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Abstract

While much of the quantitative research on Black women faculty has taken a comparative approach to understanding their experiences, this study provides a counternarrative, centering their experiences as faculty. This large-scale, multi-institution glance at Black women faculty helps to give us an overview of these women across the country, looking at who they are, where they are, how they spend their time, and what they value in undergraduate education. This study allows us to strengthen various arguments made in qualitative studies of Black women faculty and give voice to a community that can be invisible. This study reaffirms and reinvigorates the need to continue to create avenues for recruitment, hiring, support, promotion, and retention of Black women across all disciplines.
Centering Black Women Faculty: Magnifying Powerful Voices

A push to diversify our pool of educators is necessary to support an agenda of equity and democracy in the United States. When examining the current demographics of faculty, it is evident that Whiteness and patriarchal systems still exist. As of 2016, Black women occupied less than 3% of all faculty positions at Bachelor-granting institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d.). Considering the pivotal role that Black women can serve in academia, it is necessary for educational leaders to recruit, develop, and retain them as faculty members. In order to increase the representation of Black women in faculty roles, a stronger understanding of the unique experiences of Black women faculty is necessary.

Although studies on faculty needs and experiences exist, there is a dearth of knowledge focused on Black women, especially utilizing quantitative data. While much of the quantitative research on faculty, including Black women, has taken a comparative approach to understanding the experiences of faculty by demographic indicators (i.e.; Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, & Bonous-Hammarth, 2000; Guarino & Borden, 2017; Thomas, & Hollenshead, 2001), the purpose of this study is to center the experiences of Black women faculty in the United States. Qualitative studies centering Black women faculty highlight numerous experiences, including distribution of work, campus climate, and navigating issues of diversity (Griffin, Pifer, Humphrey, & Hazelwood, 2011; Warren-Gordon & Mayes, 2017). Taking an autoethnographic approach to understanding Black women in academia, Warren-Gordon and Mayes (2017) explore the experiences of working at predominately White institutions, which include examinations on balancing service, teaching, and research, as well as navigating a social justice curriculum to a majority White audience. Furthermore, Griffin et al. (2017) found that in order to combat racist environments, Black faculty, including women, look to disprove stereotypes, engage in service,
as well as develop informal networks of support. This study seeks to expand the qualitative data narrative of Black women in academia to include a data examination of who they are, where they are, how they spend their time, and what they value.

**Literature Review**

Black women have fought and worked hard for their place in academia. Their trajectory has been fraught with oppression and discrimination based on both race and gender. While research on race (e.g.; Diggs, Garrison-Wade, Estrada, & Galindo, 2009; Stanley, 2006; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008) and gender (e.g.; Griffin & Maranto, 2010; Kosoko-Lasaki, Sonnino, & Voytko, 2006; Marschke, Laursen, McCarl Nielsen & Rankin, 2007) are common, looking specifically at the intersections of both is less frequent. This type of research is necessary as the experiences of Black women are unique, based on both their race and gender as well as other marginalized identities they may hold (Crenshaw, 1989; Griffin, 2016). For research focused primarily on the intersection of these two identities, often studies incorporate the experiences of women faculty of color without focusing attention on Black women in particular (e.g.; Moore, 2017; Pittman, 2010). The following section examines the scholarship on Black women faculty.

**Institutional Context**

**Working at an HBCU.** Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) provide an avenue of advancement for Black women pursuing careers in academia. Davis and Brown (2017) point to the potential value and opportunity in existence at HBCUs where Black women should not have to content with the double bind status of race and gender, among other potential marginalized identities. But although opportunities may exist, there are gendered power dynamics, historically and present day that Black women have to navigate to be successful in their respective fields (e.g.; Davis & Brown, 2017; Gasman, 2007). One faculty’s
counternarrative shares that her hopes for support while teaching at an HBCU were met with isolation and lack of support (Ricks, 2012). While barriers exist for Black women faculty at HBCUs, it is important to recognize that the climate at Predominately White Institutions (PWIs) is not fairing better.

