

***SUCCESS
AFTER
TENURE***

SUPPORTING MID-CAREER FACULTY

*EDITED BY VICKI L. BAKER,
LAURA GAIL LUNSFORD, GRETCHEN NEISLER,
MEGHAN J. PIFER, AND AIMEE LAPOINTE TEROSKY
FOREWORD BY MARY DEANE SORCINELLI*

SUCCESS AFTER TENURE

Supporting Mid-Career Faculty

Edited by

Vicki L. Baker

with Laura Gail Lunsford, Gretchen

Neisler, Meghan J. Pifer, and Aimee

LaPointe Terosky

Foreword by Mary Deane Sorcinelli

Stylus

STERLING, VIRGINIA



COPYRIGHT © 2019 BY STYLUS PUBLISHING, LLC.

Published by Stylus Publishing, LLC.

22883 Quicksilver Drive
Sterling, Virginia 20166-2019

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, recording, and information storage and retrieval, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Baker, Vicki L., 1978- editor. | Neisler, Gretchen, editor. | Lunsford, Laura Gail, editor. | Pifer, Meghan J., 1978- editor. | Terosky, Aimee LaPointe, editor.

Title: Success after tenure : supporting mid-career faculty / edited by Vicki L. Baker, Gretchen Neisler, Laura Gail Lunsford, Meghan J. Pifer, and Aimee LaPointe Terosky ; Foreword by Mary Deane Sorcinelli.

Description: First edition. | Sterling, Virginia : Stylus Publishing, [2018] | Includes bibliographical references and index. Identifiers: LCCN 2018012526 (print) | LCCN 2018028011 (ebook) | ISBN 9781620366820 (uPDF) | ISBN 9781620366837 (ePUB, mobi) | ISBN 9781620366806 (cloth : alk. paper) | ISBN 9781620366813 (paperback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9781620366820 (library networkable e-edition) | ISBN 9781620366837 (consumer e-edition) Subjects: LCSH: College teachers--Tenure--United States. | Mid-career--United States. | Career development--United States. Classification: LCC LB2335.7 (ebook) | LCC LB2335.7 .S84 2018 (print) | DDC 378.1/2140973--dc23 LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018012526>

13-digit ISBN: 978-1-62036-680-6 (cloth)
13-digit ISBN: 978-1-62036-681-3 (paperback)
13-digit ISBN: 978-1-62036-682-0 (library networkable e-edition)
13-digit ISBN: 978-1-62036-683-7 (consumer e-edition)

Printed in the United States of America

All first editions printed on acid-free paper
that meets the American National Standards Institute
Z39-48 Standard.

Bulk Purchases
Quantity discounts are available for use in workshops and
for staff development.
Call 1-800-232-0223

First Edition, 2019

*We dedicate this book to mid-career faculty as they seek
to reimagine the next phase of their careers, and to the
individuals who support and inspire them.*

- Trower, C. A., & Mathews, K. R. (2007, August 1). *Tenure-Track Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey: Highlights report* [Statistical Report]. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from <http://coache.gse.harvard.edu/news/one-two-policy-punch-be-sure-consider-importance-and-effectiveness>
- Trower, C. A., & Mathews, K. R. (2010). *The experience of tenure-track faculty at research universities: Analysis of COACHE survey results by academic area and gender*. [Statistical Report]. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from <http://coache.gse.harvard.edu/news/coache-releases-first-study-pre-tenure-faculty-satisfaction-discipline-sex>
- Tufte, E. (1983). *The visual display of quantitative information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.
- University of Central Florida. (n.d.). *Faculty excellence: COACHE*. Retrieved from <https://facultyexcellence.ucf.edu/coache/>
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 29, no. 5). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1–19.
- Weinberg, S. L., & Scott, M. A. (2013). The impact of uncapping of mandatory retirement on postsecondary institutions. *Educational Researcher*, 42(6), 338–348.
- William T. Grant Foundation. (n.d.). *Research-practice partnerships*. Retrieved from <http://rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org/>

NAVIGATING A FOGGY CLIMATE

Women Associate Professors' Sense of Agency and Work Environment Experiences

Courtney Lennartz and KerryAnn O'Meara

Despite progress in women's overall representation among tenured faculty, the percentage of women full professors, especially in research universities, remains stubbornly low. This chapter examines gender differences among associate professors' sense of agency and work environment factors that likely contribute to differential progress in associate to full advancement among female and male faculty at one institution. Work environment survey data of a large, very high research activity, public institution in the Northeast reveal common challenges embedded within all associate professors' career paths. However, we consider the distinct additional challenges faced by female associates versus male associates. We address five areas where female associates noted greater concern and challenges than their male counterparts at the same rank: workload, work-life balance, resources, networks, and agency in career advancement. After considering the facilitators and consequences of challenges faced by female associate professors from the perspective of "foggy climate," we offer recommendations for associate professor mentoring, career development, and institutional policy and practice.

We also address two questions that emerge from the results: (a) Who, if anyone, benefits from the ambiguity female associate professors reported experiencing, and (b) how do implicit bias and gendered logics and norms constrain agency, and thereby advantage male faculty over female faculty in promotion to full professor? We conclude that changes are needed to enhance associate professor agency by reducing the ambiguity that surrounds workload, resources, work-life integration, promotion criteria, and access to

networks. We acknowledge that such change is difficult because there are those who benefit from the status quo.

Review of the Literature

We begin by reviewing the literature on faculty agency. We use agency theory to consider how ambiguity in tenure and promotion pathways can hinder female associate professor advancement to full professor. We then review the extant literature on women associate professors' differential time to promotion and the factors that shape career paths from associate to full professor. Finally, we draw on the metaphor of foggy climate to illustrate how ambiguity in promotion and tenure criteria can create differential work experiences for women and men, and explain how gendered expectations may be influencing faculty workload in ways that are disadvantageous to female associate professors' career advancement.

Agency

Several studies of faculty careers and professional lives have used agency as a theoretical framework (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006; Gonzales, 2015; Lester & Sallee, 2009; Neumann, Terosky, & Schell, 2006; O'Meara & Campbell, 2011; O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008; Terosky, O'Meara, & Campbell, 2014). Agency theory is particularly useful for uncovering the ways in which faculty navigate, negotiate, and reframe their environment to enact their professional goals (O'Meara & Campbell, 2011). We define *agency* as perspectives and actions taken to achieve career goals (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014; O'Meara, 2015; O'Meara & Campbell, 2011). Agency perspectives are thought processes that make meaning of situations and contexts in ways that advance personal goals, whereas agency actions are steps that individuals take to pursue their goals (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014; O'Meara & Campbell, 2011). Research has shown significant benefits to feeling agency in work, life, and relationships (Alkire, 2005; Archer, 2003; Marshall, 2005). In academic life specifically, agency has been linked to satisfaction and career advancement (Gonzales, 2015; Neumann et al., 2006; O'Meara, 2015, 2016; Terosky & O'Meara, 2011). However, a lack of clarity around advancement criteria, mentoring, work overload, and work-life constraints can make associate professors, and female associate professors especially, among the least satisfied faculty (Baldwin, Lunceford, & Vanderlinden, 2005; O'Meara, 2015; Terosky et al., 2014) and contribute to women's differential time to advancement (Barrett & Barrett, 2011; Buckley, Sanders, Shih, Kallar, & Hampton, 2000; O'Meara, 2011; Sax,

Hagedorn, Arredondo, & Dicrisi, 2002). Ambiguity removes one's sense of control and constrains choice and the ability to plan, which can contribute to women being stalled in their advancement (Britton, 2009, 2017; Hart, 2016; Terosky & O'Meara, 2011).

