CHAPTER 6.

WRITING SUPPORT FOR FACULTY OF COLOR

Laura R. Micciche and Batsheva Guy
University of Cincinnati

Abstract: *This chapter addresses the unique writing support needs of faculty of color at historically white institutions. Based on our experience facilitating writing groups, we identify the critical need for affinity-based communities, mentorship, and structured writing goals tailored for faculty of color. The chapter highlights institutional barriers and the impact of typically white attitudes and behavioral norms on faculty well-being and retention. It calls for tailored writing support programs that reflect the experiences of faculty of color, advocating for systemic changes in academic culture to foster equity and inclusion.*

As facilitators of faculty writing groups at a historically white institution (HWI) in the Midwest, we have had the opportunity to work with faculty members across rank, college, and discipline in face-to-face and online contexts. During these sessions, we noticed that faculty of color expressed a need for affinity group community, peer mentors, work/life balance, and structured writing goals with more specificity and regularity than did white faculty members. What we were hearing anecdotally motivated the research detailed in this chapter. We set out to learn how faculty of color at our four-year Research I institution describe the conditions under which they write, so that we might develop writing and publishing support tailored to their needs. We anticipate that our findings will have applicability to other institutions where attracting, supporting, and retaining faculty of color, particularly at HWIs, require data-based evidence as well as creative thinking. In this chapter, we use HWI (Historically White Institution) instead of PWI (Predominantly White Institution) to acknowledge the institution's origins and legacy of systemic exclusion rather than its current demographics.

We come to this research with an awareness that unchecked whiteness, or whiteness as a presumed norm that structures entry and advancement in academic institutions, is baked into higher education labor practices. How else to explain the deplorable demographics across U.S. higher education? In 2017,

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2025.2555.2.06

for example, the National Center for Education Statistics found that faculty in postsecondary institutions remain 76 percent white, while student demographics are changing at a much faster rate (Davis & Fry, 2019). This disparity has several negative effects on faculty success. For instance, Brandolyn Jones et al. (2015) argue that women and faculty of color tend to take on more student advising than their white male colleagues, in part because students "gravitate toward faculty members who look like them or [are] of the same race or ethnicity in search of empathy for common cultural experiences and mentoring" (p. 143). In addition, faculty of color face what Sherri L. Wallace et al. (2012) call "roadblocks to productivity and career advancement" (p. 424). Such roadblocks include "getting oriented to the institution and its culture; getting access to informal networks and information, monetary resources, and collegial feedback in research and teaching endeavors; managing expectations for performance, particularly the tenure process; finding collegiality; and creating a balance between professional roles and family life" (Wallace et al., 2012, p. 424).

We have more than a pipeline problem, in other words; we have a culture problem. Previous studies of faculty of color retention rates have shown that, rather than background experiences, "quality of experiences once the individual arrives at an institution have the greatest impact on retention" (Jayakumar et al., 2009, p. 550). If this holds, then impactful faculty support programs can be powerful tools in institutional culture change. Rashida Harrison (2016) describes the dialogic potential of strategic support programs, noting that "excellent support" leads to expanded numbers of diverse faculty, which leads to "inclusive learning environments and more diversified kinds of scholarly inquiries" (pp. 56–57).

To build a case for creating "excellent" writing support, we combine insights from interdisciplinary research on faculty development—most often framed by feminist and critical race theory, educational and labor studies, and the scholarship of teaching and learning—with research in rhetoric and composition. The former rarely addresses writing theory and practice; the latter largely backgrounds cultural and social differences in discussions of writing support (Ballif et al., 2008; Olson & Taylor, 1997; Tulley, 2018). Ensuring that all faculty members are prepared to succeed in research-intensive environments is going to require culture change. While writing support is only one small part of such change, alongside teaching and service support, both of which are better documented in existing research (e.g., Belcher, 2019; Boice, 1990; Boyce & Aguilera, 2021; Pyke, 2011; Rankin, 2001), we believe culturally enhanced writing support can potentially have a big impact on faculty well-being and productivity by nurturing community-building, faculty coalitions around shared interests, access to resources, and cross-disciplinary collegiality.

In this chapter, we report on an institutional survey and group-level assessment (GLA) designed to gather faculty members' experiences with, preparation for, and feelings about writing for reappointment and promotion. Our discussion and analysis below are based on responses from 50 survey respondents and six participants in the GLA, a participatory group method that moves toward an action plan. We focus on the open response portions of our survey in which participants commented on writing needs, and on the results of our GLA discussion, including the action plan developed by participants. These segments of our study highlight three key themes related to writing support: financial and collegial resources, isolation and competition, and time and space issues. Drawing on these themes, we share GLA members' action plan initiatives aimed at writing productivity for faculty of color. We hope our findings offer strategies for thoughtful writing support while also informing efforts to recruit and retain faculty of color in the first place.

POSITIONALITY AND METHODS

The IRB-exempt study we designed grew out of our work with faculty on writing initiatives. We sought a better understanding of writing conditions for faculty of color at our institution and felt a mixed-methods approach would illuminate both faculty demographics and qualitative experiences with writing. However, we also recognized the limitations of our shared positionality from which to conduct this study. As two white women, one tenured in English and one serving as Program Director of Inclusive Excellence in the College of Engineering and Applied Science, we recognize the privilege of our institutional and cultural positions. We believe white people must put in the work to understand how institutions marginalize and undervalue faculty of color so that we can contribute to positive change. Too, we recognize, following standpoint theory, that "groups who share common placement in hierarchical power relations also share common experiences in such power relations" (Collins, 1997, p. 377). As researchers writing about and for those with whom we do not share common placement or access to power, we knew we needed to check our whiteness. The work and knowledge of faculty members who occupy nondominant subject positions are too often devalued and/or misunderstood in HWIs, where whiteness is very often the unacknowledged criteria for good or acceptable work.

