50%
White	43%	45%	30%	30%	40%	43%	60%	60%

Source: Created by the author.

tenured and promoted to associate professors, women seem to dedicate more time to research activities than men (Table 3.6). This trend is more pronounced for white women who seem to be driving up the research effort of women who are associate professors. Additionally, men from racially under-represented groups reported dedicating most of their time to research activities across the academic ranks (assistant and full professors).

As reported herein, faculty research effort shows a direct association with their research productivity in the case of women and faculty from racially under-represented groups but not in the case of white men. Overall, women reported spending the least amount of their work time on research activities and having the lowest publication rate for refereed articles and books – which are the publications that matter the most in tenure and promotion decisions. This trend is more pronounced for white women who are assistant professors. Although women from racially under-represented groups reported the lowest research productivity over their entire career, those who are assistant professors reported publishing at similar rates with white men. This fact can be explained by the high research effort that this group of women report. White men reported dedicating among the least amount of their work time to research activities, and yet they reported the highest research productivity for refereed articles when compared to the other faculty groups. This trend is more pronounced for white men who are assistant professors, and it can be explained by the

role that informal mentoring and professional networks play in advancing the academic career of white men (Meschitti & Lawton Smith, 2017; Schwartz-Shea, 2020).

Research Support

Research-intensive universities are more generous in supporting the research of their tenure-track faculty than the ones which are more teaching oriented. Research release time is one of the most common research support incentives that is used in assisting junior faculty to establish and carry out research agendas. Some interviewees reported that their employers (e.g., R1 institutions) built an automatic release system that all their junior faculty benefited from. The automatic course release lasted for one to three years of the faculty probationary period when they were expected to have a 1/1 teaching load. Other interview participants noted that faculty members negotiated additional yearly release time as part of their hiring package. This practice has inequitable consequences for faculty career advancement. One woman working at a research-intensive university noted, “They gave course reductions as part of new hiring negotiations, but course reductions were not assigned to all incoming faculty and that caused complex issues because not everyone was treated the same”. Additionally, women indicated they didn’t know they could negotiate a reduced teaching load beyond one year.

Other research support incentives that benefit tenure-track faculty members refer to start-up money, summer research salary, internal competitive grants, fellowships, and workshops, junior sabbaticals (e.g., half a year sabbatical), funds for conference and research-related travel, graduate assistants, and writing boot camps. Faculty members indicated there were differences in terms of start-up packages and summer salary which affected faculty research productivity and their contributions toward tenure and promotion.

Faculty Teaching Contribution

Interview participants indicated that although teaching was necessary to get tenure one could not get tenured solely based on their teaching contributions, they also needed to have publications. There were a few instances at teaching-oriented universities when faculty members indicated that being an excellent teacher could help offset a lower research productivity.

In public affairs, student evaluations are considered the most important factor in evaluating the teaching contributions of pre-tenure

faculty members, followed by the quality of syllabi, teaching graduate courses, and peer evaluations (Coggburn & Neely, 2015). All interview participants reported that student evaluations were the most common indicator used in assessing faculty teaching quality. Typically, universities hold an average standard for student teaching evaluations (e.g., 4 out of 5-point ranking scale) or they consider the progress of teaching evaluation scores over time. Faculty members who taught statistics, research methods, and graduate level courses reported having lower student evaluations because those courses were more challenging. Faculty serving on tenure and promotion committees agreed that showing progress over time in teaching evaluation was an expected and generally approved practice due to the diverse topical depth and the modality of course delivery.

An important theme that emerged from the interviews refers to the presence of a gendered approach in faculty's teaching evaluations. Faculty members discussed some invisible burdens that women had to deal with when their teaching was evaluated. Specifically, women were evaluated by students based on their personal warmth and appearance rather than their knowledge. Students were reported to treat women faculty differently when compared to men because the former were expected to be the students' confidant. This is problematic because students tend to rank women and faculty members from racially and ethnically under-represented groups lower than men faculty (Mitchell & Martin, 2018; Wagner et al., 2016). Therefore, women contribute a significant amount of emotional labor when compared to men – work that is unaccounted for in tenure and promotion decisions in spite of its contribution to student retention and satisfaction.

In addition to student evaluations, interview participants indicated the quality of faculty teaching was assessed through a review of the candidates' syllabi, a sample of their course assignments, and their teaching methods. Tenure and promotion reviewers expected syllabi to have clear objectives, expectations and learning outcomes, course assignments be appropriate for the course level, be linked to learning objectives, and have rigorous, current, and diverse content. Interview participants indicated that annual evaluations of faculty performance typically assessed the quality of the pedagogical materials and method – which proved to be very helpful for the preparation of the faculty teaching dossier. About half of the interviewees indicated that peer teaching observations were also considered in faculty tenure's assessment.