Differential Time to Advancement

It is well documented in the literature that female faculty take longer to advance from associate to full professor, or never reach the rank of full professor, during their academic careers in research universities (Allan, 2011; Britton, 2009, 2017; Conley & Leslie, 2002; Geisler, Kaminski, & Berkley, 2007; Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011; Modern Language Association of America, 2009; Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2012). A number of explanations have been posed for why this differential progress exists. For example, scholars have examined women leaking out of the academic pipeline and representation of women and minority faculty (Marschke, Laursen, Nielsen, & Dunn-Rankin, 2007; Van Anders, 2004; Wolfinger, Mason, & Goulden, 2008); aspects of chilly climate for women (Allan & Madden, 2006); and isolation as a result of being underrepresented, or a lack of critical mass, in certain fields and at the professor level (Carrigan, Quinn, & Riskin, 2011; Xu, 2008). Instead of a glass ceiling, De Welde and Laursen (2011) argue that female faculty face a "glass obstacle course" (p. 576) of unequal gendered processes in the academy, including exclusion from the "Old Boys' Club," sexism, a lack of women role models, and difficult work-life choices (p. 571). These obstacles are considered glass obstacles because they are often "implicit and unanticipated" (p. 571; see also Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995). Another metaphor or explanation that has been gaining traction over the last few years, and which we will use to examine the issue of female associate professor work experiences in this chapter, is the concept of a foggy climate (Banerjee & Pawley, 2013; Beddoes & Pawley, 2014).

Foggy Climate

Social and organizational psychologists have long found that implicit bias and gender norms and logics are most likely to emerge and shape behavior when work conditions are ambiguous (Babcock, Laschever, Gelfand, & Small, 2003; Beddoes & Pawley, 2014; Dovidio, 2001; Heilman, 2001). Whether during hiring processes or promotion and tenure evaluation, inequity and biases operate more in environments with ambiguous evaluation criteria, whereas environments with concrete, objective evaluation criteria "mitigate the operation of prejudices" and inequity (Beddoes, Schimpf, & Pawley, 2014, p. 5). Ambiguity in faculty roles, advancement standards, rules

of negotiation, and collaboration can create a work environment where gender biases emerge to create different work experiences for women and men faculty. For example, if there are no clear expectations or guidance on how many committees faculty members should serve on, or how many advisees they should have, female faculty especially may serve on more committees and advise more students than necessary.

Banerjee and Pawley (2013) and Beddoes and Pawley (2014) describe such faculty work environments, where the standards for tenure and promotion are unclear, as having a “foggy climate.” We draw on their work and the work of prior scholarship on women associate professor advancement naming this problem (Banerjee & Pawley, 2013; Britton, 2009, 2017; Gardner & Veliz, 2014; Hart, 2009, 2016; Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2003) to frame our analysis of faculty work environment experiences. Through this lens, we can see how female associate professors may find certain aspects of their work environment to be fair, equitable, and gender-neutral and find other aspects to be gendered. One way in which faculty work can be gender-neutral is in the submission of annual faculty reports for merit evaluation. The formatting and categories required in the submission materials (e.g., faculty curriculum vitae) are standardized, so it is impossible for the university system, in any reasonable way, to request men and women to submit these materials differently. However, many more areas of faculty work experience for associate professors are less likely to have as clearly delineated lines. For instance, many departments do not track faculty’s campus service commitments or student advising loads. As a result, female associate professors may be asked or assigned to serve on more committees and pick up more advisees throughout the semester than their male peers because they are perceived, or wish to be perceived, as helpful and accommodating (Basow, 2000; Sprague & Massoni, 2005). Without articulating what is expected of associate professors in terms of workload, gendered expectations among colleagues, students, and even the female associate professors themselves may shape outcomes that are disadvantageous for career advancement.

Time is one of the most valuable resources available to faculty. Yet female faculty in research universities repeatedly report not spending enough time on research because of time spent on teaching (Winslow, 2010) and service roles (O’Meara, 2016; O’Meara, Kuvaeva, & Nyunt, 2017). Heavier teaching and service loads have been shown to negatively impact research productivity (Aguirre, 2000; Bellas & Toutkoushian, 1999; Carrigan et al., 2011; Link, Swann, & Bozemann, 2008). This is because teaching and service are often weighted less heavily in local academic reward systems. As a result, time spent on areas outside of research can disadvantage faculty when they go up for promotion and tenure (Aguirre, 2000; Bellas & Toutkoushian,

1999; Carrigan et al., 2011; Link et al., 2008). Although assistant professors are typically shielded from heavy teaching loads and time-intensive service commitments to improve their chances of achieving tenure (Fairweather, 1996; O’Meara et al., 2017; Trower, 2012), associate professors tend to be overloaded with such responsibilities (Misra, Lundquist, & Templer, 2012; Neumann & Terosky, 2007; Trower, 2012; Ward, 2003). This is especially evident among female associate professors given their double bind of being both tenured and women in the academy. Researchers have found female faculty are asked more often to serve on committees, volunteer, and engage in less promotable service tasks than their male counterparts (Babcock, Recalde, Vesterlund, & Weingart, 2016; Misra et al., 2011; Mitchell & Hesli, 2013; O’Meara et al., 2017). Furthermore, O’Meara (2016) found female professors reported greater communal orientations toward campus service and men more individualistic orientations, meaning some women will take up institutional housekeeping activities at the expense of their own career advancement in order to keep their departments afloat. The foggier the set of expectations for workload, the greater the likelihood that bias will emerge in what work is assigned, taken up, and recognized in the local academic reward system (O’Meara et al., 2017).

The same can be said about resources. Research has shown when circumstances are ambiguous and it is unclear whether it is possible to negotiate, women are less likely to ask for what they want (Leibbrandt & List, 2014). Likewise, Babcock and colleagues (2016) found that when a less preferred task is allocated (e.g., writing a report, serving on a committee, etc.), women either volunteer or are asked to volunteer, and women accept requests to volunteer for such tasks more often than men. These tasks are often unrecognized in promotion and tenure reviews. They also found that women are more likely to say yes to tasks with low promotability. In situations where gender norms seem to be salient (e.g., people expect women to conform to gendered stereotypes), women may give away one of their most important resources—time—in order to enact gendered norms about helpfulness and prevent backlash from their colleagues or students (Heilman, 2001).

Research suggests that female faculty also have less access than male faculty to the types of collegial and social networks that convey system knowledge and information helpful for advancement (O’Meara, 2016; Perna, 2001; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Such mentoring, networks, and knowledge about career advancement is imperative given that formalized standards for promotion to full professor are rare and often intentionally vague (Britton, 2010). Britton (2009) found in one study of associate professor advancement criteria that “there were no statements at all about what is required to achieve promotion, and sometimes tenure, or there were statements that were made

deliberatively unclear" (p. 19). Britton (2010) noted this left associate professors scrambling to figure out "unspecified elements" (p. 7) of what it takes to be promoted to full professor at their institution.

