Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic revealed and exacerbated documented racial and gender inequities in academia. Responding to the impact of COVID-19 requires addressing pre-existing inequities and countering their intersectional and compounding effects on service, teaching, and research. We argue this response must be based in a holistic, intersectional approach to evaluation, promotion, and merit that integrates service, teaching and research as interdependent elements of academic achievement and promotes inclusive excellence. A holistic, intersectional approach is one which dynamically integrates the collective and cascading impact of systemic bias by approaching teaching/research/service as interactive and non-hierarchical. It recognizes that a reformulation of evaluation, promotion, and merit is a necessary structural step towards ameliorating extensively-documented racial and gender inequities in academia.

Contrary to explicit and implicit suggestions, a holistic approach to evaluation, promotion, and merit does not undermine standards of excellence (Fujii 2017; Barber et al. 2020).[1] Rather, such an approach corrects for documented discriminatory *standards* which systemically penalize minoritized and female scholars in evaluation, promotion, and merit (Hero 2015). It also directly advances the transformation of disciplinary *norms* that negatively affect the career trajectories of minoritized and female scholars and undermine the discipline as a whole (Hero 2015; APSA 2011; APSA 2022).[2] This review critically synthesizes and assesses evidence of systemic bias and discrimination within academia and the discipline of political science, proving that a reformulation of academic professional norms and practices is long overdue, and advances suggestions for change. The regressive racialized and gendered impacts of the ongoing pandemic (Schneider et al. 2021; Skinner et al. 2021; Gonzales and Griffin 2020; Malisch et al. 2020) intersecting with the murder of George Floyd and subsequent Uprisings have, collectively and individually, been all too quickly dismissed *just as* they make such a reformulation all the more crucial (Simien and Wallace 2022)[3]

[1] Barber, P. et. al (2020) noting that the "false dichotomy of 'excellence or diversity' must end" (1440). https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abd7140

[2] Disciplinary histories of political science document its racialized and gendered origins, its exclusionary practices, and trace the lasting impact this has had on specific fields, as well as the discipline i.e., Wilder, C. (2013) Niemann, Y., et. al, eds. (2020).

Syracuse University recently settled a class action lawsuit, agreeing to a 3.7 million payment, brought by 150 female faculty members who experienced discriminatory pay and promotion policies: https://www.syracuse.com/syracuse-university/2021/10/syracuse-university-agrees-to-pay-37m-to-settle-lawsuit-from-female-faculty-members.html

[3] See Matthew, Patricia. A. (2016) See also Ahmed, Sara (2012).

We draw from an extensive range of research evaluating the existence and implications of systemic inequities both within the discipline of political science and academia more generally. Scholars have been publishing studies documenting gendered and racial biases within academia for at least fifty years (see Schuck 1969) and there has been an increase in recent years. Marked change, however, has not easily followed and remains slow, incremental, and depressingly 'captured' by academia and administrators for their own ends (Táíwò, 2022). In this critical review, we aim to facilitate greater change by providing a usable and relatively compact, yet comprehensive, account which integrates analyses from three discrete areas common to tenure track faculty—service, teaching, and research—improving our collective ability to access findings and identify actionable steps.[4] Absent integrative analysis, the full scope and interactive effects of inequities remain obscure and solutions remain incomplete or even detrimental (Simien and Wallace 2022).

The majority of research specific to political science focuses on empirical evidence of widespread gender bias in the discipline. The experiences of faculty of color, and of the intersection of race and gender, are gaining more attention when assessing the intersectional effects of bias, while research on gender expression or sexual orientation is less common. Since there is still yet a small number of political science faculty of color and openly LGBTQ faculty, the empirical data that is available is supported and extended by research in academia more broadly.[5] Further, since academia is subject to the same "well-documented misogyny, racism, homophobia, and ableism—and the intersections among them —endemic to the educational system and to the broader labor market," we also draw on research in those areas (Majic and Strolovitch 2020: 764). As a discipline, we clearly require more fine-grained analysis of the forms, targets, and effects of discrimination—for example, along with the above, a study of increasing differences in resources/constraints among and between public and private universities and consequential effects on differentially-situated scholars (see Garcia and Alfaro 2021). However, we note with equal caution that a call for more research *can also* function to deflect or substitute for more immediate change. It risks depoliticizing more radical efforts for change which, at their core,

[4] Disciplinary reports, such as APSA 2022, fulfill a crucial need for highly detailed analyses, but at over 100 pages APSA's report is less than easily accessible for general training or educational purposes across a range of audiences. The one area we do not address herein is graduate training, which is highly significant and fundamental to restructuring the professoriate, because we are aiming for a more general, usable document across all tenure track faculty inclusive of non-PhD granting institutions (for a crucial discussion of teaching and training, see the PS: Political Science and Politics 2022 symposium "Structuring Inclusion into the Political Science Student Experience: From Recruitment to Completion, From Undergraduate to Graduate and Beyond").

[5] Throughout this report, we rely on the language and descriptions (e.g., woman or female) used in the original studies This means often we are unable to break down the categories, such as women, according to race, sexuality, ethnicity or other pertinent categories, or adequately address intersectional identities, positionalities, and experiences.

fundamentally and necessarily challenge hierarchies of power, recognition, and distribution (Fulweiler 2021).

This report's findings are generally organized under the headings of "research", "teaching", and "service" but, considering the interdependent, mutually reinforcing effects of gender and racial inequities, the findings are cross-referenced and should also be read as mutually reinforcing. The research we present primarily reflects academic working conditions of faculty on the tenure track prior to and in the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. Research on the pandemic finds that it has disproportionately burdened minoritized and female faculty, especially those with children, compounding pre-existing professional disparities (e.g, Pebdani, et al., 2022; Yildirim and Eslen-Ziya 2021; Docka-Filipek and Stone 2021).

II. Service

Faculty service includes a broad range of administrative, committee-based, and mentoring responsibilities crucial to the success, efficacy, and climate of departments, universities, and the academic profession. Service is formally the least valued of faculty enterprises, often in explicitly gendered terms—e.g., institutional housekeeping or academic care work. The devaluation of service is a historical artifact of a racialized, gendered, fully-funded, 'household model' of the University where care and service were outsourced to staff and others, the demographics of faculty, staff and students were markedly less diverse, and the expectations of service were comparatively minimal. The constitutive elements of *that* household model have changed dramatically, and yet the household model still structures approaches to service even as, notably, service expectations and needs have exponentially increased without concomitant support and recognition.

In addition to the persistent racialization and gendering of service, reasons for this disjuncture include cuts to state funding, downsizing of administrative and support staff, non-replacement of tenured faculty lines, an increase in expectations of student mentorship, greater administrative burdens in increasingly bureaucratized universities, and the acceleration and intensification of academic work (Hanasono et. al 2018; O'Meara et al. 2017). Unsurprisingly, the pandemic has amplified service needs further reduced resources, additionally burdening minoritized and female faculty (O'Meara et al., 2021).

II.I More Service, Token Service, Relational Service

Evidence shows that women faculty and faculty of color consistently perform more service work than their white male peers (Mitchell and Hesli 2013; Gaurino and Borden 2017; Flaherty 2015, 2017, forthcoming; Pyke 2011; Turner et al. 2011; O'Meara et al. 2020; Hanasono et al. 2020). Female faculty

of color perform the most service compared to white colleagues (Wood et al. 2015). Lest greater service be attributed to purely a consequence of individual choice or personal commitment, research shows that women faculty and faculty of color are *asked* formally and informally to do service more often, and their flexibility to *refuse* or to *select* their service is more constrained due to their relative positions within the academic hierarchy (Mitchell and Hesli 2013; Disch and O'Brian 2007; O'Meara et al. 2017: 1157). Consequently, even as "overwhelmingly, both men and women faculty members express a preference for research," not all are equally supported or accommodated to do so (Misra 2011). These higher service demands, especially at the associate level, directly affect "productivity in . . . research and teaching" which, in turn, results in "salary differentials and overall success in academia" (Guarino and Borden 2017: 690; Alter et al., 2020).

The systemic underrepresentation of women faculty and faculty of color, particularly at senior levels, leads to a disproportionate level of service requests and commitments. The centering of diversity and equity concerns also contributes to greater burdens of service while, ironically, mitigating against formal recognition and support of women faculty and faculty of color who do the work (Flaherty 2019; Anderson 2020; O'Meara et. al 2021).[6] "(W)e don't have enough people to go around to help with diversity work. You have an issue, you bring it to a nontenured faculty member who is a person of color, or a woman, and they have to do all the heavy lifting because they teach race or some related issue. Everyone's calling them all the time, they can't get enough work done and you've already set that person up for failure" (Anthea Butler, quoted in Flaherty 2020).

In addition, women faculty and faculty of color are frequently requested to engage in 'token' service. Token service occurs when faculty are asked to take on non-leadership service roles to ensure their demographic group is represented on a given committee or academic program, not because their individual skills are appropriate for the role. Hamlin (2021) writes that "several women told me of having to be put on 'every committee under the sun' so that each could have a senior woman or person of color." Being asked to perform such service is problematic for many reasons, but especially so "given that women are less likely to gain the sorts of accommodations that ensure that service does not

[6]See also Miguel Jimenez et al. (2019) "Underrepresented faculty play a disproportionate role in advancing diversity and inclusion," *Nat Ecol Evol* 3, 1030–1033.

