Retention of African American Faculty in Research Universities

Clara Awe

My last review ignored my substantial professional accomplishments. My work has been recognized nationally, yet I am ranked at the bottom by the executive committee and told I need to work on my collegiality. I have tried inviting my colleagues to lunch, but they are always too busy; yet, I see them out to lunch with each other. I have resorted to socializing with graduate students. Now I am being criticized for "being seen off campus with a student." Male colleagues sleep with students in this department, yet, I am sent a letter by a departmental committee because I go out to dinner with a female student whom I am mentoring. I am not allowed to disagree with my colleagues; if I do I am accused of being uncollegial. They hired me to fill the void of ethnic diversity, but I will only be accepted here if I limit my ambition, succumb to mediocrity.

(African American tenure-track faculty member)

Abstract

Most literature on the American professorate provides a culture of evidence that suggests that the above account represents the typical experience endured by many African American faculty members and other faculty of color. African American faculty remain under-represented in predominantly White research universities. The number of African Americans in the professorate has remained static over the last three decades despite affirmative action program policy and related efforts of universities to attract African American faculty members. Worse yet, even in light of this already low representation, many of these African American faculty members are marginalized in terms of their scholarly activities which contributes to their low retention rates. The author's analysis makes a case that a "business-as-usual" attitude continues to dominate academic culture, and a new leadership and governance approach is needed to increase the diversity of urban and metropolitan university faculty.

In this new millennium, with affirmative action all but dismantled, colleges and universities are placed in the position of either advocating greater democratic participation or social equity, or regressing to the traditional model of privilege for certain groups (Garcia and Baird 2000). While most urban and metropolitan universities feel pressure to increase the recruitment and enrollment of racially and ethically diverse student bodies and are making remarkably good efforts, they still grapple with how to attract, recruit, and retain faculty of color, especially African

American faculty. A review of faculty development programs in metropolitan and urban areas reveals, however, that most have faculty development programs. A notable example is the University of Central Florida. However, even in these institutions there is a need to understand that for African American or other minority faculty members, there are social and structural forces that intertwine to shape professional socialization and workplace satisfaction and hence, these faculty members' retention. More specifically, there remains a need to critically reassess the organizational structure of higher education institutions, including metropolitan and urban universities, with particular attention to personal communications and interactions that take place in our departments, colleges and institutions in order to successfully engage and retain African American faculty. With the demographic shift and impending retirements of senior faculty, metropolitan and urban universities have a particular role to play and, therefore, need to be poised more than ever to diversify their professorate.

It appears, however, that regardless of the rhetoric and the attention to the undeniable force of changing demographics, the power of tradition and past practice in higher education continues to work against this desperately needed diversity (Sanders and Mellow 1990). In other words, other social forces still exist in the academic work place that resists initiatives to increase diversity.

Concerns about the low representation of African American faculty members in the academy are not new. Tenure rates for African American faculty members remain abysmal. Thus, the question persists, "Are African American faculty members being socialized in the academy for success or failure?"
This article attempts to deconstruct the issues related to the under-representation of African American faculty in the academy. To delve into the academic culture of the academy and its relationship to African American faculty, I use critical race theory as the interpretative framework for analysis.

Historical Legacy of Exclusion

Since its earliest beginnings, the American public school system has been deeply committed to the maintenance of racial education. This outlook was shared both publicly and privately. Philosophers of the common schools remained silent about the education of minority children. White educators profited from the enforced absence of Black and other minority competitors of jobs. Planned deprivation became a norm of educational practice (Weinberg 1977).

The normative structure of American society prior to the Civil War was one that prohibited African Americans from receiving an education within the American educational system (Caplow and McGee 1958). This structure persisted well into the twentieth century. The 1954 Supreme Court decision, *Brown vs. Board of Education*, ruled that race-specific schools-schools whose social organization (of students, faculty, and support staff) were based solely on the criterion of race-violated the constitutional

rights (Smith 1993) of those individuals being excluded. The following year, the U.S. Supreme Court ordered that desegregation proceed with "all deliberate speed." From histories of the school desegregation process, however, we know that public school desegregation did not take place with all deliberate speed (Bullock, 1967; Franklin, 1992).

Historical accounts of minority scholars' exclusion from full participation in the academy is virtually absent from the standard histories of the United States and American education (Anderson 1988; Omi and Winant 1994; Donato and Lazerson 2000). As early as 1977, Weinberg documented incidents of racism against African Americans in academic settings. For example, Weinberg stated that, "White academia ensured its ignorance, by excluding eminent minority scholars from university faculties." Not only were African Americans excluded from faculties, they were excluded from academic discourse altogether as their scholarly contributions were visibly void within mainstream majority works (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000).

Olivas (1988) posits that history of exclusionary employment has created learning environments that are citadels of segregation. Brown (1994), noted that strict exclusionary hiring practices, sanctioned by custom and law in both private and public higher education, continued well into the mid-twentieth century for all minority groups. As a result, the lack of representation of minorities throughout the range of disciplines continues to exist. It is, therefore, not surprising that many faculty of color describe a lack of respect and a lack of recognition for their scholarship (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000). Finnegan, Webster, and Gamson (1996), also acknowledge that social barriers that precluded and limited access to professional opportunities for African American scholars prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are still present.

Affirmative Action Executive Order 11246

On September 24, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson issued Executive Order 11246, which ordered all government contractors to take affirmative action, seeking to ensure the termination of occupational segregation by race as mandated by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Executive Order 11246 required federal contractors, including universities contracting with the federal government, to ensure that all employment applicants be treated without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000). Ethridge (1997) noted that it was not until the Labor Department Orders were issued in 1970 and 1971 and Revised Order No. 4 that there was any real impact on higher education.