To decenter our institutional and racialized perspectives, we developed a two-phase study that prioritized participant-driven data analysis in the second phase. The first phase of our study was a 37-question survey administered online through Qualtrics (see Appendix B for recruitment email and survey questions). The survey was open to faculty of color, nontenure or tenure track, who are required to

publish research or creative activity for reappointment, promotion, or tenure. We distributed our recruitment email by tapping campus leaders—deans, associate deans, heads of special centers—sending to transdisciplinary listservs, and reaching out to affinity groups on campus: Black Faculty Association, Latinx Faculty Association, and the Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies department. In each case, we depended on recipients' willingness to forward our call to their contacts, creating a snowball effect that we believe worked effectively.

In our recruitment email, we invited colleagues who self-identify as faculty of color to complete the survey. We sought to avoid constructing categories of identity that don't match individual experiences as well as to extend agency for self-definition to our participants. Rather than create a comparative study with whites as the norm against which others are measured, we wanted to focus on the distinct experiences of faculty of color. This approach, in combination with our recruitment email, had its own problems, as we later realized. Fourteen of our 50 respondents identified as white, which we believe resulted from our wording in the first paragraph of our email ("research study of writing support for faculty of color") leading faculty members to think that we were asking how they support faculty of color. In addition, we failed to incorporate skip logic in the identification portion of the survey that would have prevented those who identified as white from completing the survey. As a result, we manually excluded white faculty members' responses in our discussion below.

In the end, the 34 respondents came from 17 disciplines and 11 colleges, two of which are branch campuses of the main campus where we work. Fourteen respondents were born outside the U.S., and 10 identified as administrators. Twenty-two survey respondents identified as women, 10 as men, one as genderqueer, and one preferred not to disclose gender. In terms of respondents' racial and ethnic identification, 16 identified as Asian/Asian American, ten as Black/African American, three as Multiracial, two as Hispanic/Latinx, two as Native American/Alaskan, and one as "other," with a write-in option indicating Hellenic Jew.

At the university, there are 841 faculty of color and 3,091 white faculty. Out of those, there are 506 faculty of color in STEM fields, 1,576 white faculty in STEM fields, 325 non-STEM faculty of color, and 1,487 non-STEM white faculty. The limited diversity of our survey participants, particularly the small number of Latinx and Native American/Alaskan respondents, is reflective of the diversity of the university faculty as a whole (80% white, 11.4% Black, 7.3% Asian) ("University," n.d.). Additionally, more faculty in non-STEM fields (59.5%) filled out the survey than did those in STEM fields (40.4%). As such, our findings in this chapter are preliminary and represent the initial phase of our research.

The content of the survey focused on participants' familial and education background; writing requirements for promotion, tenure, and reappointment;

feelings about writing; and ideal forms of writing support. Two optional open responses at the end invited respondents to add feedback about writing needs and advice for new faculty of color at the institution. In addition, respondents could add an email address if they were interested in being part of a follow-up small group discussion. Twelve people added their email addresses, and seven participated in the GLA: two men and five women. Both men who participated identified as Black, and out of the five women who participated, two identified as Black and three as Asian. Collectively, they represented diverse locations within the university: Asian studies, art history, business, psychology, medicine, health information, nursing, and rehabilitation and nutrition sciences.

To account for the richness and epistemic salience of participant experiences represented in the data, we used a GLA format when meeting with participants remotely. This method allows researchers to foreground participant-generated themes that they see in the data and to outline a collaboratively developed action plan. A GLA is like a focus group in that both include demographically similar people who represent a subset of a larger population. While focus groups typically function through a controlled interview process with predetermined questions, a GLA is a "qualitative and participatory large group method in which timely and valid data are collaboratively generated and interactively evaluated with relevant stakeholders leading to the development of participant-driven data and relevant action plans" (Vaughn & Lohmueller, 2014, p. 336).

We adapted the typical large group format for our smaller number of GLA participants. On the one hand, the smaller group limits the representational validity of our results; on the other, group members were able to have a nuanced, deep conversation that might have been impossible with more participants. In short, we believe that the size of the group and the GLA process itself, which incorporates participants' response, reflection, discussion, and action planning, ended up being an advantage for our first attempt at studying writers who identify as faculty of color. While GLAs are typically hosted in-person, we modified the process to a remote format, detailed stepwise as follows:

1. *Responding to prompts (asynchronous):* Participants were asked to respond to 15 open-ended prompts that we crafted based on hot spots in the survey data (e.g., support, feelings about writing and writing needs). Participants were asked to respond with their first thoughts, using words and short phrases seen only by us.
2. *Reflecting upon answers (asynchronous):* Anonymized responses to prompts were combined into a shared document that all participants had access to via a Google document. Participants reflected upon others' answers and used asterisks (*) to indicate which responses resonated with them.

3. *Introductions & icebreakers (synchronous):* Following the prompt responses and reflection, we met with participants over Zoom, beginning with introductions and an explanation of the GLA process.
4. *Small group discussion (synchronous):* While on Zoom, participants were divided into small groups and assigned a set of prompts and prompt responses. They were instructed to identify 3-5 themes across the prompt responses.
5. *Large group discussion (synchronous):* Small groups shared their themes with the larger group, and as a large group, participants consolidated the themes and developed overarching themes.
6. *Action planning (synchronous):* Based on the key themes, the group as a whole developed action steps to address the issues that surfaced during the large group discussion.

Participants were given two weeks to complete the asynchronous portion of the GLA process. The synchronous portions were completed in a single 90-minute Zoom session, facilitated by the authors. While the GLA was in session, we took notes that were visible to the participants on screen. Near the end of the session, we asked everyone to review the notes and to suggest additions and corrections and/or to ask questions about the written representation of our conversation. The resulting participant-identified themes and action planning, along with the open survey responses, provide a framework for understanding what supports and thwarts writing productivity for faculty of color at our institution.