In addition to unclear and changing promotion standards and limited access to mentoring and knowledge-sharing networks, female faculty often report feeling that they have to meet a higher bar of competence than their male colleagues to be perceived as qualified in their roles (Britton, 2009, 2010, 2017; Fox, 2010; Hart, 2016; O'Meara, 2015). Such ambiguity hurts female faculty members' sense of agency in career advancement (Terosky & O'Meara, 2011).

Removing ambiguous institutional policies and practices, increasing clarity in access to and distribution of resources, and fostering more equitable ways of organizing professional and personal interactions is critical to associate professor advancement (Baldwin & Chang, 2006; Roos & Gatta, 2009). Additionally, scholars have documented negative personal health as well as retention, satisfaction, and productivity consequences of foggy climates for female faculty (Eagan & Garvey, 2015; Stout, Staiger, & Jennings, 2007).

Data and Methods

We will refer to the university that these data were collected from as Land-Grant University (LGU) in order to preserve anonymity. LGU is a public research university in the Northeast. It is highly selective in terms of admissions, as it serves approximately 40,000 students (roughly 70% undergraduate) and engages in extensive research activity, with over \$500 million in research expenditures. In 2015, at the time of the work environment survey that will be discussed later, there were 1,611 tenure-track and tenured faculty employed at LGU. Female faculty made up 32% of tenure-track and tenured faculty overall—roughly 46% of assistant professors, 35% of associate professors, and 23% of full professors.

The university also has an active ADVANCE program office, which was initially supported by a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant, but is now supported through campus funds. The ADVANCE program works to support the recruitment, retention, advancement, and professional growth of women and underrepresented minority faculty at LGU in ways that improve the workplace for all faculty. Since the LGU ADVANCE program was initiated seven years ago, LGU has seen greater gender equity in time to advancement from associate to full professor. However, as we discuss later in this chapter, there is still much work to do in order to reach gender equity in the work experiences and time to advancement of female associate professors to full professors at LGU. As part of their annual reporting to NSF, LGU

ADVANCE studied associate professor advancement in the 2015–2016 academic year. Institutional researchers found that among those promoted to full professor by 2016, the average time to advancement for women was 1.34 times longer than the average time to advancement for men. In an attempt to better understand reasons male and female associate professors might be advancing at differential rates, we analyzed Faculty Work Environment Survey (FWES) data collected from LGU faculty in 2015.

The FWES was administered to all full-time, tenure-track faculty in 2015. The survey was developed using agency theory, and survey items related to agency in promotion and tenure were developed after an extensive review of the literature on agency and factors that may benefit or constrain faculty choices in the promotion and tenure process. The survey was reviewed by content experts, pilot tested, and revised before implementation. It was designed to measure the degree to which faculty perceive and experience their units, colleges, and university to be investing in their professional growth and creating an inclusive work environment. Much social science and educational research has found that supporting faculty professional growth (e.g., through agency, learning, professional networks, and recognition) and creating inclusive work environments (e.g., fair workload, diversity climate, work-life climate) is linked to faculty retention, advancement, and productivity (Campbell & O'Meara, 2014; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; O'Meara et al., 2008). In this chapter, we analyze the results from the 2015 administration of the FWES to better understand differences in experiences of work environment that could be contributing to differential time to advancement among female and male associate professors at LGU. Of the full-time tenure-track or tenured faculty at LGU, 53.3% ($N = 854$) completed the 2015 FWES. Among the faculty who completed the 2015 FWES, 23.5% were assistant professors ($N = 201$), 32.4% were associate professors ($N = 277$), and 44.0% were full professors ($N = 376$). *t*-tests for independent means were conducted to quantitatively illustrate gender differences in time to advancement and work experiences that might be contributing to this observed difference.

We also analyzed open-ended comments from the same FWES for associate professors by gender. One of the open-ended questions from the survey asked whether faculty had any concerns about their opportunity to advance in their careers at LGU. Of the associate professors who participated in the 2015 FWES, 48.2% ($N = 134$) indicated a concern for advancement. Of the female associate professors who indicated a concern for advancement at LGU, 28 elaborated on their concern(s) in an open-ended response. We also drew on another open-ended question that asked faculty members whether or not the distribution of campus service work in their department was fair

and why or why not. The female associate professor participants were more likely than male associate professor participants to report feeling that the distribution of campus service work in their department was unfair. Among those indicating unfair distribution, 62 female associate professors provided explanations. These open-ended comments from the FWES data source are woven throughout this chapter in order to offer a rich portrait of the foggy climate hindering LGU female associate professors' advancement to full professor.

Findings

Before considering issues of gender in associate professor experiences, it is important to provide additional context related to the overall 2015 FWES results. There were 84 survey items on the FWES covering such areas as workload, learning opportunities, professional networks, mentoring, career advancement opportunities, resources, and work-life balance. There were significant differences (a) between faculty of color and White faculty in 18 of 84 items, (b) between male and female faculty on 44 of 84 items, and (c) among associate professors and other ranks on 77 out of 84 items. Associate professors were significantly less positive than assistant and full professors about work experiences in 77 of the 84 work environment survey items. We began with this context because it is important to note that consistent with previous work (Terosky et al., 2014), there are distinct career challenges faced by associates that cause dissatisfaction, regardless of gender. Given over half of the overall survey items were also significantly less positive by gender, gender clearly played a salient role in LGU work experiences. In the analysis that follows, we present five areas of work environment where all LGU associate professors had concerns that were greater than their assistant and full professor colleagues. However, in these same areas we identified gender differences among male and female associate professors, using *t*-test analyses for independent means (see Table 14.1) and supplemented by open-ended comments. Given that we are drawing on qualitative comments to further explore these gender differences, and specific challenges articulated by female associate professors, we only shared qualitative quotes from female associate faculty throughout this chapter.

Ambiguity in Service Expectations and Workload Distribution

Female associate professors felt less in control over their participation in service activities than male associate professors ($t(270) = 2.547, p < .05$).

