ESSAY

Reproducing the "white public space" in anthropology faculty searches

Mark Schuller ⓘ | **Christina Abreu**

Northern Illinois University

There's a bit of a dark joke circulating among historians: that years from now, when the dust has settled, countless dissertations and books will be written referring to the past few years as "the long 2020." In a nod to historiographic shifts that brought us "the long nineteenth century" and "the long civil rights movement," "the long 2020" also acknowledges the breadth and unrelenting tumultuousness of these pandemic times. Some suggest that 2020 threatens to surpass 1968 as *the* watershed moment in modern US history. At the time we were writing this, November 2020, COVID-19 had killed over 276,000 people in the United States, and many more have died since. The pandemic also forced many colleges and universities to turn to online course offerings, cancel or postpone athletic events, and suspend all but "essential" student services. Hundreds of thousands of university employees, including many contingent faculty, have lost their jobs or seen their courses cut, and the academic job market, already dismal, now offers job seekers even fewer prospects for full-time or tenure-track employment.[1] Even tenured faculty, often thought to be immune to layoffs amid economic crises and university restructuring, have seen their positions, programs, and departments eliminated, or nearly so, with drastic cuts announced at the University of Vermont, University of Akron, and Indiana University of Pennsylvania, as just a few key examples.

With the pandemic still raging during the 2020 summer months, participation in Black Lives Matter protests spread across small towns and large cities throughout the country. On May 25, 2020, Minneapolis police officer Derek Chauvin killed George Floyd, an unarmed Black man, by holding his knee to Floyd's neck for 8 minutes and 46 seconds. Floyd's murder sparked major protests across the United States, with protestors, community activists, political leaders, and athletes, including players for the NBA and WNBA, calling for police reform, centering the "radical" proposal to "defund the police" and demanding an end to racial violence and systemic racism. But Floyd's tragic death was only one horrific example of police violence against Black people, coming just months after the deaths of Breonna Taylor and Ahmaud Arbery. By September 2020, close to 170 Black people had been killed by police, reaching 226 by the end of the year.

That same month, on September 22, President Trump issued an executive order (13950) "combating race and sex stereotyping," which effectively banned programs receiving federal funds from teaching critical race, feminist, or queer theories and offering what the administration described as "blame-focused" diversity trainings. In response, some institutions, such as Texas State University, the University of Iowa, John A. Logan College in Illinois, and the University of Memphis, suspended academic diversity, equity, and inclusion (ADEI) trainings and initiatives. Others, like the University of Michigan, publicly recommitted to diversity efforts on their campuses.[2]

As we drafted this essay in November 2020, President Trump continued to challenge the results of the election that saw him lose the popular vote by over seven million votes. The president continued to make false claims and file flimsy lawsuits alleging massive and widespread voter fraud. The courts have rebuked these charges, but the president's aim in targeting "illegal" voters in cities like Detroit and Philadelphia and counties with large Black and Latinx populations has been made clear: to disenfranchise millions of Black and Latinx voters.

Where is anthropology in this, a decade after Brodkin, Morgen, and Hutchinson's (2011) critique of the discipline as a "white public space"? The 2018 *HAU* scandal provided an opportunity for radical voices from BIPOC anthropologists to assess the progress since Faye V. Harrison's ([1991] 2010) call to decolonize anthropology. Jaskiran Dhillon (2018) argues that anthropology must "clean house from within," and Aimee Cox (2018) that we center Black feminism. Women of color have noted particular ways in which anthropology departments still reproduce dominant value systems that privilege white, hetero, cisgender male perspectives, despite our professed desire to promote the "natives' point of view" (Berry et al. 2017; Navarro, Williams, and Ahmad 2013). Writing before Floyd's murder but published days after, Ryan Cecil Jobson (2020) is succinct: "let it burn." Calls to "decolonize" are not unique to anthropology; historians and sociologists have also articulated efforts to decolonize their research and teaching practices (Behm et al. 2020; Connell 2018; LaBrecque 2018; Lichtenstein 2018), while some ethnic studies scholars have offered a broader critique in demanding that we "decolonize the university" (Davies et al. 2003; García-Peña and Lyon 2020; la paperson 2017). Tuck and Yang (2012) argue that decolonization needs to center active efforts to return land taken from Indigenous peoples.

Meanwhile, following the renewal of Black Lives Matter and a flurry of public statements of support, like other departments in our medium-sized "R2" in a small midwestern city, anthropology leaped into conversations about how to be "antiracist," using Ibram X. Kendi's (2019)

wileyonlinelibrary.com/journal/aman

conceptualization. All faculty, not only those on the tenure track, and a graduate student representative participated in biweekly conversations. The department engaged in talks on four parallel and sometimes overlapping issue areas, each of which was facilitated by an ad-hoc group. Several faculty examined our classroom practices and curriculum, a second group revised our website and public communication, and others coordinated with other units on campus, including the Faculty Senate, which issued a report and created a standing social justice committee, and the faculty union, whose discussions with BIPOC faculty led to workshops on personnel policies.

