Disrupting the Status Quo: Forging a Path to Promotion that Explicitly Recognizes and Values Faculty Work Focused on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Gina Sánchez Gibau, Rachel Applegate, Margaret R. Ferguson, and Kathy E. Johnson

Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis

ADVANCE Journal

Author Note

Gina Sanchez Gibau https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1730-2932

Rachel Applegate https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3942-8648

Margaret R. Ferguson https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1254-5166

Kathy Johnson https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4739-4647

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Gina Sánchez Gibau, Email: gsanchez@iupui.edu; 317-274-4926.

Abstract

This article focuses on the importance of creating new pathways to promotion and tenure that explicitly recognize and reward excellence related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). We explain the approach we have taken at Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). Challenges to the status quo related to faculty systems of evaluation are reviewed, as well as the urgency afforded by the interconnectedness of a global pandemic, an economic recession, and a national reckoning with respect to race that could accelerate reforms in higher education. We reflect upon eight critical lessons learned when implementing a new pathway to promotion that recognizes integrated excellence in DEI activities. We hope the lessons we learned will inspire other institutions to lead similar transformational change efforts aimed at disrupting systems that historically have created inequities in the retention and advancement of faculty from marginalized groups.

Keywords: equity, inclusion, faculty diversity, promotion, tenure

Disrupting the Status Quo: Forging a Path to Promotion that Explicitly Recognizes and Values Faculty Work Focused on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

The year 2020 will be remembered as a watershed year. Grappling with the interconnected challenges of a global pandemic, a national reckoning with respect to race, and a sharp economic contraction led many colleges and universities to pledge to redouble efforts to address opportunity gaps and disparities that were magnified through the lens of these adversities. Though many institutions concentrated on new ways of providing support to students—particularly to those from minoritized backgrounds—we chose to also focus on aligning our policies for promotion and tenure with our long asserted institutional values related to equity and inclusion. Promotion and tenure policies are core elements of the academic enterprise in that the faculty we retain and advance undoubtedly have the potential to influence our curricula, our research endeavors, and the students they inspire for decades to come. In this article, we reflect upon the process, challenges, successes, and lessons learned along the way in leading these changes at Indiana University–Purdue University, Indianapolis (IUPUI), in the hope that our experiences might inspire others in the academy to undertake similar transformational efforts. We review literature that speaks to the imperative for clear mechanisms to value diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) work in higher education.

While DEI work should be core to the work of all faculty and staff, our campus chose to first focus on promotion and tenure for the faculty members who choose to make DEI work their focal point. Promotion and tenure reviews are major hurdles in the professional lives of faculty. Given our principles of shared governance, one might assume that changing promotion and tenure criteria should be fairly straightforward. That is, once a school or department (often, but not always, in collaboration with administration) decides that changes are needed, votes are

taken, policies are updated and implemented, and then everyone moves on. In reality, disrupting the status quo of a process to actually affect such change is akin to moving mountains, given so many collective forces working against the mere idea of doing anything differently…ever! The beliefs, attitudes, and biases that comprise the cultural norms through which faculty become socialized to the institution are forces to be reckoned with, as are the fears about what could be lost if standards shift in ways that do not continue to benefit colleagues who secure the largest external grants and publish most prolifically in "top-tier" journals. Thus, standards and policies that surround promotion and tenure processes tend to replicate themselves across generations of faculty members and, not surprisingly, benefit the same sorts of faculty members.

There have been a few major shifts since the modern conception of tenure was launched through the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure by AAUP and AAC&U. First, Boyer's (1996) call to expand the traditional definition of scholarship to also include the scholarship of integration and the scholarship of application has prompted many institutions to develop pathways for recognizing community-engaged scholarship, interprofessional education, and public scholarship, as well as alternative forms of metrics to assess impact (Alperin et al., 2019). Recognition of the role that universities play in fostering innovation and economic development has led some institutions to recognize patents, licensing, and commercialization activity by faculty as being meritorious for promotion and tenure (Sanberg et al., 2014). And, of course, research standards have crept inexorably higher, particularly among institutions striving to move up in the Carnegie rankings (Gardner & Veliz, 2014). Yet we have seen no examples of R1 or R2 universities crafting new pathways to promotion and tenure that are explicitly designed to recognize activities directed at enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion within the academy and across disciplinary sectors.

How Has Faculty Evaluation Gone Awry?

Academia is deeply committed to the idea that it is founded on a meritocracy, especially within the arena of promotion and tenure. The status quo is powerfully embedded in the idea that merit is objectively definable and that the measures we currently employ are the only way to define scholarly contributions and impact. Those who lead promotion and tenure processes have, by definition, succeeded under the current system and therefore believe that the current system is working just fine or that it cannot be changed without compromising standards. This notion of meritocracy has always been at least partially mythological. Faculty use shortcuts such as treating a degree from a prestigious institution as a proxy for impactful contributions. This practice is rife with the potential for bias as it means that women and people of color who have not attended such institutions are often excluded or their contributions are downplayed (Stewart & Valian, 2018). Moreover, even attending a prestigious institution is not always valued to the same degree for all people: the successes of African American students earning degrees from selective and historically white institutions are often minimized by hiring committees (Gaddis, 2015). Other tools for evaluating merit such as letters of recommendation are also affected by bias and contribute to differential successes for traditionally underrepresented groups in academia (Chance 2012; Dutt et al., 2016). These are merely a few examples of the ways in which the notion of "meritocracy" is undermined.