TABLE 14.1
Mean Differences Among Male and Female
Associate Professors' FWES Responses

	Gender		T	df
	Male	Female		
Teaching Research and Service				
I feel in control of my participation in service activities	3.22 (0.996)	2.91 (1.042)	2.547*	270
Overall, I feel the distribution of campus service work in my department is fair	1.35 (0.48)	1.55 (0.499)	-3.309***	271
Assistance with finding grants	3.08 (0.942)	2.71 (1.052)	3.117**	270
Expectations for committee service	3.21 (0.903)	2.85 (1.012)	3.071**	271
Assistance with research administration in my unit	3.11 (1.07)	2.78 (1.104)	2.498*	268
The amount of time I spend on research versus teaching and service	3.08 (1.092)	2.57 (1.145)	3.741***	267
Work-Life Balance				
In general, I feel I have control over creating a satisfying work-life balance	3.51 (0.968)	3.08 (1.118)	3.467***	272
I am satisfied with my unit's culture around work-life balance	3.31 (1.021)	3.03 (1.15)	2.154*	273
The institution does what it can to make family life and the tenure track compatible	3.02 (1.061)	2.68 (1.036)	2.71***	272
There is NO bias against family caregiving in my unit	3.47 (1.008)	3.05 (1.056)	3.329***	269
Resources				
My salary and benefits	2.81 (1.186)	2.47 (1.146)	2.386*	270
Clerical/administrative support	3.34 (1.051)	2.88 (1.179)	3.41***	269
The quality of campus facilities	3.37 (1.000)	3.09 (1.087)	2.207*	268
Networks				
Individuals at this institution have made an effort to connect me with important people in my field	2.99 (1.153)	2.66 (1.125)	2.382*	274

Table 14.1 (Continued)

	Gender		T	df
	Male	Female		
I am satisfied with the opportunity I have to collaborate with other LGU faculty	3.37 (1.175)	3.05 (1.132)	2.256*	273
Agency in Career				
The opportunities for female faculty at LGU are at least as good as those for male faculty	3.74 (0.943)	2.7 (1.159)	8.142***	270
I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar	2.71 (1.132)	3.45 (1.121)	-5.418***	265
My unit makes genuine efforts to recruit female faculty	4.05 (0.917)	3.74 (0.997)	2.666**	271
Faculty in my unit have the freedom to succeed here if they work hard	3.7 (0.957)	3.41 (1.076)	1.076**	271

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below means.

Female associate professors were also less likely to feel that the distribution of campus service work in their departments was fair ($t(271) = -3.309$, $p < .001$), and reported feeling less satisfied with expectations for committee service ($t(271) = 3.071$, $p < .01$). We examined open-ended responses regarding the distribution of campus service work and perception of fairness. Among those from female associate professors, several themes emerged from the open-ended responses: (a) Women, and those who have performed well in previous service roles, are asked more often to engage in service; (b) different expectations often result in uneven distribution of service responsibilities; (c) women take up more service than others in their unit; and (d) there are no consequences for poor service. One female associate professor explains:

Some individuals are recognized as not contributing and/or not being good committee members for one reason or another. As a result, these individuals are not put on committees or asked to do things, which increases the burden of work on the same people who do most of the work. In a sense the competent and highly organized are "punished" by being asked to do even more and those who are not competent, not responsible, not organized are "rewarded" by being left alone and not given new responsibilities. In general, the female faculty members shoulder the greatest service burden.

Several female associate professors also indicated that the service work in their department is not evenly distributed due to different expectations for service. As stated by one female faculty member:

I think the expectation is that it will be fair but there are some faculty who give their all and others who squeeze by. That is a universal issue but needs to be accounted for in the distribution of service work.

Another faculty member surveyed expanded on this issue:

I think expectations are different for different people. There is no sense of what is a "sufficient load," so I think that there are some people who do an awful lot, and others who don't do very much, because there is no sense of accountability or a benchmark there.

Both women shared the same conclusion and experiences that when a defined set of service expectations was not provided, some faculty do more than their fair share of service work, whereas others in the department do little to none. In other words, a lack of transparency in service work can create an environment where there is an uneven distribution of service responsibility, with women often taking on more service responsibility than men in the same department. Without the ability to benchmark service workload against others in the department, there is ambiguity in what is considered a sufficient service load. This ambiguity can result in a lower sense of agency among female associate professors regarding their ability to say yes or no to service requests.

Although most of the female associate professors do not directly cite gender in their responses, there were gendered themes observed among women's open-ended responses that were not observed in men's open-ended responses. For instance, many female associate professors indicated that there are no consequences for poor service work in their department, which leads to an unfair distribution of campus service workload. As explained by one woman in particular, "the most competent people have to do the most work. Some people have largely avoided service obligations by screwing up the ones they've been assigned." There is an underlying tone of frustration in this female associate professor's response that some people are able to get out of future service work by performing poorly on the service work they have previously been assigned. Furthermore, there was a pattern of among female associates' open-ended responses regarding a lack of policy or practice in place to hold poor service performers accountable. Another female faculty member explained that "several people seem to be protected, for unclear reasons, except that they are ineffective, or ignore the service duty, and are then

not put on committees, and thereby rewarded for bad behavior." Qualitative comments reflected low morale among female associate professors and their service loads as a result of the current patterns of ambiguity and lack of accountability in how service roles are assigned, taken up, and rewarded.

Finally, female associate professors at LGU also reported feeling less satisfied than their male counterparts about the amount of time they spend on research versus teaching and service ($t(267) = 3.741, p < .001$). One woman expressed these concerns directly: "[LGU] provides great opportunities, both on campus and off campus. However, my main challenge is in carving out time to advance in grant writing and publishing. Much time gets spent in service activities and teaching." Some women even referred to their teaching and service loads as burdens in terms of the time they take away from research: "The administrative and teaching burden on faculty has steadily increased due to state budget constraints. This has significantly diminished the time that faculty have to allocate to scholarly pursuits." Finally, several other female associates in this sample expressed concern about lack of time to conduct research because of time-intensive administrative responsibilities. "I am so bogged down in administrative duties that I have little time to do my research." According to these female associate professors, high service, teaching, and administrative duties (e.g., submitting paperwork, grant writing, etc.) contributed to their reduced time for research, thereby negatively influencing their agency perspectives and actions regarding their ability to be promoted to full professor.

Overall, female associate professors found it difficult to balance their service workload with research needed for advancement to full professor because of vagueness in what work tasks were expected, who was supposed to ask whom to do what, how much of each work area was expected, how performance would be evaluated, and whether or not faculty would be rewarded or penalized for high or low performance in teaching and campus service areas.

Ambiguity in How to Integrate Work and Life

Compared to male associate professors at LGU, female associate professors reported feeling less in control over their ability to create a satisfying work-life balance ($t(272) = 3.467, p < .001$). In the open-ended comments of this survey item, one associate professor explained her struggle concisely: "I am not sure if I can advance further due to: 1) accepting administrative responsibilities early in my career, and 2) my current reluctance to push the 80+ hour work week." According to this faculty member, finding work-life balance comes at a cost, given her perception that many of her male and female

colleagues at LGU work 80-hour work weeks. Many female associates at LGU felt that their current workload constrained their career advancement, as well as the number of hours they are willing to devote to their work each week, given other life priorities.

Female associate professors were also less inclined to agree that LGU does what it can to make family life and the tenure track compatible ($t(272) = 2.71, p < .001$). As expressed by one female faculty member, "As a working mother, I am balancing my scholarly career with an administrative position and family. I have been teaching, administrating, and raising my kids for the last five years. . . . I have little time to do research." Another woman explained how life got in the way of her research productivity, thus leaving her with limited options for advancement at LGU:

Due to family obligations . . . and health problems . . . my publication track record slowed down and I had difficulty getting unstuck. When I asked repeatedly for help and guidance, none was forthcoming. I don't see a clear path to full and have moved into administration; but my options [to move into administration] are limited due to my rank.