A COACHE survey found that a "perception gap exists as to how department colleagues support and promote diversity and inclusion within programs. While 78 percent of white professors agree that their departments are committed, just 58 percent of Black faculty members feel that way. Twenty-eight percent of Black professors disagree that their departmental colleagues are committed to these goals," Mathews, K. R. et al., (2017) The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education: Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, 2012-2017. See also APSA 2022, Chp 3.

undermine the productive capacity of the scholar" (Mitchell and Hesli 2013: 362-3; Alter et al. 2020). Misra et al. (2012) found that time spent in service roles contributed to delays in women scholars' promotion from associate to full professor, one possible outcome of the expectation that "faculty of color . . . sustain the inclusive community of students at their institution. . . a form of underappreciated labor that carries a heavy toll" (Malisch et al. 2020; June 2015).

The *type* of service that women faculty and faculty of color are asked to undertake is also different: it is often 'relational' as opposed to 'task' based service. Relational service is especially intensive because it is less bounded in time, its duties less discrete, and it has an emotional component (e.g., improving climate or mentoring as opposed to awarding fellowships or defined committee duties). Relational service is more likely to be unrewarded and devalued because it is less immediately visible, because it is gendered and raced in form and by association, and because it is characterized as something other than work, e.g., voluntary or preferential, or explained as a result of poor professional choices. Further, by its very nature, relational service is often confidential and therefore difficult to enumerate (Majic and Strolovitch, 2020). Yet, as Manchester et al. note in a forthcoming paper, "Universities...[are] *disproportionately looking* to female faculty to address the service needs – or caregiving work – of the institution. . .[and]. . these demands exert a greater opportunity cost on research time of female relative to male faculty, which has implications for future career success" (27). To put it succinctly, female faculty and faculty of color may not only be unrewarded but also penalized for their service (see also Hill & Hurley 2022)

II.II Costs, Climate, and Consequences of Service

Intensive service obligations directly affect time available for activities that are deemed 'rewardable'. Lack of prestige attributed to service roles continues even as such service is touted as fundamental to increasing faculty and student diversity, retention and graduate student placement, in addition to facilitating a functioning workplace (Hanasono et al. 2018).[7] Further, requests for participation in service roles deemed more prestigious are affected by the "implicit bias and closed social networks" which mark the discipline, themselves a consequence of the discipline's relatively unrepresentative nature (Mershon and Walsh 2015; Alter et al. 2020). Thus, the lack of diversity and representation in faculty leads not only to the overburdening of minoritized and female faculty, but also

[7] Ironically, considering that student satisfaction, recruitment, and retention rates are directly linked to the funding and health of the University, service done in this regard is, in fact, an *essential* benefit for all those employed by the University.

to exclusionary and exploitative patterns in which the service done by faculty of color and women is devalued precisely because it is done by women faculty and faculty of color and not white men (Monroe et al. 2008).

Gendered and racialized dynamics also impact how faculty are *expected* to interact with students and participate in the life of colleges and universities. On the one hand, for faculty of color, their service or "hands-on attention. . . is an unheralded linchpin in institutional efforts to create an inclusive learning environment and to keep students enrolled" and, on the other hand, "that invisible labor reflects what has been described as cultural taxation: the pressure faculty members of color feel to serve as role models, mentors, even surrogate parents to minority students, and to meet every institutional need for ethnic representation" (June 2015 ; see also Pittman 2012). For example, a study of 37 Black professors at three institutions found that Black female faculty faced uniquely high expectations for maintaining close contact and personal relationships with students, resulting in a heavier mentoring burden (Griffin and Reddick 2011).

Importantly, women faculty and faculty of color undertake this work in more chilly and often hostile climates aggravated by current political contexts, certainly heightened during and after the protests surrounding the murder of George Floyd, ongoing racial backlash, as well as the pandemic and its effects (Jefferson and Ray 2022). A study of experiences at APSA annual meetings revealed that "30% of women who responded to the survey have encountered situations in which… colleagues in this professional setting have made sexist comments or called inappropriate attention to their gender, sexuality, or bodies" (Sapiro and Campbell 2018: 197). The same survey "shows that two things—gender and how often one goes to meetings—are predictors of these forms of harassment," which raises troubling questions about equal and safe access to and participation in a central meeting for networking and academic exchange in the discipline (Ibid., 205). In response to chilly and/or hostile climates, the creation and maintenance of 'whisper networks,' those informal protection networks and alliances among women faculty and faculty of color, are fundamental to many individual and collective protection and coping strategies. However, the emotional and mental effort required to sustain them is not recognized as part of faculty members' jobs, even as departments and universities rely upon these networks in place of more formal institutional sanctions.

Women faculty and faculty of color identify the emotional and material costs of micro and macro aggressions and invalidations, as well as outright harassment, pointing to the additional time and energy spent negotiating it for themselves and as mentors for other faculty and graduate students (Anderson 2018; Lavariega Monforti 2012; 2020; Lavariega and Michelson 2019; 2020; APSA 2022). Griffin and

Reddick (2011) found that Black male faculty strove for more formal and distanced relationships with their mentees. They did so partly due to perceptions that they were disproportionately visible (and disproportionately surveilled) on campus and partly out of fear that they were more likely to be accused of having inappropriate relationships with female students (1051). Several prominent Black professors have resigned from their positions in the past year citing disparate treatment and institutional racism, including over-surveillance (Flaherty 2021; Alexander-Floyd 2008; Sampaio 2006; Monforti and Michelson 2008).

II.III Characterization of Service

Finally, valuable institutional contributions by women faculty and faculty of color, even in leadership positions, are more likely to be categorized as service rather than as teaching or as research. For example, work that provides analysis of gender and racial inequities and/or identifies solutions is typically listed as service rather than research (APSA 2022, Chp.3). Departments and universities "…devalue these positions, characterizing the achievements as service-oriented rather than leadership. These biases justify discrepancies in salaries, resource distribution, service responsibilities, and institutional responsiveness to outside offers" (Mershon and Walsh 2015: 441; Monroe et al. 2013; see also Alperin J.P et al 2019; Cooper 2021).[8] This mischaracterization of research-intensive leadership efforts as service is yet another reason that mere recognition of service is superficial unless it is matched by an increase in value during tenure, promotion and merit evaluations, especially considering the disproportionate burdens caused by the pandemic. Unsurprisingly, in a survey experiment that spanned a wide range of academic fields, Misra et al. (2021) found that white women perceive their departments as having less equitable workloads and weaker commitment to workload equity than white men. Claypool and Mershon (2016: 383) found that, according to 2009 APSA survey results, "women/and racial/sexual minorities perceive their departments as less friendly." Women of color perceive that their departments are less likely to give them credit for their work through departmental rewards systems than white men (Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group 2017: 231, citing Bird et al. 2004; Moore et al. 2010; Mathews et al. 2020). Furthermore, female political scientists of color have identified challenges associated with navigating departmental spaces in which Eurocentric language regarding

[8] "This happens because such work is often conflated with assumptions about what women are naturally good at or interested in. And women are not rewarded for capacities and concerns deemed to be intrinsic. Therefore, when a woman manager provides team members with emotional support during a time of societal crises, it can be overlooked as "caretaking" instead of being recognized as strong crisis management. When a Black woman manager hosts a panel on anti-racism in the wake of racial violence, she can be applauded for her "passion" but not rewarded for her time, leadership, or DEI acumen" (Cooper 2021).

"professionalism" occlude opportunities for promotion and advancement: "…the guiding principle of professionalism is both a help and hindrance to women of color in the discipline… more frequently, however, this framework operates as a barrier to entry and obstacle for retention as women of color become exhausted in our attempts to successfully navigate these norms and expectations" (Harbin and Greene 2022: 376).

Overall, women faculty and faculty of color are multiply burdened by service. This status-quo has direct psychological, financial, and professional consequences. This burden is not created by choice. Rather, within the context of educational institutions at large, women faculty and faculty of color are asked to engage in more time intensive, less rewarded, less prestigious, and less discrete service tasks. However, due to the racialized and gendered assessment and categorization of this service, these faculty are less likely to see any reward and, in fact, due to the impact on research productivity, are penalized for doing the work necessary for universities and departments to function.

Collectively, research and teaching ***depend*** on substantial and effective service work. This fact makes the devaluation of service all the more outdated, particularly as it acutely concentrates racial and gendered discrimination. While inequities in service allocation have an impact on women faculty and faculty of color during their entire careers, the impact is especially pernicious for moving from associate to full professor, a period where women faculty and faculty of color frequently 'stall'. Acknowledging the crucial significance of service by giving it greater formal weight in promotion, tenure and merit decisions does not undermine the mission of research-centric universities. On the contrary, it institutionalizes the central importance of service to the research mission, to inclusive excellence and, even more importantly, as a key site for countering systemic racial and gender bias.