This article has its genesis in the group examining our departmental practices, which led to conversations with the Center for Black Studies and Center for Latino and Latin American Studies (CLLAS). Through these conversations, the department began working on new classes specifically addressing racism and a joint minor with Black Studies. Christina, as CLLAS director, offered to collaborate on hosting Zoom presentations with Latinx anthropologists. Organically, through these frank discussions that included the department's hiring practices, the two authors shared experiences that previously brought Christina together with the department on a faculty search committee.

For some, this is an uncomfortable conversation, and we as authors have taken on the responsibility of bringing to light and questioning the processes and practices associated with faculty hiring. Actually changing department practices necessitates moving beyond the "comfort zone" and into the "growth zone" by what BLM cofounder Patrisse Cullors (2022) calls "courageous conversations." We write of our lived experiences not to "air dirty laundry" but as a continuation and extension of the department's stated commitment to racial equity. Putting it in writing and in our own names, using experience-near examples, holds us accountable to following through on our commitments. The problems we identify and discuss are not unique to the department nor the university. Feedback from departmental colleagues prompted us to reach out to BIPOC colleagues at other institutions, all of whom confirmed that every step of the faculty hiring process presents roadblocks to building a more diverse professoriate.[3] Unsurprisingly, the issues we encountered are quite common in university departments, and thus we draw on these examples at key moments in the process: how to approach diversity in the staffing of committees, defining the position, determining qualifications, and selecting people to interview and ultimately hire.

While anthropology departments everywhere must decolonize our curriculum, student recruitment and mentoring, and other practices, this essay focuses on faculty hiring, which impacts all other aspects. While important first steps, statements acknowledging anthropology's complicity with colonialism and white supremacy require further action. Public statements affirming Black Lives Matter following the events of 2020 were not universally embraced by BIPOC people, including university faculty. A common warning from skeptics regarded performative allyship;[4] true antiracism requires changing outcomes, not reifying intentions (for accounting on follow-up, see link in note).[5]

In the end, the search process we discuss did diversify the faculty in the small department. However, the process exposed the "white public space," several structural and cultural impediments to "cleaning house from within." Given the university's official promotion of ADEI as one of the institution's core values and goals while simultaneously enforcing budget cuts that limit units' work on antiracism and social justice, uprooting institutional racism and the ways in which it is vernacularized and reinforced has become ever more important.

DEFINING OUR NEEDS

One of US anthropology's origin myths that continues to shape disciplinary and departmental practice is that we have "four fields." Our apical ancestor, Franz Boas, assembled archaeological, ethnological, biological, and linguistic evidence to refute dominant xenophobic and racialist ideas at the turn of the twentieth century (a historiographical sleight-of-hand that erases generations of explicitly racist "armchair" theorizing, notably de Gobineau's *Inequality of the Races*).[6] In practice, this four-field approach has led to infighting and splintering of some departments, including the one from which Mark received his PhD. Following important critiques by Vine Deloria Jr. ([1969] 1988) and Edward Said (1979), anthropology engaged a self-critique beginning in the mid-1980s. Feminist anthropology brought insights of standpoint theory (Haraway 1989; Harding 1991; Harstock 1983) and issued calls for reflexivity (Behar 1992; Behar and Gordon 1995; Ulysse 2003). The status of the field being an "objective science" was in question, most emblematically in an exchange between Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Roy d'Andrade (Scheper-Hughes 1995). The rising stature of Paul Farmer led a charge for "public anthropology," particularly within sociocultural anthropology; arguably, most within the subdiscipline no longer aspire to objectivity but some form of public engagement. Other subdisciplines are engaging in similar conversations, but the debate is far from settled.

Thankfully, the tensions that have ripped other departments apart along the subdisciplinary divide or over the "science question" were not evident in Mark's department, which enjoyed a collegial atmosphere. While conducting divergent research and employing increasingly distinct methodologies and epistemologies, faculty attend one another's events and work together in "mash-ups" with graduate students. Several years prior, when Mark was hired in a cohort of three tenure-track faculty and a new museum director, the department had plans to create a doctoral program. That idea has long since been abandoned, even before the state's two-year budget stalemate that contributed to an uncertain financial future for the university and led the university's previous administration to develop the cutthroat process of "program prioritization," forcing units to make a case for their survival. All of this was done concurrently with revamping the general educational curriculum. Imagining a PhD program allowed us to think creatively about how to bring the subfields together—albeit without archaeology represented, since they were leaving the institution or didn't agree with the idea—in the service of addressing contemporary issues.