Several other open-ended comments emphasized a need for childcare on campus and a need to normalize the use of parental leave and tenure delay at LGU in order to make family life and the tenure track more compatible.

Female associate professors were also less satisfied with their unit's culture around work-life balance than their male colleagues ($t(273) = 2.154, p < .05$). One woman associate professor in particular noted:

To be a truly successful faculty member in a research-intensive university, one elects to invest time and energy in research, without what some might call a work-life balance. Research is their life. That is the balance. That is a choice those individuals make. Their reward is great, and apparently worth it to them and their families (if they have families).

These open-ended responses revealed ambiguity in how much time a faculty member had to devote to work in order to be successful, whether it was possible to raise a family and be a competitive and productive scholar, and where support might be found for faculty balancing family and faculty commitments. Such ambiguity resulted in lower perceived agency for achieving a satisfying work-life balance among female associate professors at LGU.

Ambiguity in Availability of Resources

Female associate professors were also less satisfied than male associate professors with their access to resources. Specifically, women reported being less

satisfied with their salary and benefits ($t(270) = 2.386, p < .05$), administrative support ($t(269) = 3.41, p < .001$), and the quality of on-campus facilities ($t(268) = 2.207, p < .05$). Regarding salary and benefits, one quote in particular summarized the situation many female associate professors have faced at LGU:

Budgetary constraints over the last several years have seriously affected my compensation; my salary lags well behind the average of my colleagues of the same rank in my department. This forces me to take on additional work in order to increase my income. Further budget cuts have affected the amount of funds available for conference and research travel, book and equipment purchases, [and so on]. I am concerned about the impact of these cuts on my ability to pursue the research necessary to advance my career.

Several women expressed dissatisfaction with differential access to administrative support, as well as equipment and facilities. According to one woman associate professor:

My department chair regularly favors male faculty in sharing information (e.g., about availability of equipment and facilities, funding opportunities, administrative support). Male faculty are offered summer salary for large administrative service contributions to the department. When I requested compensation [for time-consuming work] I was yelled at for asking and told that, people are being fired due to budget issues, indicating I was being out of line for asking for compensation.

Clearly uncertainty in the legitimacy of negotiating for resources worked against this associate professor who left the conversation dumbfounded at perceived double standards. For some female associate professors, dissatisfaction with resources left them wondering whether leaving LGU might be a strategic career decision. One faculty member notes:

I feel that moving here has not let me advance as quickly and as far as I could have elsewhere. The opportunities available when I came here were misrepresented and/or were unsupported with sufficient resources or administrative support for me to succeed. The amount of time I have spent on those obligations has been costly. I believe that my time here has not been the strategic move that I thought it would be.

In sum, female associate professors reported ambiguity in how to access resources, who grants them, and how to compete for them, in addition to inequities in who is able to ask for them. We found that this perceived

ambiguity in the availability of, or access to, resources fueled dissatisfaction among female associates.

Ambiguity in Professional Networks

Female associate professors were less satisfied than male associate professors regarding the effort that individuals at LGU made in connecting them with important people in the field ($t(274) = 2.382, p < .05$) and with their opportunity to collaborate with other faculty at LGU ($t(273) = 2.256, p < .05$). According to several female associate professors at LGU, without ADVANCE mentoring programs, they would not have an on-campus network. One faculty member explains:

It should be noted that ALL of my answers about my core network of colleagues on campus were with reference to the writing group [run by my ADVANCE professor. Without that group, I would have no intellectual network of colleagues on campus.

Another woman expressed a similar concern regarding collaboration with colleagues at LGU:

I do not have such a community to support and mentor my research. I benefited from the support of a sabbatical and have been supported to attend numerous conferences where I have developed a supportive network of colleagues. However, back on campus I have been severely limited in my ability to complete research.

For many female associate professors, professional networks were primarily with off-campus rather than with on-campus colleagues. Overall, we found confusion in how to access stronger on- and off-campus contacts and professional networks among female associate professors at LGU.

Lower Sense of Agency in Career Advancement

Female associate professors were less inclined to agree that the faculty in their unit have the freedom to succeed if they work hard ($t(271) = 1.076, p < .01$), and that the opportunities for female faculty at LGU are at least as good as those for male faculty ($t(270) = 8.142, p < .001$). For instance, one woman stated:

The path to becoming a full professor seems unclear and most opportunities that would aid in earning full do not seem available to me. The department head is highly biased toward male faculty members in terms of key

assignments, praise, and information sharing (especially with regard to funding opportunities).

As summed up by one woman associate professor:

I wonder if I am doing too much that doesn't count. . . . I wonder if that is limiting my productivity and keeping me from opportunities. . . . I am also unsure if the work I am doing is having the right impact. The process of advancing from associate to full seems more nebulous and fuzzy, and while I think I am making good progress, I am not certain.

Female associate professors felt there was great ambiguity in what matters for advancement, in addition to a lack of knowledge about requirements for promotion and a lack of access to promotable opportunities. They also felt that gender bias influenced interactions between faculty and administrators.

Finally, female associate professors agreed more strongly with the statement "I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar" ($t(265) = -5.418, p < .001$). Many women emphasized having to prove their competence to their male colleagues: "[I] was told by male colleagues that I would make tenure because I am a woman, as opposed to being competent and good at what I do." Other women explained they had to face an uphill battle throughout their time at LGU to prove themselves and gain the respect (and comparable compensation) of their colleagues. One faculty member states:

I have been underpaid compared to my colleagues for years and the only way I was able to advance was by getting job offers. Even then, I had to fight tooth and nail to get a base salary somewhat close to the others that started around the same time as me. There are three reasons why I feel like I was discriminated against: 1) I'm female in a mainly men's unit, 2) My field/specialty isn't considered to be legitimate by some in the unit, and 3) I don't have a research appointment so I used to be discredited by my peers as not having the same value as a 70% research faculty. I've had to work harder than most to prove to everyone that I deserve every ounce of their respect and the same salary level. I've worked at [LGU] 14 years and this is the first year that I felt like I'm actually close to receiving a similar compensation to my peers in my unit.

Many female associates felt that it was unclear what tasks and scholarship would be considered meritorious, what was considered enough to go up for promotion, and what standards would be used to judge their work. These challenges constrained female associate professors' agency in career advancement.

Discussion

As discussed in our findings, female associate professors noted greater concern and challenges in the areas of workload, work-life balance, resources, networks, and agency in career advancement. Considering these findings from the perspective of foggy climate (Banerjee & Pawley, 2013; Beddoes et al., 2014) helps us to see how ambiguity constrains agency toward career advancement. It is also clear how such ambiguity might cause many female associate professors to leave the institution or never go up for promotion to full professor. In this section, we relate our findings to prior research and consider who, if anyone, benefits from foggy climates in the academy.

Consistent with previous research (Misra et al., 2012; Neumann & Terosky, 2007; Trower, 2012) and our FWES findings, compared to their male counterparts, female associates were less likely to believe the distribution of campus service work in their department was fair, less in control over their participation in service activities, and less satisfied with expectations for committee service. Women also reported that female faculty perceived as competent and good at service work were asked to serve more often than those who had turned down service requests in the past or had performed poorly in past service assignments (Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; O'Meara, 2016; O'Meara et al., 2017). Therefore, ambiguity about who does what, coupled with a lack of accountability, shapes the distribution of service roles.