III. Teaching:[9]

Studies show that student evaluations of teaching are biased against minoritized and female faculty. This is cause for concern as student evaluations of teaching (SRT) are used in high stakes ways at many colleges and universities. Research over the past two decades has offered substantial evidence that student evaluations are at the very least gender biased. Several studies of online courses found that evaluations were higher when students thought the instructor was male (e.g., Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016 ; MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt 2015). Another study analyzed over 19,000 evaluations and found

[9] This section draws from our 2020 collective work completed by the Women's Faculty Cabinet at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. For updated information on teaching evaluations see Professor Kreitzer's invaluable research: https://www.rebeccakreitzer.com/bias/

that women faculty receive systematically lower teaching evaluations than male colleagues, even while controlling for students' grades and study hours (Mengel, Sauermann, and Zölitz 2017). Studies have also further clarified some of the ways in which gender bias manifests itself. For example, students use different criteria for evaluating women than they do for men, with students focusing on female instructors' appearance, age, and personality (Wilson, Beyer, and Monteiro 2014; Mitchell and Martin 2018; Rosen 2018). One study of online political science courses found that, even when the courses contained identical content, schedules, and instructor communication, women and faculty of color received lower scores than white men (Chávez and Mitchell 2019, 270).

There is evidence that educating students about the potential for biases to impact teaching evaluations may help level out score disparities, but the duration and the strength of the effect is unclear. Key and Ardoin (2019) conducted an experiment in which 52 political science classes were divided into two groups. Prior to administering teaching evaluations, one group was sent an email that encouraged students to keep explicit and implicit biases in mind and linked to a repository of studies about student evaluation bias. The other group was not sent that email. Among the group that received the email, students were significantly more likely to refer to female faculty as "professors" (as opposed to "teacher" or "instructor") and less likely to comment on female faculty's physical appearance or fashion choices within their evaluations relative to the control group.

Less research measures bias related to race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, and we have found no research focused explicitly on disability. Existing studies on race demonstrate similar patterns of bias, resulting in lower SRT scores for members of marginalized and racialized groups based upon stereotypes (Harlow 2003; Smith and Hawkins 2011), and a recent study showed bias against non-native English speakers (Fan et. al. 2019). Interestingly, the limited findings in relation to LGBTQ instructors suggest that student biases have evolved over time. A 2002 study by Russ et. al. found that students rated gay male instructors as less credible than hetero instructors; however, a replication of that study by Boren and McPherson (2017) fifteen years later showed no significant bias, indicating increasing acceptance of gay male instructors. We are unaware of parallel research on lesbian or transgender instructors.

III.I Time, Money, and Rewards

Biased evaluations contribute to the greater time that women faculty put into teaching compared to male faculty, to the detriment of their research agendas (Link et. al 2008). For example, research finds that female professors experience more demands for special favors and additional support, with academically privileged students "more inclined to make the requests, be irritated or disappointed if the

professor denied the requests, and persist in asking for favors after being denied, if the professor was female versus male" (Flaherty 2018, citing El-Alayli 2018). Indeed, Djupe et al. (2019) found that women in political science and sociology report devoting 8% more time to teaching than men (see also Sampaio 2006, Agathangelou and Ling 2002). Interestingly, Hesli et al. (2012) found that granting of teaching releases corresponds with higher rank. And, while teaching releases increase likelihood of promotion to associate for both men and women, men who are given teaching releases are 4% more likely to obtain rank of full professor. There was no relationship for women in promotion to full. Their qualitative data indicates this could be because women advise more undergraduate projects and theses for undergraduates than male faculty, thus making it more difficult for them to wholly use the release.

Gender bias in student evaluations may also contribute to the gender gap in salary and promotion. Women are less likely to be granted tenure than men, but the factors behind this discrepancy are only partially explained by differences in productivity; a large portion of the cause remains unexplained (Weisshaar 2017). Finally, gendered biases in teaching evaluations affect teaching awards across political science departments, as women are less likely than men to receive teaching awards at four-year institutions (Butcher and Kersey 2014: 140).Overall, the constant necessity of negotiating racial and gendered bias wears on women faculty and faculty of color, negatively affecting health and well-being, limiting time available to pursue research, while colleges and universities benefit from their unrewarded and unfairly evaluated labor.

IV. Research

Research productivity is related to the amount of time and resources faculty have available to conduct research. Women faculty and faculty of color often have less time available to spend on research due to their distinct service and teaching demands. Time available for research is also a function of funding, which allows faculty to buy out of teaching and service and/or self-fund research expenditures. Here, women faculty and faculty of color are negatively affected by discrepancies in salary, startup packages, and external funding. As the American Association of University Professors found in their most recent review of salaries (using 2018 data from Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System), movement towards salary inequity remains 'flat' with women faculty receiving, on average, 81.2% salary of male faculty at rank (data unavailable by race) (Weissman 2020; Claypool et al. 2021). Evidence from a study of the U.K. academic job market suggests that women faculty may be less likely to get outside offers, which effectively reduces their chances for improving their standing (Blackaby et al. 2005; see also O'Meara et al. 2017 which finds rank to mediate offers).

Across academia, a 2018 study on faculty retention found that "among those who didn't ask for a counteroffer, men are more likely than women to receive one, anyway; among those who do ask for a counteroffer, women are more likely to be denied." [10] Gendered and racial disparities in starting salary and resources compound over time, leading to yet another feedback loop of inequity. Yet evidence across a range of disciplines confirms that women faculty and faculty of color are 'damned if they do and damned if they don't' when negotiating for salary and start up, often experiencing backlash and especially when absent 'role congruity' in negotiation (Dannals et al. 2021; Toosi et al. 2019; Mazei et al. 2015).

External funding also displays similar biases. For example, Oliveira et al. (2019) found that the median NIH first-time award for men was $40,000 more than that for women, while a 2020 study of NIH grants found that African American scholars remain significantly under awarded: "the overall award rate for black applications is 55% of that for white applications (10.2% versus 18.5%), resulting in a funding gap of 45%" (Erosheva et al. 2020: 8). Collectively, the result is that women faculty and faculty of color "have disproportionately less capital -- both through start-up and their grants -- yet are required to have equal outcomes. ..[They] are working harder for the same end points" (Flaherty 2019). When there is overall less funding/salary/start up, there is also overall less capacity to self-fund, to be able to spend prior to reimbursement and to participate in necessary activities for professional advancement such as conference attendance. Accordingly, the general contraction in research funding, compression in salary and lack of cost-of-living increases affect women and faculty of color distinctly because they start with less. The austerity measures imposed by Universities in the wake of COVID 19, such as reduction in salary or suspension of retirement contributions, also have had a differential impact because these faculty begin with fewer resources and/or different needs (Schneider et al 2021).

IV.I Citations and Recognition

The bulk of empirical evidence demonstrates that minoritized and female faculty have less time and resources to spend on research due to differential service and teaching demands and discrimination in salary, start up, and external funding, which creates a negative feedback effect. Furthermore, when their research is undertaken and published, it is cited less, awarded less, and garners less publicity as measured by invitations to present it publicly (Nittrouer, C. et al 2018).[11] In other words, as with the case

[10] https://coache.gse.harvard.edu/blog/findings-first-ever-multi-institutional-survey-faculty-retention-exit-infographic

[11] The phenomena known as 'manels' is one clear example of this.

of teaching and service, even when doing more with less, recognition and advancement does not follow. A striking example is that the "total number of publications is weighted differently in tenure decisions for men and women identified scholars," such that the "total number of publications does not significantly increase the likelihood of obtaining tenure for women. . .while the opposite is true for men" (APSA 2022, Chp.1; Hesli et al. 2012: 485).

There is a well-documented "gender gap" in both journal publications and citations within political science. In a study analyzing all articles published between 2007-2016 in six top political science and social science methodology journals, Dion, Sumner, and Mitchell (2018) found that female political scientists are consistently cited less frequently than males. Women are even cited less frequently than men even in research areas where women are a majority of authors (for example, gender and politics studies). Within the international relations subfield, a 2013 study found that women are systematically cited less than men even after controlling for a wide range of variables including year of publication, venue of publication, substantive focus, theoretical perspective, methodology, tenure status, and institutional affiliation. The authors of this study identify two central drivers of the IR gender gap: 1) women tend to cite themselves less than men, and 2) men, who make up a disproportionate majority of IR scholars, tend to cite men more than women (Maliniak et al. 2013).