**Navigating the PWI Terrain.** There is more research available on the experiences of Black women navigating the academy at PWIs than at HBCUs. Hartley (2008) states that the climate at PWIs for Black faculty, particularly Black women, can be chilly and hostile. How Black women are viewed in academia is outside of their control, influenced by both internal factors as well as external faculty such as the dominant narrative of the role and responsibilities of Black women in society (Harley, 2008). The stress faced by Black women in predominately White spaces can have lasting impacts (Henry & Glenn, 2009). A lack of critical mass, leading to feelings of isolation, compounded by racism and sexism in the academy means many of these women are facing an uphill battle (Henry & Glenn, 2009).

**Navigating the Academy**

**Teaching, Service, and Research.** Traditionally, faculty are expected to take on responsibility in three academic areas including teaching, service, and research. Black women in the academy navigate these three arenas in unique ways. Often, the teaching and service load of Black women is higher compared to their research load (e.g.; Evans & Cokley, 2008). Harley (2008) compares the heavy teaching and mentorship load of Black women faculty to that of child rearing whereas they are expected to carry the brunt of caring for and teaching students. As one faculty member shares, service is viewed as a catch-all that Black women bear the brunt of even though it is not typically as valued as teaching and especially research in the tenure process (Griffin, 2013).
While they may be expected to teach more, Black women’s pursuit of and value as teachers is varied. Specifically, for Black women in academia, their pedagogical practices are often politicized and Othered (Perlow, Bethea, & Wheeler, 2014). Black women are perceived as biased and their teaching taken less seriously when teaching about issues related to race and gender (Perlow et al., 2014). Therefore, Black women continue to face an uphill battle to be accepted and viewed as an intellectual equal within the academy (Perlow et al., 2014). Qualitative research on Black women’s teaching, service, and research has predominately focused on the lived experiences of Black women as they navigate these three important areas of the academy. One quantitative study engaged in understanding what faculty encourage and support in their classroom (Wheatle & BrckaLorenz, 2015). Their findings suggest that Black women faculty are likely to their students to engage in civic engagement and they incorporate service-learning in their classrooms.

**Tenure and Promotion.** There are many factors that influence the tenure and promotion process for faculty, including the aforementioned expected contributions of teaching, research, and service. Black women often face an uphill battle when pursuing tenure. In a study conducted by Griffin, Bennett, and Harris (2013) they examined the gendered difference of Black faculty discourse on tenure, advancement, and professional success. They found that Black women uniquely acknowledged the institutional emphasis on research for tenure, but they perceive a larger emphasis on teaching evaluations in consideration for their tenure and promotion (Griffin, et al., 2013). One woman discussed how one negative teaching evaluation led to her initial denial for tenure. These standards of evaluation for Black women impact their potential for equitable tenure and promotion.
While much of the literature examines the experiences of Black women in the early stages of their career (e.g.; Bertrand Jones & Osborne Lampkin, 2013; Montgomery, Dodson, & Johnson, 2014) or working towards tenure, Croom and Patton (2012) utilize critical race theory and critical feminism to examine Black women and full professorship. Acknowledging the hierarchical structure of faculty-ranks, they posit that this system is deeply rooted in racism and sexism due to its creation by and for White men. Instead of looking to Black women to fall in line with the current system, it may be time to reimagine a tenure system that is inclusive of culture and identity.

An Asset-based Mindset

While much of the previous literature highlights the oppressive system faced by Black women faculty and the obstacles that are necessary to overcome both academic success and personal well-being, several articles highlight the benefits that Black women faculty bring to higher education as well as tools and resources that can be utilized to combat oppressive systems. In a case study of tenured Black women faculty at Michigan State University, Smith (2003) found that Black women felt that when more Black women, faculty and staff, were hired the campus climate improved. The institution held more cultural events with Black performers and the research produced by the faculty hired centered the range of experiences of Black people.

Perlow et al. (2014) provide pedagogical tools they have personally utilized in their teaching and learning to help combat some of the negative and harmful experiences Black women face in the classroom. They suggest making clear from the first day with setting class expectations as well as dispelling the notion that anything can be apolitical. In addition, they recommend drawing attention to and making explicit the recognition that all students (and
faculty) enter the classroom with years of socialization and preconceived notions and using the microaggressions of students as teachable moments.