Several research studies have shown heavy service loads among associate professors are linked to longer time to advancement to full professor (Babcock et al., 2016; Misra et al., 2011; Stout et al., 2007). At LGU specifically, female associate professors were less satisfied with the amount of time available to commit to research and other scholarly pursuits due to heavy service loads and administrative duties. Thus, reduced agency in how work time is spent results in lower satisfaction among female associate professors, in particular, and can negatively impact time to advancement if too much time is spent on teaching or service at the expense of research.

Female associate professors were also less satisfied than male associate professors with the resources and professional networks on campus. Many women reported having less access to, and knowledge of, resources that would support their career advancement. Such resources include comparable salaries, administrative support and assistance, access to on-campus facilities and equipment, and knowledge of existing or potential professional networks. Because there is ambiguity surrounding what resources are available, and how to get them, female associate professors experience reduced agency in access to the same, or comparable, resources than do their male counterparts (Leibbrandt & List, 2014).

Regarding agency in their academic careers, female associate professors felt what they needed to do for promotion to full professor remained unclear and that promotable opportunities were hard to come by. Given that agency has been linked to satisfaction and career advancement (Gonzales, 2015; Neumann et al., 2006; O'Meara, 2015, 2016; Terosky & O'Meara, 2011), it is not surprising that female associate professors were less satisfied overall with their perceived ability to advance to full professor at LGU. Several of the open-ended responses to the 2015 FWES indicated that many female associate professors felt that they had to work harder than some of their colleagues in order to be perceived as legitimate scholars, and, in addition to that, their competence was routinely questioned. Ambiguity in how to gain legitimacy as a female faculty member, coupled with gendered notions of competence, reduces female associate professors' agency regarding their perceived ability to succeed and opportunities for advancement.

Finally, female associate professors at LGU referenced inconsistent criteria and perceived unfairness with the tenure and promotion system as a source of concern for their advancement to full professor. This is a common critique found in the literature; female faculty tend to have less understanding of the criteria and requirements necessary for promotion to full (Buckley et al., 2000; Terosky et al., 2014; Trower, 2012). Consistent with Britton's finding (2010), the tenure and promotion standards at LGU are vague and the process for review is largely unknown. Female associate professors who do not have access to informal institutional knowledge about the process are left in the dark about necessary actions to advance to full professor.

Although such ambiguity creates a foggy climate in which female associate professors have to navigate in their path to full professor, it is important to recognize that there are those who benefit from it. For example, when women take on more campus service and advising work, it leaves more time for others, namely men in this case, to do research. The concept of the ideal worker (Sallee, 2012, 2014) is premised on the concept that there will be workers underneath the star performers in the hierarchy to pick up institutional housework (e.g., campus service and advising). Although institutional housekeeping is indeed significant, campus service and advising are especially undervalued in local reward systems and thus less promotable. If less promotable work is shared, star performers, or those who spend the majority of their time on research, will lose time to engage in more promotable work. There are also institutional advantages to women's tendency to not negotiate, or to negotiate less hard, for salary increases and resources; the institution gets to keep more of its resources.

Another example is ambiguity in work-life integration. When there is ambiguity in how to raise a family and be a competitive and productive

scholar, women faculty with children are at a disadvantage. Although there are more dual-career households with men taking on a greater share of housework and childcare than ever before (Sallee, 2012, 2014), female professors still report spending more time on childcare and housework each week (Wolf-Wendel & Ward, 2003). In addition, more male faculty at research universities are married than their female faculty counterparts (Morrison, Rudd, & Nerad, 2011). Finally, leaving promotion criteria ambiguous allows senior faculty to make decisions based on discretionary factors, including things that should not be considered such as whether they like the faculty member or not. As such, there are reasons the fog is in place. It has formed to support dominant group interests (Beddoes et al., 2014).

Those who want to engage in equity-minded reform (Bensimon, 2012) to create stronger pathways for female associate professors to full professor can do so by clearing away the fog from each of the areas discussed previously: workload, work-life balance, resources, networks, and agency in career advancement. In the next section, we provide suggestions to remove ambiguity and offer strategies to improve associate professor perceived and actionable agency in career advancement.

Recommendations

After considering the challenges faced by female associates navigating a foggy climate, we offer the following recommendations. Each recommendation emerges from our findings and the patterns found in previous work, and these recommendations are intended to make the pathway for female associate professors more transparent and equitable, improving perceived and actionable career agency.

Reduce ambiguity in service expectations and create more equitable workload distributions. This can be done by creating more explicit expectations for service work within academic units and implementing accountability measures for teaching, advising, and campus service contributions. The following are specific policies and practices that can be put in place:

1. Create "service dashboards" to track, make visible, and recognize faculty teaching, service, and research contributions (O'Meara, 2016; O'Meara et al., 2017). Use these data to benchmark individual faculty performance and identify potential inequities related to gender or rank. Department chairs can reduce ambiguity in who is serving on what committee(s) by making campus service responsibilities public (to the department) through a service dashboard (O'Meara, 2016; O'Meara et al., 2017). This will

enable faculty to benchmark their service responsibilities against others in the department. In addition to making service roles more transparent within the department, service dashboards can reduce gender stereotypes of women's helpfulness that contribute to unequal committee assignments and outcomes (Misra et al., 2011; O'Meara, 2016; O'Meara et al., 2017).

2. Create clear department policies that provide minimum standards for advising and committee service, recognition for high performance, and disincentives for poor performance (Faculty Workload & Rewards Project, 2017).
3. Create a formalized process for committee assignments either by rotating service roles among members of the department or moving requests through a centralized process such as the department chair, so that there is oversight in who is asked to serve (Faculty Workload & Rewards Project, 2017).
4. Encourage department chairs to create annual review of campus service and advising contributions and to reallocate equally among all faculty in the unit when they are inequitable (Misra et al., 2012).

Reduce ambiguity in what resources and professional networks are available. Instead of relying on informal networks and faculty's individual ability to negotiate, departments should ensure all faculty have equal access to resources that support their advancement such as information, mentoring, professional networks, and career development opportunities. To do this, institutions can do the following:

1. Offer and make known what resources are available to all faculty in the department, including administrative support and assistance and access to on-campus facilities and equipment.
2. Make faculty salaries transparent in the department so that women and other underpaid groups have access to the information necessary to negotiate for comparable faculty salaries.
3. Provide faculty professional development on such topics as developing career goals and accepting or declining service and administrative requests strategically.
4. Link female associate professors with other women at the institution who have reached full professor so that institutional knowledge can be shared and mentor-mentee relationships can be created.
5. Incentivize diverse research collaborations within and outside academic units, providing funding, awards, and recognition to research teams with men and women of different fields and career stages working together on exemplar research projects.

Reduce ambiguity in how to integrate work and life. Departments should embrace a culture of work-life balance to improve satisfaction and intent to stay. This can be done by making work-life balance and the tenure track more compatible through the following:

1. Increased visibility of female full professors who have children and live productive lives as scholars at the institution.
2. Clear and consistent instructions to appointment, promotion, and tenure review committees regarding what personal life events are relevant or irrelevant. For instance, time taken as part of the stop-the-tenure-clock policy cannot be included when considering whether candidates have achieved the requirements for promotion.
3. High-quality childcare and after-school care on campus for children of faculty, staff, and students.