The use of prestigious journals as an indicator of "impact" or "merit" is also problematic in several different ways. Peer review processes, especially at "prestigious" journals, are flawed, not very effective at determining merit, and embody biases that contribute to the preservation of the status quo (Helmer et al., 2017; Resnik & Elmore 2015, Stewart & Valian, 2018; Walker et al., 2015). There is a growing understanding that traditional measures such as Journal Impact

Factors (JIFs) are imperfect though they continue to be broadly used (McKiernan et al., 2019). They are often, however, misused (Kurmis, 2003; Hecht et al., 1998). Understanding these shortcomings, alternative or alt-metrics have recently been touted as more accurate ways to measure the impact of scholarship, thus opening more venues for dissemination while simultaneously ensuring that a wider array of scholarly work is appropriately valued. These metrics include mentions in social media such as blogs or tweets, library circulation counts, bookmarks, and electronic book downloads. Though these new metrics are also imperfect, they are a promising alternative to the traditional JIF (Bornmann & Haunschild, 2018). As these types of metrics are more widely used, academia will gain more inclusive ways of measuring the full impact of scholarly work.

Student evaluations of teaching are also prone to bias. Women and people of color are routinely reviewed more negatively by students than white men (Bavishi et al., 2010; Mengel et al., 2017) and such evaluations do not seem to actually measure teaching effectiveness (Boring et al., 2016). Rather, they likely reflect existing stereotypes about the makeup of the academy. When people, but especially female faculty of color, pursue roles in which they are scarce or outgroup members due to historic and systematic exclusion, they suffer from perceptions of poor performance even when there is no evidence for those perceptions.

A final challenge to evaluating faculty is the notion that somehow “diversity” is at odds with “excellence,” despite the fact that a large body of research indicates that diversity actually adds to excellence. For example, diversity contributes to excellence by increasing innovation (Stewart & Valian, 2018; Page, 2007). Perhaps most importantly, a more diverse faculty ensures that a wider range of academic interests will be represented in the classroom, exposing students to a broader array of ideas and questions than they would otherwise encounter (Stewart &

Valian, 2018). Pitting diversity against excellence is a false dichotomy that opponents use to try to preserve the status quo. Here, we define *status quo* as a situation in which traditional metrics reward traditional candidates, where promotion and tenure reward and advance only those who have succeeded on metrics—and under conditions—which reflect the historical experiences and opportunities of a particular group of individuals, typically white male upper middle-class faculty.

Specifically, the status quo in R1 and R2 U.S. universities translates to the valuation of research above all other activities, as if universities exist by and for the sole benefit of researchers. Notice the embedded assumptions even in popular coverage of this issue, as illustrated in a recent Washington Post article: "Female associate professors, for example, are more likely than their male peers to take on 'service' roles, such as department chair or division head, Moffitt said, which hampers their ability to *do their own research and rise through the ranks*. Similarly, faculty of color spend a disproportionate amount of time mentoring minority students who look to them as role models—taking *time away from scholarship and other activities that could lead to promotions* [emphasis added]" (Lumpkin, 2021). This accurately summarizes the status quo as one in which research rather than actual leadership (department chair) is the route to advancement.

The Urgency of Now

If we are to educate today's students to live, work, and engage in a more complex and diverse world, institutions must attend to matters of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and its manifestations: within our academic cultures and the climates of our departments, across our curriculum, and among our campus communities. Institutions have been trying to do just that, with the establishment of DEI offices and appointments of Chief Diversity Officers to lead them.

Increased awareness and focus on implicit bias training have also signaled institutions' intentional movement toward change. Students have made demands in recent years related to diversifying the faculty, among other initiatives (O'Meara et al., 2020). Unfortunately, many DEI efforts have failed to yield sustained change on campuses (Heilig et al., 2019). More recently, long-standing inequities were unveiled through the COVID-19 pandemic and the flashpoint of George Floyd's murder. The higher education community certainly took note, not only in proclamations and statements, but through publications with multiple signatories from the scientific community (Barber et al., 2020; Graves & Jarvis, 2020). These called for a shift in academic cultures and reform of policies that reinforce systemic racism in higher education and negatively impact marginalized faculty. As Barber et al. (2020) states, "Catalyzing these culture shifts in the Academy, however, will require making tenure dependent on excellence in research, teaching, and service that centers on equity and inclusion" (p. 1441).

Actualizing diversity, equity, and inclusion as values in higher education can only be made manifest when there is a diversity of individuals at the table, contributing to and engaging in action leading to change. There is no value in representational diversity if those representing are either disregarded and otherwise silenced or ostracized and excluded for initiating the change they were hired to enact (Kolowich, 2017). Authentic DEI work attends to representation, climate, and value of contribution (Vargas et al., 2018). As universities have taken steps to not only embrace but enact the values of DEI, the underbelly of unrecognized and invisible labor that has long overtaxed the too-often small number of faculty, especially women of color at historically white institutions, has been revealed (Matthew, 2016). These faculty are burdened with heavier service loads on faculty governance bodies, search committees, institutional taskforces, and virtually any other collective on campus attempting to be more diverse. Students

from minoritized backgrounds routinely seek out faculty members who look like them as aspirational role models, sounding boards, success coaches, and decoders of the hidden curriculum. This need is particularly acute for female students within STEM disciplines. While these faculty may willingly take on this excess burden, many as a way of giving back and providing the support they may not have received when they were students, they are often simultaneously chastised by their colleagues for devoting time to these activities that could otherwise have been allocated to research. Institutions fail when they are unable to discern how this, and other meaningful work, aligns with their values and goals as academics and when they are unable to properly value this work within promotion and tenure processes (Stewart & Valian, 2018). With all of this in mind, we endeavored to develop a unique pathway for promotion and tenure as a small but significant step in the right direction.

