"Accessible and engaging, *Intersectionality and Higher Education* will have a great impact on the field. This is a meaningful and powerful book."
ROBIN J PHELPS-WARD, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

"This sophisticated and comprehensive treatment of the intersectional identities of students, faculty, and staff experienced within structures of inequality is a must read for all who care about higher education."
SUSAN R. JONES, COAUTHOR OF IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

Though colleges and universities are arguably paying more attention to diversity and inclusion than ever before, to what extent do their efforts result in more socially just campuses? *Intersectionality and Higher Education* examines how race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, sexual orientation, age, disability, nationality, and other identities connect to produce intersected campus experiences. Contributors look at both the individual and institutional perspectives on issues like campus climate, race, class, and gender disparities, LGBTQ student experiences, undergraduate versus graduate students, faculty and staff from varying socioeconomic backgrounds, students with disabilities, undocumented students, and the intersections of two or more of these topics. Taken together, this volume presents an evidence-backed vision of how the twenty-first century higher education landscape should evolve in order to meaningfully support all participants, reduce marginalization, and reach for equity and equality.

W. CARSON BYRD is an associate professor in the department of sociology at the University of Louisville in Kentucky. He is the author of *Poison in the Ivy: Race Relations and the Reproduction of Inequality on Elite College Campuses* (Rutgers University Press).

RACHELLE J. BRUNN-BEVEL is an associate professor of sociology at Fairfield University in Connecticut. She is the coeditor of *Intersectionality in Educational Research*.

SARAH M. OVINK is an associate professor of sociology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Blacksburg. She is the author of *Race, Class, and Choice in Latino/a Higher Education: Pathways in the College-For-All Era*.

Cover photo: iStock.com/gregobagel
Cover design: Dave Kessler Design

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY PRESS

www.rutgersuniversitypress.org

ISBN 978-0-8135-9766-9
53495
9 780813 597669

BYRD, BRUNN-BEVEL, OVINK INTERSECTIONALITY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

INTERSECTIONALITY AND HIGHER EDUCATION

IDENTITY AND INEQUALITY ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

EDITED BY W. CARSON BYRD, RACHELLE J. BRUNN-BEVEL, AND SARAH M. OVINK

9 • FACULTY ASSESSMENTS AS TOOLS OF OPPRESSION

A Black Woman's Reflections on Color-Blind Racism in the Academy

BEDELIA N. RICHARDS

When I started my job as a tenure-track professor of sociology at the University of Richmond (UR), I thought of my colleagues as nice people, and I would have characterized the departmental culture as collegial. My colleagues were gracious about sharing course syllabuses or generously providing feedback on journal articles and grant applications. If I presented my research on campus, they would make an attempt to show up in support. Even so, this interpersonal niceness and collegiality coexisted with and masked increasingly hostile, toxic relationships with my colleagues as a collective. This hostility toward me—primarily reflected in my annual performance reviews—was fueled by my refusal to accept the department's interpretation of the student evaluations it used to assess my teaching effectiveness, and its resistance to acknowledging the distinct challenges I faced as a black woman[1] working at a historically white institution (HWI). Although the impact of gendered anti-black stigmas and ideologies is well documented in academic literatures and testimonials of underrepresented faculty on college campuses (Collins 2002; Desmond and Emirbayer 2010; Gutiérrez y Muhs et al. 2012; Matthew 2016), our experiences with racism are routinely ignored or treated as if they are a tangential aspect of our professional lives (Joseph and Hirshfield 2011). By minimizing the impact of racism on our lives, HWIs engage in a practice that the sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2014) describes as color-blind racism.

In contrast to the explicit forms of racism and racial discourse that were dominant before the 1960s civil rights movement, sociologists agree that a more covert form, color-blind racism, has become the dominant racial ideology in the

twenty-first century (Bonilla-Silva 2014; Omi and Winant 2014). Dominant racial ideologies exist to both justify and conceal racial dominance and the inequalities it produces. Thus, Bonilla-Silva (2014) argues that white Americans draw on four central frames of color-blind racism—abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and minimization of racism—to talk about racial issues with race-neutral language, even while supporting policies or engaging in practices that rationalize and reproduce racist structures.

In this chapter, I draw on my experiences as a black woman teaching at an HWI to illustrate how institutional assessments can function effectively as tools of gendered racial oppression when color-blind frames are used to evaluate the experiences and accomplishments of underrepresented faculty. I do so by highlighting the gendered anti-black stigmas that manifest in students' end-of-semester evaluations of my teaching, and my departmental colleagues' reliance on a color-blind lens to assess these biased comments. In doing so, my colleagues minimized my racialized experiences in the classroom while empowering and legitimizing student biases and converting student evaluations into effective tools of gendered racial oppression. This conversion was particularly effective because excellence in teaching is critical to career advancement at small liberal arts schools like UR, and until recently, student evaluations had been uncritically accepted as a reliable measure of excellence.