Amid this budget fallout, all four of the department's archaeologists left, each for different reasons. The following year, passing on the chance to hire a Latinx candidate, the department hired one archaeologist, who left two years later. In their exit interview, the departing archaeologist voiced concerns about being the only archaeologist in the department, which the department leveraged to secure permission to make two simultaneous hires. The department imagined the two hires as complementary but distinct, which could have had overlap, one topical and one regional. The descriptions were deliberately kept "open," in the words of senior colleagues, "to get the best candidate." Keywords such as race, identity, and immigration, which speak to the concerns of our increasingly diverse student body, were not included in the position advertisements. The "best candidate" and the position descriptions were determined independently of any intent or desire to hire BIPOC faculty. In other words, diversifying the faculty was not intentional at the department level.

INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES

Like many universities across the United States, particularly Predominantly White Institutions, the status quo reproduces what Kwame Ture (formerly Stokely Carmichael) and Charles Hamilton termed "institutional racism" (Carmichael and Hamilton 1967). While NIU's student body is increasingly more diverse as a result of several factors, it becomes less diverse at each higher rank: for example, the graduate student population is less diverse than the undergraduate, and so on. In fall 2018, 50.2 percent of our institution's undergraduates were first-generation students, and 51.6 percent had Federal Pell Grant eligibility. The university enrolled an undergraduate student population that was 19 percent Latinx and 16.5 percent Black non-Hispanic. Data on the race/ethnicity of instructional staff is unavailable to us for fall 2018, but data shared for fall 2019—after measures to improve hiring outcomes and diversify the professoriate were implemented—reveal that BIPOC faculty remain strikingly underrepresented, undervalued, and undercompensated relative to their teaching, advising, mentoring, and service on our campus, with Latinx faculty making up just 2.6 percent of the professoriate and Black faculty making up 2.7 percent of the professoriate. Put another way, in fall 2019, the university employed one Latinx professor for every seventy-five Latinx students and one Black professor for every sixty-six Black students on campus.[7] Around this same time, the university unveiled a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan that included achieving the goal of federal recognition as a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI).

The new university administration recognized the pressing need to diversify its faculty, admitting that this was important for students and for the few overworked and overburdened BIPOC faculty already on campus. As BIPOC faculty (particularly women) since at least Ann DuCille (1994) have long noted, being one of few "diverse" faculty saddles one with additional service burdens. The California Faculty Association, faculty union of the largest university in the United States, the California State University system, is aiming at redressing this, what Amado Padilla (1994) called "cultural taxation." BIPOC faculty in what has been called a "neoliberal university" (e.g., Chatterjee and Maira 2014; Greyser and Weiss 2012; Gusterson 2017; Petersen and Davies 2010) have been made responsible for recruitment, retention, mentoring, and successful graduation of students of color. In addition to top-down pressures from administration, students themselves often reach out to faculty who look more like them (Davis 2015; Navarro, Williams, and Ahmad 2013).

But specific measures to improve the representation of BIPOC faculty on campus were not enacted; for example, there were no target hires or cluster hires in areas more likely to attract BIPOC faculty. Rather, the university sought to change outcomes by mandating changes at the level of the hiring committee. Two steps were enacted: search committee members were now required to attend a single, one-hour implicit-bias training, and hiring departments were now required to include a BIPOC faculty member on all faculty search committees. Implicit-bias trainings were conducted for all units, from faculty to buildings and grounds staff, and all in between. A major component to the trainings were high-production-value PricewaterhouseCoopers videos aimed at a corporate audience. Small group discussions that followed the videos straddled the many job categories within a university, and the discussion facilitator was not a faculty member or instructional staff. These two factors are significant, because this training did very little to reorient how or what faculty members think about the hiring process, particularly when an underlying goal is to diversify the professoriate. The training facilitator also deflected questions about how to assess "qualified" candidates. While implicit-bias training is a reasonable first step, alone it does not do enough to change existing expectations and mark as unacceptable a racialized culture that prefers the familiar. The challenges are not that prospective BIPOC faculty do not exist or that BIPOC faculty are not as qualified as their white counterparts (though these beliefs remain prevalent). The issue is that departments and faculty have not really "bought into" the institutional call for diversity through hiring BIPOC faculty and are dismissive of the fact that our diverse student population deserves a diverse faculty.

In another step toward diversity, the university also requires that all search committees be "diverse." This requirement often plays out in problematic ways. Broadly, it perpetuates a situation whereby the few BIPOC faculty on campus are, by necessity, pressed into service that is undercompensated, undervalued, time-consuming, and often emotionally draining (Jayakumar et al. 2009; Settles et al. 2020), leading to "racial battle fatigue" (Arnold, Crawford, and Khalifa 2016). Similarly, not every hiring unit is welcoming of the mandate to diversify its search committee by bringing in an outside person into the process, which is the result of most departments not having BIPOC individuals already within their unit. When invited to serve on the archaeology search committee, Christina was not asked about her experience or interest in the search fields or possible collaborations with her unit. Rather, she was asked, "Are you what people might consider a Latina?" This signaled that participation was more of a formality than an invitation to really engage in the process and impact the outcome.