The DEI Integrative Case

With the goal of aligning our stated institutional values with the premiere structure of accountability of faculty work (namely, promotion and tenure), we set out to create a pathway that would recognize this essential work carried out by many yet often not fully rewarded. At the request of the chancellor, the executive vice chancellor (Author 4) engaged the academic deans in conversation to gauge the possibility of embarking upon this type of revision to the promotion and tenure guidelines. We had a distinct benefit of being midway through an ADVANCE grant project and related activities associated with the Aspire Alliance coordinated through the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU) and the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL), both with support through the National Science Foundation. As a result, STEM deans were already becoming stronger advocates for equity and inclusion, which helped to offset faculty resistance while also softening the ground for more

significant policy work across the campus. Armed with the knowledge gained from Stewart and Valian's (2018) well-researched *An Inclusive Academy* and inspired by examples from institutions around the country making similar strides in this area, campus leaders tapped an existing ad hoc committee structure to grapple with the review of our current policies and practices. This committee included faculty representatives from nearly all of our 17 schools.

Throughout several meetings, this committee concluded that it was not a matter of "if" but "how" to create a case that centers DEI work within promotion and tenure criteria, beyond a statement within the "Institutional Values" section of the guidelines. This broad base of faculty (led by Author 2) engaged in lengthy discussions that by no means resulted in complete consensus but rather landed on an attainable outcome: creating change that was bold but also in alignment with existing university policy. This entailed the creation of a proposed pathway that would allow faculty to make a case for excellence that demonstrates an integration of diversity, equity, and inclusion work across two or more traditional domains of faculty work: research, teaching and/or service. The work of the ad hoc committee was supplemented by that of the faculty governance DEI committee, which provided suggestions on potential metrics of evidence.

The faculty committee examined initiatives being undertaken by other institutions as well as in our own institutional context. IUPUI is a core campus of Indiana University, with system-wide policies that are difficult to change, and impossible to modify quickly. For example, the idea of DEI work constituting a "fourth bucket" (alongside teaching, research, service) was considered, but abandoned because it was too divergent from existing policy. Similarly, while we encouraged schools to require annual documentation of DEI activities for all faculty during merit reviews, we were reluctant to require this at the campus level because of the tenet that local

faculty have shared governance over criteria and standards for merit review within their disciplines. Ultimately, the committee believed that the most important goal was to ensure that when activities that enhance DEI are core to the faculty's work, there is an opportunity to be promoted based on the impact of these integrated activities.

Unlike Oregon State University, which in 2015 pioneered a change to require that all faculty demonstrate some contribution to DEI, we decided to focus first on the DEI champions—people who are doing more than a typical faculty member would to advance DEI across multiple domains of faculty work. Our first goal was to ensure that their special contributions would be positively weighed in evaluations for promotion. This does not preclude the goal of expecting all faculty to engage in this work (particularly in the domain of teaching). At the time of this writing, all schools are in the process of revising criteria for merit review to incorporate DEI activities, which will be implemented next year. But that is different from the special recognition that the DEI case provides for those who are in fact doing "champion" level work—work that is frequently ignored or discounted in traditional promotion evaluations.

Therefore, the "Integrative-DEI Balanced Case" was framed within existing Indiana University policy referencing, "evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance" and in consideration of IUPUI's history and norms. Within this context, the distinctions made between the existing balanced case and one that was integrative proved pivotal to the discussion process. At the conclusion of careful faculty governance procedures and broad participation from faculty at two campus townhalls, the proposed case was ultimately approved by a decisive majority vote. This new pathway is unique because it centers rather than marginalizes faculty work related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (O'Rourke, 2008). Key to this innovation is the perspective that faculty work can and should be assessed holistically.

Moreover, critical to the passage of this pathway is a reframing of DEI work as endemic to an institution's conceptualization of faculty excellence. This case, for example, not only recognizes and rewards the integration of work across multiple domains, but also considers a broader scope of scholarly dissemination as well as impact among localized communities, both here and abroad. Table 1 illustrates this new case in comparison to a traditional research case.

Table 1

Sample Comparison Between Traditional Research Case vs. Integrative DEI Case

	Traditional Case Based on Research Excellence	Integrative DEI Case
Research, Teaching and Service Activity	Earned reputation among academic peers based on research achievement, including average or above-average numbers of publications in outlets with high impact factors, high h-index, and competitive external funding (if applicable) Satisfactory teaching Satisfactory service, as assigned Little or no integration of service activity with activity in teaching or scholarship	Earned reputation among academic peers based on scholarly accomplishments contributing to generalizable knowledge (or creative activity) focused on equity and/or inclusion and intentionally engaging diverse research teams Adept educators, especially in supporting the learning and success of diverse students Service incorporates attention to diversity, equity, and justice issues, and may go beyond what is assigned Activities seamlessly integrate scholarship, teaching, and service
Impact	Impact on knowledge base	Social and community impact (which can be local, regional and/or global) is as important as impact on knowledge base
Focus for External Reviewers	Length of CV and evidence of scholarly impact of research	Assessment of the value of a wide range of activities that advance DEI goals in modern universities
Organization of Candidate Statement	1) Introduction; 2) Research (themes, scientific achievements, external support, dissemination, evidence of reputation; 3) Brief mention of	1) Introduction (philosophy and area of focus); 2) Description of DEI activity as it extends across research, teaching and service, indicators of quality/impact; 3) Brief mention of

	teaching and service activities; 4) Summary of excellence, 5) Plans for the future	other activity (typical faculty responsibilities); 4) Summary of evidence from signature accomplishments as demonstrating excellence that impacts DEI; 5) Plans for the future

As noted above, advancing DEI work should be shared among all faculty and administrators. It should be infused into notions of excellence in research, teaching, and service for all faculty. That is our ultimate goal. But it is also the case that certain faculty pursue this work because it is at the core of their identities as educators, scholars, and academics. Our promotion and tenure policies must reward this valuable work.