There is an abundance of essays and empirical work on the racial and gendered bias embedded in students' evaluations of teaching (Hamermesh and Parker 2005; Smith 2007; Smith and Hawkins 2011; Lazos 2012), as well as the racial microaggressions that faculty of color are subjected to by students or by colleagues on predominantly white campuses (Smith 2004; Sue et al. 2011; Pittman 2012). This chapter expands on this work by showing how (white)[2] students and (white) colleagues function unwittingly as "co-conspirators" in an oppressive system that privileges whiteness. I end this chapter with research-driven, actionable steps that institutions can take to truly foster a more inclusive, anti-racist environment for underrepresented faculty.

GENDERED ANTI-BLACK RACISM, STUDENT EVALUATIONS, AND INCIVILITIES

For pre-tenure faculty, gendered racism manifests most consistently in end-of-semester evaluations of teaching. This bias was strongest in my Introduction to Sociology courses, as this is the first time that students' worldviews are being challenged by readings and discussions revolving around the issues of inequality central to sociological inquiry. Students were particularly resistant to discussions about racial injustice. For example, in 2011, a student complained, "I don't like her teaching style. She constantly brings up race in every subject we talk about." This

discomfort emerges from the fact that my students, who are predominantly white[3] and economically privileged, think inequality is a relic of the past. As one student noted in 2014, "She has a close minded view that Blacks and minorities are always discriminated on." Additionally, my white students often felt that they or white people more generally were being targeted unfairly (Bohmer and Briggs 1991; Davis 1992). A quote from a student in 2014 is representative of this perspective: "My fellow students and I come to gain elementary knowledge of sociology, and all we got were sources pointing out racism in this country and why the majority class—being White—should feel like terrible people." These statements persist, despite steady improvement in my evaluations for this course over time, because my social role as a black woman made it difficult for some students to also see me in the role of a credentialed expert imparting sociological knowledge. These students' rhetoric is consistent with prior research that suggests minority and women professors are more likely to be perceived as ideologically driven than their white and male counterparts, and that students penalize professors whom they perceive as promoting a biased (liberal) agenda in the classroom (Kelly-Woessner and Woessner 2006).

Course evaluations were convenient tools for students to express their resentment at having to engage with uncomfortable issues of racial inequity. However, student evaluations are not only tools for expressing their disapproval. They are mechanisms of racialized social control, especially for pre-tenure and short-term faculty, since student evaluations may influence whether we are (re)hired, tenured, or promoted. In particular, (white and male) students use course evaluations to exert power over minority and women professors by penalizing us for not conforming to their racialized and gendered expectations (Harlow 2003; Wingfield 2010; Ford 2011). For example, my no-nonsense demeanor and straightforward communication style were often interpreted as "mean," "rude," and "intimidating" because of the expectation that black women should be nurturing and motherly (Harlow 2003). Additionally, race and gender bias were partially at play in student comments that referred to me as "unfair" or as a "hard grader." Students are more likely to be hostile to a black female professor with rigorous academic expectations because we challenge both racialized and gendered expectations of our incompetence and we disrupt the role expectations of women as nurturers. We are simultaneously violating racial and gendered norms of subservience to our white and male students, respectively. As a whole, these complaints suggest that, while I formally held the title of professor, as a "black woman," I could not be trusted in the role of "credentialed expert" that this position entails.

Students manifest racial and gendered bias in their greater likelihood to challenge the authority of professors who are women and/or faculty of color than that of our white and male counterparts (Johnson-Bailey and Lee 2005; Ford 2011). In my case, these challenges occurred inside and outside the classroom. For example, during classroom discussions students have posed questions for the sole

purpose of testing my knowledge rather than engaging in an authentic discourse, or have attempted to talk over me when they disagree with a position I am trying to articulate based on my expertise. White male students are more likely to engage in these overt forms of incivilities, which underscores the significance of both race and gender in shaping these interactions with students (Pittman 2010).

Students are also more likely to challenge the authority of their black female professors by going over our heads, due to the perception that we are not qualified for our positions (Miller and Chamberlin 2000). For example, during my first two years at UR, if students struggled with an assignment, they complained to the department chair instead of speaking with me directly. Instead of requiring students to speak with me, my chair met with students privately, guaranteed them anonymity, and then she conveyed the nature of student concerns to me in a separate meeting. With this approach, my chair encouraged students to further undermine my authority by functioning more as a mediator charged with settling a dispute between peers, which abrogates the professor-student relationship. Additionally, my chair's actions normalized students' biases as legitimate and bolstered their ability to make allegations without ever having to be accountable for them. Her actions reflect an implicit assumption that students would not complain in this manner about "competent" professors. This color-blind reading was possible because she minimized the impact of racial and gendered biases in how students responded to me.