Interview participants also discussed how teaching expectations could overwhelm junior faculty, especially during their first year when they needed to take on teaching assignments that they may not have been

comfortable with and when they needed to fill existing holes in the schedule. One woman working at a teaching-oriented university shared her teaching experience as a junior faculty:

I had a lot of new teaching preps for most semesters. I was on a four/four load, sometimes I was on a five-five load. If we were short-handed, I would have an overload. One year, I taught five days a week and I didn't get much research done at all at that point. And I remember my major professor when I finished my Ph.D. telling me to protect my time. And at the time, I had no idea what she meant. And it probably didn't daunt on me until about year three. OK, this is why she told me that, and that's what it actually meant to protect my time.

One man working at a teaching-oriented university summarized the teaching experience of first-year faculty at his institution, as follows: "They teach first time in the morning, last time at night schedules that the more senior faculty don't like to teach. So, it basically starts hard and theoretically gets a little easier the longer you're there rather than the other way around".

Although faculty members were not prepared to be instructors during their doctoral studies, some of the interviewed faculty reported serving as teaching assistants (TAs) and instructors, experiences that allowed them to gain teaching experience. All interviewees agreed that their universities offered multiple opportunities for faculty to be successful instructors in the form of teaching workshops, seminars, online learning, and teaching observations.

Less important factors that are used in assessing faculty teaching evaluation refer to engaging students in community-based projects and service-learning teaching although these aspects are important for students in public administration (Coggburn & Neely, 2015). Establishing and maintaining community relations is vital to universities and these contributions should be accounted for in tenure and promotion decisions.

Although teaching is not considered as important in tenure and promotion decisions as research, women indicated they aimed to be great instructors to alleviate potential gender biases when they were reviewed for tenure. One woman working at a research-intensive institution noted:

I tried to have decent evaluations because I wanted to look good in the classroom although it was never mentioned as being an important thing for tenure (...). If you had bad teaching evaluations, they could use it against you during the tenure review.

Other faculty members who evaluated tenure cases reported that, in addition to meeting publication standards, women were expected to be excellent teachers while men were not. But when men had similar teaching contributions as women, the former got a higher tenure assessment score than the latter. This expectation suggests that women are held to higher teaching standards than men in their tenure and promotion evaluations. Additionally, women reported they got involved in activities that were not valued in tenure and promotion decisions such as filling in for last-minute teaching assignments and advising students. One woman working at a teaching-oriented university mentioned: “Oftentimes it’s the women who will step in and fill in a gap to teach a class that is a last-minute prep. But those things are not counted. I mean, there’s an assumption that you are naturally going to be a good teacher”.

Teaching Load

Next, faculty teaching load is described to understand whether there are differences among faculty teaching based on their academic rank, gender, and race. Table 3.7 describes summary statistics for faculty teaching load by gender and academic rank. Overall, men and women teach on average a similar number of classes per year (4.75 and 4.62, respectively). There is a slightly higher percentage of men (46%) than women (41%) who teach five and more courses a year. Conversely, there is a slightly smaller percentage of men than women (36% vs. 40%) who reported teaching four courses a year and an almost similar percentage of men (18%) and women (19%) who reported teaching three and fewer courses per year.

When examining faculty teaching load by academic rank, gender differences are higher at the associate professor rank than at the assistant and full professor ranks, but they are not statistically significant. For assistant professors there is a slightly higher percentage of men (48%) than women (44%) who reported a high teaching load that translates in teaching five and more courses per year. Conversely, a slightly lower percentage of men than women reported having a teaching load of four courses per year (36% vs. 38%). Similar trends are recorded for faculty with a low teaching load where fewer men (16%) than women (18%) reported teaching three and fewer courses a year. Table 3.7 also describes that most men who are associate professors (58%) reported teaching five and more courses a year when compared to 39% of their female peers. Conversely, a higher percentage of women (44%) than men (25%) who are associate professors reported teaching four courses per year.

For full professors the gender teaching load differences are minimal with slightly more men (39%) than women (38%) reported teaching five

TABLE 3.7 Faculty Teaching Load by Gender and Academic Rank

<i>Faculty Rank</i>	<i><3 Courses</i>	<i>4 Courses</i>	<i>>5 Courses</i>	<i>Total</i>
Assistant professor	17%	37%	46%	112
Men	16%	36%	48%	56
Women	18%	38%	44%	56
Associate professor	17%	35%	48%	170
Men	17%	25%	58%	84
Women	17%	44%	39%	86
Full professor	21%	40%	39%	207
Men	21%	40%	39%	147
Women	24%	38%	38%	60
Overall	18%	38%	44%	509
Men	18%	36%	46%	300
Women	19%	40%	41%	209

Source: Created by the author.

courses or more a year and slightly fewer men (36%) than women (40%) who reported teaching four courses a year. These statistics indicate that although not statistically significant the gender differences in faculty teaching loads are higher at the associate professor rank and minimal at the assistant and full professor ranks. Notably, men who are associate professors teach, on average, 0.7 more courses per year than their women peers.

When the faculty teaching load is further broken down by race, it can be noted that some faculty groups have higher teaching loads than others, as depicted in Table 3.8. Overall, there is a higher percentage of white men (47%) than men from racially under-represented groups (43%) who reported teaching five and more courses a year, and a lower percentage of white women (39%) who reported teaching the same level of classes when compared to women from racially under-represented groups (53%).