Lessons Learned

While clearly each institutional culture varies as a function of its unique history, mission, and the composition of the tenured faculty and academic leadership team, we nevertheless believe that there are eight general guiding principles that can inform transformational change leadership with respect to faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure. For each principle, we share examples or anecdotes for illustrative purposes.

Don't skip the foundation

Aspiring to be a campus that is truly welcoming to diverse faculty, staff, and students has been a top priority for our campus for many years. This goal is woven into the campus diversity plan and has been grounded in data from periodic climate surveys that enable the tracking of progress over time. Dashboards have been developed by our Office of Institutional Research and Decision Support to track faculty retention and advancement, and all of these can be disaggregated by characteristics such as gender, race, and ethnicity as well as by school. A $1 million Welcoming Campus Innovation Fund was launched in 2016 to fund projects proposed by

faculty, staff, and students to help transform IUPUI into a more welcoming and inspiring destination for faculty, staff, students, and visitors. New deans are selected in part based on their expressed commitment to equity and inclusion, and ongoing professional development for faculty, staff and campus leaders has been a high priority. Many offices that support faculty professional development have been engaged in sharing theoretical and empirical evidence in support of equity and inclusion. Librarians also have been very involved in helping faculty to understand the limitations of frequently used metrics for evaluating impact along with educating them on newer alt-metrics. Each of these strands of activity was ultimately connected in a significant way to the dialogue on alternative pathways to promotion and helped to create pockets of support at multiple levels for enacting changes to promotion and tenure procedures.

Support from the top is key

It is essential that presidents and provosts make it clear that changes are urgently needed, that their support for those changes is steadfast, and that it ultimately will be in the best interest of the institution if the changes are made. We were fortunate that our campus efforts were supported and indeed launched by the chancellor, who shared a preprint of Barber et al. (2020) with his cabinet for review and discussion in August 2020. Executive leaders' enthusiastic endorsement of responding to this call to action to address systemic racism in higher education led the chancellor to task the chief academic officer with leading a review of campus promotion and tenure processes through the faculty council. Deans played critically important roles in supporting change within their schools. Our council of deans had spent the previous academic year reading and discussing Stewart and Valian's (2018) text that provided concrete suggestions grounded in empirical evidence for creating a more inclusive academy, particularly for women and people of color. In the year that the revisions to promotion and tenure were being considered,

the chancellor's cabinet and this same council read and discussed Kendi's (2019) text, *How to Be an Antiracist*. The conversations that unfolded among executive leaders across both years helped deans develop skills in responding to concerns or criticisms raised by faculty and staff. The reading groups also fostered trust and a shared vision of how our institution could be strengthened if we were successful in a path for promotion and tenure that appropriately recognized faculty activities that enhanced DEI. The result was that the leadership team presented a strong and united front when articulating the rationale for this work to faculty. The chancellor's engagement signified the importance of the work and supplied reassurance that changes proposed would be championed to both external and internal audiences. Although principles of shared governance with respect to the faculty's role in establishing standards and criteria for promotion suggest that affecting change could have been possible even without strong support from executive leaders, it certainly would have been more difficult to achieve and likely would have demanded a much longer timeframe.

Strong faculty governance is the best vehicle for "getting change done"

The hard work of crafting a new policy that would make support for DEI a real part of promotion and tenure was situated, necessarily and importantly, within existing shared governance structures. Faculty fundamentally own promotion and tenure standards and take poorly to edicts from administration. The campus already had an ad hoc promotion and tenure task force dedicated to review and revision of campus-level P&T standards. This task force consisted of volunteers from several subcommittees of the faculty council (e.g., faculty affairs, diversity, equity, & inclusion, executive committee) as well as the elected campus-level promotion and tenure committee that reviews and votes on cases each year after they are reviewed within schools. No volunteer was refused, all but one school was represented, and the

largest schools had multiple representatives. Throughout, a larger group of faculty involved in governance (from every school and every level) was kept informed of each draft and each step with the goal of avoiding any surprises. The convener of the ad hoc task force (Author 2) bridged campus administration and faculty governance: she serves as assistant vice chancellor for faculty affairs and oversees the campus P&T process but was also a past-president of the faculty council and an ex officio participant on the faculty council's executive committee.

Communications were sent regularly to update all faculty on progress, and opportunities for discussion were afforded through Zoom. Reliance on videoconferencing—and the general crisis mode of COVID-19—had actually improved attendance at monthly faculty council meetings. The ad hoc task force developed a draft of the proposed promotion pathway in fall 2020, and this draft was introduced to the faculty in January, revised iteratively and often, based on feedback, then received a formal first reading in April. Two separate special town halls were held in April, along with many meetings with school level groups and individuals, and the final version was voted on in May. Throughout, the faculty council executive committee, officers, and parliamentarian were engaged to ensure no procedural challenges would derail the initiative. This preparation was crucial, as the small minority who were opposed moved from substantive objections—which gained no wide traction—to procedural complaints, as discussed below.