Through in-depth interviews with 14 Black women faculty, Sulé (2009) found three critical enactments Black women to self-define their career success at PWIs. Participants shared that they center issues of race and gender, uses their access to different spaces inside and outside the institution to talk about these issues. In addition, Black women work to uplift others in their academic journey including students and POC outside the institution. Lastly, participants shared that while they were required or chose to follow certain protocol, they also were intentional about creating their own paths that aligned with their own nontraditional values. After reviewing literature on Black women in the academy, Hartley (2008) provided strategies Black women faculty can use to succeed in the field and cope with stressors. The four strategies included: that Black women cannot be all things to all people, sometimes self-validation may be the only source of acknowledgement received, Black women must recognize and learn to navigate the institutional culture, and it is important to maintain mental, spiritual, and physical health.

**Enriching the Current Literature Gaps in the Literature**

The current literature on Black women faculty, particularly the contributions from Black women, have helped to shape the narrative of navigating academia as a Black woman. Although these contributions are vital, there are several areas within the literature that this current study hopes to add to. Traditionally in education qualitative methods are seen to best to provide space for counternarratives and storytelling compared to quantitative methods. Much of the literature has been qualitative in nature (e.g.; Griffin, et al., 2013; Mawhinney, 2012; Perlow et al., 2014), providing a rich analysis of the experiences and phenomena of Black women scholars. Because
of this, the current studies also have focused on smaller populations (i.e.; Griffin, 2016; Leon & Thomas, 2016). Quantitative studies focused on faculty experiences often aggregate Black experiences into racial minority experiences, due to the reliance on large numbers, and conduct between-group comparative analyses (Lawrence, Celis, & Ott, 2014; Reid, 2010). These research approaches can continue to normalize Whiteness and maleness while othering Black women. The current study aims to move beyond these approaches by examining descriptive information and within-group comparative analyses to examine Black women faculty experiences. There is a need to continue adding information to previous research centering intersecting experiences of Black women faculty, especially using a large scale, multi-institutional dataset. The current study will address who these Black women faculty are, where they are located, how they spend their time in their faculty positions, and what they value.

**Positionality Statement**

We are higher education scholars, comprised of doctoral students and a faculty member, and a group of women interested in highlighting the stories of less studied populations in higher education. At the conception of the group and research study, we decided to focus on crafting a story on Black women faculty. None of us identify as Black women faculty; we are all outsiders of the intersecting identity, and we are aware that this means we cannot fully understand or relate to the experiences of Black women faculty. Two of us, however, identify as Black women graduate students that aspire to become faculty members, and understanding current Black women faculty experiences is insightful and encouraging to give space to a population they will join. As we went through the data we found the representation of Black women in faculty ranks disheartening at the possibility of not being on the tenure track after the completion of our degree. Exploring the experiences of Black women faculty has created opportunities of reflection
for the Black women graduate students to manage expectations of their future career. Two of us have a qualitative background with a focus on feminist research methodologies, which led to the incorporation of Critical Race Feminism as the framework of the study. Two of us have a strong quantitative background with experience on researching small populations. Having previous experience working with smaller populations made us aware of different approaches to analyzing data. The researchers set out to be intentional about focusing solely on Black women faculty without a comparison group to center the narrative of these women, add to literature, and provide an example of critical quantitative methodology. We worked collaboratively, playing on the strengths of each member to work on combing their expertise to best explore the data. Throughout the research we consistently checked-in with each other to ensure we have a collective understanding of the approach of our study. A group bias occurs in our analysis and presentation data because of group care for Black women faculty. Throughout our examination of the data we challenged ourselves to extract a story using quantitative methods. There were no expectations to fulfill all inquiry into Black women faculty in higher education research but to proceed with care and intention with our methods and theoretical framework.

**Theoretical Framework**

Critical race theory (CRT) is an intellectual movement introduced through legal studies. CRT formed from multiple frustrations of legal scholars in the 70s and the 80s. Legal scholars Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman were frustrated with the slow pace of change from the civil rights era. Their frustrations and scholarly work set the tone for emerging legal scholars to create a space to engage in critical race studies within the law. These students took their frustration to form CRT to address racism in society and the law. CRT “is a collection of activists and scholars engaged in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power” (Delgado
The CRT tenets have become a major staple in the academic community to guide scholars and activists that incorporate CRT in their work.