The citation gap persists regardless of the prestige of female political scientists, as measured by awards for most cutting-edge work in the field. Tatalovich and Frendreis (2019) collected citation counts for all "best book" awards named by organized sections of the American Political Science Association since 1985 and found that, not only do men receive such awards more frequently than women, but award-winning books by men are cited more often than award-winning books by women. Collectively, this compounds the continued financial and professional undervaluation of women faculty and faculty of color as citations frequently function as a shorthand for excellence and play directly into external awards and funding, as well as considerations for promotion and tenure.[12]

Men's proclivity towards self-citation is not unique to IR or political science (Hutchings and Owens 2020). King et al. (2017) analyzed 1.5 million research papers across a wide spectrum of academic disciplines and found that, between 1779 and 2011, men cited themselves 56 percent more often than did women. Between 1991 and 2011 alone, men self-cited 70 % more than women. As men publish more often than women, the compounding self-citation gap seriously affects women's advancement in academic professions (Vettese 2019). Recent research reveals that white scholars are cited at

significantly higher rates than scholars of color across all subfields and types of institutions within the political science discipline. Black political scientists, in particular, are severely underrepresented in citation counts (APSA 2022, Chp.2). It is unclear what factors precisely lead to the citation gap for scholars of color, however fewer submissions from female scholars do *not* wholly explain the overall lack of citations, awards, and recognition that their scholarship garners. A similar pattern may be at work in the racial disparity in citations. Citation counts are increasingly influential in decisions surrounding tenure and promotions, a practice that has been criticized for exacerbating gender inequities in research assessment and further entrenches disparities in promotion (Fowler and Aksnes 2007, Sumner 2018).[13]

There are also disparities across the rates at which female and male political scientists publish peer-reviewed articles and books (Teele and Thelen 2017; Samuels and Teele 2021). Dion and Mitchell (2019) conducted a study that revealed that, across all subfields, women are underrepresented in journals compared with their membership rates in those journals' sponsoring subfield associations. The largest gender gaps in publication rates appear in the journals that, despite their unrepresentative nature, are still held to be the most prestigious— known as the "big three": the *American Political Science Review*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, and the *Journal of Politics*. Dion and Mitchell (2019) write that the "big three" are "perceived as less likely to publish research that uses qualitative rather than quantitative methods" and that this also "often excluded interpretive or postcolonial research, as well as research on race or ethnicity, gender, sexuality, disability, and/or the intersections of these identities-political science fields that are more populated by women".[14] McClain et al. (2016: 477) found that 4.5% of the 553 articles published in the big three were related to race and ethnicity, suggesting that this critique is not misplaced. Sharon Wright Austin, a current member of the *American Political Science Review* editorial board, estimated in 2019 that less than ten African American scholars had published with the *Review* in that journal's entire history (Todd 2019).

What this means is that women faculty and faculty of color must combat epistemic ignorance in two ways. *First*, they must combat the categorization of their scholarship as merely niche research, reflective of personal identity or passions, and/or tangential to the discipline itself. And *second,* they must shoulder the burden of proof of the value of their research and publications because they are not in the 'big three', rather than the continued *absence* of such research in the 'big three' remaining the central issue .[15]

---

[14] See also Djupe et al. (2018); Key and Sumner (2019); Alter et al. (2020).

[15] For example, when faced with events such as the editor of the *American Journal of Political Science* using the primary webpage of the journal to deny allegations of sexual harassment, the onus should not be on individual scholars

Considering, again, the commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion in research, it is no small irony that scholars who do and have done work on areas historically excluded have been "less valorized" and "systematically undervalued", even now amidst the move to adopt such considerations (Majic and Strovolitch 2020; Maliniak, et al. 2013: 31; Teele and Thelen 2017; Alter et al 2020). Consequently, over a decade ago the 2011 APSA State of the Field Report recommended that "departments should also be more inclusive of the types of journals valued in the assessment of scholarly productivity" and renewed that recommendation in 2022.

IV.II Publication

Available evidence indicates that the gender publication gap is not driven by discriminatory editorial practices, but by fewer article submissions among female scholars relative to men resulting from differential demands on time and available resources, as well as perceptions and evidence of receptivity of such scholarship (Brown et al. 2020). A 2018 study of five top-ranking political science journals revealed no evidence of systemic gender bias in editorial decisions (Brown and Samuels 2018). This conclusion was supported in a survey study where 1,700 political scientists and sociologists provided information about their publications and attempts to publish (Djupe et al. 2019). That survey study revealed a gender gap in submission rates that is nearly identical to the publication gender gap. Male scholars submit 1.18 articles for every one that women submit, while men publish 1.23 articles for every one that women publish.

Regarding the pandemic, a 2021 publication found that "complete data on all Elsevier journals indicate that women submitted fewer manuscripts than men during the first wave of the pandemic in early 202o," suggesting "that the first wave of the pandemic has created potentially cumulative advantages for men" (Squazzoni 2021: 1). A report by the *American Journal of Political Science* documented a slightly greater proportion of pandemic submissions co-authored by women, but that the proportion of solo-authored papers by women was less (Dolan and Lawless 2020).[16] Another 2021 study that incorporated online survey data and data from semi-structured interviews with female scholars found that more women reported an increase in their service responsibilities and a decrease in hours able

to change their submission habits per se, but on the profession and the journal to confront what it reveals about harassment, sexism, and power in the discipline.

[16] There is also research which suggests that co-authorship boosts men's chances for promotion more so than it does for women. See Sarsons, H. (2017)"Recognition for group work: Gender differences in academia." *American Economic Review*, 107, (5): 141-45; Sarsons et al (2020) "Gender differences in recognition for group work." *Journal of Political Economy* 129, 101-147.

to devote to research relative to male scholars since the onset of the pandemic. These gendered disparities were found to be magnified for female parents of young children (Shalaby et al. 2021; Pebdani et al 2022).

An early-2022 study on gendered publication patterns across 21 academic disciplines during the pandemic found that female scholars did not publish at lower rates than men in 2020-2021 compared to 2019 (Flaherty 2022). However, given the length of time from submission to publication, which tends to be significantly longer in the social sciences compared to the natural or medical sciences, the results of that study are unlikely to sufficiently capture the impact of the pandemic on female political scientists' research productivity. Commenting on the 2022 cross-disciplinary study, Kathleen Dolan, current co-editor of the *American Journal of Political Science,* cautioned that "we shouldn't expect to see [the impact of the pandemic] until the journals that are published in 2022 at the earliest, but more likely 2023 and 2024" (Ibid.). Furthermore, it must be emphasized that the pandemic is still ongoing, and its impacts on journal processing times and individual scholars' personal and professional lives are still compounding. As additional data on the pandemic's ramifications, and the intensified targeting of higher education by the Republican party, continues to be gathered and analyzed, it will be crucial for political scientists to remain attentive to gendered and racialized trends in pandemic-era productivity.

Women faculty and faculty of color engage in the research, submission, and publication process with greater teaching and service burdens, fewer resources for research, and less (and less safe) access to and participation in powerful professional networking opportunities and mentorship, among other factors. These factors are combined with the perception and reality of certain kinds of scholarship as not a 'good fit' with the journals held to be the top journals in political science—scholarship that women faculty and faculty of color are more likely to, but not necessarily, produce—directly influencing the submission gap (Djupe et al. 2019, Key and Sumner 2019).

Racial disparities in citation counts have not been empirically evaluated to the same extent as gendered citation gaps. However, recent research reveals that white scholars are cited at significantly higher rates than scholars of color across all subfields and types of institutions within the political science discipline. Black political scientists, in particular, are severely underrepresented in citation counts (APSA 2022, Chp.2). It is unclear what factors precisely lead to the citation gap for scholars of color, however fewer submissions from female scholars do *not* wholly explain the overall lack of citations, awards, and recognition that their scholarship garners. A similar pattern may be at work in the racial disparity in citations.

The negative feedback loop created by the above gendered and racialized patterns of exclusion is highly detrimental to women faculty and faculty of color. Absent a structural and systemic analysis, it is far too easy to attribute it to individual faculty choices or effort, while the multiple benefits accrued to majority faculty remain unacknowledged and unaddressed, perpetuating "meritocratic mythologies" (Majic and Strolovitch 2020: 766).

IV.IV: Pipeline

Several investigations of gender disparities in academia have highlighted the "leaky pipeline," a term used to describe the increasing number of women who leave the profession at every stage of career advancement (Monroe and Chiu 2010, Monroe et al. 2014). Women faculty and faculty of color are underrepresented at the upper echelons of academic fields, achieving tenure and promotion at a lower rate (Park 2011; National Center for Educational Statistics 2018). For scholars of color, underrepresentation begins early in the career pipeline. Except for Asian Americans, professors of color are underrepresented relative to U.S. population demographics at every academic rank. Women of color were less than 4% of faculty in political science as of 2011, and faculty of color held approximately 10% of positions. (Pinderhughes et al. 2011, 43). Across US academia more broadly, as of 2019, only 2.1% of tenured associate and full professors were Black women (Williams June and O'Leary 2021). Also as of 2019, despite comprising nearly 40% of the US population, people of color only held 25.1 percent of all faculty positions (Jeffries-El 2022). Reid and Curry (2019) argue that much of the existing scholarship on diversity within political science "can address changes in the participation of only white women in the field; people of color are relegated as the catch-all for all non-white individuals because there are simply too few non-white scholars to systematically evaluate" (281). Importantly, the 2022 APSA Task Force's original research on the experiences of over 600 faculty across ten years, which charts how differentially positioned and structurally marginalized faculty experience the profession, found that, over the ten-year period studied, "high percentages of faculty of color were not promoted or left the discipline," with nearly 1/3 of Black men exiting. This data is exploratory, but it underscores the dire need for updated and more nuanced research in this area (APSA 2022 Chp. 1).