Engage the naysayers

Though it is certainly more pleasant to spend time discussing change with people who agree that it is needed, it is important to resist this temptation! In leading transformative change, it is utterly essential to elicit and carefully listen to criticism so that one can either incorporate such feedback into policy to strengthen it further, or else examine the root causes of resistance to diagnose how best to advance beyond them when crafting rebuttals. We found that countering

substantive objections depended upon a blend of technical policy expertise, strong theoretical and empirical foundations, and an engaged cadre of highly effective champions. At town halls and open forums for discussion, sometimes it was the naysayers who spoke first, but champions from all ranks and from a wide variety of disciplines quickly stepped in to respond or to argue for change. Importantly, these champions often were senior faculty, including white men, who were highly respected by their peers. Senior faculty from minoritized groups were especially effective at rebutting criticism, often by sharing their own personal experiences of bias and discrimination as well as examples of the unrecognized service that they had performed. What they shared made it abundantly clear that faculty of color had had to work significantly harder than their white counterparts to earn promotions.

People who resist change will grasp any reasons that could potentially derail the effort. While there were occasional references to concerns about accreditation and rankings, there ultimately were four main areas of objection. The first was that "the current system is fine." This objection did not last very long. There are many quirky idiosyncrasies of the current IUPUI system (most stemming from its complex history and organization) that helped to create a general appetite for change. A second objection was that DEI work could not be measured objectively. People concerned with measurement were assured that there would be serious work devoted to guiding candidates and reviewers on assessment, and that objective measurement was indeed achievable. Existing work on alt-metrics and a greater appreciation of community impact will help our institution to continue to work on this issue. Third, some suggested that DEI work be compensated through course releases or other mechanisms. This suggestion did not appeal to many. The unequal burden of service by women and minoritized faculty is so prevalent that few can imagine it can be addressed by simple workload adjustments. Finally, some faculty were

concerned that the creation of a new DEI promotion pathway would compromise ambitions for strengthening our research profile. IUPUI is a research-intensive R2 institution and has spent the last decade strengthening infrastructure to expand research efforts further. The main counter to this was that DEI work enhances the campus as a whole; even if or when it does not bring in standard external grant funding, it enables all of us to be more productive. The pragmatic counter was that the DEI pathway to promotion was only one option. Schools and departments remained free to emphasize research-only cases, and even to restrict faculty to a path focused on research excellence. Given that, there was little reason for someone in one school to try to prevent another school from offering the DEI pathway to promotion.

STEM disciplines provided some of the strongest arguments both for and against the proposal. In our School of Science, some faculty had already done extensive work in DEI topics, while representatives from other departments questioned the relevance of DEI to their scholarly work, and also raised the specter of DEI detracting from research rankings, a situation not helped by many rankings being heavily dependent on external funding totals. However, at the same time, campus-led work related to an ADVANCE grant to improve minoritized faculty retention was ongoing and had raised awareness of issues of structural racism as well as the positive benefits for research and for students of improved inclusivity. In the end, the School of Science was one of the first academic units to start requiring annual statements of activities towards DEI from all faculty.

Carefully plan every procedural detail, striving for transparency

Much of the heavy lifting in support of the new pathway to promotion occurred through the incredibly hard work of faculty governance leaders. However, it was important that the Office of Academic Affairs provided strong procedural support through suggested timelines and

deadlines maintained on a public website that also included background readings, the original charge from the chancellor, and links to examples from other institutions also striving to recognize faculty activity related to DEI in promotion and tenure. Academic Affairs leaders (Authors 1-4) also helped with the production and sharing of revisions to draft policy documents (and revisions of those revisions) based on faculty feedback. Regular updates were provided to the chancellor's diversity cabinet, the council of deans, networks of other campus leaders, and academic leaders from other campuses of Indiana University. Finally, emails were regularly sent to all faculty members, apprising them of the work underway and soliciting their feedback through a webform maintained on the same website used to share updates on the work. Our goal was to supply ongoing opportunities for review and comment, as well as to make sure that these efforts would culminate in a vote before the end of the academic year.

Voting became a procedural detail of great consternation. While faculty disagreeing with the need for the new path became less vocal over time, there were two late-breaking technicalities that threatened to derail the effort. First, edits made to the document that had been presented at a "first read" in April were argued to constitute a new version that could not be voted on in May: defeat by inaction. These arguments were rejected by the parliamentarian as the changes were clarifying, not substantive, and they were in the accompanying documentation, not the circular that was to be voted upon by the faculty council. Second, there was a small coalition of faculty insisting that any votes taken on the new policy be done through a secret ballot. Because meetings were being held virtually through Zoom, this would mean conducting the vote via an electronic survey either during or after the meeting. Others on the council believed that our typical practice of voting publicly by voice or show of hands was essential to maintain transparency, given that representatives were voting on behalf of their constituencies. The

parliamentarian indicated that the council could hold a secret ballot if a majority of voting members present agreed. After a voice vote was inconclusive, a Zoom poll was taken. A small majority of voting members preferred to use a transparent voting method. It was decided that a vote in the chat feature of Zoom was the closest thing to a show of hands. This helped to maintain transparency, as well as to ensure that votes could be audited after the meeting to ensure that only "voting members" (and not guests or nonvoting members) had their votes recorded. Procedurally, it is extremely important for leaders to know and be able to manage bureaucratic processes such as Roberts Rules of Order given that individuals opposing change will cling to them to derail processes when other efforts to stall the change have failed. Ultimately, the vote to create the new pathway to promotion and tenure passed, 75 to 5.