When further analyzing faculty teaching load by rank, a higher percentage of white men (52%) than men from racially under-represented groups (31%) who are assistant professors reported teaching five and more courses a year. Similarly, a higher percentage of white women (45%) than women from racially under-represented groups (34%) who are assistant professors reported teaching five and more courses a year.

The teaching load patterns change for associate professors with a higher percentage of men (57% vs. 52%) and women (63% vs. 46%) from racially under-represented groups who reported teaching five courses or more a year when compared to their counterparts. Full professors show similar trends with assistant professors but the percentages for high teaching loads are lower. There is a higher percentage of white men (40% vs. 25%) and

TABLE 3.8 Faculty Teaching Load By Gender, Race, and Academic Rank

Faculty Rank	Men				Women			
	<3 Courses	4 Courses	>5 Courses	Total	<3 Courses	4 Courses	>5 Courses	Total
Assistant professors	17%	36%	47%	55	17%	39%	44%	57
Non-white	15%	54%	31%	13	33%	33%	34%	9
White	17%	31%	52%	42	15%	40%	45%	48
Associate professor	16%	26%	58%	85	18%	43%	39%	85
Non-white	17%	26%	57%	23	11%	26%	63%	19
White	17%	31%	52%	62	15%	39%	46%	66
Full professors	21%	40%	39%	146	24%	38%	38%	59
Non-white	8%	67%	25%	12	25%	50%	25%	4
White	22%	38%	40%	134	24%	36%	40%	55
Overall	18%	36%	46%	301	19%	40%	41%	208
Non-white	16%	41%	43%	51	16%	31%	53%	32
White	18%	35%	47%	250	20%	41%	39%	176

Source: Created by the author.

white women (40% vs. 33%) who reported teaching five or more courses per year.

These statistics indicate that teaching load differences exist mainly along racial lines. White faculty members tend to have higher teaching loads at the assistant and full professor ranks when compared to their counterparts. Conversely, faculty members from racially under-represented groups who are associate professors tend to have higher teaching loads than their counterparts. Women from racially under-represented groups who are associate professors reported having the highest teaching load of all the faculty groups.

Teaching Support

When asked about teaching support interview participants shared that their universities prepared them to be successful in their teaching through the availability of internal teaching resources centers that provided pedagogical support to their junior colleagues in the form of teaching workshops and training (e.g., syllabi and course materials), and professional development opportunities. While most faculty members agreed that teaching centers were more developmental in their pedagogical efforts, a

few mentioned that teaching resources and methods were used in a punitive way and were meant for faculty who were struggling in the classroom.

Another form of teaching support that was identified by faculty members refers to the flexibility in teaching schedules, especially for faculty who were on the tenure-track. Flexibility in teaching schedules includes the following: allowing junior faculty to teach multiple sections of the same course, minimizing the number of new course preparations to allow junior faculty time to perfect the courses they teach, and offering faculty the possibility of teaching a mix of online and in-person courses.

A third form of teaching support that emerged from the interviews refers to the use of TAs for large classes (e.g., those exceeding 30 students). A few faculty members mentioned they were assigned small classes (e.g., capped at 15 students) – a fact that allowed them to be successful in their teaching.

Faculty Service Contribution

Service is considered the least important factor in tenure and promotion decisions, and it is typically expected of junior faculty to focus on service activities at the department or school level. Among the internal service activities that are considered the most important in tenure decisions are service to the department, serving as a student association advisor, and serving on college and university-level committees (Coggburn & Neely, 2015). Faculty working at research-intensive institutions reported being successful in protecting their junior faculty from time-consuming service commitments. One woman working at a research-intensive university described strategies to minimize the service load of junior faculty: “You know, if you’re in the office working, close your door and focus on your research. You won’t be assigned any substantive departmental service. We might put your name down for some things but in a non-participant sort of expectation. But your primary focus is to focus on your research”.

Faculty working at teaching-oriented universities reported their employers expected their pre-tenure faculty members to focus mainly on departmental level service activities such as curriculum, advisement, and assessment, but other university-level service such as participation in recruitment events (e.g., open houses, informational sessions), student affairs, admissions, and performance committees was expected. Further, faculty members who are part of small public affairs programs and departments reported having a disproportionately higher teaching and service load when compared to their peers at larger schools. Junior faculty members ended up spending a lot of time on service activities due to a lack of availability or willingness of tenured colleagues to serve and due to junior faculty inability to say “no” when asked to serve. One man working at

a teaching-focused university noted: “Service is the complicated part because even though the expectations are relatively low, there are not enough tenured faculty serving on departmental committees. Somebody had to serve so, another junior colleague and I stepped in”.

External service activities that are deemed important in tenure and promotion decisions include serving as peer reviewers, being part of journal editorial boards, serving as panel chairs, moderators, or discussants at conferences and serving on the boards of professional associations (Cogburn & Neely, 2015). Although not required of pre-tenure faculty members, professional service is expected because of its importance in establishing and expanding professional networks.