These inequities sit atop general issues of compensation, wherein women and BIPOC faculty—even if tenured—are more likely to fall into the "associate professor" trap, burdened with additional service. White cisgender men like Mark are more likely to be loosened from these burdens, not even considering the gendered inequities implicit in the "work/life balance," and so can spend more time on their individual research agendas, submitting articles, books, and research proposals. Our institution even acknowledged this in an equity report released the year before the hire being discussed (Britt et al. 2017). Put together, these institutional practices reinforce white-majority faculty's implicit biases, which not surprisingly lead to hiring outcomes that resemble the white majority, as we describe below.

RITUALS OF STATUS

Predictably, given the "open" nature of the job advertisements, not to mention the dearth of other tenure-track jobs (the search chair called it a "buyer's market"), there were over 150 candidates for the jobs. While a handful of people applied for both positions, the search chair instructed the committee to ignore the overlap in any decision-making and view the pools independently. Additionally, at the outset of the search process, there was no effort made to frame this as an opportunity to hire BIPOC faculty. The latter is particularly striking given the messaging coming from the university president and the conversations centered on ADEI happening at the college level. That the anthropology department was authorized—and guaranteed funding—to make two hires at a time when there were only about a dozen total hires approved within the college suggests that, at the very least, diversification ought to have been a topic of consideration from the very beginning. Introducing diversity as a consideration, framed within larger institutional needs, and only during the final stages of the search process had profound consequences. For example, one committee member complained that it seemed unfair that the department had to consider diversity in hiring when the senior university administrators were not themselves diverse.

As central as they are to the ongoing reproduction of tenure-track faculty, faculty search committees wield a lot of power and expose the structural inequalities within the university. Even departments such as ours that invite people who are not part of the tenure track to participate in the process, such as instructors, non-instructional staff, and graduate students, this participation is not even. Not everyone who has a "voice" has a vote. The process of whittling the full list to the "long short list" and the "short list" to bring to campus was open to only the search committee, all tenure-track faculty. These power dynamics shape the decision-making process. Similarly, some on the search committee felt pressure to hire a "rising star," someone with high levels of recognized research productivity, because of the lasting memories of the top-down process of program prioritization. The belief was that the department's high level of research activity had previously shielded it from budget cuts. Using neoliberal metrics of "countable" research achievements disrupted intersectional understandings, reinforcing a zero-sum, either/or logic: potential for excellence in research was pit against other considerations, such as diversity.

With such a large pool, and limited time for review, it was decided that sample publications and recommendation letters would not be sought to inform decisions about first-round cuts. The American Anthropological Association has long recommended to search committees that letters of reference not be required up front. Therefore, the candidates' CVs, including their institutional pedigree, and cover letters carried significant weight, determining if the candidate would make it to the next rounds of evaluation. This fact alone reinforces the status distinction of the "prestige" PhD programs, sometimes even expressed out loud as some faculty identified with the prestige of the R1 that bequeathed their PhD. Our department offers an MA program that is very well regarded that accepts students based on potential and passion for the field. This mismatch—one could say "false consciousness"—reproduces the prestige and disrupts the full picture. People who are primarily concerned with teaching, who have one-on-one experience with students, prioritize the ability of faculty to connect with students, particularly students from lower socioeconomic brackets that are increasingly enrolling at our institution. A rubric was developed to assess each candidate's contribution to excellence in scholarship and teaching. After some discussion—presented by the authors—a category was added for "potential contributions to diversity." Given the demographics of our undergraduate student population, during formal on-campus group interviews, some individuals asked candidates how their teaching engaged students of color and how they sought to get students of color and nonmajors interested in anthropology and archaeology.

A reflection of the either/or logic, the "science divide" became more apparent when assessing scholarship. Some faculty measured potential in terms of grant dollars or the prestige of granting agencies and number of journal articles. While the department's merit document, which determines how to allocate raises,[8] did not make this distinction, several faculty gave first authorship of articles greater weight. Faculty at teaching-heavy universities, who have demonstrated abilities to teach disproportionately greater percentages of Black and Latinx students and first-generation students, had to compete with candidates with postdocs with little or no teaching responsibilities in terms of research productivity. Higher teaching loads mean that faculty—particularly exploited contingent faculty, the "precariat"—have less time and other support to publish. With publishing and grants prioritized as the most important criteria under consideration, it became necessary to advocate for qualified BIPOC candidates who did not clearly meet or exceed the written and unwritten requirements of the majority of the search committee. This requires acknowledging or taking into consideration the institutional barriers that exclude BIPOC graduate students from the opportunities (i.e., grants, postdoctoral fellowships, publishing), which complicates the discussion of the "best candidate," the ideal to which some faculty remain steadfastly attached. Admittedly, if a search committee member felt strongly to include a candidate past the first cut, even if others disagreed, we proceeded to request further materials. This

nod to the tradition of collegiality within the department notwithstanding, conversations were sometimes tense and uncomfortable as committee members debated the criteria, metrics, and the merits of institutional and departmental needs. Because of some people's idea of "merit," they considered "unacceptable" a promising young BIPOC candidate who in the end withdrew from the search after they received a prestigious postdoctoral fellowship. In other words, some white faculty's implicit biases prevent them from recognizing BIPOC faculty's research excellence.