Examples are really helpful, but don't turn back if you can't find them

Faculty from basic science disciplines and other units where research focused on inequities is seldom practiced often requested examples of faculty activities aligned with research, service, or teaching that would "count" toward DEI efforts. The faculty council committee on DEI created an extensive list of examples of faculty activities, shared through a public website to help increase awareness and understanding. The chancellor and the chief academic officer frequently reminded faculty that inclusive teaching practices should be learned and practiced by everyone, and that engagement in such practices would benefit all students, while also helping to reduce opportunity gaps in academic performance. The Center for Teaching and Learning strengthened its programming related to inclusive teaching practices and the vice chancellor for diversity, equity, and inclusion created additional programming for faculty and staff who work closely with students.

Examples also were illuminated through our engagement with national change networks similarly focused on diversifying the professoriate. In particular, the ADVANCE Resource and Coordination (ARC) Network Community and the Aspire Alliance provided many examples of promising practices, as well as ways of highlighting faculty activities related to DEI when hiring (e.g., through "diversity statements") or during the review of faculty work. However, despite widespread commitment to effecting policy changes that would hasten progress toward a more diverse professoriate, we could find no examples of large, public research-intensive institutions that had created new pathways for promotion and tenure that considered DEI activities to be as worthy of the standards for excellence as other types of work. The absence of examples was frequently touted by some of the naysayers as evidence that we should not be heading in this direction. However, it increased the commitment and the conviction of the members of the ad hoc committee shepherding the process that it was important to be leaders by creating a solution that worked for our institution. This bold creativity was itself energizing for many faculty but needed to be carefully calibrated to engage faculty who were more change averse. Ultimately our solution to focus on the excellence of the integrated work faculty contribute through research, teaching, and service to advance diversity, equity and inclusion emerged as the galvanizing force behind which real change occurred.

Just get the policy changed, and the rest will follow

There is a tendency in academia to deeply study and to critically analyze possible pathways toward change until all momentum ceases. Kendi (2019) contrasts educational approaches to combatting racist policies that have the express goal of changing minds with more direct efforts to simply get the policies changed. This notion of a focus on transformative policy change—coupled with the realization that efforts to change minds in order to effect policy

change seldom work—really resonated with our council of deans as we read Kendi's text, and it helped motivate us to move forward as quickly as possible with the new promotion pathway.

Attempting to disrupt the status quo is daunting, and it will almost certainly never occur through extended discussion or through reading groups aimed at persuading people to act, however well-intentioned those activities may be. We were compelled to effect the changes we did during a single academic year because we knew that if we lost momentum over the summer, additional barriers would likely emerge in the future that would be more difficult to overcome. Kendi (2019) argues that once policies are changed, behavioral and attitudinal changes will follow, at least for many. It was important to set a bold goal that was anchored by empirical evidence as well as theoretical arguments advanced by scholars on bias and discrimination, many of whom were members of our faculty from disciplines such as education, psychology, anthropology, and the health sciences. And then make haste to attain that goal as efficiently as possible.

Celebrate the change, but don't stop working

Once the new pathway for promotion had been voted into effect by the faculty council, it was important for the chancellor and others to express sincere thanks to faculty leaders involved in the change effort. The news was disseminated through internal and external press releases, some of which were picked up by news outlets that shared the work nationally. A letter was sent to all faculty affirming the significance of the change and emphasizing its consistency with our institutional values around equity and inclusion as well as our aspiration to cultivate a more diverse faculty, staff, and student community. Deans were reminded that this was just a first step, and that schools and departments needed to similarly review their own criteria and standards to ensure alignment with the campus standards for tenure-track faculty, and then to engage in a

similar process of review for non-tenure-track faculty promotion. As most faculty go through promotion only twice in their careers, we emphasized to deans the importance of also reviewing and revising the criteria determining merit through annual faculty reviews. This work will be coordinated through the Office of Academic Affairs across the next two academic years. It is our hope that this process will lead to a broader sharing of DEI work across all faculty.

Leadership both from administration and faculty governance were deeply educated, committed, and involved. This does not mean that this was an administrative dictate. This was an all-faculty effort, and accomplishment. Respected white and minoritized faculty were part of committees, spoke at town halls, and distributed materials to their colleagues. Minoritized faculty in particular were essential partners in the process, although not expected to carry the entire load. A key example was a Black female faculty member recently promoted to full professor under the existing criteria: her stellar contributions to campus and scholarship were widely recognized and the fact that someone who could have succeeded in any prior schema was deeply committed to this new pathway assured people that it was a pathway for excellence, not mediocrity.

Leading change is energizing, though at the same time it is sobering to consider the extent to which promotion and tenure review also depends on forces beyond one's institution that likely will continue for some time to reflect the status quo. External review letters are of fundamental importance to establishing excellence, and it may be challenging to help external reviewers to understand the essence of the integrated DEI dossier as they evaluate the body of faculty work. External reviewers themselves are subject to bias, as mentioned earlier, and perhaps the solution is ultimately to reconsider the weight of the impact they typically afford while simultaneously continuing to advance alternative metrics for gauging impact and

evaluating excellence. Finally, policy changes invariably need to occur alongside continual educational efforts that will support ongoing professional development and help to onboard new faculty as well as new academic leaders. Continuing to offer these educational opportunities through increasingly impactful communications, programs, workshops, and communities of practice will need to remain a priority indefinitely.