DATA ANALYSIS

We implemented an iterative data analysis process to integrate the open-ended survey findings with the GLA findings. Responses to the quantitative survey questions were analyzed, and this data was used to create targeted prompts for the GLA. Following the GLA, which included a large group thematic analysis, we coded the open survey responses and, in turn, linked them to the GLA themes. The coded survey responses were largely subcategories of the themes determined by GLA participants.

THEMES & ACTION PLAN

Financial and collegial support, isolation and competition, and time and space issues—these themes might at first appear to be universal concerns among faculty. We found, however, that threaded throughout discussion of these themes was talk about cultural and racial inequity. Behind the themes were concerns

that faculty work was not recognized or materially valued, that colleagues were reluctant to invite them to collaborate, that a competitive environment left them feeling isolated from colleagues, and that racial and ethnic bias played a part in all of the above. In what follows, we discuss the themes identified by participants while drawing on examples from the survey and GLA discussion. We then present the action plan developed by GLA members, which includes practical and aspirational changes that would make our university, and likely other HWIs, a healthier and more habitable place for faculty of color.

Theme 1: Financial and Collegial Support

Support comes in many forms. Perhaps the most obvious is equitable compensation, which emerged as a major concern for survey respondents and GLA participants. When survey respondents were invited to add "any comments related to your writing needs that will help us understand what you see as factors supporting or inhibiting your productivity," they responded by articulating compensation issues that disadvantage faculty of color. One respondent noted, for instance, that our university "rhetorically articulates" support but does not back it up with compensation. As a result, faculty of color spend precious time and energy applying for "each and every funding opportunity," an exhausting process that cuts into research time. When asked what advice they would give to new faculty of color about how to achieve their writing goals, one respondent contended that they wouldn't encourage potential faculty members to accept a position at our university, explaining that "[s]alaries are grossly lower than other schools."

Inadequate compensation also came up in the GLA discussion, as participants described the inflexible spending rules on available funding and problems with allocation. Others articulated the need for on-campus editorial assistance for writing projects, and mentorship for new faculty in order to create a pipeline for success. One participant described an aspirational model for success: teams of senior faculty mentors and new faculty collaborating on a publication to establish momentum and create a network of connected faculty. This idea was offered after the group spoke about the need for collaboration to spark writing and career success. Writing preparation and support came up in other ways, too; for example, participants in one GLA floated the idea of a writing center dedicated to faculty writing needs. And there was wide support for well-timed teaching releases that would allow for the kind of intensive research and publication expected at a Research I. Survey participants, too, commented on this issue in their open responses. One noted that our university "does not offer reduced teaching loads and other forms of institutional support" needed for research (although

this varies by department). In the same vein, another warned, "Do not expect to be rewarded or promoted for your accomplishments and understand that others who have produced less scholarship will be promoted through the ranks." One participant commented even more pointedly, "White faculty get more research support and their research is valued more."

Theme 2: Isolation and Competition

In an open survey response, one person explained that people of color are seldom the first asked to collaborate: "We are always the last one to be invited to the party." Instead of a collaborative ethic, GLA participants described a "cloak and dagger" approach to research characterized by secretiveness and evasiveness. As a result, faculty of color say their approach is to "find your pack," "find your tribe," and "figure it out on your own." Their comments reinforce findings by education scholars Gloria D. Thomas and Carol Hollenshead (2001) who developed a qualitative study to learn how women faculty of color cope, resist, and succeed at a research university. Their participants described feeling invisible, colleagues' dismissal of their research, and a lack of support for their intellectual work (2001, pp. 166-167). Unsurprisingly, this isolating experience has a negative effect on research and publication, because faculty need intellectual community and reciprocity to be motivated and productive.

Our participants noted that, as a matter of survival, they try to model behaviors of inclusivity, or model the change they want to see and lead from there—a perspective that indicates the responsibility faculty feel toward the academic communities they are joining, or attempting to join. To be the change they want to see suggests that faculty of color feel that they must produce intellectual and emotional labor to survive in an unwelcoming or downright threatening environment. To that point, a Native American faculty member wrote in a survey response that they were told by former department heads that "Indians are drunks and thieves" and "You have gone off the reservation." In addition, colleagues referred to this faculty member as "Chief."

To counter the isolation and degradation they experience, faculty of color are often left to "figure it out on [their] own," which involves the production of invisible labor, nothing new to under-represented people in most any line of work. Institutional apathy, explicit forms of white privilege, overt racism—all are familiar themes in research about the experiences of faculty of color. Too, choosing between tokenization or being left out, as Anwer (2020) writes, has long been part of the narrative. But these themes and hard choices don't define everyone's experience or mindset when it comes to writing support. We noticed, for example, that our survey respondents offered counter-narratives when asked

about giving advice to new faculty of color. Participants described the following deliberate actions to make their research lives more productive:

> Connect with other faculty of color to create a network of support. Do not be afraid to continue your research, even if you are discouraged from it: find grants and outside support to continue your work.
>
> Find colleagues with whom you are comfortable sharing your writing.
>
> The same advice I give everyone: treat writing as a part of your job. Just like you show up to teach at a certain time every day whether or not you feel like it, you show up to write at a certain time whether or not you feel like it, and the work will get done.
>
> Don't limit yourself to co-authors in your department, college or even at UC. Use contacts you make at conferences and via professional email listservs to find writing opportunities and co-authors. These opportunities can be found across the nation and across the globe.