Since the concept of CRT hit the legal field and other academic disciplines, there have been a few critiques that have broadened the impact and applicability of CRT. One such branch of CRT is FemCRiT or critical race feminism (CRF). CRF came from a need to address a lack of intersection in CRT (missing women) and feminist legal studies (women of color). Women of color legal scholars needed a theory and movement that could more appropriately address their issues. CRF is multidisciplinary in nature because of the intersection of race and gender. Legal studies are not enough to analyze the compounding power dynamics women of color face. There is a continuing need to elevate the stories of Black women and CRF provides a space for Black women to be heard, which is why CRF was chosen to guide the current study. We do not discredit the experiences other minorities, however there is a need to continue to elevate the stories of Black women and CRF provides a space to do this work. “Critical race feminists expose how various factors, such as race, gender, and class, interact within a system of White male patriarchy and racist oppression to make the life experiences of women of color distinct from those of men of color and white women” (Owuachi-Willig, 2006, p. 736). CRT and CRF overlap with a focus on race and racism being normalized and ordinary, counter storytelling, and intersectionality. CRF aims to bridge theory and practice. It is not enough to theorize about experiences when change is necessary. The tenets that frame this study are:

1. *Racism is essential.* All CRT research accepts the idea that “racism is permanent component of American life” (Bell, 1992, p.13). It is a realist perspective that racism is embedded in the all structures, political, economics, and social dynamics (DeCuir &
Dixson, 2004). CRT focuses on the impact of racism on people of color and brings to light their unique experiences.

2. *Valuing experiential knowledge*. There is value and legitimacy in the knowledge people possess. CRT takes a critical analysis using this knowledge as valid in critiquing race in society. Lived experiences of people of color are used in methods of storytelling, providing a counter-narrative to the dominant society’s portrayal of people of color (Yosso, 2006).

3. *Challenging dominant paradigm*. CRT challenges Whiteness and White privilege and entitlements that educational institutions provide in protecting Whiteness. CRT challenges neutral and objective societal views when discussing race issues. By challenging these strong held beliefs, CRT scholars provide space for the voices of people of color.

Acknowledging that CRT and CRF originate from legal studies, the application to education has increased since the scholarship of Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) laid a necessary foundation. CRF guides the study in a critical exploration of the intersection of race and gender for Black women faculty. Our use of CRF allows us to look at within group differences to veer away from grouping the experiences of Black women faculty as the same.

**Data Sources and Method**

The data come from the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) 2014-2018 administrations, FSSE, a complimentary survey to the National Survey of Student Engagement, asks faculty about their use of educational practices that are linked with student learning and development. More specifically, questions asked faculty about their perceptions of student experiences and interactions, approaches to teaching, faculty development and supportive
environments, along with demographic information. Between 2014 and 2018, FSSE was administered to 1639 Black women faculty at 295 four-year institutions. Data were also used from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to examine Black women faculty’s descriptive information on the national level. In our exploration of the experiences of Black women faculty, we focused on examining descriptive statistics and relationships among demographic information. The use of non-comparative methodology in the current study aligns with CRF, as we aimed to intentionally center the experiences of Black women faculty.

Results

Who They Are

Among the 1639 Black women faculty respondents, approximately 31% identified as adjunct faculty members, 27% are assistant professors, 20% are associate professors and 22% are instructors. About 42% of Black women faculty respondents are not in tenure track faculty positions but are employed at institutions that have tenure systems, while 20% reported being tenured. About 49% of Black women faculty respondents are employed at minority serving institutions, with 35.9% at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Approximately 46% are at Master’s colleges and universities with about 31% of Black women faculty having teaching experience between 10 and 19 years. The top academic disciplines that Black women faculty reported their faculty appointment being in were Health Professions (17%), Education (14.5%), Social Sciences (14.3%), and Arts & Humanities (13.6%). More demographic details can be found in Table 1.

How They Spend Their Time
About 53% of Black women faculty respondents reported allocating over 17 hours per week on teaching activities, such as prepping class materials, class sessions, grading, etc., while 39% reported spending one to four hours per week allocating time to student advising. Additionally, 35% reported spending one to four hours per week on research or scholarly activities and 31% on service activities, such as committees and administrative work.

Respondents were also asked about their participation in high-impact practice experiences with their undergraduate students. Approximately 31% reported working with undergraduate students on research and 34% reported supervising undergraduate internships or other related experiences. There were about 38% of Black women faculty who responded ‘Some’ when asked about how many of their undergraduate courses incorporate a community-service project.