In 1973 the American Association of University Professors endorsed affirmative action in faculty hiring and charged the professorate with promoting diversity to remedy past discrimination (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000). Wey (1980) goes on to inform us of the resistance of major research universities to comply with affirmative action in noting that faculty members from the University of California system testified before the

president of the United States and the Commission on Civil Rights arguing against the implementation of affirmative action in higher education.

Blackwell (1988) went on to describe the opposition to affirmative action in higher education as a complex and subtle phenomenon, as its verbal support was often inconsistent with institutional behavior. He describes the different ways early on, that affirmative action was undermined in institutions of higher education such as transmitting negative signals during interview processes, failing to include minorities on search committees to review curricula vitae of applicants, the absence of tenured minority faculty on search committees, and the continued use of White male networks as a primary recruitment tool for faculty positions.

For most of the century that followed the Civil War, African Americans were excluded from teaching positions at White colleges and universities (Brown 1994; Bond 1972; Fleming, Gill, and Swinton 1978). Further, the educational apartheid during the years before *Brown v.Board of Education* (347 U. S. 483, 1954), virtually assured that there were few, if any, racial minorities on the faculties of predominantly White colleges and universities (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000). In 1973, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund filed a law suit in the case of *Adams v. Richardson* (480 F. 2d 1159, DC Cir., 1973). The suit challenged the segregated, dual system of higher education and the under-representation of minority faculty, staff and students at White institutions in selected southern public institutions of higher education. Olivas (1988) posits that today's most senior White faculty directly benefited from affirmative action. That is, not only did they attain but also they have maintained positions of privilege in markets and institutions in which competition from women and minorities did not exist, there was a ten year period (1980 to 1990) of retrenchment in affirmative action dubbed as part of the "Reagan Revolution." During this time period, there was a concomitant decline in civil rights enforcement, and, the Black share of all faculties, inched up only from 4.1 percent to 4.7 percent over the decade.

Highlights of the Current Status of African American Faculty

We are nearing the fourth decade since the enactment of affirmative action laws in the United States. Higher education, however, remains largely a White male enterprise (Tack and Patitu 1992; National Center for Education Statistics 1998, 2001-02). Just as statistics tell of the dismal rate of participation and completion rates for minority students in the educational pipeline, low representation of African American faculty among tenure-track and tenured faculty ranks follows this pattern as well (Turner, Meyers, Jr., and Creswell 1999; Tack and Patitu 1992). Further, despite the decreasing numbers in the professorate, White males still occupy the majority of faculty positions (National Center for Education Statistics 2002-see Table 1).

Table 1

Percentage of Full-Time Higher Education Instructional Faculty and Staff, by Race/Ethnicity & Type and Control of Institution – Fall 1998

Type and Control of Institution	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black, non-Hispanic	Hispanic	White, non-Hispanic
All[1]	0.8	5.0	5.3	3.3	85.6
Public Research	0.4	8.1	3.5	3.2	84.8
Private Research	0.2	4.5	5.4	2.3	87.6
Public Doctoral[2]	1.7	4.6	4.5	4.0	85.3
Private Doctoral[2]	1.2	7.1	4.8	3.0	83.9
Public Comprehensive	0.4	6.1	6.5	3.7	83.3
Private Comprehensive	1.5	3.4	4.5	2.1	88.4
Private Liberal Arts	1.0	3.0	5.3	1.8	88.9
Public 2-Year	0.8	3.1	5.6	4.5	86.1
Other[3]	0.8	5.5	8.5	1.6	83.7

[1] All public and private not-for profit Title IV participating, degree-granting institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

[2] Includes institutions classified by the Carnegie Foundation as specialized medical schools and medical centers.

[3] Public liberal arts, private 2-year, and religious and other specialized institutions, except medical.

Source: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Background Characteristics, Work Activities, and Compensation of Faculty and Instructional Staff in Postsecondary Institutions: April 2002 updated version. http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001152u.pdf.

Within the ranks of full-time faculty members, African Americans represent five percent of all full-time faculty and half are employed at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The proportion of African American faculty in White institutions stands at 2.3 percent, the same as it was twenty years ago (*The Chronicle of Higher Education* 2003). For example, forty-four percent of African American faculty members compared to fifty-four percent of White faculty members were tenured in the fall of 1998 (see Table 2) according to data released by the U.S. Department of Education (1999).

Table 2
Percentage Distribution of Full-Time Faculty Whose Primary Responsibility is Teaching According to Tenure Status, by Gender and Race/Ethnicity – Fall 1998

	Tenured	Tenure Track	Not on Tenure Track	No Tenure System
Total	53.1	18.8	18.1	10.0
Gender				
Male	59.7	17.1	14.7	8.5
Female	41.6	21.8	24.1	12.5
Race/Ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	54.3	17.4	17.8	10.5
Black, non-Hispanic	43.9	26.1	20.6	9.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	49.1	29.8	17.1	4.0
Hispanic	48.5	22.1	22.9	6.5
American Indian/ Alaska Native	29.4	34.4	24.2	12.0

Note: Includes full-time instructional faculty and staff at Title IV degree-granting institutions with at least some instructional duties for credit. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:98). http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002170.pdf.

The largest representation of African American faculty is in public two-year institutions where in 1998, approximately twelve percent identified as persons of color, an increase of seven percent since 1972. The lowest representation is among private four-year colleges and universities, where less than eight percent of the faculty identified as members of an under-represented ethnic/racial group in 1998, an increase of only five percent (see Table 3) (Sax et al. 1999).

African American Faculty: Knowledge and Discipline Areas

Garza (1993) also notes that faculty of color are concentrated in departments that are often held in low regard and considered less prominent and prestigious within higher education, such as ethnic studies, women studies, humanities, education, and the social sciences. He termed this phenomenon as the "ghettoization" and "barrioization" of faculty of color and their scholarship (Garza 1993). Data appear to support Garza's assertions. For example, in 1995, thirty-two percent of African American faculty members had appointments in the humanities or in education, while less than two percent were in the physical sciences (Astin et al. 1997).