As the decision about whittling the pool of people on our "shortlist" to invite to campus (not to mention making the offer) neared, implicit biases became more evident, and the conversation became more heated. The "consensus" that was supposed to guide collective decisions was more difficult to see. Further, explicitly racially charged statements about a candidate's potential or "excellence" were made out in the open. When discussing a Latinx candidate for one of the positions, one faculty member remarked that they may be quiet. Another said that "[they] may get on with [Latinx] students." Not only do these comments devalue the professional accomplishments and qualifications of the candidate, but they also suggest that in "pushing diversity," we are giving up or sacrificing something else that is more important. Similarly, a different Latinx candidate for the other position was twice referred to explicitly as "the diversity candidate." And yet, another faculty member argued, offering no evidence to support the claim, that this candidate had likely "not been self-reflexive" about being a role model for Latinx students.

These kinds of remarks revealed troubling assumptions about the university's Latinx student population (i.e., that they are all of Mexican origin or descent) and minimize the kinds of mentoring relationships Latinx students develop with Latinx faculty. Another faculty member offered written comments that reflect a problematic understanding of Latinx identity and culture: "I did not sense that their primary identity is 'Latinx' and I am not convinced that Latinx students will identify with them very much." Another comment was made about this candidate's class status—that they were from their country's upper class. These assumptions about the candidate's cultural identity and socioeconomic class work to homogenize the backgrounds and experiences of Latinx students, who we know are not a monolithic group. Thus, some white faculty seem to have a clearly defined image of what a Latinx faculty member should look, act, and feel like. In this case, the faculty member concluded that this candidate did not perform as imagined. White professors are not expected to come from working-class backgrounds; in fact, the protracted ritual of the in-person interview process that includes meal conversations are often highly charged markers of Bourdieu's (1984) "cultural capital." As this example of the double standard highlights, BIPOC faculty face additional obstacles during interview processes to perform in ways that mirror the racialized imaginaries—straddling between too Latinx or not Latinx enough, sometimes simultaneously—of white faculty members.

After some faculty, including the authors, forcefully pushed back at a singular notion of "excellence," arguing instead for the "whole picture," the coded language used to rank candidates and make decisions became "fit" and "collegiality." Speaking on behalf of one white candidate and against the only BIPOC candidate in the final pool, a senior faculty said, "they remind me of me." Indeed, they had one more publication than the BIPOC candidate (both were already well over the bar for tenure). When discussing the lone BIPOC candidate, one search committee member remarked that Christina had commented that one of the candidate's strengths was their ability, as Latinx faculty, to help recruit Latinx students. That was entirely untrue in this case. Christina's assessment did not include any mention of the candidate's Latinx identity or potential to connect with and mentor Latinx students; in fact, it was Mark who raised that issue. It is true that when BIPOC faculty are in the room, they often shoulder the responsibility for raising issues related to race and ethnicity when the only alternative is silence, and they are often heard saying things within explicitly racial terms. But BIPOC faculty are also not simply "one-trick ponies" incapable of offering other kinds of feedback, the kinds that are often considered more important or substantive by some white colleagues. Such biases mar the experiences of BIPOC faculty on search committees when it is presumed that they are "unfit" and seated at the table for a single purpose (Gutiérrez y Muhs et al. 2012).

Having not led the process with a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion as a central focus made each step of the deliberation process more difficult, as the authors consistently reintroduced these as a priority. Our experience is a clear example of what Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2021) called "color-blind" racism: unless proactive or "affirmative" actions are taken, white-majority hiring units usually reproduce the white status quo. Discussions sometimes grew contentious, particularly when assessing qualifications and selecting the "long short" and the "short list" of candidates to invite to campus. Eventually, the department did choose to hire a BIPOC candidate for one of the positions, while passing on another BIPOC finalist for the second position.

LESSONS LEARNED

This is only one department of many, of course. And as a small R2 department that does not have a PhD program, these decisions may be less impactful than others. However, our conversations with Black and Latinx colleagues at other universities, including with some in anthropology departments, revealed that these patterns are quite common. What we describe here could well have been written about other departments and other disciplines. This "ethnographic" look at the search processes, and the ways in which faculty hires reproduce institutional racism, helps explain aggregate data, underscoring why decolonizing anthropology remains an urgent priority.

This commentary offers an explanation for *why* anthropology continues to be a "white public space" (Brodkin, Morgen, and Hutchinson 2011). Implicit biases and prestige play an important role: graduates from the top 15 PhD programs in the United States make up a majority of tenure-track professors (Kawa et al. 2018). While women PhDs in anthropology now outnumber men two to one, men are disproportionately hired in

tenure-track jobs, a number that has increased since 2009 (Speakman et al. 2018). Archaeology is out of step in that men still predominate, possibly reflecting the lore of the masculine figure of Indiana Jones. Correcting this, the search committee did commit to inviting almost all women to campus. Also significantly, the subfield with the greatest racial disparity is archaeology, which is even more predominantly white than subfields like cultural anthropology, revealing and reproducing a legacy of racialism and white supremacy (e.g., Echo-Hawk and Zimmerman 2006; Franklin et al. 2020). This gap is also more pronounced for PhD-granting institutions, yet to hear some older white men tell it, women of color are taking over the discipline.