**What They Value**

Black women faculty respondents were asked about their perceptions on various student experiences and teaching practices. Black women faculty perceived internship experiences (76%), capstone or senior experiences (65%) and community based projects (50%) to be ‘Very Important’, while only 20% perceived study abroad experiences as ‘Very Important’. For teaching practices, approximately 63% of respondents reported using a variety of teaching techniques to accommodate diversity and 65% reported high importance for incorporating diverse perspectives in course discussions and assignments. There were about 70% of respondents who reported high importance for students examining strengths and weaknesses of their own views on issues and 78% reported high importance on students connecting ideas from their courses to prior experiences and knowledge.

**Chi-Squares**
A series of chi-square analyses were conducted to examine associations between demographic information for Black women faculty. Adjusted residuals (AR) were used to analyze notable differences in chi-square analyses. An AR less than -2 or greater than 2 was considered a notable difference in our analyses (Agresti & Finlay, 1997). There was a significant association found between discipline and institution type for Black women faculty ($\chi^2(10, 1574) = 31.57, p < .01$). Black women faculty in social sciences were underrepresented at HBCUs (AR = -3.5) and were underrepresented in biological sciences (AR = -2.7) and engineering (AR = -2.6) at non-HBCUs. There was significant association found between tenure status and institution type ($\chi^2(3, 1567) = 76.49, p < .01$). Black women faculty were underrepresented at HBCUs that did not have tenure systems (AR = 6.6) and at HBCUs where they were not on the tenure-track (AR = -3.4) while being overrepresented at HBCUs in tenure-track (AR = 4.3) and tenured (AR = 4.8) positions. There was also a significant association found between rank and institution type ($\chi^2(6, 1584) = 30.63, p < .01$). At HBCUs, Black women faculty were overrepresented in associate professor (AR = 2.3) and assistant professors (AR = 3.5) while being overrepresented as instructors at non-HBCUs (AR = 3.7). There was a significant association found discipline and tenure status ($\chi^2(30, 1594) = 80.46, p < .01$). Black women faculty were overrepresented in Business at institutions with no tenure systems (AR = 4.4) while being underrepresented in non-tenure-track positions in Biological Sciences, Agriculture, Natural Resources (AR = -2.2) and Education (AR = -2.2). More chi-square results can be found in Tables 2 and 3.

**Discussion**

It is a natural reaction for researchers and readers of quantitative work to situate their thinking in terms of comparisons. Readers may look at the findings here and wonder, “but how
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does that compare to other faculty?” or “but is that normal?” and we challenge our readers with such questions to reflect on that initial reaction. Qualitative explorations are not held to a standard of comparison in telling the stories of its participants, and we challenged ourselves to do the same. Instead of trying to understand the experiences of Black women faculty by looking at them above, below, or beside other faculty, we aimed to understand them on their own, singularly telling their story without support characters. Admittedly, taking a non-comparative stance was an unusual task, and we had little guidance from the field. We hope that this first step in broadly understanding the context of Black women faculty opens the door to future large-scale studies that further explore the nuances, perceptions, decisions, and actions of Black women faculty on their own.

We strove to better understand the experiences of Black women faculty by investigating who they were, where they were employed, how they spent their time, and what they valued. Black women faculty were primarily found in non-tenured positions, with 42% of them employed at institutions that have tenure systems. This finding may not be as surprising considering how few Black women are employed as faculty members across the nation. However, with about 36% of this sample being employed as HBCUs, questions arise as to how much HBCUs contribute to the patriarchal norms that are often found at PWIs. HBCUs are continually found to be positive and supportive climates for Black students overall (Cokley, 2000; Outcalt & Skewes-Cox, 2002), but were found to be hostile environments for women faculty members (Renzulli & Kathuria, 2006). Although Black women faculty still experienced gender equity issues at HBCUs, they still preferred the HBCU campus climate over climates experienced at PWIs (Renzulli & Kathuria, 2006). It is important, however, to celebrate the success of Black women in addition to noting inequities. Despite their underrepresentation
within systems that were not created with them in mind, many Black women faculty are finding pathways to success, and their accomplishments are worth noting. Finding ways to further support these women and continuing to work to remove the barriers they have and continue to face are important goals for higher education.