The reason for the cluster in education, humanities, and the social sciences, is related to both an opportunity structure and to personal choice. In some instances, as a result of K-12 tracking, students of color are often placed in vocational tracks or academic tracks that do not prepare them for science-based fields (Oakes 1985). At every educational level from kindergarten through graduate schools (K-20), there appears to be a lack of interest, skill, and resources to support and develop talent among African American students who may be interested in the natural or physical sciences, or in other science-based fields (Oakes 1985).

Moreover, as a result of too few students of color having the interest, preparation, or an opportunity to benefit from adequate resources and support to pursue interests in these fields, they end up being excluded from considerations relative to graduate work leading to academic professions (Oakes 1985). The lack of representation of minorities throughout the range of disciplines continues to exist (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000).

Another reason why African Americans' academics tend to be concentrated in certain fields involves a sense of responsibility to community (Villalpando 1994). As African Americans we enter fields where we can work toward achieving social justice for our communities through our teaching and research of related issues. As noted by Villalpando (1994), we are able to produce scholarship that addresses different forms of social inequality through fields of humanities, education, social sciences, and ethnic studies.

Table 3
Trends in Distribution of Faculty of Color, by Type of Institution
(in percentages)

Total Fac Col	African Amer.	Asian Amer.	Native Amer.	Chicano/ Chicana	Mex. Amer.	Puerto Rican	White
All Institutions							
1972	95.0	3.7	1.3	1.3	.7	.2	.2
1989	90.9	7.0	2.1	2.9	.8	.8	.4
1998	91.7	9.3	2.6	3.3	2.0	1.0	.4
% Change	-3.3	5.6	1.3	2.0	1.3	.8	.2
Public Universities							
1972	95.9	3.0	.7	1.4	.7	.2	0.0
1989	90.1	7.3	1.3	4.1	.7	.8	.4
1998	91.3	8.9	2.3	4.2	1.2	.9	.3
% Change	-4.6	5.9	1.6	2.8	.5	.7	.3
Private Universities							
1972	95.7	3.5	1.2	1.7	.4	0.0	.2
1989	92.1	5.5	2.0	2.8	.4	.2	.1
1998	91.3	8.2	2.5	3.9	.7	.8	.3
% Change	-4.4	4.7	1.3	2.2	.3	.8	.1
Public Four-Year							
1972	92.2	5.5	1.9	1.6	.8	.2	1.0
1989	90.6	7.4	2.4	3.2	1.0	.6	.2
1998	91.1	9.2	2.6	3.6	1.7	.9	.4
% Change	-1.1	3.7	.7	2.0	.9	.7	-.6
Private Four-Year							
1972	96.3	2.6	1.1	.7	.6	.1	.1
1989	93.3	5.0	1.4	1.7	.5	.3	1.1
1998	92.5	7.6	2.9	2.5	1.5	.7	.4
% Change	-3.8	5.0	1.8	1.8	.9	.6	.3
Public Two-Year							
1972	94.0	4.6	2.0	1.2	.8	.6	0.0
1989	89.4	8.8	3.3	2.3	1.2	1.8	.2
1998	92.1	11.5	2.7	2.3	4.3	1.5	.7
% Change	-1.9	6.9	.7	1.1	3.5	.9	.7

Sources: National Norms for the 1989-90 HERI Faculty Survey. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA. Sax et al. 1999. Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Faculty of Color Across
Academic Ranks and Tenure Rates

African American faculty members are also stratified by academic rank, and the disparities appear to have remained relatively unchanged in nearly twenty-five years. In 1972, nearly ninety-six percent of all full professors were White, while only about three percent of full professors identified as African Americans or people of color. In 1989, the percentage of professors of color had only inched up to less than seven percent, while their White colleagues comprised over ninety-two percent of this academic rank (Milem and Astin 1993). In nearly twenty-five years, faculty of color improved their representation within the rank of professors by less than four percent (see Table 3). In the fall of 2001, sixteen percent of African Americans held the ranks of full professor, compared with twenty-nine percent of Whites. Furthermore, African American faculty members were more likely than Whites to be found at the rank of instructors (21% versus 15% respectively-see Table 4) (National Center for Education Statistics 2001-02).

African American faculty also report being told by their departments that they did not fit the profile for tenure at selected institutions. Others report having been passed over for promotion and told to leave the university for another where promotion for faculty of their ethnic/racial group was more likely (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000). African American faculty members perceive that they are constantly under scrutiny (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000), and as such, must work twice as hard as their White colleagues. Their competencies are more apt to be questioned and challenged. Many White faculty members also appear never quite sure whether the African American faculty member was hired based on merit or affirmative action (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000). The latter often leads to isolation, (Aguirre and Martinez 1993; Stein 1994), lack of mentors (Boice 1993), and the receipt of promotion and tenure at lower rates in comparison to their White counterparts. Further, the conservative shift of national policy has made it easier than ever for White faculty members to remain passive, if not oblivious, to campus-based racial issues (Altbach 1991).

African American Faculty Productivity and Work Roles

The ambiguity of how quality is determined is also a general concern for most African American faculty members. Departments grade publications in the first tier, second tier or third tier journals.

Table 4
Percentage Distribution of Full-time Faculty Whose Primary Responsibility is Teaching According to Academic Rank, by Gender and Race/Ethnicity – Fall 2001

Applicable	Estimated number in other/not population	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Lecturer
Total	617,868	26.5	21.0	23.5	15.0	3.1	10.9
Gender						
Male	380,485	3.2	21.5	21.1	12.0	2.3	9.8
Female	237,383	15.6	20.1	27.4	19.8	4.3	12.8
Race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	499,557	28.5	21.6	22.0	14.8	3.0	10.0
Black, non-Hispanic	31,681	15.9	21.5	28.5	20.6	3.3	10.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	38,026	24.6	22.1	29.5	10.5	2.3	11.0
Hispanic	18,514	16.8	18.9	25.9	24.6	4.3	9.6
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	2,775	17.7	16.8	22.0	27.9	2.4	13.2

Note: Data exclude faculty employed by system offices. Totals may differ from figures reported in other tables because of varying survey methodologies. Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding and exclusion of *Race/Ethnicity* unknown data.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Winter 2001-02. (This table was prepared September 2003). http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d03/tables/dt231.asp

Negative grades are often attributed to articles that appear in glossy publications and or with a picture of the author (Tierney and Bensimon 1996). The notion that African American faculty members may publish in non-traditional research publications speaks to the devaluation of African American scholars and their works.