These responses make clear that waiting for the institution to do the right thing is not a viable option for faculty of color. They take matters into their own hands by constructing best practices when institutional collaboration, mentorship, and compensation fall short. GLA participants, too, encouraged faculty of color to find support beyond the institution—for example, through the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (particularly their writing bootcamps and faculty success program) and the Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Research Design program. We acknowledge that this kind of support is not accessible to all, particularly if institutions do not have a membership that enables faculty and graduate students to take advantage of the available resources. Without a membership to NCFDD, for example, the cost burden of $500 per year may be out of reach for many faculty members.

As faculty members shared resources and made plans to connect with one another beyond our group meeting, we could see the importance of "collectivist, peer" mentoring, which Thomas and Hollenshead (2001) found to be critical for the success of women faculty of color. We see potential in applying this model of mentoring to the specific instance of writing support. While all faculty members, to some extent, must proactively support their own writing goals, doing so is made immeasurably more challenging in an environment where faculty experiences are "simultaneously invisible (e.g., accomplishments

are unimportant, lack of belonging) and hypervisible (e.g., heightened scrutiny)" (Settles et al., 2019).

Theme 3: Time and Space Issues

During the GLA discussion, faculty members expressed a need for spaces on campus where they can work and get support. Our conversation took place during the COVID-19 pandemic, when most faculty were working from home, so distractions and space limitations on research were on everyone's minds. One participant noted that, before the pandemic, she regularly reserved a library carrel for writing and research, away from the distractions of both home and campus office. She could no longer do that with the library closed, nor could she visit the newly established Faculty Enrichment Center (FEC), also located in the main library on campus. The FEC is a space where faculty can work in open areas, meet in small groups in conference rooms equipped with large screens and white boards, and attend professional development sessions on the institutional review board process, mid-career faculty support, and mindful movement, among other regularly offered sessions.

Even prior to the pandemic, though, several faculty members reported being unaware of the FEC, and others found it inaccessible given their office locations on campus. Despite its rich resources and ample workspace, the FEC seemed inaccessible to some for reasons beyond the center's control: the location in the middle of campus and the lack of close parking. As an urban university, space is a perpetual challenge, as is access to buildings from bus stops and parking lots. One must traverse concrete paths and hills to move from building to building (and then walk some more to get to a car or bus stop). As a result, the physical space of campus ends up reinforcing the intellectual and emotional isolation that faculty of color experience. The geography of the campus and the lack of creative ways to mitigate its effects, in other words, contribute to faculty feeling unsupported and isolated. We contend that the effects of such physical barriers are more costly to faculty of color than to white faculty. Because faculty of color constitute just 18% of overall faculty ("University," n.d.), they are in need of community and sociality, made possible by accommodating spaces and access to them.

In addition to writing and research difficulties presented by spatial limitations, both survey and GLA participants commented on the need for time to write. As noted earlier, faculty of color expressed frustrations with spending precious time on grant applications for research support. A seasoned administrator who completed our survey wrote that faculty of color need something other than sabbaticals to catch up on their research agendas, especially when those agendas are sidelined by heavy service loads. Suggestions included the need for

pre-tenure course releases that would better position them to meet the publication requirements of a research university. Faculty described research writing for publication as a "marathon, not a sprint." Just as a marathon involves support and care during each leg of the 26.2 mile course, so should universities offer practical, material, and intellectual support for writers on the road toward tenure or reappointment. GLA members suggested that mentors should share with faculty the realities of time to publication to unmask the timeline of academic publication that might seem hidden from view. Most prominently, participants spoke about the need for protected time, a need that is amplified when understood through the context of unsupportive colleagues, competition and isolation, and a culture of racism or malignant neglect. This point was underscored by a GLA participant who described the experience of being the only person of color in committee meetings—a role that involves a considerable time commitment—as discouraging and as leading to disengagement because faculty of color find themselves "fighting against the tide here."

By weaving space and time issues into our discussion of writing support, faculty of color indicated that larger systemic issues—buildings, parking, workspaces, course releases, research time to compensate for service responsibilities—take on specific importance when viewed alongside the other themes we've discussed. That is, because racism and white privilege structure institutional life in ways that are both invisible and absorbed into the culture of a place, time and space issues should be understood as racially inflected rather than universal issues that affect everyone in the same way.

Action Plan

Following the theme discussion portion of the GLA, participants engaged in action planning to address the aforementioned themes. Specific actions addressed were resources, mentorship, and time and space issues.

Action 1: Resources

GLA participants felt that on-boarding new faculty members could be more useful if meaningful information about resources was disseminated, and opportunities for collaboration were presented upon hire. The "roadblocks to productivity and career advancement" identified by Wallace et al. (2012) and mentioned at the beginning of this chapter align with what we heard from faculty, who indicated that having a more comprehensive handle on funding and research resources available to them would help immensely in the success of their writing and scholarship. Communicating this information early (during the hire and orientation process) and often is critical. Day-to-day tasks sometimes obscure

important communications that live on difficult-to-find-or-navigate websites. To that end, participants agreed that having a one-stop shop for resources in an online format would allow for awareness and dissemination of resources to be more effective and efficient for all faculty members. This could manifest as a page on the internal-facing website or a newsletter to the faculty email list. While this sounds obvious and simple enough, we're continually astonished by the number of resources available on campus that are new to us as faculty-staff leaders; we can only imagine how faculty "out of the loop" must feel. Additional sought-after resources include more hands-on writing support, such as professional editing services onsite. We know from our work with faculty writers that quite a few hire writing and editing coaches, form writing groups, and attend university-affiliated writing workshops like ours, as well as ones offered by national organizations. Attending to the needs that drive faculty members to these resources in the first place would amount to a practical intervention with significant consequences for writing productivity, community-building, and perhaps retention. Hosting writing and editing services on campus would benefit all faculty members but would especially serve faculty of color, often lacking institutional and collegial support for their research programs.