Demystify standards for promotion. Instead of ambiguous criteria for promotion, criteria could be reformed by providing concrete examples of prior cases. By reforming the current standards for promotion to full professor to reduce vagueness and making the process for review more transparent, all faculty can better succeed:

1. Revise promotion and tenure guidelines to provide clearer criteria and requirements for advancing from associate to full professor. Specifically, clarify what is expected in terms of research, scholarship, teaching, and service, and reevaluate these criteria as necessary.
2. Delineate the process for review in each academic unit (if it differs by academic unit). For example, department chairs can outline the process for tenure review in their academic unit for faculty who are considering advancing to full professor. Individual faculty members can then meet with their department chairs to create a time line or action plan for their own tenure review.
3. Provide associate professors example portfolios of recently promoted faculty that are accessible to anyone who wants to go up for full professor, storing these materials in a public space.

Conclusion

The process of promotion to full professor at many institutions has been shrouded in ambiguity (Gardner & Blackstone, 2013, 2017). This lack of clarity can be especially problematic for female faculty members and faculty

from underrepresented groups, as it can foster conditions wherein implicit biases and gendered norms operate and constrain agency in career advancement. However, by enacting the proposed recommendations and becoming aware of how ambiguity in workload, work-life balance, resources, networks, and promotion criteria can reduce faculty agency among female faculty in particular, we can lift the fog surrounding the promotion process and close the gap observed among female and male associate professors' time to advancement.

References

- Acker, S., & Feuerverger, G. (1996). Doing good and feeling bad: The work of women university teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26(3), 401-422.
- Aguirre, A. Jr. (2000). *Women and minority faculty in the academic workplace: Recruitment, retention, and academic culture* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 27, no. 6). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Alkire, S. (2005). Subjective quantitative studies of human agency. *Social Indicators Research*, 74(1), 217-260.
- Allan, E. J. (2011). *Women's status in higher education* (ASHE Higher Education Report, vol. 37, no. 1). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Allan, E. J., & Madden, M. (2006). Chilly classrooms for female undergraduate students: A question of method? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(4), 684-711.
- Archer, M. S. (2003). *Structure, agency and the internal conversation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Babcock, L., Laschever, S., Gelfand, M., & Small, D. (2003). Nice girls don't ask. *Harvard Business Review*, 81(10), 14-16.
- Babcock, L., Recalde, M., Vesterlund, L., & Weingart, L. (2016). Gender differences in accepting and receiving requests for tasks with low promotability. *American Economic Review*, 107(3), 714-747.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Chang, D. A. (2006). Reinforcing our "keystone" faculty: Strategies to support faculty in the middle years of academic life. *Liberal Education*, 92(4), 28-35.
- Baldwin, R. G., Lunceford, C. J., & Vanderlinden, K. E. (2005). Faculty in the middle years: Illuminating an overlooked phase of academic life. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(1), 97-118.
- Banerjee, D., & Pawley, A. (2013). Gender and promotion: How do science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) faculty members survive a foggy climate? *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, 19(4), 329-347.
- Barrett, L., & Barrett, P. (2011). Women and academic workloads: Career slow lane or cul-de sac? *Higher Education*, 61, 141-155.
- Basow, S. A. (2000). Best and worst professors: Gender patterns in students' choices. *Sex Roles*, 43(5-6), 407-417.
- Beddoes, K., & Pawley, A. L. (2014). "Different people have different priorities": Work-family balance, gender, and the discourse of choice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(9), 1573-1585.
- Beddoes, K., Schimpf, C., & Pawley, A. L. (2014, June). *New metaphors for new understandings: Ontological questions about developing grounded theories in engineering education*. Paper presented at the American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference, Indianapolis, IN.
- Bellas, M. L., & Toutkoushian, R. K. (1999). Faculty time allocations and research productivity: Gender, race and family effects. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22(4), 367-390.
- Bensimon, E. M. (2012). The equity scorecard: Theory of change. In E. M. Bensimon & L. Malcom (Eds.), *Confronting equity issues on campus: Implementing the equity scorecard in theory and practice* (pp. 17-44). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Britton, D. M. (2009, February). *Engendering the university through policy and practice: Barriers to promotion to full professor for women in the science, engineering and math disciplines*. Paper presented at the International Conference at the Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen, Germany.
- Britton, D. M. (2010). Engendering the university through policy and practice: Barriers to promotion to full professor for women in the science, engineering, and math disciplines. In Riegraf, Aulenbacher, Kirsch-Auwärter, & Müller (Eds.), *Gender Change in Academia* (pp. 15-26). Wiesbaden: Verlag.
- Britton, D. M. (2017). Beyond chilly climate: The salience of gender in women's academic careers. *Gender and Society*, 31(1), 5-27.
- Buckley, L. M., Sanders, K., Shih, M., Kallar, S., & Hampton, C. (2000). Obstacles to promotion? Values of women faculty about career success and recognition. *Academic Medicine*, 75(3), 283-288.
- Campbell, C. M., & O'Meara, K. (2014). Faculty agency: Departmental contexts that matter in faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education*, 55(1), 49-74.
- Carrigan, C., Quinn, K., & Riskin, E. A. (2011). The gendered division of labor among STEM faculty and the effects of critical mass. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 4(3), 131.
- Colbeck, C. L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. In R. A. Eberly & J. Cohen (Eds.), *A laboratory for public scholarship and democracy* (New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 105, pp. 17-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conley, V. M., & Leslie, D. W. (2002). *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 93), Parttime instructional faculty and staff: Who they are, what they do, and what they think* (NCES 2002-163). Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- De Welde, K., & Laursen, S. (2011). The glass obstacle course: Informal and formal barriers for women Ph.D. students in STEM fields. *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology*, 3(3), 571-595.
- Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 829-849.

- Eagan, M. K. Jr., & Garvey, J. C. (2015). Stressing out: Connecting race, gender, and stress with faculty productivity. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*, 923–954.
- Faculty Workload & Rewards Project. (2017, May). *Organizational strategies to facilitate workload equity*. Handout presented at the Faculty Workload & Rewards Project Workshop, Baltimore MD.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and service in American academic life*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Federal Glass Ceiling Commission. (1995, November). *Solid investments: Making full use of the nation's human capital*, p. 4. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Fox, M. F. (2010). Women and men faculty in academic science and engineering: Social-organizational indicators and implications. *American Behavioral Scientist, 53*(7), 997–1012.
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, S. K., & Blackstone, A. (2013). Putting in your time: Faculty experiences in the process of promotion to full professor. *Innovative Higher Education, 38*, 411–425.
- Gardner, S. K., & Blackstone, A. (2017). Faculty agency in applying for promotion to professor. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education, 2*, 59–75.
- Gardner, S. K., & Veliz, D. (2014). Evincing the ratchet: A thematic analysis of the promotion and tenure guidelines at a striving university. *The Review of Higher Education, 38*(1), 105–132.
- Geisler, C., Kaminski, D., & Berkley, R. (2007). The 13 club: An index for understanding, documenting, and resisting patterns of non-promotion to full professor. *Feminist Formations, 19*, 145–162.
- Gonzales, L. D. (2015). Faculty agency in striving university contexts: Mundane yet powerful acts of agency. *British Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 303–323.
- Hart, J. L. (2009). Challenges of the faculty career for women: Success and sacrifice. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 2*(1), 252–255.
- Hart, J. L. (2016). Dissecting a gendered organization: Implications for career trajectories for mid-career women in STEM. *Journal of Higher Education, 87*, 605–634.
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 657–674.
- Leibbrandt, A., & List, J. A. (2014). Do women avoid salary negotiations? Evidence from a large-scale natural field experiment. *Management Science, 61*(9), 2016–2024.
- Lester, J., & Sallee, M. (2009). *Establishing the family friendly campus: Models for effective practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Link, A. N., Swann, C. A., & Bozeman, B. (2008). A time allocation study of university faculty. *Economics of Education Review, 27*(4), 363–374.
- Marschke, R., Laursen, S., Nielsen, J. M., & Rankin, P. (2007). Demographic inertia revisited: An immodest proposal to achieve equitable gender representation among faculty in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*, 1–26.
- Marshall, V. W. (2005). Agency, events, and structure at the end of the life course. *Advances in Life Course Research, 10*(1), 57–91.
- Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E.D., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The ivory ceiling of service work. *Academe, 97*, 2–6.
- Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., & Templer, A. (2012, June). Gender, work time, and care responsibilities among faculty. *Sociological Forum, 27*(2), 300–323.
- Mitchell, S. M., & Hesli, V. L. (2013). Women don't ask? Women don't say no? Bargaining and service in the political science profession. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 46*(2), 355–369.
- Modern Language Association of America. (2009). *Standing still: The associate professor survey* (Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession). New York, NY: Modern Language Association.
- Morrison, E., Rudd, E., & Nerad, M. (2011). Onto, up, off the academic faculty ladder: The gendered effects of family on career transitions for a cohort of social science Ph.Ds. *The Review of Higher Education, 34*(4), 525–553.
- Neumann, A., & Terosky, A. L. (2007). To give and to receive: Recently tenured professors' experiences of service in major research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 78*(3), 282–310.
- Neumann, A., Terosky, A. L., & Schell, J. (2006). Agents of learning: Strategies for assuming agency, for learning, in tenured faculty careers. In S. Bracken, J. Allen, & D. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 91–120). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2011). Inside the Panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 161–220). New York, NY: Springer.
- O'Meara, K. (2015). A career with a view: Agentic perspectives of women faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*, 331–359.
- O'Meara, K. (2016). Whose problem is it? Gender differences in faculty thinking about campus service. *Teachers College Record, 118*(3), 1–38.
- O'Meara, K., & Campbell, C. M. (2011). Faculty sense of agency in decisions about work and family. *Review of Higher Education, 34*(3), 447–476.
- O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., & Nyunt, G. (2017). Constrained choices: A view of campus service inequality from annual faculty reports. *The Journal of Higher Education, 88*(5), 1–29.
- O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). *Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective* (ASHE Higher Education Report, vol. 34, no. 3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Perna, L. W. (2001). Sex and race differences in faculty tenure and promotion. *Research in Higher Education, 42*(5), 541–567.

- Roos, P. A., & Gatta, M. L. (2009). Gender (in)equity in the academy: Subtle mechanisms and the production of inequality. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 27(3), 177–200.
- Sallee, M. W. (2012). The ideal worker or the ideal father: Organizational structures and culture in the gendered university. *Research in Higher Education*, 53(7), 782–802.
- Sallee, M. (2014). Disciplinary culture and the ideal worker. *Faculty fathers: Toward a new ideal in the research university* (pp. 97–132). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Sax, L. J., Hagedorn, L., Arredondo, M., & Dicrisi, F. A. (2002). Faculty research productivity: Exploring the role of gender and family-related factors. *Research in Higher Education*, 43, 423–446.
- Sprague, J., & Massoni, K. (2005). Student evaluations and gendered expectations: What we can't count can hurt us. *Sex Roles*, 53(11–12), 779–793.
- Stout, P. A., Staiger, J., & Jennings, N. A. (2007). Affective stories: Understanding the lack of progress of women faculty. *NWSA Journal*, 19(3), 124–144.
- Terosky, A. L., & O'Meara, K. (2011). Assuming agency: The power of strategy and networks in the professional lives of faculty. *Liberal Education*, 97, 54–59.
- Terosky, A. L., O'Meara, K., & Campbell, C. M. (2014). Enabling possibility: Women associate professors' sense of agency in career advancement. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 7(1), 58.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Trower, C. A. (2012). *Success on the tenure track: Five keys to faculty job satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Van Anders, S. M. (2004). Why the academic pipeline leaks: Fewer men than women perceive barriers to becoming professors. *Sex Roles*, 51(9–10), 511–521.
- Ward, K. (2003). *Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, vol. 29, no. 5). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). *Academic motherhood: How faculty manage work and family*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Winslow, S. (2010). Gender inequality and time allocations among academic faculty. *Gender & Society*, 24, 769–793.
- Wolf-Wendel, L., & Ward, K. (2003). Future prospects for women faculty: Negotiating work and family. In B. Ropers-Huilman (Ed.), *Gendered futures in higher education: Critical perspectives for change* (pp. 111–134). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Wolfinger, N. H., Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2008). Problems in the pipeline: Gender, marriage, and fertility in the ivory tower. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(4), 388–405.
- Xu, Y. J. (2008). Gender disparity in STEM disciplines: A study of faculty attrition and turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, 49, 607–624.

SUPPORTING MID-CAREER FACULTY MEMBERS

A Research and Practice Agenda

Jaime Lester, Jennifer L. Lebrón, and Carrie Klein

The final chapter will provide a synthesis of the work featured in this volume, with attention to the diversity of mid-career faculty and the role of intersectionality in the mid-career faculty experience. Drawing on the work on faculty of color, academic parenting, and LGBTQ faculty, among others, the authors will connect the research across faculty and organizational studies to address the institutional challenges and barriers to supporting mid-career faculty. The intent is to promote nonnormative conceptualizations of faculty work to support career pathways for diverse faculty groups. The chapter concludes with future directions for research and practice in supporting mid-career faculty development.

Mid-career faculty today are arguably one of the first generations to directly experience dramatic shifts in faculty work. This change can be characterized by an increase in nontenure-track positions; a shifting notion of higher education as a public good, which has led to a decrease in public financial investment; and a rise of discourse and actions to justify competition for scarce resources in a more capitalistic market of education (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2010). Many publications outline the ills of the changing professoriate, carefully documenting the impact on individual desire to enter the professoriate, the inequities across faculty contracts, and how the push for more productivity has a negative impact on quality in academic work (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Mamiseishvili & Rosser, 2011). Other research identifies a complex set of needs across career cycles for faculty. For example, research has suggested that mid-career faculty experience post-tenure blues, a slump, or