Much of the literature on faculty careers and productivity has concluded that there are certain roles and activities that tend to be more beneficial in the tenure and promotion process than others (Fink 1984; Boyer 1990; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff 1997). One of the roles most highly related to the success of faculty across all types of institutions is their research and publication productivity (Bowen and Schuster, 1986). Thus, even though the majority of all faculty are more interested in and spend more time engaged in teaching than in research (Higher Education Research Institute, 1989 Weighted Faculty Norms, Special Tabulations), the academic reward structure acknowledges and compensates productivity in research activity and research publication more readily (Boyer 1990). While White and African American faculty members share the same degree of interest in research, they appear to be rewarded differentially for their interests (Higher Education Research Institute 1989). The 1989 HERI Faculty Survey suggests that as a group, African American faculty are just as productive in research and publications as their White colleagues (Higher Education Research Institute, 1989 Weighted Faculty Norms, Special Tabulations). However, their tenure rates are low in comparison to their White colleagues.

Critical race scholars also offer specific examples of how African American and other under-represented minority faculty members are unequally recognized and rewarded through the "politics of citation" (Delgado 1984; Espinoza 1990; Matsuda 1988). Citation counts are often a standard measure of academic prestige and contribution. Retention, tenure, and promotion committees often ask whether a candidate's work is cited in a given field of study. Matsuda (1988) points to the politics of citation as one means by which the apartheid of knowledge is maintained and the scholarship of African Americans and other faculty of color remain invisible and unrewarded.

This problem according to Matsuda (1988, 3) "is a system of education that ignores outsiders' perspectives and artificially restricts and stultifies the scholarly imagination." This process ignores the epistemologies of faculty of color and rejects their scholarship on the basis that it is biased, illegitimate, and/or inferior (Matsuda 1988).

African American Faculty Teaching, Advising, and Service Roles

In the area of teaching, White faculty and African American faculty members have also been found to share the same degree of interests; yet, it is a documented fact that faculty of color overwhelmingly spend more time engaged in teaching (Astin, Korn, and Dey 1990; Boyer 1990; Astin et al. 1997). Also interestingly, despite the public interest in promoting greater faculty involvement in teaching, African American faculty are retained, promoted, and tenured less frequently based on teaching. In fact, according to the HERI (1989), many of the roles endorsed by the general American public as important functions of higher education are more readily endorsed by faculty of color than White faculty.

Along theses lines, more African American faculty members than White faculty believe it is very important or essential to prepare undergraduates for employment, develop [their] moral character, prepare them for family living, and help [them] develop personal values (Higher Education Research Institute 1989). Clearly, the roles of faculty of color appear to be closely aligned with the public's expectation that faculty should spend more time working to enhance the undergraduate educational experience (Bok 1986; Boyer 1987).

While White faculty members also experience feelings of vulnerability and uncertainty on the tenure-track, the major element in academic life that works uniquely against African American faculty is the burden of cultural taxation (Tierney and Bensimon 1996). Padilla (1994) defines cultural taxation "as the obligation to show good citizenship toward the institution by serving its needs for ethnic representation on committees, or to demonstrate knowledge and commitment to a cultural group which may even bring accolades to the institution but which is not usually rewarded by the institution on whose behalf the service was performed."

Perceptions of African American Faculty Socialization in the Academy

Tenure, according to Tierney and Bensimon (1996) represents the strongest example of a socializing mechanism for tenure-track faculty members, in that it involves the exchange and definition of thoughts and actions. Bourdieu (1977) argues that to survive in academe one has to have a set of competencies known as "cultural capital," which he defined as linguistic and cultural competencies individuals inherit because of their class, race, and gender. Academic culture is supposed to provide faculty members with a collective identity, because it provides them with a "set of values that leads to individual preferences and a system of technical knowledge that informs individuals about which means to choose in order to achieve specified ends" (Meyer, Boli, and Thomas 1994, 12). This "culture" socializes faculty members to a common worldview, perceptions of the environment, and value orientation (Aquirre, Jr., 2000). African American faculty members face oppositions from some White faculty members because of their perception that African American faculty are hired because of affirmative action policies mandates. Thus, the person [culture] that may be responsible for mentoring or socializing the African American faculty member for success may be the person [culture] most philosophically opposed to their scholarship (Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000). This narrative by a tenure-track African American faculty member is not new: "I tried leaving the door to my office wide open so that they will know I am there and that they are welcome to come in. I even asked a White colleague to lunch this day but, he said he would let me know. Then, I go out to have lunch and see him with other White colleagues. I just get ignored."

Other intervening variables that may serve to explain why there are so few African American faculty members are presented below.

Why So Few African American Faculty?

The Pipeline Problem. The assertion in this argument is that universities would hire African American faculty members but that there are too few African Americans who are in the Ph.D. programs and, therefore, too few qualified African American candidates for faculty positions. Bell Hooks (1990) helps put this argument into perspective when she posits "whenever I called attention to the relative absence of Black women scholars at this institution, naming the impact of sexism and racism, I was told again and again by White male colleagues, 'If Black women are not here, it is not because Yale is racist, it is that Black women are simply not good enough.'" However, faculty members, who are at the core of the university governance, tend to select those who have similar academic and personal experiences, values, orientations, and outlooks to join them in the academic workplace (Harvey 1994). As to the reason for the scarcity of African American faculty members in tenured faculty positions, incumbent White faculty would contend that the outcome of and search is not predetermined and that the recruitment process is constructed to ensure the widest possible range of candidates (Harvey 1994).