I never accepted my students' or colleagues' presumption of my incompetence as a teacher, but as someone who has always been passionate about teaching, I was open to constructive feedback. So I enthusiastically participated in professional development opportunities offered through the university, educated myself on the impact of racial and gendered bias on student evaluations, and sought mentorship from women colleagues of color on how to minimize these biases. My efforts were rewarded with more positive ratings on items meant to assess student learning. Thus, by the time of my midcourse review in the spring of 2013,[4] the majority of students in my courses either agreed or strongly agreed that my courses stimulated critical thinking and that taking the course increased their knowledge of the subject. Students' racial and gendered biases became even more pronounced as my ratings on these items continued to improve, because they were not consistent with low ratings on items that reflect their feelings for me as a person. For example, the same students who gave high assessments of their learning also said that they would not recommend that others take my course. Students reconciled these inconsistencies in the comment section by distinguishing between how they felt about the course material and how they felt about me with comments such as "The material was interesting and thought-provoking, but the teacher made me hate the course." Admittedly, resentment and distress over the grades students received played a significant role in how students evaluated me (Sinclair and Kunda 2000). Students consistently rated my courses as more challenging than

others they have taken at the university, and complaints about workload and grades are the strongest pattern that emerges from reviewing several years' of student evaluation comments.

COLOR-BLIND RACISM AND FACULTY ASSESSMENTS

My colleagues' attempts to craft color-blind interpretations of the inconsistent course evaluations described earlier in this chapter led to a pattern of illogical and contradictory statements in my performance reviews.[5] For example, in the initial draft of my spring 2013 midcourse review,[6] my colleagues point out "there continue to be narrative complaints (by students) that Dr. Richards' knowledge is not always being passed on to them." Yet, elsewhere in the document, the department acknowledges that one of the areas where students evaluate me favorably is "increasing knowledge of course topics." In that same document, my senior colleagues state that students "avoided" my classes because I did not clearly communicate my standards to them. However, this statement contradicted the prior two paragraphs, where these colleagues agreed with my assessment that students complained that I failed to communicate my standards to them due in part to their dissatisfaction with low grades on writing assignments. My chair at the time suggested working more on rubrics in order to better communicate my expectations to students. I pointed out that I had a number of rubrics, and asked whether she could point out what was wrong with them. She could not. In fact, I reminded her that she and another senior colleague had complimented my rubrics the prior semester. Exasperated, my chair finally admitted, "the department thinks that something you are doing is turning students away, but we can't figure out what it is." This statement is a powerful example of how the minimization of racism informed and is informed by the presumption of guilt and incompetence. For in this one sentence my department chair, speaking on behalf of my senior colleagues, conveyed the following three messages:

1. We have no concrete evidence that you have done anything wrong pedagogically, but we believe the students that you are guilty of doing "something" wrong; we just cannot figure out what that is . . . yet (presumption of guilt and incompetence).
2. We do not believe your race or gender has anything to do with how students are evaluating you, and therefore it is logical to believe that "something" you are doing is turning students away (minimization of racism).
3. We do not really know what you have done wrong, but since we are positive that the students are right about your incompetence, we still have to provide a rationale for your low merit review scores because you still need to be punished for whatever it is that you are doing wrong (gendered racism).

In a department of sociologists and anthropologists who prided themselves on our department's coverage of diversity issues in our curriculum, it was striking that bias (racial or gendered) evidently was never considered as one potential explanation. Instead, this interaction exemplifies the strategic maneuvering of departmental colleagues who persisted in putting forth color-blind explanations for student evaluation responses that were themselves contradictory. My colleagues' assessments and suggestions mirrored the inconsistencies in students' evaluations of my teaching because they were just as likely to view me through the anti-black stigma of incompetence as some of my students. And, therefore, they were just as inclined to presume me guilty of whatever students accused me of—even if the evidence did not support the students' perspectives (Johnson-Bailey and Lee 2005; Joseph and Hirshfield 2011). In this regard, my students and my colleagues colluded, albeit unintentionally, in transforming student evaluations of my teaching and my performance reviews into effective tools of gendered racial oppression.

In some cases, the statements my colleagues made in my reviews were blatantly inaccurate. In the first draft of my 2012–2013 annual review and my midcourse review that same year, the department claimed, "Bedelia consistently teaches the least amount of students per capita of anyone else in the department." With help from my mentor, I was able to provide evidence that this statement was inaccurate by reviewing four years of course enrollment data in order to compare mine with those of my sociology colleagues. Although my department amended this statement in the final draft, their new statement expressed their "concern for lower enrollments" in my Introduction to Sociology courses relative to those of other full-time colleagues. Obviously, I could not challenge the fact that they were "concerned." However, insistence on keeping this information in my review showed a lack of support for me as a junior colleague, as this was the very first time that this issue was being raised in an official capacity. Additionally, the department did not acknowledge any external factors that could contribute to lower enrollments, such as teaching in the spring versus fall, being perceived as more difficult than other sociology professors, or racial bias. Thus, my department used this information to undermine rather than support me. As this inaccuracy was part of a pattern, I was constantly using my time to fact-check my reviews in order to defend myself, time that could have been spent more effectively on my research, writing, and teaching.