Action 2: Mentorship

Faculty participants also determined that a mentorship program or network specifically related to writing and publishing would be ideal. Mentoring as a venue to create community once faculty are here can help improve the retention rates of faculty, and faculty of color, specifically (Jayakumar et al., 2009). For African American faculty, both the need for good mentors and writing with a team lead to increased quality and quantity of writing (Allen et al., 2018). For GLA participants, formalized mentoring that leads to collaborative publication is highly valued. Too, remembering Thomas's qualitative study indicating the positive impact of "collectivist, peer" mentoring (2001, p. 174), we were struck by how GLA participants enacted, but did not explicitly discuss this model. During the discussion, participants entered resources in the chat, for instance, and made informal plans to connect with one another after the session. What was happening dovetails with findings Alexander and Shaver (2020) detailed in "Disrupting the Numbers: The Impact of a Women's Faculty Writing Program on Associate Professors." In their study, Alexander and Shaver found that when women of the same rank spent time together in a common space, they prioritized publication and promotional goals. In their review of national faculty writing programs, they noted that programs provided "emotional support, even facilitating academic alliances and friendships where individuals learn about institutional structures or campus politics" (p. 62). Though our participants were neither all women nor

all associate professors, GLA members enjoyed connecting in a common space and spontaneously shared experiences, advice, and resources.

Creating more opportunities for collectivist peer mentoring among faculty of color would likely have similar results as those uncovered by Alexander and Shaver.

Action 3: Time & Space

According to GLA participants, providing faculty members with course release or sabbaticals that specifically focus on writing would require prioritizing writing within colleges and disciplines. Prioritizing faculty writing could involve implementing dedicated weekly blocked time for writing, creating interdisciplinary writing accountability groups, and providing workshops on the topics of writing and publishing. These sorts of formalized initiatives might function as institutionally sanctioned reprieves from the service burden placed on faculty of color, which makes dedicated writing time challenging. As Jones et al. (2015) indicate in their study of African American women faculty, "All the participants in this study shared how burdened they felt in trying to balance scholarship, student advising, service, and teaching" (p. 143). Black faculty members are frequently faced with taking on invisible labor, as our participants attested, including creating networks of support, finding resources outside the university, and dealing with exclusionary and/or racist behavior from colleagues. Space also came up as a point for action planning—the need for more space and free parking so that faculty can easily access designated spaces, as well as reservable spaces in university buildings and practical furniture. While an overarching goal is culture change within academia, incremental steps such as offering course releases, monetary incentives, and physical space for faculty of color to focus on writing can begin to chip away at unconscious bias.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The themes as a whole—the importance of compensation, the negative effects of competition and isolation, and the need for time and space—are likely universal amongst tenure-track faculty attempting to develop their research agendas. We contend that they have particularity when applied to faculty of color. For example, the GLA discussion surrounding inequity, which addressed the lack of recognition or value attached to the work of faculty of color and a need for collaboration and mentorship, was couched in the context of racial bias, microaggressions, and blatant discrimination. These conditions wear on people and exact a real toll. In their Foreword to *Presumed Incompetent*, Bettina Aptheker (2012) comments on the human cost of inequity: "We are in the university. We are in the labs. We are in the law schools and courtrooms, medical schools and operating theaters. We

prevail, but sometimes it is at enormous costs to ourselves, to our sense of well-being, balance, and confidence" (p. xi). The emotional and psychic costs, which are sometimes difficult to quantify, underscore why writing support should not be approached as a universal that applies the same to all. As Sara Ahmed (2012) reminds us in *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, "To recognize diversity requires that time, energy, and labor be given to diversity. Recognition is thus material as well as symbolic: how time, energy, and labor are directed within institutions affects how they surface" (p. 29).

Studies of writing and publishing by writing scholars have considerable room to grow in this context. For example, in *How Writing Faculty Write: Strategies for Process, Product, and Productivity* (Tulley, 2018), *Women's Ways of Making It in Rhetoric and Composition* (Ballif, Davis, & Mountford, 2008), and *Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition* (Olson & Taylor, 1997), we learn how successful writers have sustained their commitment to writing throughout their careers while balancing their roles as teachers, administrators, and mentors. We learn about publication venues and processes. Overall, though, these books do not address differential forms of support inflected by culture and identity, about surviving as an outsider in an insider's game.

A study by Sandra L. Tarabochia (2020) demonstrates what such research might look like. She contends that writing studies scholars who work with faculty writers "must honor and promote trajectories of becoming tied to actual bodies, histories, emotional landscapes, emerging identities and lived realities" (p. 19). Tarabochia's qualitative study of faculty writers feature three pre-tenure women working at a "very high research" institution. One participant in her study, Sadie, an education faculty member who identifies as a Black woman, describes how schooling created for her a struggle to trust her voice and experience. By the time she enters higher education as a tenure-track professor, the voice inside her head tells her that "the institution just wants to kill you" (p. 21). Commenting on Sadie's story, Tarabochia addresses the institutional landscape that faculty of color and those from marginalized populations find themselves in:

> [They] face disproportionate challenges as writers and humans fighting to survive systems that not only fail to recognize and support their unique trajectories of becoming, trajectories built around epistemologies of lived experience, but inflict harm on those who contort their trajectories (and epistemologies) to fit traditional 'tales of learning' and pathways to success. (p. 23)

Tarabochia's study illustrates the complexity of faculty writing support for faculty trying to navigate these systems.

In a study of work-life balance, Anwer (2020) describes invisible labor specific to faculty of color pre- and post-COVID-19: We can be sure that Black faculty, and faculty of color more generally, will face (and are already facing) an intensification of the demands on their time, their intellectual-emotional resources. They will find themselves in a bind—to add to their already mammoth workloads or forgo serving on committees, letting them be steered by predominantly white faculty and administrators, as they try to "fix" the problem of racist campuses. Thus, "this quandary—to participate in the toxicity of being tokenized or risk being out altogether—predates COVID-19, of course" (Anwer, 2020, p.6).