Women indicated they devoted a lot of time to service because they were expected to serve. One woman working at a teaching-oriented university shared her service experience:

I devoted a lot of time to service in my first tenure track job, and I still do that today. I think it’s this gendered burden that women tend to have more service assignments. And I felt like I couldn’t say ‘no’ as a young tenure-track female. As one of the only junior faculty members in that department, I was dumped a lot of service work in terms of community service and departmental service. (...) I won quite a few leadership awards and I got a lot of experience early on, but it was exhausting.

One important theme that emerged from the interviews is that women have and are expected to have a disproportionately higher service workload than men. There are at least three reasons that can explain this gender difference. First, the work climate at the departmental and/or school level was reported to be gendered – if men were not expected to engage in service, women were penalized if they didn’t engage in it. Many interviewees indicated that the service workload distribution fell heavily on the women in the department, particularly junior women faculty because the department leadership and authority were dominated by men. Second, interviewees indicated there was a lack of representation of women and faculty members from racially and ethnically under-represented groups in various university committees. Women and faculty from racially under-represented groups indicated they chose to participate in service activities that mattered to them, despite knowing that service would not count too much in their tenure assessment. One woman working at a research-intensive university observed: “I was asked to participate in a couple of university committees so, even though I had zero requirements to do service, I ended up doing the service because it was related to my background, and I was more than happy to do it”. Third, women reported they voluntarily chose

to mentor junior faculty because of a lack of women and faculty members from racially under-represented groups in senior ranks who could serve as mentors. Women perceived their service contributions as a significant means to affect change in their organizations.

Men reported being strategic about their service contributions by choosing to serve on committees that brought them visibility among their colleagues. It should be noted that women place a higher importance than men on internal and professional service activities. According to the public affairs faculty survey, a higher percentage of women faculty considered service to the department to be extremely important (22%) and important (33%) when compared to men (17% and 30%, respectively). Similarly, a higher percentage of women considered service to the college to be extremely important (10%) and important (24%) when compared to men (8% and 17%, respectively). Women also placed a slightly higher importance on professional service when compared to men (30% vs. 24%).

Summing up, women seem to be more committed to their organizations by fulfilling service activities that help retain students and ensure organizational sustainability (Flaherty, 2017; Portillo, 2017) when compared to men. Men seem to focus on service activities that are geared toward their career advancement.

Service Load

To better understand how faculty members differ in their service contributions, Table 3.9 *presents* summary statistics about public affairs faculty service workload stratified by gender and race. Overall, men and women

TABLE 3.9 Faculty Service Load by Gender and Rank

<i>Faculty Rank</i>	<i><5 Hours</i>	<i>6–10 Hours</i>	<i>>11 Hours</i>	<i>Total</i>
Assistant professor	62%	23%	15%	110
Men	57%	26%	17%	54
Women	66%	20%	14%	56
Associate professor	47%	29%	24%	168
Men	52%	25%	23%	83
Women	42%	33%	25%	85
Full professor	35%	34%	31%	200
Men	34%	34%	32%	142
Women	36%	34%	29%	58
Overall	45%	29%	26%	498
Men	44%	29%	27%	292
Women	46%	29%	24%	206

Source: Created by the author.

seem to contribute their work time to service activities at similar rates. When delving deeper and examining gender differences for service workload by rank, it can be noted that assistant and associate professors show opposing trends.

On one hand, men who are assistant professors tend to spend more time on service activities than their women peers – 43% of men compared to 34% of women who are assistant professors reported spending six and more hours on service activities per week. On the other hand, women who are associate professors are more likely to spend more hours on service activities when compared to their men peers. More specifically, there is a higher percentage of women (58%) than men (48%) at the associate professor level who reported spending six and more hours per week on service.

Table 3.10 describes summary statistics about the service workload of faculty members by further breaking the data down by race. Overall, women from racially under-represented groups (31%) are most likely to dedicate 11 hours and more per week to service activities, followed by white men (27%), men from racially under-represented groups (25%), and white women (23%). When examining gender differences for assistant professors, it should be noted that while the majority of faculty members spend the least amount of time on service assignments, a higher percentage

TABLE 3.10 Faculty Service Load by Gender, Race, and Rank

<i>Faculty Rank</i>	<i>Men</i>				<i>Women</i>			
	<i><5 Hours</i>	<i>6–10 Hours</i>	<i>>11 Hours</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i><5 Hours</i>	<i>6–10 Hours</i>	<i>>11 Hours</i>	<i>Total</i>
Assistant professor	57%	26%	17%	54	66%	20%	14%	56
Non-white	62%	23%	15%	13	87%	0%	13%	8
White	56%	27%	17%	41	62%	23%	15%	48
Associate professor	52%	25%	23%	83	42%	32%	26%	85
Non-white	57%	17%	20%	23	33%	39%	28%	19
White	50%	28%	22%	60	44%	30%	26%	66
Full professor	34%	34%	32%	142	36%	34%	29%	58
Non-white	36%	27%	37%	12	25%	25%	50%	4
White	34%	34%	32%	130	37%	35%	28%	54
Overall	44%	29%	27%	292	47%	29%	24%	206
Non-white	53%	22%	25%	52	44%	25%	31%	33
White	43%	30%	27%	240	47%	30%	23%	173

Source: Created by the author.