In a controversial article authored by Stephen Cole and reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* titled "Increasing Faculty Diversity: The Occupational Choices of High-Achieving Minority Students," the author, a faculty member at the State University of New York, made the assertion that universities are making concerted efforts to recruit minority faculty members from the insufficient pool available. He goes on to say that the reason there is an insufficient pool of minority faculty to begin with is because most minority undergraduate students do not earn good grades for admission into graduate schools and, for that matter, cannot convince themselves that they are suitable for careers in the professorate. Cole blames affirmative action programs for low performance of African American students. Since most faculty positions, particularly at major research universities, require the doctoral degree, related barriers to pursuing a Ph.D. also serve to limit entry to faculty positions for African Americans.

Cole's assertion flies in the face of Bok and Bowen's (1998) longitudinal study, "The Shape of the River: Long-term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions," which produced evidence of African American students who attended elite schools, earned good grades and became successful.

The Market Force Problem. There is a body of literature documenting the impact of economic and market forces on the decision to pursue a Ph.D. and to enter academia (Breneman and Youn 1988; Ehrenberg and Smith 1991). These forces include attraction to the other professions, such as law and medicine; preference and perceptions about life in academia; the demands of entering the profession (Bowen and Schuster 1986; Turner and Meyers, Jr. 2000); the high cost of graduate education (Brazziel 1987-1988); and a variety of other deterrents (Ehrenberg and Smith 1991; Stamps and Tribble, 1993). Ehrenberg and Smith (1991) conclude that earnings in

academia are among the strongest determinants of the pursuit of Ph.D.'s and indirectly, of the supply of faculty.

The Chilly Climate, Alienation, and Isolation Problem. Studies have found that a major barrier for African American faculty is the pervasive racial and ethnic bias that contributes to unwelcoming, unsupportive work environments and the devaluation of their research (Turner, Meyers, Jr., and Creswell 1999; Delgado and Villalpando 1996). The body of evidence keeps growing that shows that African American faculty and other minority faculty members experience severe marginalization on campuses (Bourguignon et al. 1987; Olivas 1988; Aquirre 2000; Boice 1993). This is reflected on their tenure rates, faculty productivity and work roles, teaching and advising roles. Some would argue that African American faculty are hired because they would make good "role models" for minority students. This argument trivializes the important scholarship that African American faculty members contribute to the academy as a whole (Allen 1997). One of the most important micro-aggressions (the subtle put-downs of African American faculty by Whites) faced by African American faculty members is tokenism. Tokenism masks racism and sexism by admitting a small number of previously excluded individuals to institutions while, at the same time, maintaining barriers of entry to others (Greene 1997). Tokenism, as Greene (1997) posited, is nothing but a symbolic equality. The only way that African Americans can reduce the impact of tokenism is to collectively repudiate it and demand that all others do the same.

Critical Race Theory as an Interpretative Framework. Critical race theory is a theoretical framework generated by legal scholars of color who are concerned with issues of racial oppression in society (Delgado, 1995; Crenshaw, et al. 1995; Matsuda et al. 1993). It explores the ways that so-called "race-neutral" laws and institutional policies perpetuate racial/ethnic subordination. This framework emphasizes the importance of viewing policies and policy-making within a proper historical and cultural context in order to deconstruct their racialized content (Bell 1995; Crenshaw et al. 1995). It challenges dominant liberal ideas such as color-blindness and meritocracy and shows how these ideas operate to disadvantage people of color and further advantage Whites (Delgado and Stefanic 1994).

Critical race theoretical framework has application to real-life social problems and is especially applicable to the realm of education (Ladson-Billings 1997; Lynn 1999; Solórzano 1998; Solórzano and Villalpando, 1998; Tate 1997). The major organizing principle of critical race theory is the notion that racism is an ordinary and fundamental part of American society, not as an aberration that can be readily remedied by law (Bell 1997). Critical race theory in education provides us with the framework to identify and analyze the racialized barriers that impede the success of African American faculty in academia. Critical race theory recognizes that the experiential knowledge of African American faculty is legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing, and teaching about racial subordination in the field of education. Critical race theory

views this knowledge as strength and draws explicitly on the person of color's lived experiences by including such methods as storytelling, family history, biographies, scenarios, parables to chronicles and narratives (Bell 1997; Carrasco 1996; Delgado 1989, 1995a, 1995b, 1996; Olivas 1990). Critical race theory, in education also challenges a historicism and the uni-disciplinary focus of most analyses and insists on analyzing race and racism in education by placing them in both historical and contemporary context using interdisciplinary methods (Delgado 1984, 1992; Garcia, 1995; Harris, 1994; Olivas, 1990).

Academic institutions and White faculty members sincerely believe that they, as individuals, do not harbor racist thoughts or are not racists. However, Sears (1988) coined the term "symbolic racism" to refer to this type of White racism. Symbolic racism according to Sears (1988), allows Whites to believe that they are no longer in support of racism while the deleterious effects of racism continue unabated. The culture that the academy portrays is one of a liberal force that supports racial equality (Scheurich and Young 2000). Bell (1995) explains that Whites may agree in the abstract that African Americans are citizens and are entitled to constitutional protection against racial discrimination. However, few Whites are willing to acknowledge or recognize that they will have to give up or surrender their racism-granted privileges for true racial equity to occur. This attests to the complexities and contradictions of the academic culture because while the image is of promulgation of racial equity, the curricular and pedagogies continue to reflect White racial privilege and bias (Scheurich and Young 2000).