IV.V Promotion

In the case of women, across the U.S. academy, women comprise the majority of college students, graduate students, and half of assistant professors (Flaherty 2020). In 2016, women accounted for 38% of all doctorates conferred in political science (APSA 2016). However, women comprise only 28% of tenured political science faculty and 23% of full professors (Alter 2020). Thus, women's

underrepresentation in the top ranks of academia is not a function of a lack of women entering the profession. Moreover, time to promotion for women scholars is "significantly longer" for women at the ranks of both assistant to associate and associate to full, while male faculty of color are less likely to be promoted overall (APSA 2022, Chp 1). Multiple reasons can contribute to this outcome. However, for all non-majority faculty, "the accumulation of implicit and institutionalized biases, and their related consequences" is elemental (Carey et al., 2020: 536).

For women, the structural impediments in the move from associate to full include an increase in service, the accumulating impact of bias documented thus far, and reproductive and care patterns, all of which often converge at this rank. The tenure clock is in-part a care clock revealing the presumption of who faculty are and who they should be. Thus, in addition to the challenges outlined in service, teaching, and research, Hamlin (2021) suggests that lack of gender parity among full professors is partially attributable to the dearth of support or acknowledgement of caregiving responsibilities which burden women's career advancement: "It's one thing to hold on to one's ambitious research agenda for six years in one's 30s.. [it is quite another] . when care for growing children often collides with care for elders" (2021).

The demands of parenting, which tend to disproportionately fall on women, impose many constraints that can hinder scholars' research output. Additionally, access to opportunities and to networking often requires travel to conferences, invited talks, and other events that may not be tenable for women with young children or other caregiving responsibilities , especially as childcare is typically not claimable as a research expense and is usually not provided (Bos, et al. Closa et al. 2020: 431). The COVID-19 pandemic has only intensified the constraints that caregiving responsibilities disproportionately impose on female scholars' research productivity: "When coupled with increased caring responsibilities, the current crises call into question who can be creative and innovative, necessary conditions for knowledge production" (Wright et al. 2020: 1). Indeed the "caregiving crisis" in the United States extends well beyond academia, as documented in a recent study of inequitable burdens of reproductive labor across gender, racial, and class divides that have been exacerbated by the pandemic (Htun 2022). Another recent study measuring the pandemic-era Twitter activity of political scientists found that the shift to remote work caused female faculty to tweet less often than their male colleagues about professional accomplishments, a phenomenon that the authors attribute in part to increased familial obligations placed on women (Kim and Patterson 2022).

The odds of moving up the academic ranks are particularly low for mothers. A recent (unpublished) study of academic career trajectories within STEM and the biological and social sciences found that 27%

of academics[17] who are mothers achieve tenure, compared with 48% of fathers and 46% of women without children (Kim and Moser 2021:2). Furthermore, 70% of tenured male professors have children, while only 44% of tenured women do (Mason 2013). Many universities have implemented "tenure clock stopping policies" to attempt to mitigate the impact of having children on early-career scholars' research productivity. These policies typically allow assistant professors to stop their tenure clock for one year after childbirth or adoption. At least theoretically, professors are not expected to produce research during that period, and tenure evaluators discount the "stopped" time in their review process. While clock stopping policies are nominally intended to reduce gender disparities in career advancement, there is evidence that such policies can exacerbate gaps in tenure rates between men and women, not to mention further worsening pay differentials between male and female faculty as a result.

Antecol et al. (2018) analyzed the impact of tenure clock stopping policies at top-50 economics departments and found that gender-neutral policies (which allow parents of any gender to pause their tenure clock) decrease female tenure rates at the policy university by 19 percentage points while increasing male tenure rates by 17 percentage points. A central mechanism driving this outcome is an increase in the number of top-5 journal publications by men after clock stopping policies are implemented, with no increase by women (2439). The evidence suggests that men tend to be able to leverage the year of stopped time because women disproportionately bear the physical and mental demands of childbirth and childcare. This does not mean that clock stopping makes women more likely to leave academia. Antecol et al. find no evidence that gender-neutral clock stopping policies reduce the share of women who ultimately achieve tenure. However, the extended time at associate has direct impacts on salary as well as other external supports, creating a cumulative effect both economically and professionally. Thus, while gender-neutral clock stopping policies may be equal, they are also inequitable, widening the gender gap (in promotion and merit) in academia by giving men a life jacket as women tread water. Overall, systemic undervaluation (and active devaluation) of women faculty and faculty of color across a range of elements fundamental to research creates measurable disparities in outcome. When women faculty and faculty of color are excluded from tenure and promotion, departments and disciplines maintain the same networks, biases, and evaluations that entrench structural and systemic discrimination.

V. Now What?

[17] "Academics" in this study included individuals who had held any academic position, including academic jobs off the tenure track. 38% of mothers who achieved the rank of assistant professor earned tenure (32).

The pandemic has worsened structural disparities for women faculty and faculty of color, further undermining diversity, equity and inclusion goals, and threatening advancement in the profession. A recent study examining the University of Minnesota confirmed that, "those in the most precarious position in terms of the pandemic's effect on career success are disproportionately female faculty and least likely to be full professors. The data are consistent with the two-pronged upheaval of the pandemic – in work and non-work domains – falling hardest on this group of faculty members" (Manchester et al. 2021).

However, recognizing the political and pandemic pressures of the last year, we underscore that empirical evidence of existing bias has spanned at least fifty years in political science. While more fine-grained data on non-majority and marginalized faculty, precarious and adjunct faculty is absolutely crucial to illuminate the whole picture, it is startling to note that a review of the journal *Political Science & Politics* indicates that scholarship aimed at addressing gendered and racialized disparities within the discipline has been published consistently since the late-1960s (see Schuck 1969; Burton 1979; Hesli and Burrell 1995; Geiger and Travis 1997). The glacial pace of change suggests "not a lack of knowledge so much as apathy, prejudice, gender stereotypes, and cultural cues that end by depriving society of some of its best talent and energy" (Monroe et al., 2017: 718; see also Disch and O'Brian 2007).

There are promising initiatives to address certain forms of bias. For example, Professor Jane Lawrence Sumner has developed the Gender Balance Assessment Tool (GBAT), an accessible program that authors and instructors can use to ensure that their citations and assigned readings include a representative proportion of female authors. Women Also Know Stuff and People of Color Also Know Stuff, two organizations that promote the work of female and minoritized political scientists, also provide resources to help instructors diversify their syllabi.

Additionally, the recent selection of the *American Political Science Review's* first ever all-women editorial board and their editorial mission represent an unprecedented effort to broaden the representative scope of an important disciplinary journal. This, in turn, can expand the kind of research in political science that is considered of significance and value, recognizing that research currently accepted as such represents only a small and subjective section of potential contributions. Diversifying the types of research that make it into the top journals and broadening the definition of "top journal" may help narrow the race and gender gaps in citation and publications.

These are but a few of the myriad of incremental changes suggested in the academic literature (see APSA 2022). Some have proven and will prove to be more successful than others (Mendelberg and

Argyle 2020), but most have yet to be fully implemented. Most notably, and more troubling, large scale *structural and systemic* change lags furthest behind and has yet to be truly undertaken. As the authors of the APSA 2022 report inquire: "what will it take to have research-based departments in the discipline take into account the research on bias" in every practice—hiring, evaluation, tenure, promotion, merit and retention (APSA 2022, Chp. 1)? Commenting on latest COACHE survey, Keiran Mathews, executive director and principal investigator, suggests that:

> " Since George Floyd's murder, there's been a kind of newfound awareness of where the seat of change really needs to be in the academy. It's not the Black faculty, Hispanic, and Latinx faculty. It's not the Indigenous faculty who have to "fit." It's the white faculty — the majority faculty — who have to change the broken system they perpetuate, who have to accommodate new perspectives, and broaden their definitions of excellence."

A full commitment to rectifying these disparities, and to respond to both the short and long-term detrimental effects of the pandemic and the Uprising begins with formal acknowledgement of what we fundamentally know about accumulative discriminatory impact. This is not an individual problem or responsibility and, in fact, making it so is one way of obscuring the role of racialized and gendered institutions in perpetuating it (Ray 2019, Fields and Fields 2012). The ways that the pandemic and the Uprising revealed, produced and exacerbated racial and gender inequities dramatically demonstrates that an immediate alteration is necessary. Continuing to minimize and ignore additional burdens on women faculty and faculty of color signals satisfaction with the status quo. One step towards change is to actively account for the interdependencies of research, teaching and service in academic achievement and inclusive excellence. The weight given to each should reflect that dynamic interdependence and our collective reliance on the whole *to do our work* as scholars and teachers. It clearly acknowledges that teaching and service are the infrastructure for research and are mutually enhancing on multiple levels—e.g. your additional teaching enables my sabbatical. Fundamental to a holistic, intersectional approach is reassessing the standards of evaluation, promotion, and merit to mitigate their proven bias. Without these steps, claims to value diversity, equity and inclusion remain simply that—mere claims.