GLA participants indicated that their identities and lived experiences were largely overlooked when it came to support for writing success, as many participants reported that the university at large is not supportive of faculty of color (although pockets of support do exist), yet it expects high service commitments, overburdening these faculty and negatively impacting their writing productivity.

Looking forward, we believe our research could have more impact if it were expanded to include the experiences of faculty of color at comparable institutions and a mix of institution types and sizes. We also suggest follow-up research regarding support for women faculty of color, specifically, given their disproportionate mentorship and service loads which could impede writing and publishing. The support needs of other populations are also worthy of study, including faculty members with disabilities and those who identify as LGBTQ+. A comparative study exploring the differences between majority faculty and faculty of color in terms of writing support could shed light onto specific interventions that would benefit faculty of color, specifically, as well as those that would benefit all faculty. Examining the interconnections between faculty support for writing and publishing and teaching and service, as well, would provide a more holistic view of faculty needs. Furthermore, if our suggested action items are implemented at our university, follow-up studies must include the assessment and evaluation of these programs to measure impact and whether such interventions were perceived as valuable by faculty of color. In addition, one-on-one open-ended interviews would yield valuable insights that could shed more light on the way race, ethnicity, and language difference inflect faculty experiences in higher education. In a 2016 interview with Cheryl A. Wall, who has worked on establishing a Black women's literary canon, Rashida L. Harrison (2016) asks Wall about the importance of increasing diversity to fulfill a university's academic mission and commitment to social justice. "If the university is going to continue to produce new knowledge," answers Wall, "it needs to diversify the people who are seeking new knowledge; that includes scholars of color" (p. 55). Supporting the needs of these scholars—writing needs, in our case—is essential

to the success of diversity and inclusion initiatives. That is, recruiting faculty of color won't lead to substantive change if they end up leaving because of a culture that neglects their expertise, voices, lived experiences, and needs.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822395324

Alexander, K. P., & Shaver, L. (2020). Disrupting the numbers: The impact of a women's faculty writing program on associate professors. *College English*, *72*(1), 58–86. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27114481

Allen, J. L., Huggins-Hoyt, K. Y., Holosko, M. J., & Briggs, H. E. (2018). African American social work faculty: Overcoming existing barriers and achieving research productivity. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *28*(3), 309–319. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731517701578

Anwer, M. (2020). Academic labor and the global pandemic: revisiting life-work balance under COVID-19. *Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence and ADVANCE Working Paper Series*, *3*(2), 5–13. https://www.purdue.edu/butler/documents/5-wps-2020-special

Aptheker, B. (2012). Foreword. In G. Gutiérrez y Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. González, & A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (pp. xi–xiv). Utah State University Press.

Belcher, W. L. (2019). *Writing your journal article in twelve weeks: A guide to academic publishing success* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press. https://wendybelcher.com/writing-advice/writing-your-journal-article-in-twelve/

Boice, R. (1990). *Professors as writers: A self-help guide to productive writing*. New Forums Press. https://archive.org/details/professorsaswrit0000boic

Boyce, M., & Aguilera, R. J. (2021). Preparing for tenure at a research-intensive university. *BMC Proceedings*, *15*(Suppl 2), 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12919-021-00221-8

Collins, P. H. (1997). Comment on Hekman's "Truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited": Where's the power? *Signs*, *22*(2), 375–381. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3175278

Davis, L., & Fry, R. (2019). College faculty have become more racially and ethnically diverse, but remain far less so than students. *Pew Research Center*, *31*. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/07/31/us-college-faculty-student-diversity/

Harrison, R. L. (2016). Building a canon, creating dialogue: An interview with Cheryl A. Wall. In P. A. Matthew (Ed.), *Written/Unwritten: Diversity and the hidden truths of tenure* (pp. 46–63). University of North Carolina Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5149/9781469627724_matthew

Jayakumar, U. M., Howard, T. C., Allen, W. R., & Han, J. C. (2009). Racial privilege in the professoriate: An exploration of campus climate, retention, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *80*(5), 538–563. https://choices.gseis.ucla.edu/pdfs/RacialPrivilege.pdf

Jones, B., Hwang, E., & Bustamante, R. M. (2015). African American female professors' strategies for successful attainment of tenure and promotion at predominantly white institutions: It can happen. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 10*(2), 133–151. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1064713

Olson, G. A., & Taylor, T.W. (1997). *Publishing in rhetoric and composition*. State University of New York.

Pyke, K. (2011). Service and gender inequity among faculty. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 44*(1), 85–87. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40984489

Rankin, E. (2001). *The work of writing: Insights and strategies for academics and professionals*. Jossey-Bass.

Settles, I. H., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson K. (2019). Scrutinized but not recognized: (In) visibility and hypervisibility experiences of faculty of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *113*, 62–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.003

Tarabochia, S. L. (2020). Self-Authorship and faculty writers' trajectories of becoming. *Composition Studies, 48*(1)*,* 16–33.

Thomas, G. D., & Hollenshead, C. (2001). Resisting from the margins: The coping strategies of black women and other women of color faculty members at a research university. *Journal of Negro Education, 70*(3)*,* 166–175. https://doi.org/10.2307/3211208

Tulley, C. E. (2018). *How writing faculty write: strategies for process, product, and productivity*. Utah State University Press.