(87%) of women from racially under-represented groups reported spending five hours and less per week on service activities, followed by men from under-represented groups and white women (62% each), and white men (56%).

Different patterns can be noted for associate professors with women from racially under-represented groups and white women reporting the highest service loads. Specifically, 67% of women from racially under-represented groups who are associate professors reported spending six hours and more per week on service, followed by white women (56%), white men (50%), and men from racially under-represented groups (43%). When examining service loads of full professors, women from racially under-represented groups seem to have the highest service burden of all the faculty groups. Half of the women from this group reported dedicating 11 hours and more to service activities, followed by men from racially under-represented groups (37%), white men (32%), and white women (28%).

These statistics suggest that although women reported a low service load at the assistant professor rank, their service load increases significantly at the associate professor rank. Data further suggests that women from racially under-represented groups who are associate and full professors have the highest service burden among all faculty groups. One surprising finding is that white men who are assistant professors reported having the highest service load when compared to their women counterparts. This may be indicative of the former group's intent to engage in service activities that have the potential to advance their careers and establish their professional networks.

Taken together these statistics are consistent with recent studies which report that women and faculty members from racially and ethnically under-represented groups devote more time to their advising and service responsibilities than men (Rauhaus & Schuchs Carr, 2022; Thomas, 2019). The heavier service burdens of women and faculty members from racially under-represented groups are directly related to their lower research productivity (Gasser & Shaffer, 2014) and their tenure and promotion outcomes.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Today the standards for tenure and promotion have become more stringent than in the past for all faculty members, with research contributions gaining preeminence over the teaching and service ones. Pre-tenure faculty members are expected to publish more refereed articles than they were expected in the past, and they are also expected to publish both independently

and collaborate with peers and students. Additionally, tenure-track faculty members are expected to be excellent teachers and have significant service contributions to their departments and schools. Not only is public affairs a discipline that is “moving towards stricter peer-reviewed research requirements at the expense of teaching and service” (Coggburn & Neely, 2015, p. 205), but it also expects faculty to excel in their teaching in addition to research.

Research-intensive institutions value a high research productivity that translates into both quantity and quality of publications (e.g., minimum number of refereed articles) whereas teaching-oriented institutions are more flexible in their research expectations and include additional publications (e.g., book chapters, policy briefs) and scholarly activities in their tenure and promotion evaluations. As reported herein, there are varied expectations for publication quantity and quality based on the university Carnegie’s classification, with research-intensive universities expecting one to two refereed articles per year, and teaching-oriented universities requiring two to three publications during the candidates’ probationary period. This variation in research expectations affects the transferability of tenure for those faculty members who consider moving from a teaching to a research-oriented university, and women would be more disadvantaged than men as they are more likely to work at teaching-oriented institutions (Hancock et al., 2013) and they are less likely to retain their rank or get promoted when moving (Yan et al., 2020).

Faculty in public affairs programs differ in meeting the tenure and promotion requirements or expectations based on gender and race in all three areas they are being evaluated in: research, teaching, and service. In terms of research, women publish refereed articles and books at half the men’s publication rates. These are the publications that matter the most in tenure and promotion decisions. The gender publication gap exists at the assistant and full professor ranks but not at the associate professor one. The gender publication gap for assistant professors is driven by white women who reported the lowest research productivity. Although women from racially under-represented groups have the lowest publication rate overall, half of them are high performers and those who are assistant professors manage to publish at similar rates with white men.

The time faculty members dedicate to research activities is directly related to their research productivity in the case of women and faculty members from racially under-represented groups but not in the case of white men. The former faculty groups reported having a low research effort and the lowest research productivity whereas the latter reported a low research effort but the highest overall publication rate for refereed articles. These results may indicate that white men spend more time on

establishing and growing their professional networks and informal mentoring which help them increase their research productivity (Meschitti & Lawton Smith, 2017).

As far as teaching expectations, women are held to higher teaching and advising standards than men. The former are expected to be excellent teachers and actively advise students, but their efforts are not accounted for in tenure and promotion decisions. These higher teaching and advising expectations for women are driven by gender discrimination (Knepper et al., 2020b; Rauhaus & Schuchs Carr, 2020) that is rooted in a gendered organizational culture (Edwards et al., 2019). Therefore, the disproportionately higher teaching and advisement workload is seen as an obstacle for women's advancement in the academy as these activities take valuable time away from research activities.

Gender discrimination was reported in student teaching evaluations. Students expect women faculty to be their confidant and evaluate them based on their warmth and availability rather than their knowledge. This is problematic because students tend to assign women and minorities lower evaluation scores (Mitchell & Martin, 2018; Wagner et al., 2016) although they contribute a significant but invisible amount of emotional labor (Ganapati et al., 2022; Guy & Newman, 2004; Newman et al., 2009) which is time-consuming.