These narratives demonstrate how the presumption of my incompetence and guilt, rooted in gendered anti-black racial ideologies, became institutionalized into my annual performance reviews. As a result, the performance review process increasingly became a site of conflict with my department because my senior colleagues refused to acknowledge that my being a black woman influenced how students viewed, interacted with, and ultimately evaluated me. I have therefore contested some aspect of my annual performance review almost every year on the

tenure track at UR. My colleagues viewed these attempts to secure fair assessments of my accomplishments as insubordination, and resented me for not behaving deferentially, consistent with my role as a junior scholar. My colleagues' response to me was also about race, for they sought to silence and debunk any assertions that students' responses and evaluations of me were filtered through their perceptions of me as a black woman. Their response epitomized the color-blind tendency to minimize the gendered anti-black racism I experienced. Missing from this chapter is the fact that my colleagues' resentment eventually manifested in more overt acts of sabotage and a violent verbal assault by my department chair while I was meeting with one of my students in the fall of 2014. I have also chosen to exclude examples of overt forms of student incivilities, and the long history of racist microaggressions to which I have been subjected by my former chair, in part because these experiences do not fit the color-blind framing I have elected to use here. Finally, because of space limitations, I have not discussed in detail the strong support I received from a black woman colleague in a different department who guided me through appropriately responding to my negative reviews, or the support from my former dean and my official institutional mentor, who, collectively, have contributed to my becoming a tenured professor.

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, racial ideologies, such as the current commitment to color blindness, both justify and conceal racial dominance. In my particular case, color-blind racial discourse rested on the assumption that my experience as a black woman was no different from the experiences of my white and male colleagues. This ideology effectively made it possible for my colleagues to ignore (conceal) the ways in which my professional life was filled with obstacles that did not present themselves to my white and male colleagues. By ignoring the gendered racism that was part of my everyday lived experience as a professor, my department could use student evaluations to justify assigning me lower merit review scores on my annual performance reviews, and reinterpret them as "objective" evidence of my incompetence relative to my white and male colleagues. Since my department functioned in a way that was consistent with the larger institutional culture at UR, there was no resistance from my first dean, who ultimately could have reversed the department's score or, at a minimum, had a conversation with my chairs about my problematic reviews. Thus, the institution as a whole, while avowing to be committed to becoming more diverse and inclusive, contributed to my oppressive circumstances.

The negative experiences I have had at UR have provided me with insight into how institutions can claim to value diversity and inclusivity, on the one hand, while simultaneously contributing to the marginalization of some of its most vulnerable members, on the other hand. I draw on the greater clarity I now have from reflecting on my experiences and the academic literature to provide recommendations in the next section for how institutions like UR can do a better job of acting in ways that are consistent with their own avowed values and priorities.

Today I am a tenured associate professor of sociology at the University of Richmond. I no longer operate in a constant state of crisis and paranoia from feeling perpetually under attack, or exist in an elevated state of insecurity and psychological distress, because the only power I have is the power to resist, not the power to remove the source of my oppression.

The experiences I have described in this chapter reflect a broader pattern among black faculty and other faculty of color who have been recruited to "diversify" predominantly white institutions (Patton 2004). These institutions draw on the common discourse of "diversity" as an ideal that is valued and that is critical to preparing their (white) students to function effectively in an increasingly multicultural and globalized world. Yet, diversity for many institutions involves the placement of more black and brown faces in historically white institutional spaces, without much thought as to how to institute structural changes to counter the systemic bias we inevitably encounter. This happens in part because white Americans tend to view racial discrimination primarily as overt acts of hatred and/or as a relic of past times that has no meaningful impact on the day-to-day lives of black and brown people in the present (Desmond and Emirbayer 2010). White administrators, department chairs, and colleagues are not exempt from internalizing this normative belief that we live in a postracial society, despite the abundance of social science data to debunk this myth.