University of Cincinnati main campus. UC demographics & diversity report. *College Factual*. https://www.collegefactual.com/colleges/university-of-cincinnati-main-campus/student-life/diversity

Vaughn, L. M., & Lohmueller, M. (2014). Calling all stakeholders: Group-level assessment (GLA)—A qualitative and participatory method for large groups. *Evaluation Review, 38*(4)*,* 336–355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X14544903

Wallace, S. L., Moore, S. E., Wilson, L. L., & Hart, B. G. (2012). African American women in the academy. In G. Gutiérrez y Muhs, Y. F. Niemann, C. G. González, A. P. Harris (Eds.), *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia* (pp. 421–438). Utah State University Press.

APPENDIX A. RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Dear Colleagues,

As facilitators of faculty writing support initiatives at UC's main campus, we write to request your participation in a research study of writing support for faculty of color at UC.

Studies of retention rates among faculty of color have shown that "quality of experiences *once the individual arrives at an institution* have the greatest impact on retention" (Jayakumar et al. 2009, p. 550; our emphasis). If this holds, then impactful faculty support programs can be powerful tools in institutional culture change. In order to create a culture that welcomes and nurtures the needs of

diverse faculty members, our study seeks to better understand how one aspect of culture change—writing support—can be keyed to the professional and personal circumstances of faculty of color.

If you self-identify as a nontenure track or tenure track faculty member of color, and you work at any UC campus where you are required to publish research or creative activity for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, then we invite you to take our survey. If you are interested in participating in a follow-up discussion about your experiences, you will have an opportunity to indicate your interest on the survey. This follow-up is completely optional. Likewise, if you wish to exit the survey at any time, you may do so. In that case, your data will not be saved.

Data from our study will be used for two purposes: 1) to propose supportive faculty writing programming at UC to partners around campus, and 2) to inform a book chapter we are writing about this topic.

The UC IRB determined this study to be exempt from review (#2021-0163). There are no known risks associated with the study. Participants will remain anonymous in our reporting process and will receive no compensation for participation in the study. If you have any questions or concerns before or while completing the survey, please feel free to contact us via email.

To access the online survey, please follow this link <<link redacted>>>. We hope to receive your responses by May 10, 2021.

Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Dr. Laura Micciche — Professor of English
Facilitator, Taft Faculty Write
Laura.micciche@uc.edu

Dr. Batsheva Guy — Program
Director, Strategic Initiatives
CEAS Inclusive Excellence & Community Engagement
batsheva.guy@uc.eu

APPENDIX B. SURVEY QUESTIONS

Survey: Writing Support for Faculty of Color
DEMOGRAPHICS

Personal & Familial Characteristics:

1. What is your gender or gender identity? [man, woman, transgender, gender non-conforming, genderqueer, preferred response not listed (please specify)]
2. Please indicate the racial or ethnic groups with which you self-identify (check all that apply):

○ Asian/Asian American ○ Black/African American ○ Hispanic/Latinx
○ Middle Eastern/North African
○ Native American/Alaskan Native○ Multiracial
○ White ○ Other

3. Were you born in the U.S.? y/n [if no: In which country were you born?] 4. Please indicate your generation status:

○ All of my grandparents and both of my parents were born in the U.S.
○ Both of my parents were born in the U.S.
○ One of my parents was born in the U.S.
○ Neither of my parents were born in the U.S.

4. Did your parents attend college, or are they currently? [yes, one parent; yes, both parents; no, neither; I don't know]

5. Did your parents earn college degrees? [yes, one parent; yes, both parents; no, neither; I don't know; direct to appropriate question below]

What is the highest college degree earned by both of your parents?

o Parent 1: Associates, Bachelor's, Master's degree in Arts & Sciences (MA, MS), Professional Master's degree (e.g., MBA, MPA, MSW, MSE, MSN, MPH, MFA, etc.), Doctorate + other
o Parent 2: Associates, Bachelor's, Master's degree in Arts & Sciences (MA, MS), Professional Master's degree (e.g., MBA, MPA, MSW, MSE, MSN, MPH, MFA, etc. + other

What is the highest college degree earned by one parent?

o Associates, Bachelor's, Master's degree in Arts & Sciences (MA, MS), Professional Master's degree (e.g., MBA, MPA, MSW, MSE, MSN, MPH, MFA, etc.), Doctorate + other

6. In what industry did your parents spend the majority of their working lives? Select all that apply. [drop down]

○ Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing & Hunting ○ Utilities
○ Computer & Electronics Manufacturing ○ Wholesale
○ Transportation ○ Warehousing ○ Software
○ Broadcasting
○ Real Estate, Rental & Leasing
○ Primary/Secondary (K-12) Education ○ Health Care & Social Assistance
○ Hotel & Food Services ○ Legal Services
○ Homemaker ○ Religious
○ Mining
○ Construction ○ Manufacturing ○ Retail
○ Telecommunications

○ Information Services & Data Processing ○ Finance & Insurance
○ College, University, & Adult Education ○ Other Education Industry
○ Arts, Entertainment, & Recreation
○ Government & Public Administration ○ Scientific or Technical Services
○ Military
○ Other [add answer]

7. Do you have siblings? [yes, no, I don't know]

8. Did your sibling(s) attend college, or are they currently? [yes, one sibling; yes, more than one sibling; no siblings; I don't know]

○ [1 sib] What is the highest college degree earned by your sibling? [Associates, Bachelor's, Master's degree in Arts & Sciences (MA, MS), Professional Master's degree (e.g., MBA, MPA, MSW, MSE, MSN, MPH, MFA, etc.), Doctorate + other]

○ [more than one] Among your siblings, what is the highest college degree earned? Click all that apply. [Associates, Bachelor's, Master's degree in Arts & Sciences (MA, MS), Professional Master's degree (e.g., MBA, MPA, MSW, MSE, MSN, MPH, MFA, etc.), Doctorate + other]

Academic Identity:

1. What is the highest degree you have earned? [Associates, Bachelor's, Master's degree in Arts & Sciences (MA, MS), Professional Master's degree (e.g., MBA, MPA, MSW, MSE, MSN, MPH, MFA, etc.), Doctorate + other]