Collectively, at some point in the transition from exploited graduate student to liminal postdoc to hushed-up untenured assistant professor to tenured faculty, many people learn to internalize the current reward structure of tenure and promotion and start believing it has some inherent value—that it is, in fact, a meritocracy. Departments, university presses, peer-reviewed journals, fellowships and grants, and even fieldsites are ranked, sometimes only implicitly, on a prestige scale. And how successful one is on this prestige scale often translates into opportunities for better employment, publishing possibilities, or grants. These reward structures are far from race-neutral: they are built on colonial legacies of white supremacy. Decolonizing anthropology is thus multigenerational, requiring intentional steps to diversify the pipeline into these prestigious PhD programs.

Meanwhile, individual search committees like ours can take proactive steps to level the playing field. Like many others, our department engaged a series of self-critiques following the murder of George Floyd in 2020. In addition to posting statements, examining curriculum, and creating new courses, this requires a hard—if unflattering—look at our own practices. Diversity starts before the job descriptions are written: incentives can be put in place to encourage cluster hires (Chilton 2020; Freeman 2019) and grant radical ethnic studies centers that attract underrepresented student groups the power to select their traditional disciplinary partners, the reverse of the typical arrangement. While the authors are well aware of the dilemmas of the "joint hire," altering the center of gravity is the best way to prevent the kind of attempted tokenism Christina experienced. It also assures that "diversity" centers get more than "input" and also get to name their priorities.

Particularly now that anthropology departments such as ours have issued public statements in solidarity with the aims of Black Lives Matter, it should be obvious that search committees see "diversity" as an asset, not as a chore getting in the way of meritocracy. Having an outsider, a "diversity advocate," was absolutely essential in this case; however, if *only* BIPOC faculty are committed to this work, this increases inequities in service burdens. White faculty need to educate themselves, do the work, and be willing to bring up "uncomfortable" topics during deliberations. Another concrete step is to prioritize diversity within the job ad, far more than just "teaching a diverse body of undergraduate and graduate students"; the listing of research capacities must include the needs of radical ethnic studies. In addition to learning (and including) the keywords of antiracist scholarship addressing racial justice in the list of "preferred qualifications," this might mean a critical, feminist, intersectional, and decolonizing pedagogy and epistemology. It may not look like the kind of anthropology we're used to, or what we currently do. We need to craft different measures of success and outcomes. Finally, this is labor that needs to be shared, and frankly disproportionately borne, by white-majority faculty. As Williams, Squire, and Truitt (2021) conclude, "academic institutions will need to ensure that *all* of their employees, not just their diversity workers of color, have the capacity, skills, knowledge, and courage to support the development of anti-racist campuses." Founded in the wake of the George Floyd protests, #BlackInTheIvory grew very quickly, offering tips to amplify efforts of Blackacademics (Davis 2021).

Search committees alone cannot improve disparities in faculty representation; rather, colleges and universities must commit to enacting policies and practices that aid in the dismantling of institutional barriers that impede the hiring and retention of BIPOC faculty. To this end, universities need to commit to a review and rethinking of tenure and promotion policies that very often disadvantage BIPOC faculty facing the consequences of disproportionate service. Policies must be revised to acknowledge and value—on par with research and teaching—the service burdens placed on BIPOC faculty. The California Faculty Association is bargaining to compensate "cultural taxation." Indiana University/Purdue University of Indianapolis has pluralized the notion of "excellence"—an individual faculty can be tenured for either excellence in research or teaching and now contributions to ADEI. Department chairs and deans need to offer informal as well as formal support and offer opportunities for peer mentoring for junior BIPOC faculty (Cole, McGowan, and Zerquera 2017). Other recommendations for improving outcomes for BIPOC faculty, particularly mid-career faculty pursuing advancement to full-professor status, include extended year-long sabbaticals at full pay and course buyouts to allow for additional research and writing time. On the latter two points, it should be emphasized that universities must commit to allocating the fiscal resources needed to materialize the visions and goals detailed in their solidarity statements.

ORCID

Mark Schuller https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3789-2359

NOTES

In compliance with directives from NIU's Division of Research and Innovation Partnerships, please note that there was no IRB review of this project.

[1] https://www.chronicle.com/article/covid-19-cuts-hit-contingent-faculty-hard-as-it-drags-on-some-question-their-future.

[2] While still a public school, only a small fraction of Michigan's overall budget comes from allocation from the state legislature.