Concluding thoughts

An institution's accountability is anchored in the ability to live out its expressed mission and values. If an institution states that diversity, equity, and inclusion are important to its organization and operation, there must be actions and outcomes aligned with those values. If indeed institutional change is desired, it must be transformational. For transformational change to occur, it must challenge the status quo. This is extremely hard to accomplish, given that the landscape of higher education is imbued with power relationships and hierarchies designed to maintain the status quo. Indeed, our efforts while innovative represent only a partial disruption of the status quo. But, certainly over time, change can and does occur, however small and despite the odds. This current moment in time is especially potent and opportune.

Institutional expressions of value should not be mere platitudes in the wake of emergent societal trends. They should signal an institution's commitment to act. As Bensimon (2018) reminds us, "[t]he authentic exercise of equity and equity-mindedness requires explicit attention to structural inequality and institutionalized racism and demands system-changing responses" (p. 97). We firmly believe that such actions must be led by coalitions of faculty with heavy representation from those who hold the most power (i.e., tenured, white, full professors). While junior faculty may benefit the most from this particular initiative, they are least able to speak freely given the power dynamics inherent in academia. And it is unethical to expect faculty from

marginalized backgrounds to be the only ones driving progress toward inclusive excellence in the academy.

Faculty members who currently do this work at IUPUI now know that they can pursue this path to promotion and tenure. Prospective faculty whose work would closely align with the underlying values of Indiana University and its mission might also see this pathway as a reason to choose IUPUI as a place to make their careers. These efforts should also encourage other faculty members to undertake the essentially valuable work of DEI so that the excessive burden currently carried largely by women and minoritized faculty members can be lessened.

We consider this work to be a first yet revolutionary step in presenting an option and an idea. It is optional: out of seventeen schools at IUPUI, one will not use it at all (Medicine since this school does not employ the balanced case), and another intends to consider it only for promotion to full (Business), continuing to emphasize research at the associate rank. Other schools are eager to proceed (Social Work, Education, Liberal Arts, and Health and Human Sciences). Another (Science) has begun revising their criteria by requiring DEI statements of all candidates, regardless of pathway. As of fall 2021, IUPUI approved the integrative-DEI cases for clinical and lecturer faculty. Most importantly, the new pathway helps to inspire more people within the institution to engage in this work. Faculty will be attracted to IUPUI, retained, and advanced (achieving tenure, and, particularly, promotion to full, which is essential to advanced leadership positions), because what they do is valued as it should be. They can be proud of and excel at all that they do, not just the narrow slice of research entries that traditional metrics notice. The goals include a measurable change as faculty retention and satisfaction are tracked, and a cultural change, whereby existing values now have an explicit home in promotion and tenure.

Higher education must interrogate its systems which have historically excluded and marginalized groups while engendering an ethos that perpetuates a false narrative of race neutrality and advancement through meritocracy. An alternative and more productive approach is one of consciousness and intentionality in the creation of systems through which people can thrive and not just survive.

Gina Sánchez Gibau is Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion and Associate Professor of Anthropology. Her research interests include racial and ethnic identity development, multicultural pedagogy, and diversity in higher education. She provides strategic vision to academic units in support of attracting, recruiting, retaining, and advancing a more diverse faculty. She co-directs the IUPUI Next Generation 2.0 program, a leadership development initiative for women and underrepresented faculty and staff. She is the Co-PI on Project EPIC an NSF ADVANCE adaptation grant, and the PI on the Midwest Experiences in Mentoring Excellence, a subaward of the Aspire Alliance's NSF INCLUDES grant.

Rachel Applegate is the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs. She was an associate professor in the Department of Library and Information Science and department chair, with a scholarly interest in the application of evaluation to public and academic libraries and their management, author of Practical Evaluation Techniques for Librarians, and Managing the Small College Library. She was campus faculty council president before assuming the AVC role, in which she coordinates administrative and faculty governance oversight of promotion and tenure processes including policy, workshops, and individual advice, as part of the entire faculty life from hiring to retirement.

Margaret R. Ferguson is the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). Previously, she served as the Assistant Vice President for Statewide Academic Relations in the Office of the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs at Indiana University. She is also a professor of political science in

the School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI. In her current position, she focuses on policies and practices related to faculty development and success. Relevant examples include promotion and tenure, faculty grievances, career enhancement, and other efforts designed to make IUPUI an employer of choice.

Kathy E. Johnson serves as Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), a core campus of Indiana University and the state's urban research and academic health sciences campus. She is a professor of psychology and currently serves as PI for IUPUI's ADVANCE grant adaptation project entitled, Project EPIC (Evidence-Informed Promotion of Inclusive Climate). She is trained as a cognitive developmental psychologist and has published extensively in scientific journals in areas related to expertise acquisition and concept development. She currently serves as Chair-Elect of the Executive Committee for APLU's Council on Academic Affairs.