A Few Ways Forward:

1. Assess evaluative structures for hiring, promotion, and merit.

a. Recognize that: 1) external letter writers are not necessarily aware of or immersed in the expanding literature on structural racism and sexism in academia; 2) gender and racial bias is a proven hazard of recommendation letters, and; 3) assess the letters accordingly (Stewart and Valian 2018).
b. Include in the request for letters a paragraph that identifies the known gender/racial bias in the field (Stewart and Valian 2018).
c. Consider explicitly noting what resources were available and which were not in response to the pandemic.
d. Recognize that the lack of women faculty and faculty of color at 'peer' institutions influence the pool of letter writers in particular substantive ways and expand the pool accordingly (Stewart and Valian 2018).
e. Consider broadening the definition of peer institutions according to diversity, equity, and inclusion metrics and attending to differences in resources available for research and teaching. This is particularly significant considering the drastically different responses to the pandemic as well as increasingly stratified resources among institutions.
f. Recognize that expanding the sum of parts pertinent to promotion and tenure does not automatically address racism or sexism. For example, valuing public-facing scholarship is commendable *and* women faculty and faculty of color (as well as those whose work is deemed more 'inflammatory' to certain public audiences) run greater risks of targeting, harassment and threats. Additionally, expanding the sum of potential parts should not become a requirement for excelling in all.

2. Remediate practices which contribute to systemic racialized and gendered inequalities

a. Ensure training and discussion of evidence and effect of racial and gender bias prior to evaluations of merit, tenure, and promotion (as is required, for example, when undertaking a faculty search or promotion to full).
i. For example, prolonged time in rank generally undermines diversity, equity and inclusion goals in representation and participation across faculty while specifically creating long term financial effects which, in turn, can further exacerbate existing bias in salaries and resources.

b. Departments can consider tenure, promotion, and merit to balance academic opportunity and academic achievement (as also impacted by racial and gender bias) with a commitment to inclusive excellence.

3. Minimize attention paid to citation accounts in evaluation, expand the range and scope of journals considered in evaluations, and batch journals rather than rank order (Stewart and Valian 2018, APSA 2011, 2022).

4. Pandemic policies are still required. Individual impact statements can exacerbate bias. Departments can conduct surveys and generate a collective statement to offset this risk and exposure. (Sieman and Wallace 2022)

5. Holistic and integrative assessment which acknowledges the double burden experienced by women faculty and faculty of color, now tripled due to the pandemic, should be prioritized in evaluation and promotion (O'Meara et al 2021; Htun 2020).

6. Disproportionate service could be offset through course releases, extra grants and such rather than asking faculty to shoulder the burden of refusal (APSA 2022 see O' Meara et al., 2021; Disch and O'Brian 2007).

7. Recognize that the pandemic is a crisis which directly threatens stated commitments to diversity, equity and inclusion and requires immediate ameliorative structural and systemic responses. More simply, the pandemic is not over and neither are its cumulative effects fully understood or addressed.

8. Unionize

References

Agathangelou, Anna M., and L.H.M. Ling. 2002. "An Unten(Ur)Able Position." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 4(3): 368–98.

Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Duke University Press.

Alexander-Floyd, Nikol. 2008. "'Written, Published … Cross-Indexed, and Footnoted" PS: *Political Science and Politics* 41 (4): 819–29.

Alperin, Juan P. et al. 2019. "How Significant Are the Public Dimensions of Faculty Work in Review, Promotion and Tenure Documents?" eds. Emma Pewsey, et.al,. *eLife* 8: e42254.

Alter, Karen J., Jean Clipperton, Emily Schraudenbach, and Laura Rozier. 2020. "Gender and Status in American Political Science?" *Perspectives on Politics* 18(4): 1048–67.

American Political Science Association. 2011. Task Force on Political Science in the 21st Century. *State of the Field Report.*

American Political Science Association. 2016-2017 APSA *Graduate Placement Survey: Placement Report.*

American Political Science Association Presidential Task Force. 2022. *Systemic Inequalities in the Discipline.*

Anderson, Nick. 2018. "Academia's #MeToo Moment: Women Accuse Professors of Sexual Misconduct." *The Washington Post*.

Anderson, Jill. 2021. "Measuring Faculty Perceptions of Diversity." *Harvard Graduate School of Education*.

Antecol, Heather, Kelly Bedard, and Jenna Stearns. 2018. "Equal but Inequitable:" *American Economic Review* 108(9): 2420–41.

Argyle, Lisa P., and Tali Mendelberg. 2020. "Improving Women's Advancement in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53(4): 718–22.

Barber, Paul H., Tyrone B. Hayes, Tracy L. Johnson, and Leticia Márquez-Magaña. 2020. "Systemic Racism in Higher Education." *Science* 369 (6510): 1440–41.

Bird, Sharon, Jacquelyn Litt, and Yong Wang. 2004. "Creating Status of Women Reports.'" *NWSA Journal* 16(1): 194–206.

Blackaby, David, Alison L. Booth, and Jeff Frank. 2005. "Outside Offers and the Gender Pay Gap:" *The Economic Journal* 115(501): F81–107.

Blatt, Jessica. 2018.*Race and the Making of American Political Science*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Boren, Justin P., and Mary B. McPherson. 2018. "Is Coming Out in the Classroom Still an Occupational Hazard?" *Communication Studies* 69(3): 242–50.

Boring, Anne, Kellie Ottoboni, and Stark, Philip. 2016. "Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness." *ScienceOpen Research*.

Angela L. Bos, Jennie Sweet-Cushman & Monica C. Schneider (2019) Family-friendly academic conferences: a missing link to fix the "leaky pipeline"?, Politics, Groups, and Identities, 7:3, 748-758.

Brown, Nadia E., and David Samuels. 2018. "Introduction to Gender in the Journals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(4): 847–48.

Brown, Nadia E., Yusaku Horiuchi, Mala Htun, and David Samuels. 2020. "Gender Gaps in Perceptions of Political Science Journals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53(1): 114–21.

Burton, Doris-Jean. 1979. "Ten Years of Affirmative Action and the Changing Status of Women in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 12(1): 18–22.

Butcher, Charity, and T. Kersey. 2014. "When Winning Is Really Losing: Teaching Awards and Women Political Science Faculty." *PS: Political Science & Politics*.

Casey, Rose. 2021. "The Pandemic's Sexist Consequences." The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Chávez, Kerry, and Kristina M. W. Mitchell. 2020. "Exploring Bias in Student Evaluations." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53(2): 270–74.

Claypool, Vicki Hesli, and Carol Mershon. 2016. "Does Diversity Matter?." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4(3): 483–98.

Claypool, Vicki Hesli, Brian David Janssen, Dongkyu Kim, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2017. "Determinants of Salary Dispersion among Political Science Faculty." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(01): 146–56.

Closa, Carlos et al. 2020. "Mind the (Submission) Gap." *European Political Science* 19(3): 428–42.

Cooper, Marianne. 2021. "Women Leaders Took on Even More Invisible Work During the Pandemic." *Harvard Business Review*.

Dannals, J. E., Zlatev, J. J., Halevy, N., & Neale, M. A. 2021. "The Dynamics of Gender and Alternatives in Negotiation" *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

Disch, Lisa, and Jeani O'Brien. 2007. "Innovation Is Overtime." In *Feminist Waves, Feminist Generations*, ed. Hokulani K. Aikau, et. al, 140–68. University of Minnesota Press

Djupe, Paul, Amy Smith, and Anand Sokhey. 2018. "Explaining Gender in the Journals." *Denison Faculty Publications*.

Djupe, Paul A., Amy Erica Smith and Anand E. Sokhey. 2019. "Women in Political Science Publish Less than Men for These Reasons." *The Washington Post.*

Dion, Michelle L., Jane Lawrence Sumner, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2018. "Gendered Citation Patterns across Political Science and Social Science Methodology Fields." *Political Analysis* 26(3): 312–27.

Dion, Michelle L., and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2019. "Here's What We Can Do about the Gender Gap in Political Science Journals." *The* Washington Post.

Docka-Filipek, Danielle, and Lindsey B Stone. 2021."Twice a "housewife." *Gender, Work, and Organization* 28, no. 6.

Dolan, Kathleen and Lawless, Jennifer. 2020. "It Takes a Submission." *American Journal of Political Science*

El-Alayli, A., Hansen-Brown, A.A. & Ceynar, M. 2018."Dancing Backwards in High Heels." *Sex Roles* **79,** 136–150

Erosheva et al., 2020 "NIH peer review: Criterion scores completely account for racial disparities in overall impact scores.' *Science Advances*.

Flaherty, Colleen. 2015. "Panel Discussion Centers on Work-Life Balance Provisions in Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreements." *Inside Higher Ed.*

Flaherty, Colleen. 2017. "Study Finds Female Professors Outperform Men in Service." *Inside Higher Ed*.

Flaherty, Colleen. 2018. "Editorial Malpractice?" *Inside Higher Ed*.

Flaherty, Colleen. 2019 "Undue Burden."*Inside Higher Ed.*

Flaherty, Colleen. 2018. "Dancing Backwards in High Heels." *Inside Higher Ed.*

Flaherty, Colleen. 2020. "The Souls of Black Professors." *Inside Higher Ed*.

Flaherty, Colleen. 2021. "Multiple Black Professors Have Resigned in Recent Years over Racism." *Inside Higher Ed*.

Flaherty, Colleen. 2022. "Academe's Sticky Pay-Parity Problem." *Inside Higher Ed*.

Fowler, James H., and Dag W. Aksnes. 2007. "Does Self-Citation Pay?" Scientometrics 72(3): 427–37.

Fujii, Lee Ann. 2017. "The Real Problem with Diversity in Political Science." *The Duck of Minerva*.