Inclusivity does not mean treating all demographic groups the same when we clearly face different institutional challenges—in fact, to do so is to engage in the practice of color-blind racism. For, treating everyone "the same" often means treating everyone as if we experience the world in the same way as the average white (male) person. However, since racially and ethnically marginalized scholars do not experience the world in the same way as our white colleagues, treating us the same minimizes the racism that is part of our everyday realities, ensuring that racialized forms of inequality will remain in place. Below I draw on my personal experiences as a black woman, as well as my expertise as a sociologist and race scholar, to offer suggestions for what institutions can do to proactively cultivate a community that is inclusive of racial and ethnically marginalized groups. I suggest that doing so will require institutions to become *proactively anti-racist and anti-sexist.*

RECOMMENDATIONS

An institution that is *proactively anti-racist and anti-sexist* will address racism and sexism as systemic issues, not as a series of individual problems with bigots who are outliers in the campus community. Perhaps more importantly, we should be sensitive to the ways in which these systems of oppression intersect and mutually reinforce each other. All members within our society, which is stratified by race and gender, are subjected to racist and sexist ideologies, symbols, and

imagery through socialization in our families, through our school curriculums, and through media (mis)representations. Thus, it is important for university administrators to recognize that higher education institutions reflect these problematic racial and gendered dynamics in the larger society. For example, as a result of anti-black racism in the United States, people of African descent are more segregated from whites than any other racial and ethnic minority group (Massey and Denton 1993). Thus, white Americans who are socialized in predominantly white neighborhoods, schools, and churches have few intimate interactions with black people as equals, and therefore few opportunities for their racial biases to be challenged. This racial isolation means that even white colleagues who may view themselves as racially progressive and committed to racial justice may be complicit in perpetuating a system that is oppressive to people of African descent and other underrepresented groups. Similarly, men and women tend to live segregated lives outside of familial and romantic contexts because of the systemic ways in which gender permeates and stratifies social life and institutions (Risman 2004). Honesty about these basic facts should be the starting point for proactively creating systems of support and mentorship that are explicitly race-conscious, but that also recognize the gendered manifestations of racism. I identify below specific anti-racist and anti-sexist practices for institutions that are serious about creating a campus community that is supportive of racially marginalized faculty.

1. *Fund a position or office to support recruitment and retention of underrepresented faculty.*

   The first step toward creating an inclusive environment is appropriately funding a position or office that is responsible for coordinating anti-racist projects across the university that take into consideration how racism intersects with other forms of oppression. Doing so is an explicitly anti-oppression strategy demonstrating institutional commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion because there is a proactive effort to create an environment that is welcoming and protective of underrepresented faculty (students and staff). An appropriately funded office or position to coordinate anti-racist projects ensures consistency across the university and provides accountability for the university to act in accordance with its avowed values, as is typically reflected in a strategic plan. The alternative is that our issues are addressed as individual anomalies within an otherwise healthy (racism- and sexism-free) system, an approach that is consistent with color-blind ideology.

   In my particular case, a more senior black woman colleague was my only source of support for many years. However, since she was not my official university mentor, and because her ability to help me depended on our ability to conceal how closely we worked together, the service she provided has never been recognized. This is particularly exploitative of underrepresented faculty, particularly women, because of the gendered division of service work in our universities (Guarino and Borden 2017). When an institution forces "race work" to be done "underground" in this manner, it is often other marginalized faculty, women of color in particular, who perform this unpaid and invisible labor at the expense of their own scholarly productivity (Joseph and Hirshfield 2011). Even in cases where this work is visible as service, there is still the potential for exploitation owing to what Padilla (1994) refers to as cultural taxation, a term used to refer to the added service responsibilities that accrue to faculty of color because of our ethnoracial backgrounds and underrepresentation on historically white and male-dominated campuses. Since cultural taxation has negative impacts on the career advancement and job satisfaction of women faculty and faculty of color, having an appropriately funded office or position for this kind of "race work" and "gender work" signifies that the institution values this kind of work and is invested in protecting underrepresented faculty from the negative impacts of cultural taxation. It is equally important for this office or position to be vested with institutional power to make decisions that directly impact the well-being of faculty of color and women faculty, such as input into hiring policies and decisions. There is no way to perform effectively as an accountability mechanism without power to transform institutional cultures designed to elevate and protect white male hegemony. This position or office would be responsible for carrying out the proactively anti-racist and anti-sexist agenda items described below.

2. *Institutionalize racism and sexism awareness and cultural competency workshops.*

   Underrepresented faculty need access to agents with institutional power to help navigate racist and sexist microaggressions in masculinist, predominantly white, color-blind institutional spaces. Administrators should take seriously that racial and gender microaggressions are a logical outcome of a society that is both stratified and segregated by race and gender (Massey and Denton 1993; Oliver and Shapiro 2006; Risman 2004). Thus, white and male colleagues (and students) often have few opportunities to have their racial and gender stereotypes and assumptions, respectively, challenged. Orientation workshops for new faculty (and incoming students) and mandatory training for tenured faculty can, at a minimum, raise consciousness as to the most common "offenses" and why these are problematic.[7] I view the goal of the racism and sexism awareness and cultural competency workshops as minimizing the possibility for underrepresented faculty to be subjected to racial and gender microaggressions in their interactions with colleagues. These workshops will not erase a lifetime of socialization, and so proactively anti-racist and anti-sexist institutions (as opposed to color- and gender-blind ones) should have systems, policies, and