References

Alperin, J. P., Nieves, C. M., Schimanski, L. A., Fischman, G. E., Niles, M. T., & McKiernan, E. C. (2019). How significant are the public dimensions of faculty work in review, promotion, and tenure documents? *eLIFE Feature Article, 8,* e42254. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.42254

American Association of Colleges and Universities. (2020). *What liberal education looks like.* https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/publications/what-liberal-education-looks-what-it-who-it's-and-where-it

Barber, P. H., Hayes, T. B., Johnson, T. L., and Márquez-Magaña, L., and 10,234 signatories. (2020). Systemic racism in higher education. *Science, 369* (6510).

Bavishi, A., Madera, J. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2010). The effect of professor ethnicity and gender on student evaluations: Judged before met. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 3* (4), 245 – 256.

Bensimon, E. M. (2018). Reclaiming racial justice in equity. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *50*(3–4), 95–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2018.1509623

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., & Stark, P. B. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. *ScienceOpen Research*; doi: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR- EDU.AETBZC.v1

Bornman, L. & Haunschild, R. (2018). Alternative article-level metrics: The use of alternative metrics in research evaluation. *Embo Reports, 19,* e47260.

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach, 1*(1), 11-20.

Chance, D. M. (2012, November 14). The idiocy of promotion - and - tenure letters. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Idiocy-of/135740/

Dutt, K., Pfaff, D. L., Bernstein, A. F., Dillard, J. S., & Block, C. J. (2016). Gender differences in recommendation letters for postdoctoral fellowships in geoscience. *Nature Geoscience*, 9, 805-808.

Gaddis, S. (2015). Discrimination in the credential society: An audit study of race and college selectivity in the labor market, *Social Forces*, *93*(4), 1451–1479.

Gardner, S. K., & Veliz, D. (2014). Evincing the ratchet: A thematic analysis of the promotion and tenure guidelines at a striving university. *The Review of Higher Education, 38* (1), 105-132.

Graves, J., and Jarvis, E.D. (2020, June 19). An open letter: Scientists and racial justice. *The Scientist.* https://www.the-scientist.com/editorial/an-open-letter-scientists-and-racial-justice-67648

Hecht, F., Hecht, B.K. & Sandberg, A.A. (1998). The journal "Impact Factor:" A misnamed, misleading, misused measure. *Cancer Genetics, 104* (2), 77-81.

Heilig, J. V., Flores, I. W., Barros Souza, A. E., Barry, J. C., & Monroy, S. B. (2019). Considering the ethnoracial and gender diversity of faculty in United States college and university intellectual communities. *Hispanic Journal of Law and Policy*. https://stcl.edu/Journals/HispanicLaw/2019/2019Heilig1-31.pdf

Helmer, M., Schottdorf, M., Neef, A., & Battaglia, D. (2017). Research: Gender bias in scholarly peer review. *ELife*, *6*, e21718. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.21718

Kendi, I. X. (2019). *How to be an Antiracist*. New York: One World.

Kolowich, S. (2017, August 3). What is a black professor in America allowed to say? *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/aug/03/what-is-a-black-professor-in-america-allowed-to-say-tommy-j-curry

Kurmis, A.P. (2003). Understanding the limitations of the journal impact factor. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery, 85*(12), 2449-2454.

Lumpkin, L. (2021, November 26). $3 million Maryland grant will tackle colleges' leadership 'caste system.' *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2021/11/26/umd-umbc-morgan-state-diversity-grant/

Matthew, P. A. (2016, November 23). What is faculty diversity worth to a university? *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/11/what-is-faculty-diversity-worth-to-a-university/508334/

McKiernan, E. C., Schimanski, L. A., Muñoz Nieves, C., Matthias, L., Niles, M. T., & Alperin, J. P. (2019). Meta-Research: Use of the Journal Impact Factor in academic review, promotion, and tenure evaluations. *ELife*, *8*, e47338. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.47338

Mengel, F., Sauermann, J., & Zölitz, U. (2017). Gender bias in teaching evaluations. *IZA Institute of Labor Economics Discussion Paper Series*, 11000. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3037907/

O'Meara, K., Culpepper, D., & Templeton, L. L. (2020). Nudging toward diversity: Applying behavioral design to faculty hiring. *Review of Educational Research*, *90*(3), 311–348. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320914742

O'Rourke, S. (2008, September 26). Diversity and merit: How one university rewards faculty work that promotes equity. C*hronicle of Higher Education.* https://www.chronicle.com/article/diversity-and-merit-how-one-university-rewards-faculty-work-that-promotes-equity

Page, S. E. (2007). The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies. Princeton University Press.

Resnik, D. B., & Elmore, S. A. (2016). Ensuring the quality, fairness, and integrity of journal peer review: A possible role of editors. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *22*(1), 169–188. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-015-9625-5

Sanberg, P. R., Gharib, M., Harker, P. T., Kaler, E. W., Marchase, R. B., Sands, T. D., Arshadi, N., & Sarkar, S. (2014). Changing the academic culture: Valuing patents and commercialization toward tenure and career advancement. *Proceedings of the National Academies of Science, 111, 18,* 6542-6547. www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1404094111

Stewart, A., & Valian, V. (2018). *An inclusive academy*. MIT Press.

Vargas, E., Westmoreland, A.S., Robotham, K. & Lee, F. (2018). Counting heads vs. making heads count: Impact of numeric diversity and diversity climate on psychological outcomes for faculty of color. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, 37* (8), 780-798. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-11-2017-0256

Walker, R., Barros, B., Conejo, R., Neumann, K., & Telefont, M. (2015). Personal attributes of authors and reviewers, social bias and the outcomes of peer review: a case study. *F1000Research*, *4*, 21. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.6012.2