In regard to discipline, Black women faculty overall were primarily appointed in the social sciences, education, and health profession fields. This fits the current narrative of Black women faculty as caretakers and nurturers of students and communities. It is critical to note, however, that Black women faculty are represented in all of the disciplinary areas here. Again we see Black women faculty present in all areas of academia, yet this presence often goes unnoticed and uncelebrated. Although their consistent underrepresentation throughout higher education is unacceptable, we don’t want to focus so heavily on the failures of our academic system that we forget to give voice to the Black women faculty that we have. It is also important to recognize that at HBCU’s, institutions intended to support and strengthen Black students and faculty, we see Black women faculty more represented in fields such as biological sciences and engineering. Perhaps in these spaces, even with their gendered equity issues, Black women are relatively more encouraged and supported in STEM fields. At non-HBCU’s, however, Black women are underrepresented in biological sciences and engineering and overrepresented in social sciences. Here again we see the narrative of Black women in service-oriented fields. A series of factors could contribute to Black women faculty being more represented in service-oriented fields compared to science, technology, engineering, or math (STEM) fields, including marginalization and limited social capital leading to departure during their pursuit of STEM degrees (Borum & Walker, 2011; Charleston et al., 2014).
Fairly common narratives exist about the experiences of Black women faculty: they are treated like caretakers, saddled with responsibility for diversity, are underrepresented in many ways, and in some ways they do too much yet aren’t rewarded for that work. In reviewing what the literature knows about Black women faculty we see a similar story told again and again, and we in no way want to dismiss any of these stories. On the contrary, we hope to strengthen these narratives by broadly focusing on Black women faculty throughout academia, across many institutions, and in all fields. Research on Black women faculty has focused attention on the concept of ‘othermothering’ or enhanced time supporting students which could be better aligned with fields known for being more nurturing (Mawhinney, 2011; Sawyer-Kurian & Coneal, 2018). Black women faculty have a hard time saying no to serving their students and this manifests in more emphasis and time dedicated to teaching and mentoring their students (Griffin, et al., 2013). This is evident in our findings as Black women spend about as much time with research activity, as they do service activities. This finding points to the need to reexamine the faculty-wide emphasis on research and production over time spent on the development of students. The current imbalance leaves Black women faculty with guilt over choosing to help their students, and sometimes at the detriment of tenure and promotion. We see the pattern of Black women told in these stories from the past in our current overview of who Black women faculty are, how they spend their time, and in what they value. We see this story across various institution types, across all disciplinary fields, and in various aspects of the measures we studied. We hope that our work draws together the individual stories that have been told before, both to broadly show academia that these stories are not isolated to particular institutions, departments, or programs, but rampant throughout higher education and to communicate to the Black women faculty throughout the academy that we see them, we hear them, and we support them.
**Limitations**

Institutions self-select to participate in FSSE and those institutions are able to select which departments and faculty receive the survey. The FSSE administration process of self-selection may produce biases based on the institutions’ choice to administer the survey to their faculty. Although, researchers intentionally chose to analyze descriptive statistics and only conduct within group comparisons due to our critical frameworks (Sablan, 2019), our analyses do little to understand Black women faculty perceptions and motivations regarding their current positions, what they value and how they spend their time. Referring back to our positionality statement, the women who comprised the research group interpreted the findings in ways that may be different from other interpretations and that should be taken into consideration in other interpretations. Additionally, researchers also understand that Black women have other salient identities, such as sexual orientation, and (dis)ability, that were not disaggregated in the analyses and should be taken into consideration in future analyses. We are aware of the more critical lens that CRF calls for in researching intersectional identities and the current study is a step in the direction of more critical quantitative analysis on Black women faculty and their experiences in higher education.

**Implications and Future Directions**

**Research**

Our study aimed to take a different approach when analyzing descriptive information about Black women faulty. The absence of between-group comparisons allowed researchers to use critical race feminism to zoom in on their unique journeys and experiences. Moving forward, examinations of Black women faculty should continue to use intersectional lenses to understand that Black faculty as a whole are a heterogeneous group. Black women faculty have experiences
unlike any other group and if the academy aims to specifically increase the representation of Black women, there must be an increased interest in understanding their experiences. Furthermore, research should build on our descriptive information of Black women faculty. Having an idea of who they are, where they are, what they value, and how they spend their time is the first step to understanding their experiences better. More detailed analyses are needed to continue to understand Black women faculty’s specific perceptions of their institutional environments and how institutions can continue to work on increasing support to both attract and retain Black women in the academy. From the aim of this study, there will hopefully also be an increased interest is using more critical approaches when examining minoritized faculty and a move away from the narrative of comparisons.