Garcia, Matthew, and Ange-Marie H. Alfaro, A. 2021. Where Do We Begin? Preliminary Thoughts on Racial and Ethnic Diversity Within Political Science. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 54*(1), 141-143.

Geiger, Shirley Tolliver, and Toni-Michelle Travis. 1997. "The Status of African American Faculty in Political Science Departments in the Southern Region." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 30(2): 219–21.

Gonzales, Leslie D, and Kimberly Griffin. 2020. "Supporting Faculty During & After COVID-19." *Aspire, the National Alliance for Inclusive and Diverse Stem Faculty*.

Griffin, Kimberly, and Richard J. Reddick. 2011. "Surveillance and Sacrifice: Gender Differences in the Mentoring Patterns of Black Professors at Predominantly White Research Universities." *American Educational Research Journal* 48(5): 1032–57.

Griffin, Kimberly. 2020. "Institutional Barriers, Strategies, and Benefits to Increasing the Representation of Women and Men of Color in the Professoriate." In: Perna L. (eds) Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Vol 35. Springer.

Guarino, Cassandra M., and Victor M. H. Borden. 2017. "Faculty Service Loads and Gender" *Research in Higher Education* 58(6): 672–94.

Gutierrez y Muhs, Gabriella, Yolanda Niemann, Carmen Gonzalez, and Angela Harris. 2012. "Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia." *Utah State University Faculty Monographs*.

Hamlin, Kimberly. 2021. "Why Are There So Few Women Full Professors?" The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Hanasono, Lisa K. Ellen M. Broido, Margaret M. Yacobucci, Karen V. Root, Susana Peña, and Deborah A. O'Neil. 2018. "Secret Service: Revealing Gender Biases in the Visibility and Value of Faculty Service." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 12(1).

Hanasono, L. K., Matuga, J., & Yacobucci, M. M. (2020). Breaking the bamboo and glass ceilings: Challenges and opportunities for Asian and Asian American faculty leaders. In C. Chin-Chao and L. Ha (Eds.), *Asian women leadership: A cross-national and cross-sector comparison*:28-45. Routledge.

Harbin, M. Brielle, and Stacey A. Greene. 2022. "Navigating the Discipline in This Moment: Considering What It Means to Be Women of Color Political Scientists in the Current Political Space." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 55(2): 376–79.

Hardt, Heidi, Amy Erica Smith, Hannah June Kim, and Philippe Meister. 2019. "The Gender Readings Gap in Political Science Graduate Training." *The Journal of Politics* 81(4): 1528–32.

Harlow, Roxanna. 2003. "'Race Doesn't Matter, but...': The Effect of Race on Professors' Experiences and Emotion Management in the Undergraduate College Classroom." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 66(4): 348–63.

Hero, Rodney. 2015. "Reflections on 'How Political Science Can Be More Diverse.'" *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48(3): 469–71.

Hesli, Vicki, and Barbara Burrell. 1995. "Faculty Rank Among Political Scientists and Reports on the Academic Environment: The Differential Impact of Gender on Observed Patterns." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 28(1): 101–11.

Hesli et al. 2012. "Predicting Rank Attainment in Political Science: What Wlse Besides Publications Affects Promotion?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45(3): 475-92.

Hill, Kim., & Hurley, Patricia. 2022. New Evidence on the Relative Scholarly Productivity of Male versus Female Political Scientists. *PS: Political Science & Politics,* 1-5.

Htun, Mala. 2022. "Women's Equality and the COVID-19 Caregiving Crisis." *Perspectives on Politics* 20(2): 635–45.

Hutchings, Kimberly, and Patricia Owens. 2021. "Women Thinkers and the Canon of International Thought: Recovery, Rejection, and Reconstitution." *American Political Science Review* 115(2): 347–59.

Jeffries-El, Malika. "How Do We Mitigate the Impact of Systemic Bias on Faculty from Underrepresented Groups?" *Improving Undergraduate STEM Education Inititative.*

Jimenez, Miguel F. et al. 2019. "Underrepresented Faculty Play a Disproportionate Role in Advancing Diversity and Inclusion." *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 3(7): 1030–33.

June, Audrey Williams. 2015. "The Invisible Labor of Minority Professors." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Key, Ellen M. and Phillip J. Ardoin. 2019. "Gender Bias Shows up in Students' Evaluations of Their Professors. Can We Fix That? *Washington Post*.

Key, Ellen M., and Jane Lawrence Sumner. 2019. "You Research Like a Girl: Gendered Research Agendas and Their Implications." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52(4): 663–68.

Kim, Scott and Petra Moser. 2021. "Women in Science: Lessons from the Baby Boom". https://www.tcd.ie/Economics/assets/pdf/Seminars/20202021/women-in-science-lessons-from-the-baby-boom-KimMoser06Apr21.pdf

Kim, Eunji, and Shawn Patterson. 2022. "The Pandemic and Gender Inequality in Academia." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 55(1): 109–16.

King, Molly M. et al. 2017. "Men Set Their Own Cites High: Gender and Self-Citation across Fields and over Time." *Socius* 3: 1-22.

Lavariega, Monforti, Jessica and Michelson, Melissa. 2008. "Diagnosing the Leaky Pipeline: Continuing Barriers to the Retention of Latinas and Latinos in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 41 (1): 161–66.

Lavariega Monforti, Jessica L. 2012. "La Lucha: Latinas Surviving Political Science." In Gabriella Gutierrez, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. González, and Angela P. Harris, eds., *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia.* Boulder, CO: University of Colorado Press. 393-407.

Lavariega Monforti, Jessica L., and Melissa R. Michelson. 2019. "Building Our Communities: Women of Color Workshops in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52, 4: 141–143.

Link, Albert N., Christopher A. Swann, and Barry Bozeman. 2008. "A Time Allocation Study of University Faculty." *Economics of Education Review* 27(4): 363–74.

MacNell, Lillian, Adam Driscoll, and Andrea N. Hunt. 2015. "What's in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching." *Innovative Higher Education* 40(4): 291–303.

Majic, Samantha, and Dara Z. Strolovitch. 2020. "Editors' Introduction: Mentoring and Marginalization." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53(4): 763–69.

Maliniak, Daniel, Ryan Powers, and Barbara F. Walter. 2013. "The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations." International Organization 67(4): 889–922.

Malisch, Jessica L. et al. 2020. "Opinion: In the Wake of COVID-19, Academia Needs New Solutions to Ensure Gender Equity." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117(27): 15378–81.

Mason, Mary Ann. 2013. "In the Ivory Tower, Men Only." *Slate.*

Mathews, Kieran, Benson, Todd, Polsky, Sara, and Scungio, Lauren. 2020. "When Perceptions of Diversity Don't Match Progress." *Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)*.

Matthew, Patricia A. 2016. *Written/Unwritten: Diversity and the Hidden Truths of Tenure*. UNC Press.

Matias, J. Nathan, Neil Lewis Jr., and Elan Hope. 2021. "Universities Say They Want More Diverse Faculties. So Why Is Academia Still So White?" *FiveThirtyEight*.

Mazei, Jens et al. 2015. "A Meta-Analysis on Gender Differences in Negotiation Outcomes and Their Moderators." *Psychological Bulletin* 141(1): 85–104.

Mershon, Carol, and Denise Walsh. 2015. "Organizing Women: Diversifying Leadership and Addressing Discrimination in Political Science Departments." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48(3): 459–63.

Mershon, Carol, and Denise Walsh. 2016. "Diversity in Political Science: Why It Matters and How to Get It." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4(3): 462–66.

Michelson, Melissa R., and Jessica L. Lavariega Monforti. 2021. "Elusive Inclusion: Persistent Challenges Facing Women of Color in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 54 (3) 152-157.

Misra, Joya, Hickes Lundquist, Jennifer, Holmes, Elissa, and Agiomavritis, Stephanie. 2011. "The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work." *American Association of University Professors*.

Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hickes Lundquist, and Abby Templer. 2012. Gender, Work Time, and Care Responsibilities Among Faculty. *Sociological Forum* 27 (2): 300–23.

Misra, Joya et al. 2017. "Collaboration and Gender Equity among Academic Scientists." *Social Sciences* 6(1): 25.

Misra, Joya, Kerry Ann O'Meara, Dawn Culpepper, Audrey Jaeger, and Alexandra Kuvaeva 2021. "Gendered and Racialized Perceptions of Faculty Workloads." *Gender & Society* 35(3): 358–94.

Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin, and Vicki L. Hesli. 2013. "Women Don't Ask? Women Don't Say No? Bargaining and Service in the Political Science Profession." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 46(2): 355–69.

Mitchell, Kristina M. W., and Jonathan Martin. 2018. "Gender Bias in Student Evaluations." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(3): 648–52.

Monroe, Kristen, Saba Ozyurt, Ted Wrigley, and Amy Alexander. 2008. "Gender Equality in Academia: Bad News from the Trenches, and Some Possible Solutions." *Perspectives on Politics* 6: 215–33.

Monroe, Kristen, and William Chiu. 2010. "Gender Equality in the Academy: The Pipeline Problem." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43: 303–8.

Monroe, Kristen. 2013. "Tougher Standards for Female Scholars? The Psychology Behind Them and Policies to Eliminate Them." *International Studies Perspectives* 14 (4): 476 – 484 .