[3] Both authors had conversations, solicited through professional networks, with Black and Latinx colleagues at community colleges and universities across the United States. A recurring theme throughout all of these conversations was the reality that policies and practices at varied institutions present barriers to hiring a diverse professoriate.

[4] See https://footnotesblogcom.wordpress.com/2019/05/06/decolonizing-everyday-praxis-space-%e2%86%92-decolonizing-anthropology/.

[5] See https://www.naspa.org/press/naspa-and-nadohe-releases-research-report-on-racial-justice-statements-from-2020.

[6] Black anthropologists such as Blakey (2020) and Mullings (2005, 2015) have long critiqued how Boasian denialism of race has rendered the field irrelevant to struggles for racial justice.

[7] Overall, in 2019, NIU had a student-to-faculty ratio of 10.3 to 1.

[8] In November 2019, the faculty union secured its first contract with the administration, which included raises in four categories, including "merit."

REFERENCES CITED

Arnold, Noëlle Witherspoon, Emily R. Crawford, and Muhammad Khalifa. 2016. "Psychological Heuristics and Faculty of Color: Racial Battle Fatigue and Tenure/Promotion." *The Journal of Higher Education* 87(6): 890–919.

Behar, Ruth. 1992. "Life Story to Take across the Border: Notes on an Exchange." In *Storied Lives: The Cultural Politics of Self-Understanding*, edited by George Rosenwald and Richard Ochberg: 108–23. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Behar, Ruth, and Deborah Gordon. 1995. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Behm, Amanda, Christienna Fryar, Emma Hunter, Elisabeth Leake, Su Lin Lewis, and Sarah Miller-Davenport. 2020. "Decolonizing History: Enquiry and Practice." *History Workshop Journal* 89:169–91.

Berry, Maya J., Claudia Chávez Argüelles, Shanya Cordis, Sarah Ihmoud, and Elizabeth Velásquez Estrada. 2017. "Toward a Fugitive Anthropology: Gender, Race, and Violence in the Field." *Cultural Anthropology* 32(4): 537–65.

Blakey, Michael. 2020. "Archaeology under the Blinding Light of Race." *Current Anthropology* 61(S22): s183–97.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2021. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. Sixth edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Britt, Anne, Paul Dawkins, Ellen Franklin, Janice Hamlet, Ana Hernandez, Laurence Lurio, Taneisha Vilma, and Simón Weffer. 2017. *Confronting the Equity Gap Issue, College of Liberal Arts and Science*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University CLAS Equity Gap Team, Summer.

Brodkin, Karen, Sandra Morgen, and Janis Hutchinson. 2011. "Anthropology as White Public Space?" *American Anthropologist* 113(4): 545–56.

Carmichael, Stokely, and Charles V. Hamilton. 1967. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation*. New York: Random House.

Chatterjee, Piya, and Sunaina Maira, eds. 2014. *The Imperial University: Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Chilton, Elizabeth S. 2020. "The Certain Benefits of Cluster Hiring." *Inside Higher Education*, February 6. https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2020/02/06/how-cluster-hires-can-promote-faculty-diversity-and-inclusion-opinion.

Cole, Eddie R., Brian L. McGowan, and Desiree D. Zerquera. 2017. "First-Year Faculty of Color: Narratives about Entering the Academy." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 50(1): 1–12.

Connell, Raewyn. 2018. "Decolonizing Sociology." *Contemporary Sociology* 47(4): 399–407.

Cox, Aimee Meredith. 2018. "Afterword: Why Anthropology?" Hot Spots, *Cultural Anthropology* website, September 26. https://culanth.org/fieldsights/1539-afterword-why-anthropology.

Cullors, Patrisse. 2022. *An Abolitionist's Handbook: 12 Steps to Changing Yourself and the World*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Davies, Carole Boyce, and Charles Peterson, with Meredith Gadsby, and Henrietta Williams. 2003. *Decolonizing the Academy: Diaspora Theory and African New World Studies*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Davis, Dána-Ain. 2015. "Constructing Fear in Academia: Neoliberal Practices at a Public College." In *Learning under Neoliberalism: Ethnographies of Governance in Higher Education*, edited by Susan Brin Hyatt, Boone W. Shear, and Susan Wright, 151–77. New York: Berghahn Books.

Davis, Shardé M. 2021. "Being Black in the Ivory: Tips for Amplifying the Voices of Blackademic TRUTHtellers in the Academy." *Black in the Ivory*, February 1. https://blackintheivory.net/blackademic-truthtellers.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. (1969) 1988. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Dhillon, Jaskiran. 2018. "The Future of Anthropology Starts from Within." Hot Spots, *Cultural Anthropology* website, September 26. https://culanth.org/fieldsights/1532-the-future-of-anthropology-starts-from-within.

DuCille, Ann. 1994. "The Occult of True Black Womanhood." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19:591–629.

Echo-Hawk, Roger, and Larry J. Zimmerman. 2006. "Beyond Racism: Some Opinions about Racialism and American Archaeology." *American Indian Quarterly* 30(3/4): 461–85.

Franklin, Maria, Justin P. Dunnavant, Ayana Omilade Flewellen, and Alicia Odewale. 2020. "The Future Is Now: Archaeology and the Eradication of Anti-Blackness." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 24:756–66.

Freeman, Carla. 2019. "The Case for Cluster Hiring to Diversify Your Faculty." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 9. https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-case-for-cluster-hiring-to-diversify-your-faculty.

García-Peña, Lorgia, and Mordecai Lyon. 2020. "Decolonizing the University." *Boston Review*, June 2. http://bostonreview.net/race/lorgia-garcia-pena-mordecai-lyon-decolonize-university.

Greyser, Naomi, and Margot Weiss. 2012. "Introduction: Left Intellectuals and the Neoliberal University." *American Quarterly* 64(4):787–93.

Gusterson, Hugh. 2017. "Homework: Toward a Critical Ethnography of the University, AES Presidential Address, 2017." *American Ethnologist* 44(3): 435–50.

Gutiérrez y Muhs, Gabriella, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. González, and Angela P. Harris. 2012. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Boulder, CO: Utah State University Press.

Haraway, Donna. 1989. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*. New York: Routledge.

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST

Harding, Sandra. 1991. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Harrison, Faye V. (1991) 2010. *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving further toward an Anthropology for Liberation.* Third edition. Arlington, VA: Association of Black Anthropologists, American Anthropological Association.

Harstock, Nancy. 1983. "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism." In *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science,* edited by Sandra Harding and Merrill B. Hintikka, 283–310. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Jayakumar, Uma M., Tyrone C. Howard, Walter R. Allen, and June C. Han. 2009. "Racial Privilege in the Professoriate: An Exploration of Campus Climate, Retention, and Satisfaction." *The Journal of Higher Education* 80(5): 538–63.

Jobson, Ryan Cecil. 2020. "The Case for Letting Anthropology Burn: Sociocultural Anthropology in 2019." *American Anthropologist* 122(2): 259–71.

Kawa, Nicholas C., José A. Clavijo Michelangeli, Jessica L. Clark, Daniel Ginsberg, and Christopher McCarty. 2018. "The Social Network of US Academic Anthropology and Its Inequalities." *American Anthropologist* 121(1): 14–29.

Kendi, Ibram X. 2019. *How to Be an Antiracist.* New York: One World.

LaBrecque, Annabel. 2018. "The National History Center's New Teaching Decolonization Resource Collection." *Perspectives on History,* March 19. https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/march-2018/the-national-history-centers-new-teaching-decolonization-resource-collection.

la paperson. 2017. *A Third University Is Possible.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lichtenstein, Alex C. 2018. "Decolonizing the AHR." *American Historical Review* 123(1): xiv–xvii.

Mullings, Leith. 2005. "Interrogating Racism: Toward an Antiracist Anthropology." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:667–94.

Mullings, Leith. 2015. "Anthropology Matters." *American Anthropologist* 117(1): 4–16.

Navarro, Tami, Bianca C. Williams, and Attiya Ahmad. 2013. "Sitting at the Kitchen Table: Fieldnotes from Women of Color in Anthropology." *Cultural Anthropology* 28(3): 443–63.

Padilla, Amado. 1994. "Ethnic Minority Scholars, Research, and Mentoring: Current and Future Issues." *Educational Researcher* 23(4): 24–27.

Petersen, Eva Bendix, and Bronwyn Davies. 2010. "In/Difference in the Neoliberalised University." *Learning and Teaching: The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences* 3(2): 92–109.

Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books.

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. 1995. "The Primacy of the Ethical: Towards a Militant Anthropology." *Current Anthropology* 36(3): 409–20.

Settles, Isis H., Martinique K. Jones, NiCole T. Buchanan, and Kristie Dotson. 2020. "Epistemic Exclusion: Scholar(ly) Devaluation That Marginalizes Faculty of Color." *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 14(4): 493–507.

Speakman, Robert J., Carla S. Hadden, Matthew H. Colvin, Justin Cramb, K. C. Jones, Travis W. Jones, Isabelle Lulewicz, Katharine G. Napora, Katherine L. Reinberger, Brandon T. Ritchison, Alexandra R. Edwards, and Victor D. Thompson. 2018. "Market Share and Recent Hiring Trends in Anthropology Faculty Positions." *PLoS One* 13(9): 1–19.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1(1): 1–40.

Ulysse, Gina Athena. 2003. "Cracking the Silence on Reflexivity: Negotiating Identities, Fieldwork, and the Dissertation in Kingston and Ann Arbor." In *Decolonizing the Academy: African Diaspora Studies,* edited by Carole Boyce Davies, 283–98. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Williams, Bianca C., Diane Squire, and Frank Truitt. 2021. *Plantation Politics and Campus Rebellions: Power, Diversity, and the Emancipatory Struggle in Higher Education.* Albany: SUNY Press.