In addition to teaching, women are also held to higher service standards in tenure and promotion evaluations when compared to men. Notably, women are expected to contribute more of their work time to service than men, a standard that is rooted in the gendered academic organizational culture. Consistent with a recent study (Thomas, 2019) this chapter discussed how women and faculty members from racially under-represented groups chose to participate in service that was related to social equity because there was a need for a better representation of these faculty groups in the decision-making process. When participating in service activities, men were more strategic and chose to contribute to areas that allowed for better visibility among colleagues and exposure to networks.

Why women and men differ in their research, teaching, and service contributions? First, faculty members value some areas in the academy more than others. An interesting observation that emerged from interviews was that men spent more time discussing their research experience whereas women spent more time discussing their service and teaching contributions. This fact is consistent with the way in which faculty members described how men and women faculty differed in meeting tenure and promotion requirements. Overall men reported having more publications than women whereas women reported having more contributions toward advising and service. Second, women and faculty members

from racially under-represented groups are held to higher standards in tenure decisions in the areas of teaching and service when compared to men. The former are expected to make excellent contributions in these areas when compared to the latter. These “unwritten rules of tenure” (Matthew, 2016) can be explained by the presence of gender (Knepper et al., 2020b) and racial discrimination (Lisnic et al., 2019) in tenure and promotion reviews which creates barriers for the academic career advancement of women and faculty of color (Acker, 2012; Rinfret & Wise, 2023; Rinfret et al., 2023), and it ultimately leads to the exiting of these faculty groups from tenure-track positions and academia (Martinez et al., 2017). Third, women’s research focuses on more non-traditional topics (Evans, 2023; Thomas, 2019) and qualitative methods (Scutelnicu & Knepper, 2019) which are under-valued by editors and peer reviewers (Breuning et al., 2018). Fourth, according to the original survey administered to public affairs faculty, men reported working on average 1.4 more hours per week than women during their tenure-track years, with an overall average of 52.4 hours worked per week. Fifth, women are more likely to face work-life balance issues (Martinez et al., 2017) as they are expected to contribute more of their time at home toward child-care, elder care, and other family obligations when compared to men. These external work expectations hurt the progress of women’s careers (Currie et al., 2000; Mullins et al., 2022). Even when available, women faculty are not incentivized to use maternity leave or tenure clock stoppage due to the negative implications and discrimination they may face (Gordon & Rauhaus, 2019).

Overall, men prioritize their advancement in the academy early in their careers which ensures them a linear career path when compared to women. The invisible advising and service burdens of women hinder their advancement in the academy (Lisnic et al., 2019; Rauhaus & Schuchs Carr, 2020; Stabile et al., 2017). Women continue to be “underpaid, overworked and stymied in their career progress” (Bonawitz & Anandel, 2006, p. 10) although they contribute a significant amount of emotional invisible work that helps with student retention and graduation. Men are perceived as being more capable than women in their academic jobs, and so are women who pursued academia as a second career. Interviews revealed there is an age bias among faculty members that seems to put younger women at a higher disadvantage than younger men.

Given the faculty gender and racial differences in meeting tenure and promotion requirements, some recommendations are suggested below to make the advancement in the academy more equitable for all faculty groups. First, universities should formulate clear tenure and promotion guidelines that contain minimum performance indicators for research,

teaching, and service. Universities should further work toward ensuring inter-generational equity in terms of service loads and be more protective of their junior faculty.

Second, gatekeepers such as chairs, deans, and senior colleagues play an important role in faculty tenure and promotion process as gatekeeping is considered an approach that contributes to gendered norms in the academy (Rauhaus & Schuchs Carr, 2022). Chairs and deans should be more equitable in their hiring practices and ensure all junior faculty have access to a support system that contributes to their success. If all faculty members are subject to minimum performance standards, course releases for junior faculty should be automatic, not negotiable. Many faculty members don't know what it is negotiable, others cannot afford to negotiate because the job location is appealing to them for family reasons, and others prefer not to negotiate because they need employer-sponsorship for work visas that allows them to secure employment in the United States. The individually negotiated course releases create workload inequalities for some faculty groups who are already subject to other inequities.

Third, as women and faculty members from racially and ethnically under-represented groups lack access to influential networks, institutions of higher learning should specifically mentor these faculty groups (Portillo, 2007) by focusing more on their research needs and career functions since they were found to have a lower productivity than white men even when formally mentored (Todoran, 2023). Group and peer mentoring could be useful in assisting women and faculty members from ethnically and racially under-represented groups to increase their research productivity and to develop and expand their professional networks since it is more difficult for them to identify mentors who look like them (Wolfe Poel et al., 2006; Portillo, 2007). Additionally, Ph.D. programs could provide workshops or one-credit courses to prepare future faculty members for the job market as suggested by Larson and colleagues (2020). Universities prepare Ph.D. students to conduct research but don't necessarily teach them how to publish and navigate academia (Larson et al., 2020).

Fourth, women and faculty members from racially and ethnically under-represented groups should pay attention to the amount of time they spend on service because that means time taken away from research. Collaboration in research may be a way to improve the lower productivity of women especially since publication patterns have become more collaborative over the years (Corley & Sabharwal, 2010). This can take the form of inter-generational or peer collaboration.