mechanisms in place to address situations when they inevitably arise. For example, in the absence of an office or position at my current institution whose work focused on supporting and retaining marginalized faculty, when a colleague told me that my natural (black) hairstyle was unprofessional, there was no one to whom I felt safe reporting this information outside of two black female friends I had on campus who could only listen and empathize. There was no one to whom I felt comfortable reporting what became a pattern of gendered racial microaggressions that contributed to a hostile work environment, and I had no expectation that anything would be done even if I had reported these incidents to my chair or the person who served as dean at that time. If my institution had been proactively anti-racist, my colleague would have had some basic training to increase awareness that her racially insensitive statements were problematic, and why. When this person eventually became my chair, the psychological distress I experienced was magnified by the feeling of powerlessness to confront her abusive behavior because she had the power to harm me professionally. The university could have spared me the countless hours spent processing these offensive statements and strategizing whether or how to address them without causing myself more harm, *time that could have been used more productively on my teaching, research, and writing.*

3. *Institutionalize race talk as an anti-racist practice.*

Being proactively anti-racist means being vigilant about making white racial norms visible so that institutions can actively mitigate their negative impacts on racial and ethnically underrepresented faculty. White Americans' discomfort with, and therefore tendency to avoid, discussions about race and racial injustice is an example of such a white racial norm (Bonilla-Silva 2014). People of African descent talk frequently about racial inequality because it is part of our everyday life experiences. However, this "race talk" is taboo in predominantly white spaces because of the powerful influence of color-blind racial ideology, which equates race consciousness with racial prejudice. To protect our jobs, people of African descent often deliberately minimize our experiences with racism in predominantly white spaces, as drawing attention to our oppression makes our white colleagues uncomfortable and can have serious personal and professional consequences.[8] Yet, our silence causes us psychological distress and makes it possible for color-blind ideology to flourish unchallenged. Thus, creating a racially inclusive environment will require institutions to normalize discussions of racial injustices that manifest in the lives of marginalized faculty, while being attentive to how these experiences are shaped by gender and sexual orientation. This takes the burden off racially marginalized faculty and releases us from the fear that our experiences will be minimized or dismissed, or—worse—will instigate retaliation. Race talk can be institutionalized through the racism and sexism awareness and cultural competency workshops described above, new faculty orientations, and professional development for teaching that focuses explicitly on best practices for teaching about racism, sexism, and other potentially contentious issues.

4. *Provide race- and gender-conscious mentorship and support.*

An institution that aims to create systems of support that are proactively anti-racist and anti-sexist should ensure that the basic professional needs of all faculty are being met in a systematic way. This, at a minimum, entails communicating clear expectations of tenure and promotion standards, creating a strong mentoring program, and offering ample opportunities for professional development. This is important because mentors tend to gravitate to others who are most like them, and because race and gender are generally proxies for "sameness." Therefore, institutions that function on the assumption that mentorship relationships will form organically (i.e., blind to race and gender) are more likely to harm women and faculty of color (Bova 2000; Stanley and Lincoln 2005). Thus, institutionalizing mentoring is an anti-racist and anti-sexist practice because it disrupts the patterned ways in which underrepresented and women faculty tend to be excluded from informal mentoring networks. Even so, an institution that is proactively anti-oppression will design these basic support structures in an explicitly race- and gender-conscious way by addressing issues specific to marginalized faculty and/or by providing interventions for underrepresented faculty on issues that are salient only within this group. In order to do so, proactively anti-racist and anti-sexist institutions should invest in the expert knowledge of anti-racist and feminist scholars and organizations that might help codify a set of anti-racist and anti-sexist best practices. These best practices can guide the professional development of any individual or entity whose job is to mentor and/or evaluate underrepresented faculty, but in a way that is attentive to their intersecting identities.

It is impossible for a doctor to make a patient well if she is continually diagnosing the patient's symptoms incorrectly. Similarly, institutions fail to effectively mentor or support underrepresented faculty when they are unable to identify and diagnose the racist and sexist biases that manifest in the professional lives of underrepresented faculty, and how these biases intersect. While the expert knowledge referenced here can be conveyed in workshops similar to the racism and sexism awareness and cultural competency workshops described above, the goal here is to make visible the ways in which racial and gender biases manifest in the professional lives of marginalized faculty and the implications of this for mentoring and assessments. Thus, a proactively anti-racist and anti-sexist institution will ensure that department chairs, deans, tenure and promotion committees, and entities tasked with professional development of faculty be introduced to scholarship delineating the unique challenges of marginalized scholars in order to design race- and

gender-conscious mentoring strategies and systems of evaluation. In particular, since many institutions draw on students' evaluations of teaching to assess faculty for merit pay, tenure, and promotion, it is critical for these entities to be familiar with the academic literature delineating how race and gender bias infuses student evaluations, as well as training on how to identify this bias in student comments.