The academy is uncomfortable with what it may discover with deep critical introspection of itself and asking serious questions such as, why are there few African Americans in the professorate, and why are the tenure rates of African Americans in the professorate so low? How can we eliminate these disparities in the twenty-first century?

Implications for Policy and Practice

Institutional commitment is critical for the success of retaining African American faculty members. Institutional leadership must set the tone for the campus in this regard. It is no longer acceptable for governing boards, presidents, provosts, deans, or department heads/chairs to give lip service to faculty diversity as is currently the case. Most institutions have diversity statements that are for the consumption of the public but that are not adhered to in the true spirit of the law. If institutions are serious in their efforts to increase and retain African American faculty members, it becomes incumbent on the key campus leadership to set the tone and back the commitment with adequate resources, funding, and support. As a follow up, an on-campus assessment mechanism should exist to measure the academic and social experiences of African American faculty. Comprehensive exit interviews are also suggested with African American faculty. The later are particularly needed, in light of recent Affirmative Action rulings not allowing for former front end strategies to be implemented, such as providing additional funding or resources and support for special recruitment or data in terms of evidence of success in retaining African American faculty.

Institutions must also recognize the inherent difficulties in categorizations of minority v. majority individuals and understand ways in which such categorizations can become impediments to African American faculty in their participation and achievements in the academy. Mentoring of African American faculty must be encouraged. Cross-disciplinary faculty research collaborations and mentoring is encouraged and should be pursued by African American faculty members as well. On a related note, institutions should endeavor to move away from lone academic specializations and reward research collaboration across disciplines. To help remove the marginalization and the devaluation of African American faculty research, departments should publicize the academic and scholarly achievements of African American scholars and institute periodic faculty seminars where such research can be shared with other non-minority faculty. This strategy will further serve as a public relations effort as well as to disenthrall the perceptions of African Americans as deficit models or unwarranted affirmative action employees.

Because of the small number of African American faculty in the academy, a pro-active approach in forming survival coalitions across disciplines to learn how other African American faculty members survived and successfully navigated the academic culture may also be in order. Mentors can be sought from among successful African American scholars. "Brothers of the Academy" (see http://www.brothersoftheacademy.org) and "Sisters of the Academy" (http://www.sistersoftheacademy.org) currently serve as strategic alliances of African American faculty as they navigate the academy.

Conclusion

If DuBois were alive today, he would still say "the problem of the twenty-first century is that of the color line." Most African American faculty members still experience alienation and isolation in the academy. African American faculty tenure rates are still very low, but, some do survive, if not thrive, in their various institutions. We must learn from these successful African American faculty members in terms of how they have been able to navigate the academy, albeit the unwelcoming climate. Research should be conducted to learn from their experiences. Future research is also needed to determine the personal and organizational mechanisms and processes which different faculty minority groups use as coping measures to become "involved." Higher education must face up to the myth of the notion of color-blindness. Perhaps an important question that should be asked is this: If the academy is truly color-blind, why do African American faculties still experience an unwelcoming climate in the academy? Why is there resistance to change the existence of "White privilege" to effect a more diverse professorate? To reverse this business-as-usual approach, a bold and transformative type of academic leadership and governance is needed in the academy, and particularly in urban and metropolitan universities if they are to be successful in truly diversifying their faculties.

References

Adams v. Richardson, 480 F. 2d 1159 DC Cir. (1973).

Allen, A. L. 1997. On being a role model. *Critical race feminism: A reader*, 81-86.

Altbach, P. G. 1991. The racial dilemma in American higher education. In *The racial crisis in American higher education*, eds. P. G. Altbach and K. Lomotey, 3-17. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, SUNY Series: Frontiers in Education.

Anderson, J. D. 1988. *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Anderson, J. D. 2002. Race, meritocracy, and the American academy during the immediate post-World War II era. In *Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education*, eds. C. S. Turner, A. L. Antonio, M. Garcia, B. V. Loden, A. Nora, and C. Presley. 2nd ed. ASHE Reader Series.

Antonio, A. L. 2002. Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73 (5) (September/October): 582-600.

Aquirre, A., Jr., and R. O. Martinez. 1993. *Chicanos in higher education: Issues and dilemmas for the 21st century* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Rpt. No.3). Washington, DC: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Aquirre, A., Jr. 2000. *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture* (ASHE–ERIC Higher Education Rpt., Vol. 27, No. 6). Washington, DC: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Astin, A. W., W. S. Korn, and E. L. Dey. 1990. *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1989-90 HERI Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Astin, H. S., A. L. Antonio, C. M. Cress, and A.W. Astin. 1997) *Race and ethnicity in the American professorate, 1995-96*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.

Bell, D. 1986. Strangers in academic paradise: Law teachers of color in still White schools. *University of San Francisco Law Review*, 20:385-395.

Bell, D. 1995. Who's afraid of critical race theory? *University of Illinois Law Review*, 893-910.

Bell, D. 1997. California's Proposition 209: A temporary diversion on the road to racial disaster. *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review*, 30:1447-1464.

Bernstein, A., and J. Cock. 1994. A troubling picture of gender equity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, (June 15): B1-B3.

Blackwell, J.E. 1988. Faculty issue: The impact on minorities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 11 (4): 417-434.

Boice, R. 1993. New faculty involvement for women and minority. *Research in Higher Education*, 34 (3): 291-333.

Bok, D. 1986. *Higher learning.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bok, D., and W.G. Bowen. 1998. *The shape of the river: The long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions.* Princeton University Press.

Bond, H. M. 1972. *Black American scholars: A study of their beginnings.* Detroit: Belamp.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a theory practice Trans.* R. Nice. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Bourguignon, E., S. A. Blanshan, L. Chiteji, K. J. Maclean, S. J. Mecking, M.A. Sagaria, A.E. Shuman, and M.T. Taris. 1987. *Junior faculty life at Ohio State: Insights on gender and race.* Columbus: The Ohio State University, Affirmative Action Grant Program.