Fifth, peer teaching observations and supervisor evaluations could be used in conjunction with student evaluations to offer a more objective

review of faculty's teaching. As reported herein and elsewhere, student evaluations are not only biased, but they don't actually measure student learning outcomes (Stroebe, 2020).

Sixth, universities and faculty members should place a higher value on the faculty contributions in the area of social equity through research, teaching, or service when evaluating their tenure and promotion dossiers. The academy should acknowledge the evolution of the discipline by including cultural competence in tenure and promotion assessments.

Finally, universities should implement tenure and promotion avenues based on the effort faculty invest in their research, teaching, or service areas. Some universities have already adopted a tiered tenure and promotion process based on the effort faculty put into teaching and research. This could be the future of faculty recruitment and retention.

References

- Acker, J. (2012). Gendered organizations and intersectionality: Problems and possibilities. *Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 31(3), 214–24.
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2021). *The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2020–21*. Retrieved June 10, 2023, from <https://www.aaup.org/report/annual-report-economic-status-profession-2020-21>.).
- Backes-Gellner, U., & Schlinghoff, A. (2010). Career incentives and “publish or perish” in German and U.S. universities. *European Education*, 42(3), 26–52.
- Bernstein, R. (2017, March 19). The art of ‘no.’ *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved March 2, 2023, from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Art-of-No-/239508>.
- Bodkin, C. P., & Fleming, C. J. (2021). Supporting women scholars' paths to academia: An examination of family-friendly policies of public affairs doctoral programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 27(3), 301–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2019.1694385>.
- Bonawitz, M. F., & Andel, N. (2009). *The Glass Ceiling Is Made of Concrete: The Barriers to Promotion and Tenure of Women in American Academia*. Retrieved June 1, 2023, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ870462.pdf>.
- Breuning, M., Gross, B., Feinberg, A., Martinez, M., Sharma, R., & Ishiyama, J. (2018). Clearing the pipeline? Gender and the review process at the American Political Science Review. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(3), 629–634.
- Cogburn, J. D., & Neely, S. R. (2015). Publish or perish? Examining academic tenure standards in public affairs and administration programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 21(2), 199–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2015.12001828>.
- Corley, E. A., & Sabharwal, M. (2010). Scholarly collaboration and productivity patterns in public administration: Analyzing recent trends. *Public Administration*, 88(3), 627–648.

- Currie, J., Harris, P., & Thiele, B. (2000). Sacrifices in greedy universities: Are they gendered? *Gender and Education*, 12(3), 269–291.
- Edwards, L. H., Holmes, M. H., & Sowa, J. E. (2019). Including women in public affairs departments: Diversity is not enough. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 25(2), 163–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2018.1565051>.
- Evans, M. (2023). Nonprofit journals publication patterns: Visibility or invisibility of gender? *Voluntas*, 34(2), 335–348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-022-00470-x>.
- Flaherty, C. (2017, April 12). Relying on women, not rewarding them. Inside higher ed. Retrieved August 1, 2023, from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/04/12/study-finds-female-professors-outperform-men-service-their-possible-professional>.
- Ganapati, E. N., Remington, C. L., & Newman, M. A. (2022). Emotional labor, gender, and public administration. In P. M. Shields, & N. N. Elias (Eds.), *Handbook on gender and public administration* (pp. 68–84). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gasser, C. E., & Shaffer, K. S. (2014). Career development of women in academia: Traversing the leaky pipeline. *The Professional Counselor*, 4(4), 332–352. <https://doi.org/10.15241/ceg.4.4.332>.
- Gordon, V., & Rauhaus, B. M. (2019). *Maternity leave: Policy and practice* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429298325>.
- Green, R. G. (2008). Tenure and promotion decisions: The relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44(2), 117–128.
- Guy, M. E., & Newman, M. A. (2004). Women's jobs, men's jobs: Sex segregation and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 289–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00373.x>.
- Hancock, K., Baum, M., & Breuning, M. (2013). Women and pre-tenure scholarly productivity in international studies: An investigation into the leaky career pipeline. *International Studies Perspectives*, 14(4), 507–527.
- Harley, D., Acord, S. K., Earl-Novell, S., Lawrence, S., & King, C. J. (2010). *Assessing the future landscape of scholarly communication: An exploration of faculty values and needs in seven disciplines*. Center for Studies in Higher Education. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/15x7385g>.
- Hesli, V., & Lee, J. M. (2011). Faculty research productivity: Why do some of our colleagues publish more than others? *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(4), 393–408.
- Knepper, H., Scutelnicu, G., & Tekula, R. (2020a). Why gender and research productivity matters in academia? Exploring evidence from NASPAA accredited schools. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 26(1), 51–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2019.1565066>.
- Knepper, H. J., Scutelnicu, G., & Tekula, R. (2020b). The slippery slope: Struggling for equity in the academy in the era of #MeToo. *Public Administration Review*, 80(6), 1111–1117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13208>.
- Larson, S. J., Miller, A., & Drury, I. (2020). Reflections on tenure, the two-body problem, and retention in the 21st century academy. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 26(4), 506–530. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2020.1759346>.