5. *Institute race- and gender-conscious systems of evaluation.*

Institutions that insist on color- and gender-blind interpretations of marginalized faculty's evaluations are, in fact, practicing color-blind racism and gender-blind sexism. While these systems of evaluation are considered to be objective and neutral, they are more likely to paint us as incompetent, reinforcing dominant narratives of the deficits many assume we already have. This is potentially damaging psychologically to underrepresented faculty who may internalize hostile student comments and, as a result, decide to leave the professoriate. Additionally, poor student evaluations may contribute to racial and gender gaps in salary and promotion outcomes while at the same time concealing the discriminatory racial and gendered mechanisms that contribute to these gaps. Alternatively, institutions that approach student evaluations through a color- and gender-blind lens compel some marginalized faculty to learn literature outside our areas of specialization, just to defend ourselves against biased institutional policies and systems of evaluation. Thus, institutions that claim to value diversity and inclusion need to think about how or to what extent systems of evaluation are designed in ways that privilege whiteness and masculinity, and need to create race- and gender-conscious systems of evaluation. To do so effectively, higher education institutions should codify anti-racist logic and anti-sexist practices into policies and systems of evaluation that impact hiring, tenure, and promotion.

NOTES

I would like to thank my colleagues and writing group members Patricia Herrera and Eric Anthony Grollman for providing valuable feedback on earlier versions of this chapter.

1. I draw on the language of "gendered racism" throughout this chapter to signal that my blackness and my gender identity as a woman are interconnected dimensions of my social identity. For this reason, anti-sexist policies would not have helped address my negative racialized experiences. In fact, most of my departmental colleagues have been white women, and they have participated to varying degrees in the oppressive system that is the subject of this chapter. To make this point even more forcefully, in the fall of 2009 when I began my career at UR, 60 percent of the faculty were men and 40 percent were women. In contrast, 92 percent of the faculty were white and 8 percent were faculty of color. Additionally, I was one of three black assistant professors of the seventy-nine assistant professors at the university in the fall of 2009 (University of Richmond Fact Book 2010). As such, my recommendations at the end of this chapter focus primarily on how to improve the experiences of racially marginalized and underrepresented faculty, even though these experiences are gendered.

2. My point here is to make visible systemic oppression; thus it is possible for faculty and students of color to also be complicit within a system that privileges whiteness, whether they intend to or not.

3. The experiences I describe in this chapter cover the period roughly between the fall of 2009 and the spring of 2014. In the fall of 2009, when I began my career at UR, students of color were 17 percent of the traditional undergraduate population and white students were 78 percent. In the fall of 2014, students of color were 25 percent of the student body (8 percent Latinx, 9 percent Asian, 7 percent black, and 1 percent Native American) and white students were 66 percent (Source: Official enrollment files, Office of Institutional Effectiveness at UR).

4. My midcourse review actually happened in my fourth year, as I had my tenure clock stopped for medical reasons.

5. At UR, all pre-tenure faculty are required to do annual performance reviews of their teaching, research, and service. Department chairs then write their own assessments of faculty and deliver both to the dean of arts and sciences. The dean's office makes the ultimate decision about the final merit score. Since my department is fairly small, it has been the practice for all tenured senior colleagues to weigh in on the narrative and the merit score for junior faculty. In other departments, the chair alone makes this decision. Pre-tenure faculty are told that annual reviews are primarily for the purpose of determining merit raises, since UR does not give standard-of-living raises. Even so, these reviews are included in our tenure package.

6. At UR, the midcourse review is an assessment of pre-tenure faculty's teaching, research, and service. However, the goal of the midcourse review is to provide feedback to pre-tenure faculty on progress toward tenure during the third year on the tenure track.

7. Universities should address microaggressions that target other marginalized groups, such as women and LGBTQ individuals. However, I do think it is more effective to focus on specific target groups in separate sessions.

8. See essays about the experiences of black faculty targeted by hate groups and generally unsupported by their institutions (e.g., Zandria Robinson, Saida Grundy).

REFERENCES

Bohmer, Susan, and Joyce L. Briggs. 1991. "Teaching Privileged Students about Gender, Race, and Class Oppression." *Teaching Sociology* 19 (2): 154–163.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2014. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bova, Breda. 2000. "Mentoring Revisited: The Black Woman's Experience." *Mentoring and Tutoring* 8 (1): 5–16.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2002. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Davis, Nancy J. 1992. "Teaching about Inequality: Student Resistance, Paralysis, and Rage." *Teaching Sociology* 20 (3): 232–238.