Practice

Our findings suggest that Black women spend a significant amount of their time teaching and that approximately two-thirds of respondents’ value and/or incorporate diverse perspective into their curriculum. Recognizing that previous research suggests that students may be resistant to these topics, particularly when addressed by Black women, it is important for faculty to incorporate pedagogical techniques that not only students are reticent to but also do not negatively impact opportunities for advancement for Black women (Perlow, et al., 2014). Creating mentorship opportunities and faculty learning communities specifically for Black women to network and grow can allow Black women to share resources and find support for their teaching practices (Montgomery, Dodson, & Johnson, 2014). Black women should not be the only faculty carrying the burden of teaching about diversity. All faculty, staff, and administrators should support Black women in their work, share in the teaching burden, and call out students and other campus community members who may be consciously or unconsciously
causing harm with their actions. In addition, educational leaders should recognize the unique and powerful position that Black women hold in academic spaces where they hold both an insider/outsider perspective and can bring different perspectives into conversations to advance their fields. These perspectives should be viewed as assets and their voices should be elevated.

**Policy**

In our study an overwhelming amount of the Black women are holding faculty positions that do not lead to tenure status. Considering the small number of Black women holding tenured faculty positions in our study and within the larger higher education landscape there need to be a shift in tenure and promotion process. Black women are left to pick up for the department to meet the advising needs, service needs, committee needs, and mentoring needs leaving them with less time to produce substantial publications (Gregory, 2001). There is a need to reconsider the value of the work faculty invest in when they are up for consideration for tenure and promotion, with a greater focus on teaching and service activities. Black women spend a great amount of their time dedicated to teaching practices and services obligations. Gregory (1999) found that Black faculty women valued the status of tenure and retention could be maintained if institutions offered more resources to support tenure. Reshaping the tenure process to include the values and work value of Black women challenges the Whiteness embedded in the current tenure and promotion process. Tenure currently upholds systemic barriers of allowing Black women faculty access to the coveted educational freedom of tenure.

**Conclusion**

This study provides a counternarrative for Black women faculty, using CRF by centering their experiences and highlighting some of the values they hold in their faculty roles. Black women faculty frequently find themselves in a double bind. The multiple minority statuses they
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hold, including other non-visible marginalized identities as well, impact how they navigate in the world. This concept translates to higher education as institutions continue to exclude them from faculty positions. Institutions have ample opportunities to acknowledge and accept the experiential knowledge they bring to institutional spaces but instead they are tokenized and often referred to as diversity experts, expecting them to be the voice for all racial minority issues. Institutional agents are charged to continue creating and sustaining equitable environments that support and uplift Black women faculty in recruitment, retention, and tenure and promotion processes.
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Table 1. Selected Black Women Faculty Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FSSE Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No tenure at institution</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on tenure track, but institutions has tenure system</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On tenure track but not tenured</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Universities</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Department</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences, Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences, Mathematics &amp; Computer Sciences</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications, Media &amp; Public Relations</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Professions</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other disciplines</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>N%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or less</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or more</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. Chi-Square Statistics for Differences in Disciplinary Area, Rank, and Tenure by Institution Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Non-HBCU</th>
<th>HBCU</th>
<th>$\chi^2$, p, n(df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 31.57^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Sci. Agric. &amp; Nat Res</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1574(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Sci Math. &amp; CS</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm., Media, &amp; PR</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Professions</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other disciplines</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Non-HBCU</th>
<th>HBCU</th>
<th>$\chi^2$, p, n(df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 30.63^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1584(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Non-HBCU</th>
<th>HBCU</th>
<th>$\chi^2$, p, n(df)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No tenure system</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 76.49^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on tenure track</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>1567(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** = p value < .001
### Table 3. Chi-Square Statistics for Differences in Disciplinary Area by Tenure Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No tenure system</td>
<td>Not on tenure-track</td>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>( \chi^2 ), p, n(df)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1594(30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \chi^2 = 80.46^{***} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( *** = p \text{ value} < .001 \)