Monroe, Kristen Renwick, Jenny Choi , Emily Howell , Chloe Lampros-Monroe , Crystal Trejo , and Valentina Perez. 2014 . " Gender Equality in the Ivory Tower, and How Best to Achieve It ." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47 (2): 418 –26.

Moore, Helen A., Katherine Acosta, Gary Perry, and Crystal Edwards. 2010. "Splitting the Academy: The Emotions of Intersectionality at Work." *The Sociological Quarterly* 51(2): 179–204.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2018. "Race/ethnicity of college faculty". https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61

Niemann, Yolanda Flores, Gabriella Gutiérrez y Muhs, and Carmen G. González. 2020. *Presumed Incompetent II: Race, Class, Power, and Resistance of Women in Academia*. Utah State University Press.

Nittrouer, Christine L. et al. 2018. "Gender Disparities in Colloquium Speakers at Top Universities." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(1): 104–8.

Novkov, Julie and Scott Barclay. (2010). Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and the Transgendered in Political Science: Report on a Discipline-Wide Survey. PS *Political Science and Politics* 43(1): 95-106.

Oliveira, Diego F. M., Yifang Ma, Teresa K. Woodruff, and Brian Uzzi. 2019. "Comparison of National Institutes of Health Grant Amounts to First-Time Male and Female Principal Investigators." *JAMA* 321(9): 898–900.

O'Meara, Kerry Ann, Alexandra Kuvaeva, Gudrun Nyunt, Chelsea Waugaman, and Rose Jackson. 2017. "Asked More Often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them." *American Educational Research Journal* 54 (6): 1154–86.

O'Meara, Kerry Ann, Dawn Culpepper, and Lindsey L. Templeton. 2020. "Nudging Toward Diversity: Applying Behavioral Design to Faculty Hiring." *Review of Educational Research* 90(3): 311–48.

O'Meara, Kerry Ann, Joya Misra, Dawn Culpepper, Audrey Jaeger, and Alexandra Kuvaeva. 2021. "Why Are Women of Color in Academia Expected to Do Diversity Work?" *YES! Magazine*.

Park, Toby. 2011. "Do Faculty Members Get What They Deserve?: A Review of the Literature Surrounding the Determinants of Salary, Promotion and Tenure." *The Journal of the Professoriate* 6(1): 28-47.

Pebdani, Roxanna, Zeidan, Adriana, Low, Lee-Fay, Baillie, Andrew. 2022 "Pandemic Productivity in Academia" *Higher Education Research &Development*. Online first

Piscopo, Jennifer., Xydias, C., Atchison, A., & Och, M. 2022.. Reproducing Hierarchies at the APSA Annual Meeting: Patterns of Panel Attendance by Gender, Race, and Ethnicity. *PS: Political Science & Politics,* 1-8.

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

Pyke, Karen. 2011. "Service and Gender Inequity among Faculty." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44: 85–87.

Reid, Rebecca A., and Todd A. Curry. 2019. "Are We There Yet? Addressing Diversity in Political Science Subfields." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 52(2): 281–86.

Ropers, Rebecca. 2018. "Values and Expectations: An Invitation to Reflect on your 7:12."University of Minnesota Internal Memo.

Ropers, Rebecca. 2021. "Evaluating Faculty, Librarians on the Continuous Appointment Track, and P&A Teaching Specialists and Lecturers During 2020-21: Recommended and Required Practices". University of Minnesota.

Rosen, Andrew S. 2018. "Correlations, Trends and Potential Biases among Publicly Accessible Web-Based Student Evaluations of Teaching." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 43(1): 31–44.

Sampaio, Anna. 2006. "Women of Color Teaching Political Science: Examining the Intersections of Race, Gender, and Course Material in the Classroom." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39(4): 917–22.

Samuels, David J., and Dawn Langan Teele. 2021. "New Medium, Same Story? Gender Gaps in Book Publishing." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 54(1): 131–40.

Sapiro, Virginia, and David Campbell. 2018. "Report on the 2017 APSA Survey on Sexual Harassment at Annual Meetings." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(1): 197–206.

Sarsons, Heather. 2017. "Recognition for Group Work: Gender Differences in Academia." *American Economic Review* 107(5): 141–45.

Sarsons, Heather, Klarita Gërxhani, Ernesto Reuben, and Arthur Schram. 2021. "Gender Differences in Recognition for Group Work." *Journal of Political Economy* 129(1): 101–47.

Schuck, Victoria. 1969. "Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations1." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 2(4): 642–53.

Schneider, Monica C, Leigh Graham, Abigail S. Hornstein, Katie Jo LaRiviere, Kathleen M. Muldoon, Stephanie L. Shepherd, and Rachel Wagner. 2021. "Caregiving, Disability, and Gender in Academia in the Time of COVID-19." *ADVANCE Journal* 2 (3). https://doi.org/10.5399/osu/ADVJRNL.2.3.5.

Shalaby, Marwa, Nermin Allam, and Gail J. Buttorff. 2021. "Leveling the Field: Gender Inequity in Academia During COVID-19." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 54(4): 661–67.

Simien, Evelyn., & Sophia J. Wallace, S. 2022. Disproportionate Service: Considering the Impacts of George Floyd's Death and the Coronavirus Pandemic for Women Academics and Faculty of Color. *PS: Political Science & Politics*

Skinner, Makala, Betancourt, Nicole, and Wolff-Eisenberg, Christine. 2021. "The Disproportionate Impact of the Pandemic on Women and Caregivers in Academia." *Ithaka S+R*. h

Smith, Amy Erica and Heidi Hardt. 2019. "Professors Assign More Readings by Men than Women, Our Research Finds." The Washington Post.

Smith, Bettye P., and Billy Hawkins. 2011. "Examining Student Evaluations of Black College Faculty: Does Race Matter?" *The Journal of Negro Education* 80(2): 149–62.

Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group. 2017. "The Burden of Invisible Work in Academia: Social Inequalities and Time Use in Five University Departments." *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* 39: 228–45.

Squazzoni F, Bravo G, Grimaldo F, García-Costa D, Farjam M, Mehmani B .2021. "Gender gap in journal submissions and peer review during the first wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. A study on 2329 Elsevier journals." *PLoS ONE* 16(10): e0257919.

Sumner, Jane Lawrence. 2018. "The Gender Balance Assessment Tool (GBAT): A Web-Based Tool for Estimating Gender Balance in Syllabi and Bibliographies." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(2): 396–400.

Táíwò, Olúf£mi O., 2022. *Elite Capture : How the Powerful Took Over Identity Politics (And Everything Else)*. Haymarket Books.

Tatalovich, Raymond and Frendreis, John. 2019. "There's a Gender Gap in Who Wins Political Science Book Awards — and in How Widely They're Cited." *The Washington Post.*

Teele, Dawn Langan, and Kathleen Thelen. 2017. "Gender in the Journals: Publication Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics 50*(2): 433–47.

Tolleson-Rinehart, Sue, and Susan J. Carroll. 2006. ""Far from Ideal:" The Gender Politics of Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100 (4):507-13. 7

Turner, Caroline, Juan González, and Kathleen Wong (Lau). 2011. "Faculty Women of Color: The Critical Nexus of Race and Gender." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 4(4): 199–211.

Todd, Sarah. 2019. "A Top US Political Science Journal Ignored Race and Gender—until 12 Women Took Over." Quartz.

Toosi NR, Mor S, Semnani-Azad Z, Phillips KW, Amanatullah ET. "Who Can Lean In? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 2019;43(1):7-21.

Vettese, Troy. 2019. "Sexism in the Academy." *n+1*.

Vitalis, Robert. 2016. *White World Order, Black Power Politics* Cornell University Press.

Weisman, Sara. 2020. "Female Faculty Continue to Face Stubborn Wage Gap and Underrepresentation in Tenured Positions". *Diverse Issues in Higher Education.*

Weisshaar, Katherine. 2017. "Publish and Perish? An Assessment of Gender Gaps in Promotion to Tenure in Academia." *Social Forces* 96(2): 529–60.

Wilder, C. 2013. *Ebony and Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities.* New York, NY: Bloomsbury Press.

Williams June, Audrey and Brian O'Leary. 2021. "How Many Black Women Have Tenure on Your Campus? Search Here." *Chronicle of Higher Ed.*

Wilson, Janie H., Denise Beyer, and Heather Monteiro. 2014. "Professor Age Affects Student Ratings:" *College Teaching* 62(1): 20–24.

Wood, J. Luke, Adriel A. Hilton, and Carlos Nevarez. 2015. "Faculty of Color and White Faculty: An Analysis of Service in Colleges of Education in the Arizona Public University System." *Journal of the Professoriate* 8(1): 85–109.

Wright, Katharine A.M., Toni Haastrup, and Roberta Guerrina. 2021. "Equalities in Freefall? Ontological Insecurity and the Long-Term Impact of COVID-19 in the Academy." *Gender, Work & Organization* 28 163–67.

Yildirim, T. Murat, and Hande Eslen-Ziya. 2021. "The Differential Impact of COVID-19 on the Work Conditions of Women and Men Academics During the Lockdown." *Gender, Work, and Organization* 28, 243–49.