Desmond, Matthew, and Mustafa Emirbayer. 2010. *Racial Domination, Racial Progress: The Sociology of Race in America*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ford, Kristie A. 2011. "Race, Gender, and Bodily (Mis) Recognitions: Women of Color Faculty Experiences with White Students in the College Classroom." *Journal of Higher Education* 82 (4): 444–478.

Guarino, C. M., and V. M. Borden. 2017. Faculty Service Loads and Gender: Are Women Taking Care of the Academic Family? *Research in Higher Education* 58 (6): 672–694.

Gutiérrez y Muhs, Gabriella, Yolanda Niemann, Carmen González, and Angela Harris, eds. 2012. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Boulder: University of Colorado Press.

Hamermesh, Daniel, and Amy M. Parker. 2005. "Beauty in the Classroom: Instructors' Pulchritude and Putative Pedagogical Productivity." *Economics of Education Review* 24 (4): 369–376.

Harlow, Roxanna. 2003. "'Race Doesn't Matter, But . . .': The Effect of Race on Professors' Experiences and Emotion Management in the Undergraduate College Classroom." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66 (4): 348–363.

Johnson-Bailey, Juanita, and Ming-Yeh Lee. 2005. "Women of Color in the Academy: Where's Our Authority in the Classroom?" *Feminist Teacher* 15 (2): 111–122.

Joseph, Tiffany, and Laura E. Hirshfield. 2011. "'Why Don't You Get Somebody New to Do It?' Race and Cultural Taxation in the Academy." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34 (1): 121–141.

Kelly-Woessner, April, and Matthew Woessner. 2006. "My Professor Is a Partisan Hack: How Perceptions of a Professor's Political Views Affect Student Course Evaluations." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39 (3): 495–501.

Lazos, Sylvia. 2012. "Are Student Teaching Evaluations Holding Back Women and Minorities?" In *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*, edited by Gabriella Gutiérrez y Muhs, Yolanda Niemann, Carmen González, and Angela Harris, 164–185. Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 2012.

Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Matthew, Patricia A., ed. 2016. *Written/Unwritten: Diversity and the Hidden Truths of Tenure*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Miller, Joanna, and Marylin Chamberlin. 2000. "Women Are Teachers, Men Are Professors: A Study of Student Perceptions." *Teaching Sociology* 28 (4): 283–298.

Oliver, Melvin L., and Thomas M. Shapiro. 2006. *Black Wealth, White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Omi, Michael, and Howard Winant. 2014. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Padilla, Amado M. 1994. "Research News and Comment: Ethnic Minority Scholars; Research, and Mentoring: Current and Future Issues." *Educational Researcher* 23 (4): 24–27.

Patton, Tracey O. 2004. "Reflections of a Black Woman Professor: Racism and Sexism in Academia." *Howard Journal of Communications* 15 (3): 185–200.

Pittman, Chavella T. 2010. "Exploring How African American Faculty Cope with Classroom Racial Stressors." *Journal of Negro Education* 79 (1): 66–78.

———. 2012. "Racial Microaggressions: The Narratives of African American Faculty at a Predominantly White University." *Journal of Negro Education* 81 (1): 82–92.

Risman, B. J. 2004. "Gender as a Social Structure: Theory Wrestling with Activism." *Gender & Society* 18 (4): 429–450.

Sinclair, Lisa, and Ziva Kunda. 2000. "Motivated Stereotyping of Women: She's Fine If She Praised Me but Incompetent If She Criticized Me." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26 (11): 1329–1342.

Smith, Bettye P. 2007. "Student Ratings of Teaching Effectiveness: An Analysis of End-of-Course Faculty Evaluations." *College Student Journal* 41 (4): 788–801.

Smith, Bettye P., and Billy Hawkins. 2011. "Examining Student Evaluations of Black College Faculty: Does Race Matter?" *Journal of Negro Education* 80 (2): 149–162.

Smith, William A. 2004. "Black Faculty Coping with Racial Battle Fatigue: The Campus Racial Climate in a Post-Civil Rights Era." In *A Long Way to Go: Conversations about Race by African American Faculty and Graduate Students*, edited by Darrell Cleveland, 171–190. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Stanley, Christine A., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 2005. "Cross-Race Faculty Mentoring." *Change* 37 (2): 44–50.

Sue, Derald, David Rivera, Nicole Watkins, Rachel Kim, Suah Kim, and Chantea Williams. 2011. "Racial Dialogues: Challenges Faculty of Color Face in the Classroom." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 17 (3): 331–340.

University of Richmond Fact Book 2009-10. 2010. Accessed December 19, 2017. https://ifx.richmond.edu/research/fact-book.html.

Wingfield, Adia H. 2010. "Are Some Emotions Marked 'Whites Only'? Racialized Feeling Rules in Professional Workplaces." *Social Problems* 57 (2): 251–268.