Bowen, H., and J. Schuster. 1986. *American professors: A national resource imperiled.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E. L. 1987. *College: The undergraduate experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row; The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brazziel, W. F. 1987. Road blocks to graduate school: Black Americans are not achieving parity. *Educational Record* 68, no. 4:98-112.

Breneman, D. W., and T. I. K Youn. 1988. *Academic labor markets and careers.* New York: Falmer Press.

Brown, S. V. 1994. The impasse on faculty diversity in higher education: A national agenda. In *Minorities in higher education*, eds. M. J. Justiz, R. Wilson, and L. G. Bjork, 314-333. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Brown v. Board Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Bullock, H. A. 1967. *A history of Negro education in the South: From 1619 to the present.* New York: Praeger.

Caplow, T., and R. J. McGee. 1958. *The academic marketplace.* New York: Basic Books.

Carrasco, E. 1996. Collective recognition as a communication device: Or, of course we want to be role models! *La Raza Law Journal*, 9:81-101.

Chronicle of Higher Education, The: Band of brothers. *The Faculty*, no.14:A8.

Chronicle of Higher Education, The. The unintended consequences of affirmative action. *The Faculty*, no. 21 (January 31, 2003): A10-11.

City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989).

Crenshaw, K. 1993. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and the violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43:1241-1299.

Crenshaw, K. 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*,130:140.

Crenshaw, K., N. Gotanda, G. Peller, and K. Thomas, eds. 1995. *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement.* New York: Almanac.

Delgado, R. 1984. The imperial scholar: Reflections on a review of Civil Rights literature. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 132:561-578.

Delgado, R. 1989. Storytelling for oppositions and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, 87:2411-2441.

Delgado, R. 1992. The imperial scholar revisited: How to marginalize outsider writing, ten years later. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 140:1349-1372.

Delgado, R. 1995a. *The Rodrigo chronicles: Conversations about America and race.* New York: New York University Press.

Delgado, R., ed. 1995b. *Critical race theory: The cutting edge.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Delgado, R., and J. Stefanic. 1994. Critical race theory: An annotated bibliography, 1993, a year of transition. *University of Colorado Law Review*, 66:159-193.

Delgado, R., and O. Villalpando. 1996. *The coming race war?: And other apocalyptic tales of American after affirmative action and welfare.* New York: New York University Press.

Digest of Education Statistics.1989. National Center for Education Statistics, U. S. Department of Education.

Digest of Education Statistics. 1997. National Center for Education Statistics, U. S. Department of Education.

Donato, R., and M. Lazerson. 2000. New directions in American educational history: Problems and prospects. *Educational Researcher*, 29 (8): 4-13.

Du Bois, W. E. 1903. *The souls of Black folk.* Penguin.

Ehrenberg, R., and R. Smith. 1991. *Modern labor economics: Theory and public policy.* New York: Harper Collins.

Espinoza, L. 1990. Masks and other disguises: Exposing legal academia. *Harvard Law Review*, 103:1878-1886.

Ethridge, R. W. 1997. There is so much more to do. In *Affirmative action's testament of hope: Strategies for a new era in higher education*, ed. M. Garcia, 47-74. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Feagin, J. R., and V. Hernan. *White racism: The basics.* New York: Routledge.

Fink, L. D. 1984. *The first year of college teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Finnegan, D. E., D. Webster, and Z. F. Gamson, eds. 1996. Faculty and faculty issues in colleges and universities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 50:5-14.

Fleming, J., G. R. Gill, and D. H. Swinton. 1978. *The case for affirmative action for Blacks in higher education.* Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Franklin, V. P. 1992. *Black self-determination: A cultural history of African American resistance.* 2nd ed. Brooklyn, NY: Lawrence Hill Books.

Garcia, R. 1995. Critical race theory and proposition 187: The racial politics of immigration law. *Chicano-Latino Law Review*, 17:118-148.

Garcia, M., and L.L. Baird. 2000. The shape of diversity: Introduction to a special JHE Issue. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71 (2): V-V11.

Garza, H. 1993. Second-class academic: Chicano/Latino faculty in U.S. Universities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 53:33-41.

Glassick, C., M. Huber, and G. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation for the advancement of teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goldberg, David Theo. 1993. *Racist culture: Philosophy and the politics of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Greene, L. 1991. Serving the community: Aspiration and abyss for the law professor of color. *Saint Louis University Public Law Review*, 10:297-303.

Greene, L.S. 1997. Tokens, role models, and pedagogical politics: Lamentations of an African American female law professor. In *Critical race feminism: A reader*, ed. K. Wing, 88-93.

Guinier, L. 1997. Of gentlemen and role models. In *Critical race feminism: A reader*, ed. K. Wing, 74-75. New York Press.

Harris, A. 1994. Foreword: The jurisprudence of reconstruction. *California Law Review*, 82:741-785.

Harris, C. I. 1995. Whiteness as property. In *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*, eds. C. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller and K. Thomas. New Press.

Harvey, W. B. 1994. African American faculty in community colleges: Why they aren't there. In *Creating and maintaining a diverse faculty*, eds. W. B. Harvey and J. Valadez, 19-25. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Higher Education Research Institute. 1989. *1989-90 Faculty Survey*, Weighted Faculty Norms, Special Tabulations. Los Angeles: UCLA.

Hooks, B. 1990. *Yearning:Race, gender, and cultural politics.* Boston: South End Press. Also available at http://www.robinsweb.com/inspiration/ mlkdream.html

Katz, D. 1991. White faculty struggling with the effects of racism. In *The racial crisis in American higher education*, eds. P.G. Ahbach and K. Lomotey, 187-196. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, SUNY Series: Frontiers in Education.

Ladson-Billings, G. 1997. For colored girls who have considered suicide when the academics are not enough: Reflections of African-American women scholars. In *Learning from our lives: Women, research, and autobiography in education*, eds. A. Neumann and P. L. Peterson, 52-70. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lynn, M. 1999. Toward a critical race pedagogy: A research note. *Urban Education*, 33 (5): 606-626.