- Lisnic, R., Zajicek, A., & Morimoto, S. (2019). Gender and race differences in faculty assessment of tenure clarity: The influence of departmental relationships and practices. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 5(2), 244–260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649218756137>.
- Marginson, S. (2006). Dynamics of national and global competition in higher education. *Higher Education*, 52, 1–39.
- Martinez, L. R., O'Brien, K. R., & Hebl, M. R. (2017). Fleeing the ivory tower: Gender differences in the turnover experiences of women faculty. *Journal of Women's Health*, 26(5), 580–586. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2016.6023>.
- Matthew, P. A. (2016). It's not just us. This is happening everywhere: On CVs and the Michigan women. In P. A. Matthew (Ed.), *Written/unwritten: Diversity and the hidden truths of tenure* (pp. 12–21). University of North Carolina Press.
- Meschitti, V., & Lawton Smith, H. (2017). Does mentoring make a difference for women academics? Evidence from the literature and a guide for future research. *Journal of Research in Gender Studies*, 7(1), 166–199. <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>.
- Mitchell, K., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender bias in student evaluations. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(3), 648–652. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800001X>.
- Mullins, L. B., Scutelnicu, G., & Charbonneau, E. (2022). A qualitative study of pandemic-induced telework: Federal workers thrive, working parents struggle. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 46(3), 258–281. <https://doi.org/10.37808/paq.46.3.4>.
- Newman, M. A., Guy, M. E., & Mastracci, S. H. (2009). Beyond cognition: Affective leadership and emotional labor. *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 6–20.
- Portillo, S. (2007). Mentoring minority and female students: Recommendations for improving mentoring in public administration and public affairs programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 13(1), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2007.12001470>.
- Portillo, S. (2017, August 23). White men must learn to say yes. *Inside higher ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2017/08/23/white-men-should-do-more-campus-service-work-essay>.
- Rauhaus, B. M., & Schuchs Carr, I. A. (2020). The invisible challenges: Gender differences among public administration faculty. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 1(26), 31–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2018.1565040>.
- Rauhaus, B. M., & Schuchs Carr, I. A. (2022). The leaky pipeline: Gender and public administration professional education. In P. M. Shields, & N. N. Elias (Eds.), *Handbook on gender and public administration* (pp. 383–398). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rinfret, S., & Wise, E. (2023). Emotional labor: Advancing our public administration classroom. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2023.2229192>.
- Rinfret, S. R., McCandless, S., & Grewell, C. (2023). Emotional labor and COVID-19: MPA program director perspectives. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 28(3), 251–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2022.2035888>.

- Sabharwal, M. (2013). Productivity and leadership patterns of female faculty members in public administration. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 19(1), 73–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2013.12001721>.
- Schimanski, L. A., & Alperin, J. P. (2018). The evaluation of scholarship in academic promotion and tenure processes: Past, present, and future. *F1000Research* 7 (1605). <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.16493.1>.
- Schwartz-Shea, P. (2020). Mentoring: The consequences of formalization in the age of corporatization. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 53(4), 775–779.
- Scutelnicu, G., & Knepper, H. (2019). A tale of two journals: Women's representation in public administration scholarship. *Public Integrity*, 21(1), 38–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2017.1421009>.
- Slack, J. D., Myers, N., Nelson, L., & Sirk, K. (1996). Women, research, and mentorship in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 453–458. <https://doi.org/10.2307/977044>.
- Stabile, B., Terman, J., & Kuerbitz, C. (2017). Gender and the role of directors of public administration and policy programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 23(3), 825–842. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2017.12002290>.
- Stroebe, W. (2020). Student evaluations of teaching encourages poor teaching and contributes to grade inflation: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 42(4), 276–294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2020.1756817>.
- Thomas, N. (2019). In the service of social equity: Leveraging the experiences of African American women professors. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 25(2), 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2018.1565041>.
- Todoran, G. S. (2023). The contribution of formal and informal mentorship to faculty productivity: Views of faculty in public affairs programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 29(4), 404–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2023.2220096>.
- Townsend, B. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2007). Workload issues and measures of faculty productivity. *Thought & Action*, 7–20. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1070674>
- Wagner, N., Rieger, M., & Voorvelt, K. (2016). Gender, ethnicity and teaching evaluations: Evidence from mixed teaching teams. *Economics of Education Review*, 54, 79–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.06.004>.
- Williams, A. M., Slagle, D. R., & Wilson, D. (2014). Ranking universities for scholarship in public administration research 2006–2010. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 20(3), 393–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2014.12001795>.
- Wolfe Poel, E., Arroyos-Jurado, E., & Coppola, B. J. (2006). Women, mentoring, and a border university. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 12(4), 501–513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2006.12001453>.
- Yan, E., Zhu, Y., & He, J. (2020). Analyzing academic mobility of U.S. professors based on ORCID data and the Carnegie classification. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 1(4), 1451–1467. https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00088.
- Youn, T. I. K., & Price, T. M. (2009). Learning from the experience of others: The evolution of faculty tenure and promotion rules in comprehensive institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(2), 204–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2009.11772139>.