2. In what field did you earn your highest degree? [text box]

3. How long have you worked at UC? [drop down]

4. What is your college? [drop down + other]

5. What is your primary department? [drop down + other]

6. Do you serve in an administrative role? If so, what is your title and responsibility?

7. What is your current rank? [Nontenure track assistant professor, NTT associate professor, NTT full professor, Tenure track assistant professor, Tenured associate professor, Tenured full professor + other; answer will direct to appropriate questions in next section]

Writing Requirements for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure:

For nontenure track, all positions:

1. What genres of writing are required for reappointment and promotion in your department? Select all that apply. [article, book chapter, creative work, book, conference presentation, internal grant, external grant, not sure, + other]

2. How would you describe your attitude about your readiness to meet these

requirements? Check all that apply. [confident, cautiously optimistic, worried, frustrated, angry, hopeless, +other]

3. Please briefly explain why you described your attitude as such.

4. What scholarly or creative projects have you worked on during the past two years? Click all that apply. [journal article, poem, story, novel, memoir, book chapter, book manuscript, grant proposal, research leave/sabbatical application, book proposal/prospectus, conference paper, book review, other]

5. Of those projects you've worked on, how many have you published, presented, or submitted? [1-5 + other]

For tenure track:

1. What genres of writing are required for reappointment and promotion in your department? [article, book chapter, creative work, book, conference presentation, internal grant, external grant, not sure, + other]

2. How would you describe your attitude about your readiness to meet these requirements? Check all that apply. [confident, cautiously optimistic, worried, frustrated, angry, hopeless, +other]

3. Please briefly explain why you described your attitude as such.

4. What scholarly or creative projects have you worked on during the past two years? Click all that apply. [journal article, poem, story, novel, memoir, book chapter, book manuscript, grant proposal, research leave/sabbatical application, book proposal/prospectus, conference paper, book review, other]

5. Of those projects you've worked on, how many have you published, presented, or submitted? [1-5 + other]

For tenured Aasociate professors:

1. What genres of writing are required for promotion from Associate to Full professor in your department? [article, book chapter, creative work, book, conference presentation, internal grant, external grant, not sure, + other]

2. How would you describe your attitude about your readiness to meet these requirements? Check all that apply. [confident, cautiously optimistic, worried, frustrated, angry, hopeless, +other]

3. Please briefly explain why you described your attitude as such.

4. What scholarly or creative projects have you worked on during the past two years? Click all that apply. [journal article, poem, story, novel, memoir, book chapter, book manuscript, grant proposal, research leave/sabbatical application, book proposal/prospectus, conference paper, book review, other]

5. Of those projects you've worked on, how many have you published, presented,

or submitted? [1-5 + other]

For tenured full professors:

1. What year did you earn tenure?

2. How frequently have you published or presented your work since earning tenure? [drop down]

3. How would you describe your motivation to write and publish research and/or creative work? [highly motivated, motivated, not motivated, indifferent]

4. Please briefly explain why you described your motivation as such.

5. What scholarly or creative projects have you worked on during the past two years? Click all that apply. [journal article, poem, story, novel, memoir, book chapter, book manuscript, grant proposal, research leave/sabbatical application, book proposal/prospectus, conference paper, book review, other]

6. Of those projects you've worked on, how many have you published, presented, or submitted? [1-5 + other]

Background & Writing for Publication

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: [strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree]

- My cultural background is important to the topics I write about.
- My educational background prepares me for the writing required for my success at UC.
- My family background prepares me for the social environment at UC.
- I have received direct instruction about how to write in my field.
- I learned how to write for my field by reading widely.
- I learned how to write for my field through trial and error.
- I am still learning how to write for my field.
- My home community has shaped my commitment to writing and research.
- When I write for professionals in my field, I worry that my work will not be taken seriously.
- I feel that I have to be more productive than my white counterparts in order to secure my position at UC.
- I often feel that I do not know the unspoken codes of academic writing and publishing.
- I feel confident that my voice and perspective are valued in my field.
- My community outside of academia is important to my writing productivity.

Writing Supports

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: [strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree]

- I have allies in my department or at UC who support my writing goals.
- I have a regular writing group that helps me stay on task.
- My writing group includes faculty of color.
- I have allies at UC who share a similar cultural background and set of experiences.
- I have a mentor or set of mentors who support my writing goals.
- I have a family situation that supports my writing goals.
- I have applied for internal grants or fellowships to support my writing goals.
- I have received internal grants or fellowships to support my writing goals.
- My department allows a semester of leave for research.
- My department assigns value to my research.
- My department rewards my writing accomplishments on par with those of colleagues at the same rank.
- My department allows for a flexible teaching schedule to support my writing goals.
- My department assigns me to teach courses that align with my research.
- I feel like I belong in my department, which affects my writing productivity.
- I feel isolated in my department, which affects my writing productivity.

Writing Needs

Please complete the following statements by selecting all options that apply:

In order to achieve my writing goals, I need [blank] to be productive.

[blank] = a flexible teaching schedule, writing accountability partners, faculty of color affinity groups, writing groups, peer mentors, structured writing goals, access to grants/fellowships, work-life balance, formal mentorship, professional development opportunities, funding for my research, other

Optional: Please feel free to add any comments related to your writing needs that will help us understand what you see as factors supporting or inhibiting your productivity. [text box]

Optional: If you were able to give advice to new faculty of color about how to achieve their writing goals while at UC, what 1 or 2 pieces of advice would you offer?

Follow-Up

In order to better understand the challenges and rewards associated with writing productivity for faculty of color at UC, we will be conducting small group sessions for sharing ideas and resources. If you are willing to participate in such a session, please add your UC email address here: