

# Faculty of Color and White Faculty: An Analysis of Service in Colleges of Education in the Arizona Public University System

*J. Luke Wood*

*San Diego State University*

*Adriel A. Hilton*

*Western Carolina University*

*Carlos Nevarez*

*California State University, Sacramento*

***Abstract:** This study examined faculty participation in service in the Arizona public university system among faculty of color and White faculty. Data were utilized from a survey of faculty in the colleges of education at Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, and University of Arizona. Independent t-tests revealed that faculty of color were more likely to be engaged in liaison-related service than their White counterparts. Findings also illustrated that faculty of color were more likely to be involved as leaders in professional organizations. This study affirmed current national-level research on faculty service which indicates that faculties of color are more involved in service than other faculties. Based upon the study's findings, suggestions for revamping the weight value of faculty service within the retention, tenure, and promotion process are considered.*

---

**J. Luke Wood** is an Associate Professor in Community College Leadership and the Director of the Doctoral Program Concentration in Community College Leadership at San Diego State University.

**Adriel A. Hilton** is an Assistant Professor in of College Student Personnel and Director of the College Student Personnel program at Western Carolina University.

**Carlos Nevarez** is a Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at California State University, Sacramento.

Copyright © 2015 by *The Journal of the Professoriate*, an affiliate of the Center for African American Research and Policy. All Rights Reserved (ISSN 1556-7699)

One element of tenured/tenure-track faculty responsibilities in higher education is that of service. Faculty service is an integral component of institutional operations that contributes to the overall mission of colleges and universities. These higher education institutions are dependent upon faculty service efforts to sustain themselves via institutional governance participation. Committee participation, assessment and evaluation, faculty senate service, institutional planning, and outreach are a few examples of the roles faculty members play in promoting the well-being and advancement of their institutions. As a result, nearly all postsecondary institutions have service requirements for their faculty (Baez, 1999; 2000; 2002). Public universities in the State of Arizona are among the vast majority of institutional systems that have a commitment to service from their governing bodies.

To ensure faculty members are engaging in service, the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) requires faculty service as one aspect to the tenure and promotion process. ABOR Policy 6-211 section A.3.b. calls for faculty performance evaluation at public universities in Arizona to include an assessment of “actual performance and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, *advising, mentoring*, research and *professional/public service* [emphasis added] through a peer review process” (ABOR, 1992, p. 467). As a result of this policy, each respective campus under the jurisdiction of the ABOR has created policies to inform faculty about the aspects of their service that are applicable to their retention, tenure and promotion (RTP).

This study will investigate faculty participation in service by examining faculty service by race/ethnicity in the colleges of education at Arizona public universities. The next section will examine relevant literature on this topic, demonstrating how excessive service demands, the weight of service in RTP processes, and types of service typically engaged by faculty of color necessitate this current investigation. RTP are generally evaluated based upon three basic areas of academic contribution – research, teaching, and service. Typically, less emphasis is placed on service than teaching and research in the RTP process. In general, the most credence is given to research, with secondary importance usually given to teaching. Service is often considered supplemental and secondary to research and teaching performance in RTP (Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1996; Brazeau, 2003; Norbeck, 1998; Park, 1996; Singell

& Lillydahl, 1996). The next section will examine relevant literature on the topic.

## Relevant Literature

The varying levels of importance of research, teaching and service in RTP considerations can place certain faculty (such as faculty of color) at a disadvantage in attaining tenure and merit increases. Faculties of color tend to be more involved in service than their White counterparts. (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Baez, 2000; Porter, 2007; Turner, 2002). However, Baez (2000) notes that “excessive service demands” from local communities, students, and their respective institutions place faculty of color at a disadvantage in advancement processes (p. 363). This in large part is a result of the service demands placed on faculty of color. Often, they are highly sought out for institutional service due to the knowledge they possess about communities of color. Moreover, service acts as a core component of their “critical agency” in facilitating the transformation of institutional structures in the promotion of social justice (p. 364). As such, service can serve as a sense of empowerment for faculty of color (Hill-Brisbane & Dingus, 2007; Turner, Gonzalez, & Wood, 2008) and, subsequently, can guide meaningful efforts in promoting equitable practices for all.

The dimensions to faculty service are complex, expansive, and can vary across institutional types (e.g., research institutions, teaching institutions) and by academic discipline. In general, there are three broad areas of faculty service: professional, institutional, and public/community. Professional service involves participation in the scholarly profession (e.g., serving as a reviewer for peer-reviewed journals or leading in professional organization). Institutional service pertains to faculty involvement in supporting the operations of the university (e.g. institutional committee or task force participation). Public/community service relates to working in the local community; often, there can be a scholarly component to this form of service (e.g., working with a non-profit organization; Baez, 1999; Loveridge, 2002; Shoenfield & Magnan, 1994). For example, a host of scholars provide thought leadership that supports strategic interventions and evaluations for local non-profit organizations. Service has also been classified as professional or public service (Miller, 1987) and internal or external service (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995).

The implications for faculty of color focusing on service efforts is that they can be penalized in the RTP process since service is usually weighted lower than research and teaching. At Northern Arizona University (NAU), the *Faculty Handbook* indicates that teaching workloads range from 50 to 70 percent, research between 20 and 50 percent (not to fall below 20 percent), and service from 10 to 20 percent (Northern Arizona University, 2008). At the University of Arizona (UofA), service accounts for 20 percent of faculty RTP considerations, which is lower than 40 percent for research and teaching (University of Arizona, 2009). Faculty workload breakdowns at ASU mirror the 40-40-20 (research, teaching, service) seen at the UofA. Furthermore, at Arizona State University (ASU) the institution clearly indicates that service is secondary to research and teaching. For instance, a document identifying criteria for tenure and promotion located on the college's webpage informs junior faculty that "extensive service contributions are not central to promotion and tenure decisions" (Arizona State University, 2009, para. 6). In this same document, the college also notes that professional and institutional service are more highly valued than public/community service, which informs junior faculty that they "should take care that these activities [public/community service] constitute a much smaller portion of their load" (para. 6). Jaeger and Thornton (2006) noted that the limited value of public service in comparison to other types of faculty service is typical in research universities. While professional and disciplinary service have been the primary focus for RTP considerations; the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching increased the importance of community service when the community-engagement classification for institutions was introduced (see Driscoll, 2008). The widespread effect of this new initiative has yet to be seen.

Currently, there is a dearth of literature on faculty of color and service, especially with respect to service in the professional context. With this in mind, it is important to articulate what is actually known about this topic area. *Figure 1* presents a cursory overview of research in this topic area; the "+" sign represents positive factors for faculty service while the "-" sign represents negative factors to faculty service. Literature on faculty of color emphasizes their strong commitment towards service participation, especially community related service (Skachkova, 2007). As a result, they expend large amounts of their time in campus service activities such as advising students, serving on campus committees,

participating in diversity-related work or being actively engaged in their local communities (Antonio, 2002; de la Luz Reyes & Halcón, 1991; Gregory, 2001; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000; Nieves-Squires, 1991; Stanley, 2006; Turner & Myers, Jr., 2000; Turner, Myers, Jr., & Creswell, 1999). For example, Antonio (2002), in an analysis of more than 21,000 faculty, found “faculty of color to be a third more likely to advise student groups involved in community service and 29% more likely to pledge the professional and personal goal of providing services to the community” (p. 594).

Figure 1  
*Overview of Literature on Faculty of Color and Service*

Service (Overall)	Campus Service	Community Service
(-) Service is discounted	(-) Faculty of color exhibit higher levels of stress from service activities	(+) Strong desire to participate in community service
(-) Disproportionate service demands	(+) Faculty of color serve as spokespersons for their communities	(+) Faculty of color serve as spokespersons for their communities
(-) Service is not properly weighed in RTP		(+) Faculty service in the community can serve to attract students and faculty of color to the institution
(-) Service is devalued by institutions		
(-) Hidden service requirements		
(+) Participate in service to greater degree than other faculty		
(+) Service can serve as a sense of empowerment		

(+) Positive factors to faculty service (-) Negative factors to faculty service

While many faculty of color participate in service, their engagement in service is often discounted (Aguirre, 2005; Jones, 2002; Turner & Myers, 2000), not equally respected in the RTP process (Baez, 2000; Delgado-Romero, Manlove, Manlove & Hernandez, 2007; Moule, 2005; Padilla, 1994), and generally devalued (Piercy, Giddings, Allen, Dion, Meszaros & Joest, 2005; Tomlinson, 2006; Turner & Myers, 2000; Urrieta & Méndez-Benavidez, 2007; Williams & Williams, 2006). To make matters worse, there are “hidden” service requirements (especially as it relates to minority-related service) that are placed upon faculty of color (Brayboy, 2003; Niemann, 1999). Often, they are called upon as defacto spokespersons for their respective communities (Takara, 2006). As a result of these issues, higher levels of service-related stress are experienced by faculty of color (Smith & Witts, 1993).

Quantitative research approaches most effectively analyze variance in faculty service engagement (Porter, 2007). While national studies exist on faculty service, there remains a lack of quantitative literature on faculty service (with a focus on specific regions or states). This dearth of scholarly research on faculty service by region/state can shape discussions of service based upon national generalizations rather than state specificities (which may not adequately address the depth of discourse needed on service by region/state). Nonetheless, this regional study can add to a larger national body of scholarship.

Additionally, there is a need to monitor variance in service in order to create equitable policies within institutions that recognize the differing contributions of faculty by academic discipline. This particular study focuses on the colleges of education as a result of the unique constraints that education faculty face regarding the service requirement inherent in the field. According to Lawson (1990), faculty in schools, colleges and departments of education face unique challenges in service involvement for several reasons including: competition for academic prestige; retention, tenure and promotion structures which favor scholarship over service; and the transition of education faculty from the “technical-apprenticeship model to a now dominate model emphasizing theory and research” (p. 58).

Bearing this in mind, this study will investigate faculty participation in service. This investigation was undertaken in response to perceived differences in faculty engagement in service along racial/ethnic lines on the part of the researchers. As such, this study will examine whether or not differences exist and the extent of those differences. This examination will be guided by one primary question: what do analyses by race/ethnicity reveal about differences in faculty participation in service. The following hypotheses will be used to analyze the data collected:

A1. Null Hypothesis: there will be no differences in faculty participation in service by race/ethnicity.

$$H_0: \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$$

A2. Alternative Hypotheses: there will be differences in faculty participation in service by race/ethnicity.

$$H_1: \mu_1 - \mu_2 \neq 0$$

## Methodology

Data for this study was collected through a questionnaire distributed to select faculty in each college of education within the ABOR universities. Faculty members were selected using proportional stratified sampling, a “type of stratified sampling in which the sample proportions are made to be the same as the population proportions on the stratification variable” (Johnson & Christensen, 2004, p. 207). The stratification variables employed in this study were faculty race/ethnicity and gender. One hundred and thirty-nine (139) total faculty members participated in the study, of which 112 were White and 27 were faculty of color. There were a total of 334 faculty in the colleges of education when the survey was distributed. This represented a 42 percent sampling return rate of the total population. Participants involved in this study were reflective of the racial/ethnic makeup of faculty in ABOR universities. Despite the sampling procedures employed, no Native American faculty participated in the study. Due to the limited number of racial/ethnic minorities in each university’s college of education, faculty of color were treated as one group in the analyses.

The researchers collected the names, emails and stratified variable information on each faculty member in these aforementioned colleges using public information posted on the websites of each respective university. The data were then entered into a spreadsheet for stratification selection. Questionnaires were distributed utilizing SurveyMonkey, an online data collection system. Informed consent was obtained by faculty via the data collection system before faculty commenced the survey. This program was utilized since it has the capability to track each individual whom a questionnaire is sent to in order to ensure that over/under sampling would not occur. The questionnaire was comprised of open-ended and Likert-scale questions (with an emphasis on the latter). This particular paper focuses on the Likert-scale responses only.

Faculty were asked about their participation in faculty service (e.g. departmental committees, journal reviewing) based upon a five-point Likert-scale indicating the amount of hours a faculty participated in each

specific type of service.<sup>1</sup> Service activities identified in the faculty policy manuals for each institution were examined (see Figure 2). While there are nuances in the service expectations for faculty across the three institutions, the researchers elected to treat the colleges in aggregate rather than discussing each individually. Service activities provide an overview of the types of service investigated. These service activities as well as the work of Astin et al. (1996) and Baez (1999; 2000) were utilized in constructing the areas of service addressed in the questionnaire.

Figure 2  
*Types of Services in Faculty Policy Manuals, By Institution*

Institution	Types of Service Indicated
Arizona State University	<p>Service to the Division, College or University</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Division, College or University committees;</li> <li>2. Sponsoring special programs, conferences, or professional activities</li> <li>3. Faculty governance activities</li> <li>4. The preservation of a collegial atmosphere at all levels of interaction within the University.</li> </ol> <p>Service to the Public</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should be an extension of the faculty members' research and teaching activity to the larger community outside the University.</li> <li>2. Service to professional organizations, journal editorships</li> <li>3. Non-paid service to community agencies or groups related to the faculty members' research or teaching area.</li> </ol>

---

<sup>1</sup> Likert-scale ranged from: 0 to 10 or more hours per week. Equal variance was assumed among individual items in the scale.



Figure 2 (continued)

*Types of Services in Faculty Policy Manuals, By Institution*

Institution	Types of Service Indicated
Northern Arizona University	Service to the Department/College <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Committees (e.g., curricular)</li> <li>2. Task forces</li> <li>3. Recruitment efforts</li> </ol> Service to the University <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Committees (elected)</li> <li>2. Task forces</li> <li>3. Leadership roles (e.g., in accreditation projects)</li> </ol> Service to the Local Community <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluation project for local school</li> <li>2. Review board for a journal</li> <li>3. Leadership role in national organization</li> <li>4. Public workshops</li> <li>5. Technical assistance</li> </ol>
University of Arizona	Service to the Institution <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Membership on and chairing of committees</li> <li>2. Temporary or continued assumption of administrative duties</li> <li>3. Major participation in decision making bodies</li> </ol> Service to the Profession <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Service as a journal editor or on editorial boards.</li> </ol> Service to the Community <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community boards</li> <li>2. Public service lectures and similar activities.</li> </ol>

Sources: Arizona State University, 2006; Northern Arizona University, 2006; University of Arizona, 2000.

After data was collected, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted in order to identify evident constructs among the 22 items examined in the survey. An exploratory factor analysis allows for the identification of

underlying dimensions among a set of items. Three composites were constructed from 22 items which roughly represent: campus service; liaison service; and professional service. The dimensionality of 22 items of faculty service measures were analyzed using a principal component factor analysis. Three criteria were used to determine the number of factors to rotate: the a priori hypothesis that the measure was uni-dimensional, the scree test, and the interpretability of the factor solution. The scree plot, which is a pictorial representation of the cluster of items including their associated eigen values, indicated the items were not uni-dimensional. Based on the plot, three factors were rotated using a Varimax rotation procedure. This procedure employs orthogonal rotation among a constrained number of factors. The rotated solution, as shown in Table 1, yielded three interpretable factors composed of 15 items. The first factor accounted for 12.59% of the item variance, the second factor accounted for 11.92% of the item variance, and the third factor accounted for 8.60% of the item variance. No items loaded on multiple factors (see Table 1). A reliability analysis was conducted, factor one (campus service; Cronbach's Alpha, .66), factor two (liaison service; Cronbach's Alpha, .71), and factor three (professional service; Cronbach's Alpha, .52). The Cronbach's alphas from the campus services and professional service constructs were low. Generally, Cronbach alpha's of .7 or greater are desirable for such analyses (Santos, 1999; Schmitt, 1996), though lower alphas are sometimes used (see Flowers, 2006). Two sets of Independent sample t-tests were conducted; the first set focused on background characteristics of the sample; and the second set focused on each item within the three constructs.

Table 1  
*Correlations Between Factors*

Items	Factor 1 Campus Service	Factor 2 Liaison Service	Factor 3 Professional Service
Departmental Committees	.667	-.040	.063
College Committees	.565	.136	-.074
Advising Students	.675	-.005	.244
Mentoring Students	.484	.075	.297
Tutoring Students	.574	-.042	-.156
Program Practicum Coordination	.525	.065	.007
Probono Advising Consulting	.424	.272	.072
Institutional Committees	.169	.619	.235
Campus Community Committee	.019	.789	.133
Nonprofit Board	.081	.515	.122
Campus Community Program	-.051	.708	.076
Journal Reviewer	.171	.024	.540
Journal Editor	-.001	-.172	.606
Leadership in Professional Organizations	.246	.243	.592
Task Force/Blue Ribbon Committee	-.174	.208	.630

Note: Note: Principal Component extraction method shown above. Items are from rotated component matrix. The strongest loadings (factors coefficient)  $\geq .40$  are identified in italics. Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

## **Limitations**

The data examined in this study represents the self-reported responses of faculty. Self-reported data can be subject to respondent bias, especially on a tenuous subject such as faculty workload. Also, it is plausible that while the total number of participants in this study (n=139) represent a reasonable sample of the population examined (42 percent), more participants may increase the likelihood of finding statistically significant differences among groups. Additionally, with the limited number of respondents in this study, findings are only generalizable to faculty in the college of education in ABOR universities. Finally, faculty of color were treated as one group in the analyses due to their limited representation in the population. Variance among these faculty in terms of their participation in research, teaching, and service may exist and would not be captured by the grouping approach used. The next section focuses on the findings.

## **Findings**

Background data on faculty of color and White faculty revealed that all faculty members spent about twelve hours per week conducting research and around nine hours per week teaching courses. On average faculty of color spend slightly less time conducting research (about half an hour per week) and slightly more time teaching (about an hour per week). However, no statistically significant differences were evident between groups relative to background characteristics (see Table 2). This suggests that faculty of color are as invested in research and teaching as their White counterparts.

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics of Selected Background Characteristics of Faculty of Color and White Faculty in the ABOR Universities*

Background Characteristics	Faculty of Color		White Faculty	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Number of hours spent per week conducting research	12.296	10.167	12.732	10.857
Number of hours spent per week teaching	9.925	7.883	8.883	7.279
Number of hours spent in teaching related duties (other than direct instruction)	14.333	10.164	14.294	9.801
Annual unit load	10.703	7.091	10.401	6.736
Number of formal advisees	4.538	2.831	4.654	2.972
Number of informal advisees	4.538	2.595	4.156	2.579

Note: Most of the programs were graduate level, as such numbers for formal and informal advisees are correspondingly low.

### **Factor One (Campus Service)**

Factor one (campus service) was comprised primarily of items related to campus service with the exception of pro bono advising/consulting. An independent sample t test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis that there would be no difference in faculty participation in campus service by race/ethnicity. Again, the alternative hypothesis was that there would be differences in faculty participation in campus service by race/ethnicity. Several measures of campus service were used to examine this construct: departmental committees; college committees; advising students; mentoring students; tutoring students; program/practicum coordination; and program advising consulting. As shown in Table 3, there were no statistically significant differences between faculty of color

and White faculty. However, faculty of color exhibited higher means scores on campus service items (except for program/practicum coordination).

Table 3  
Means of Items From Factor One (Campus Service)

Campus Service Items	Faculty of Color		White Faculty	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Departmental Committees	.2871	.144	.2806	.156
College Committees	.2426	.156	.2189	.181
Advising Students	.4142	.164	.3504	.189
Mentoring Students	.3972	.173	.3531	.188
Tutoring Students	.1914	.187	.1212	.168
Program/Practicum Coordination	.2670	.287	.3156	.285
Pro Bono Advising/Consulting	.2619	.186	.1960	.161

**Factor Two (Liaison Service)**

Factor two (liaison service) was comprised of four items (e.g., institutional committees, campus community committees, non-profit boards, and campus community programs). The commonality among these items is the role of faculty in serving as liaisons from their respective departments to the institution and the community (with an emphasis on the latter). An independent sample t test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis there would be no difference in faculty participation in public/community service by race/ethnicity. Again, the alternative hypothesis was that there would be differences in faculty

participation in liaison service by race/ethnicity. Several measures of public/community service were used to examine this construct: institutional committees, campus community committees, non-profit boards, and campus community programs.

Table 4

*Means of items from factor two (liaison service)*

Public/Community Service Items	Faculty of Color		White Faculty	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Institutional Committees	.2245 **	.237	.1163	.168
Campus Community Committee	.2146 **	.214	.1107	.150
Nonprofit Board	.1681	.208	.1286	.171
Campus Community Program	.1264 **	.189	.0466	.126

\*  $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .01$

Table 4 shows three of the four items measured in the construct of public/community service were significant. Service on institutional committees was significant ( $t(137) = 2.746, p = .007$ ). As a result, the null hypothesis was rejected. Faculty of color on average ( $M = .2245, SD = .237$ ) spend more time engaged in service on institutional committees than White faculty ( $M = .1163, SD = .168$ ). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in the means ranged from .030 to .186. The eta square index indicated that 5% of the variance in the institutional committee variable was accounted for by faculty race/ethnicity.

Service in the campus community was also significant ( $t(137) = 2.939, p = .004$ ). Similar to the first item in the construct, the null hypothesis was rejected. Faculty of color on average ( $M = .2146, SD = .214$ ) spend more time engaged in campus community committees than their White faculty ( $M = .1107, SD = .150$ ) counterparts. The 95% confidence interval for the

difference in the means ranged from .034 to .173. The eta square index indicated that 6% of the variance in the campus community committee variable was accounted for by faculty race/ethnicity.

Finally, the last item of the construct was also significant  $t(137) = 2.645$ ,  $p = .009$ . As a result, the null hypothesis was rejected. Faculty of color on average ( $M = .1264$ ,  $SD = .189$ ) spend more time engaged in campus community programs than White faculty ( $M = .0466$ ,  $SD = .1268$ ). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in the means ranged from .0201 to .1395. The eta square index indicated that 5% of the variance in the campus community program variable was accounted for by faculty race/ethnicity.

### **Factor Three (Professional Service)**

Factor three (professional service) was comprised of four items related to service in the scholarly community. An independent sample  $t$  test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis there would be no difference in faculty participation in professional service by race/ethnicity. The alternative hypothesis was that there would be differences in faculty participation in professional service by race/ethnicity. Several measures of professional service were used to examine this construct: journal reviewer, journal editor, leadership in professional organizations; and task force/blue ribbon committee.

Of the items examined, one was found to be statistically significant (see Table 5). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Leadership in professional organizations was significant ( $t(137) = 3.156$ ,  $p = .002$ ). Faculty of color on average ( $M = .2686$ ,  $SD = .177$ ) spent more time engaged in leadership in professional organizations than White faculty ( $M = .1490$ ,  $SD = .176$ ). The 95% confidence interval for the difference in the means ranged from .0446 to .1946. The eta square index indicated that 7% of the variance in the campus community program variable was accounted for by faculty race/ethnicity.



Table 5

*Means of items from factor three (professional service)*

Professional Service Items	Faculty of Color		White Faculty	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Journal Reviewer	.1803	.170	.2213	.144
Journal Editor	.0799	.157	.0662	.178
Leadership in Professional Organizations	.2686* *	.177	.1490	.176
Task Force/Blue Ribbon Committee	.0911	.162	.0466	.124

Note: \* =  $p < .05$ , \*\* =  $p < .01$ 

## Discussion

There are important considerations that educational leaders can take away from this study. Though only one of the three factors yielded statistically significant differences among the majority of items examined in the factor, it is instructive that faculty of color had higher mean scores on 13 of the 15 items examined in this study. This illustrates that faculty of color are involved in greater service activities, though not at a significant level in the campus service and professional service. The exceptions (though not significant) in which White faculty had higher means scores, were the journal review item within the professional service construct and the program/practicum coordination item within the campus service construct.

Arguably the most important finding from this study is that faculty of color participate in liaison service (based upon three of the four measures used) more often than their White counterparts. This study found statistically significant differences between faculty service in leadership in professional organizations (see the professional service factor). Analyses of this item indicated that faculty of color spend more time engaged in this type of service than their White counterparts. While the

factor analysis did not group this item in the liaison service factor, there seems to be a relationship between serving as a liaison of the university and serving as a leader in a professional organization. The literature notes that faculty of color tend to participate in service more than White faculty, on average (Antonio, 2002; Antonio, Astin & Cress, 2000; Baez, 2000; Porter, 2007). The finding of this study also complements this notion.

These findings indicate important regional particularizations in faculty service that raise several considerations as well as some unique opportunities for Arizona public universities. Some institutions value campus and professional service with higher regard than service to the community (Holland, 1997). Since it is apparent that many of the items with the liaison service factor are directly related to community service, the ABOR and public educational leaders may examine the manner in which this form of service is weighted among other forms of service within colleges of education. Consideration must be given to whether liaison-related service is receiving equitable recognition in the tenure and promotion process as campus and professional service. Ensuring equitable weights among these forms of service is important in ensuring parity in the tenure process.

Unlike research and teaching which can be clearly delineated in meaning, service is vague and expansive. This in itself is problematic, as it makes it difficult to define and assess. Difficulty in assessment can lead to less weight and credibility given to this area. Based upon the findings of this study, it is clear that faculty of color spend more time engaged in service than their White counterparts. As such, the weights among teaching, research, and service in the tenure and promotion process should take into account variance in the overall productivity of faculty based upon race/ethnicity. Finally, faculty of color may also want to evaluate and analyze the institutional type of college/university prior to accepting the role. Each type has expectations for research, service, and teaching that must be met, and faculty should work at institutions where their service commitments are valued.

---

## Conclusion

An examination of faculty participation in the area of service found statistically significant differences by race/ethnicity in the liaison service factor and higher mean scores across campus and professional service factors. Based upon these findings, there is a need to address the importance of service in RTP considerations. An important step to promote this includes: 1) the development of new weights for service which can create parity for faculty of color in RTP processes. As it stands, the current weights may tend to be counterproductive to their success in the area of service; 2) an effort to view faculty service as an integral component of faculty workload should be promoted. This can be done by recognizing and supporting faculty involvement in service activities (e.g., funding, release time), as well as publicizing faculty service activities; and 3) all faculty must take responsibility in knowing the expectations involved with the RTP process. Once this is evident, faculty of color need to adjust their workload in accordance to what is expected of them. Knowing that service is not given much consideration, they can make a conscious (and likely difficult) decision to limit or forego service – at least until they have received tenure or policies have been changed.

Faculty service excellence will not thrive without a culture that values service and holds faculty accountable to work towards making service an everyday practice. The discrepancy between actual work conducted by faculty of color and evaluation processes are not systematically aligned. This impedes the success of faculty of color, which can further widen the disproportional representation of these faculty members in institutions of higher education. A key element of institutional excellence includes a rich, vibrant pool of faculty of color. RTP process must be reconsidered, particularly in the area of service. This can promote and adequately reward the contributions of faculty of color.

## References

- Aguirre, A. (2005). The personal narrative as academic storytelling: A Chicano's search for presence and voice in academe. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18, 147–163.
- Antonio, A L. (2002). Faculty of color reconsidered: Reassessing contributions to scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 582–602.
- Antonio, A.L., Astin, H.S., & Cress, C.M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 373-397.
- Arizona Board of Regents. (1992). *Policy manual*. Phoenix, AZ: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.azregents.edu/policymanual/default.aspx>
- Arizona State University. (2000). *Workloads for non-tenure accruing faculty (lecturers, instructors and clinical faculty)*. Tempe, AZ: Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from [http://education.asu.edu/about/resources/workload\\_nontenure\\_dot](http://education.asu.edu/about/resources/workload_nontenure_dot)
- Arizona State University. (2009). *Criteria for tenure and promotion*. Tempe, AZ: Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from <http://education.asu.edu/about/resources/criteria.dot>
- Arizona State University. (2006). *Faculty promotion and tenure policy*. Section 3 Quality of service to the profession, the university, and the community. Tempe, AZ: Author. Retrieved from [http://coe.asu.edu/personnel/p\\_and\\_t\\_policies.html](http://coe.asu.edu/personnel/p_and_t_policies.html)
- Astin, H.S., Antonio, A.L., Cress, C.M., & Astin, A.W. (1996). *Faculty involvement in community service*. Unpublished report prepared for the Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.

- Baez, B. (1999). Faculty of color and traditional notions of service. *Thought and Action, 12*, 131–138.
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education, 39*, 363-391.
- Baez, B. (2002). *Affirmative action, hate speech and tenure: Narratives about race, law, and the academy*. Independence, KY: Routledge Falmer.
- Blackburn, R.T., & Lawrence, J.H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Brayboy, B.M J. (2003). The implementation of diversity in predominantly White colleges and universities. *Journal of Black Studies, 34*, 72–86.
- Brazeau, G. (2003). Revisiting faculty service roles: Is “faculty service” a victim of the middle child syndrome. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education 67*(3), 1-6. Retrieved from <http://www.ajpe.org/view.asp?art=aj670385&pdf=yes>
- De la Luz Reyes, M., & Halcón, J.J. (1991). Practices of the academy: Barriers to access for Chicano academics. In P. G. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The racial crisis in American higher education* (pp. 167-186). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Delgado-Romero, E.A., Manlove, A.N., Manlove, J.D., & Hernandez, C.A. (2007). Controversial issues in the recruitment and retention of Latino/a faculty. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 6*, 34–51.
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carengie’s community-engagement classification: Intentions and Insights. *Change, 39*-41.
- Flowers, L.A. (2006). Effects of attending a 2-year institution on African-American male’s academic and social integration in

the first year of college. *Teachers College Record*, 108(2), 267-286.

Gregory, S.T. (2001). Black faculty women in the academy: History, status, and future. *Journal of Negro Education*, 70, 124–138.

Hill-Brisbane, D.A., & Dingus, J.E. (2007). Black women teacher educators: Creating enduring afriographies as leaders and change makers. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 22(1). Retrieved from <http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/winter2007/Hill.htm>

Holland, B.A. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 30-41.

Jaeger, A.J., & Thornton, C.H. (2006). Neither honor nor compensation. *Educational Policy*, 20(2), 345-366.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed method approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). San Francisco, CA: Pearson.

Jones, L. (Ed.). (2002). *Making it on broken promises: African American male scholars confront the culture of higher education*. Herndon, VA: Stylus.

Laden, B.V., & Hagedorn, L.S. (2000). Job satisfaction among faculty of color in academe: Individual survivors or institutional transformers? *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 105, 57-66.

Lawson, H.A. (1990). Constraints on the professional service of education faculty. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 41, 57-70.

Loveridge, S. (2002). Keys to engaging faculty in service: Lessons from West Virginia's community design team. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 21(1), 331-339.

- Miller, R.L. (1987). *Evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Moule, J. (2005). Implementing a social justice perspective in teacher education: Invisible burden for faculty of color. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(4), 23–42.
- Nieves-Squires, S. (1991) *Hispanic women: Making their presence on campus less tenuous*. Washington, D.C: Association of American Colleges.
- Niemann, Y.F. (1999). The making of a token: A case study of stereotype threat, stigma, racism, and tokenism in academe. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 20, 111–134.
- Norbeck, J.S. (1998). Teaching, research, and service: Striking the balance in doctoral education. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 14(4), 197-205.
- Northern Arizona University. (2006). *Procedures and criteria for performance review*. 7.0 Criteria for the Scholar in Service. Flagstaff, Arizona: Author. Retrieved from <http://www4.nau.edu/cee/policies/Procedures%20and%20Criteria%20for%20Faculty%20Performance%20Review.pdf>
- Northern Arizona University. (2008). *Faculty handbook*. Flagstaff, AZ: Author. Retrieved October 2, 2009, from: [http://www2.nau.edu/~provo-p/doc/Faculty\\_Handbook\\_August08.pdf](http://www2.nau.edu/~provo-p/doc/Faculty_Handbook_August08.pdf)
- Padilla, A.M. (1994). Ethnic minority scholars, research, and mentoring: Current and future issues. *Educational Researcher*, 23(4), 24–27.
- Park, S.M. (1996). Teaching and service: Why shouldn't women's work count? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 67(1), 46-84.
- Piercy, F., Giddings, V., Allen, K., Dixon, B., Meszaros, P., & Joest, K. (2005). Improving campus climate to support faculty

diversity and retention: A pilot program for new faculty. *Innovative Higher Education*, 30(1), 53–66.

Porter, S.R. (2007). A closer look at faculty service: What affects participation on committees? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(5), 523-541.

Santos, J.R.A. (1999). Cronbach's Alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of Extension*, 37(2). Retrieved from <http://www.joe.org/joe/1999April/tt3.html>

Schmitt, N. (1996). Uses and abuses of coefficient alpha. *Psychological Assessment*, 8(4), 350-353.

Shoenfield, A.C. & Magnan, R. (1994). *Mentor in a manual: Climbing the academic ladder to tenure* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Madison, WI: Magna.

Singell, L.D., & Lillydahl, J.H. (1996). Will changing times change the allocation of faculty time? *Journal of Human Resources*, 31(2), 429–449.

Skachkova, P. (2007). Academic careers of immigrant women professors in the U.S. *Higher Education*, 53, 697–738.

Smith, E., & Witt, S.L. (1993). A comparative study of occupational stress among African American and White university faculty: A research note. *Research in Higher Education*, 34, 229-241.

Stanley, C.A. (2006). Coloring the academic landscape: Faculty of color breaking the silence in predominantly White colleges and universities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 701–736.

Takara, K.W. (2006). A view from the academic edge: One Black woman who is dancing as fast as she can. *Du Bois Review*, 3, 463–470.



- Tomlinson, L.L. (2006). *Listening to faculty of color: Diverse experiences on a predominately White campus*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University.
- Turner, C.S.V. (2002). Women of color in academe: Living with multiple marginality. *Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 74–93.
- Turner, C.S.V., González, J.C., & Wood, J.L. (2008). Faculty of color in academe: What 20 years of literature tells us. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(3), 139-168.
- Turner, C.S., & Myers, S.L., Jr. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Turner, C.S., Myers, S.L., Jr., & Creswell, J.W. (1999). Exploring underrepresentation: The case of faculty of color in the Midwest. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70, 27–59.
- Urrieta, L., Jr., & Méndez Benavídez, L. (2007). Community commitment and activist scholarship: Chicana/o professors and the practice of consciousness. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 6, 222–236.
- University of Arizona. (2000). *University handbook for appointed personnel*. Section 3.21.01 Selection criteria based on scholarship, teaching, service. Flagstaff, Arizona: Author. Retrieved from <http://web.arizona.edu/~uhap/chap3.html>
- University of Arizona. (2009). *2009 annual workshop: Promotion & tenure and continuing status*. Tucson, AZ: Office of the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
- Williams, B.N., & Williams, S.M. (2006). Perceptions of African American male junior faculty on promotion and tenure: Implications for community building and social capital. *Teachers College Record*, 108, 287–315.