Matsuda, M. 1988. Affirmative action and legal knowledge: Planting seeds in plowed up ground. *Harvard Women's Law Journal*, 11:1-17.

Matsuda, M., C. Lawrence, R. Delgado, and K. Crenshaw, eds. 1993. *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the first amendment*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Matsuda, M. J. 1989. When the first quail calls: Multiple consciousness as jurisprudential method. *Women's Rights*, 11, L. Rep.1.

Meyer, J., J. Boli, and G. Thomas. 1994. Ontology and rationalization in the western cultural account. In *Institutional environments and organizations: Structural complexity and individualism*, eds. W. R. Scott, J. Meyer, and Associates, 9-27. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Milem, J., and H.S. Austin. 1993. The changing composition of faculty: What does it really mean for diversity? *Change*, 25 (2) (March/April): 21-27.

National Center for Education Statistics. 1998. Digest of education statistics 1988. Washington, DC:NCES.. Also available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002170.pdf.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2001-2002 Digest of education statistics 2001-02 (Winter). Washington, DC: NCES. Also available at http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d03/tables/dt231.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. 2002. Digest of education statistics 2002 (April Update). Washington, DC: NCES. Also available at http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001152u.pdf.

Nieves-Squires, S. 1992. Hispanic women in the U.S. academic context. In *Perspectives on minority women in higher education*, ed. L. Welsh, 71-92. New York: Praeger.

Oakes, J. 1985. *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Olivas, M.A. 1988. Latino faculty at the border: Increasing numbers key to more Hispanic access. *Change*, 2:6-9.

Olivas, M. 1990. The chronicles, my grandfather's stories, and immigration law: The slave traders' chronicle as racial history. *Saint Louis University Law Journal*, 34:425-441.

Omi, M., and H. Winant. 1994. *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s.* New York: Routledge.

Padilla, A. M. 1994. Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, 23 (4): 24-27.

Powell, Thomas. 1992. *The persistence of racism in America.* New York: University Press of America.

Regents of University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

Sanders, K., and G. Mellow. 1990. Permanent diversity: The deferred vision of higher education. *Initiatives*, 53:9-13.

Sax, L., A. W. Astin, W. S. Korn, and S. Gilmartin. 1999. *The American college teacher: National norms for the 1998-99 HERI Faculty Survey.* Los Angles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Scheurich, J. J., and M. D. Young. 2000. White racism among White faculty: From critical understanding to antiracist activism. In *Racial crisis in American higher education: Continuing challenges for the twenty-first century*, eds. William Smith, Philip Altbach, and Kofi Lomotey, 221-238. New York: State University of New York Press.

Sears, D. O. 1988. Symbolic racism. In *Eliminating racism: profiles in controversy*, eds. Phyllis A. Katz and Dalmas A. Taylor, 53-84. NewYork: Plenum.

Smith, T.A. 1993. *United States v. Fordice: The interpretation of desegregation in higher education and the struggle for the survival of the historically Black college in America.* Southern University Law Review, 20:407-439.

Snyder, T.D., and C. M. Hoffman. 2000. *Digest of education statistics 1999, NCES 2000-031.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

Solórzano, D. 1998. Critical race theory, racial and gender microaggressions, and the experiences of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11:121-136.

Solórzano, D., and O. Villalpando. 1998. Critical race theory: Marginality and the experiences of students of color in higher education. In *Perspectives on minority women in higher education*, eds. C. Torres and T. Michell, 211-224. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stamps, S.D., and I. Tribble. 1993. If you can walk, you can dance. If you can talk, you can sing: A successful African American doctoral fellowship program. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 13 (16):30-33.

Stein, W. 1994. The survival of American Indian faculty: Thought and action. *The National Education Association Higher Education Journal*, 10:101-114

Tack, M. W., and C. L. Patitu. 1992. *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, No. 4). Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Tate, W. 1997. Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, 22:195-247.

Tierney, W. G., and E. M. Bensimon. 1996. *Promotion, and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Turner, C. S., A. L. Antonio, M. Garcia, B. V. Loden, A. Nora, C. L. Presley. 2002. *Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education*. 2nd ed. ASHE Reader Series.

Turner, C. V. S., S.L. Meyers, Jr., and J. W. Creswell. 1999. Exploring Underrepresentations: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 70 (1): 27-56.

Turner, C. V. S., and S. L. Meyers, Jr. 2000. *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Villalpando, O. 1994. Comparing the effects of multiculturalism and diversity on minority and White students' satisfaction with college. Paper presented at the annual national meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Tucson, AZ: (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 375721).

Weinberg, M. 1977. *A chance to learn: The history of race and education in the United States.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wey, N. 1980. Asian-Americans in academia. In *Political participation of Asian Americans*, ed. Y. H. Jo, 38-49. Mental Health Research Center.

Wyche, K., and S. Graves. 1992. Minority women in academia: Access and barriers to professional participation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16:429-437.

Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education, 467 U.S. 267 (1886).

Author Information

Clara Awe, holds a Ph.D. in Educational Policy Studies from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a Doctor of Education degree in Higher Education Administration from Northern Illinois University, DeKalb. She is the Director of Urban Health at the University of Illinois at Chicago and directs faculty and staff development for the campus. Awe is also an adjunct Associate Professor in the Pharmacy Administration, College of Pharmacy at the University of Illinois at Chicago and holds a courtesy appointment as Assistant Professor in the Department of Policy Studies in the College of Education.

Clara Awe, Ph.D.
Director, Urban Health Program
University of Illinois
College of Pharmacy (M/C 874)
833 South Wood Street, 176 PHARM
Chicago, IL 60612
E-mail: awe@uic.edu
Telephone: 312-996-3516
Fax: 312-996-3272