

8

RELEGATED TO THE MARGINS

Faculty of Color, the Scholarly Record, and the Necessity of Antiracist Library Disruptions

Harrison W. Inefuku

Knowledge, as it has been shaped in the United States, is grounded in whiteness. Academic publishing, and scholarly communication more broadly, have been shaped by professions that are overwhelmingly white—academia, publishing, and librarianship. These professions have developed a scholarly communication system comprised of policies, practices, and beliefs that marginalize contributions by and about communities of color.

Scholarly communication is “the system through which research and other scholarly writings are created, evaluated for quality, disseminated to the scholarly community, and preserved for future use” (ACRL Scholarly Communications Committee 2003). A core tenet of Critical Race Theory (CRT) is that racism is ordinary and pervasive in societal structures—scholarly communication is no exception. It is marked by a series of gatekeepers that judge the admissibility of research into the scholarly record, sending messages to People of Color that they do not belong in academia and their research is not valuable. The inequities in publishing are representative of racial power dynamics in greater society, reflecting and reinscribing White Supremacy over the construction of knowledge.

Academic publishing, the publication of the products of scholarly research, is the primary means through which knowledge is validated and entered into the scholarly record. In order to get published, research products typically undergo editorial and peer review, through which decisions are made as to whether these products are valid and significant enough for publication. Critique of liberalism is a tenet of

CRT—an analysis of academic publishing through this lens reveals that the standards of validity and significance are neither objective nor meritocratic, but work to buttress whiteness in the construction of knowledge.

This chapter is a consideration of the role of race and power in the construction of knowledge, employing a CRT lens. Engaging with the CRT tenets that racism is ordinary and pervasive, and the critique of liberalism, I analyze four gatekeeping processes that impact the creation and acceptance of knowledge—the selection of research topics and methodologies; peer review; knowledge dissemination; and faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure. Through these processes, academic publishing in the United States creates a body of knowledge that privileges a white worldview and marginalizes the perspectives, experiences, and contributions of communities of color. I close the chapter with a call for academic librarians, libraries, and our professional organizations to engage in social justice work to center research by and about communities of color in the scholarly record.

GATEKEEPING IN ACADEMIC PUBLISHING

The pervasiveness of White Supremacy and racism in the United States presents barriers to scholars of color at numerous points in their education and careers, impacting the construction of knowledge. It begins early, with biased textbooks and curricula and messaging that tells women and People of Color that they don't belong in science and technology. It continues through college and university admissions, government and nonprofit funding priorities, grant-making decisions, and hiring and promotion, among many other points. Through gatekeeping practices, academic publishing deprives communities of color of representation in many spheres of society beyond academia, and of knowledge necessary to advance an antiracist and anti-oppressive agenda.

THE GATEKEEPERS: ACADEMICS, PUBLISHERS, AND LIBRARIANS

Academic publishing is located at the intersection of three professions—academia, publishing, and librarianship, with each having gatekeeping roles at various points in the research and publication cycle (Inefuku and Roh 2016). Academia provides the pool of authors, editors, and reviewers; publishing determines whose voices are included in the scholarly record; and librarians play a large role in disseminating knowledge and helping scholars locate scholarly resources.

The demographics of these professions are overwhelmingly white. Faculty of color in the United States comprise 24 percent of the professoriate (McFarland et al. 2019), significantly less than their number in the American population at large, of which 39 percent identified as Hispanic or Latinx, a racial category other than white, and/or multiracial (US Census Bureau, n.d.). Publishing and librarianship are even more homogenous. A study of demographics of professionals working in scholarly publishing found that 90.67 percent of respondents identified as white or Caucasian (Greco, Wharton, and Brand 2016). The American Library Association's (2012) "Diversity Counts" study found that 86.1 percent of credential librarians in higher education were white.

These demographics speak to the obstacles People of Color face in entering and thriving in these professions and to their absence in shaping the policies and practices that have shaped the scholarly record. The norms of academic publishing have been constructed from a perspective of whiteness, with limited to no input from communities of color. Systemic biases manifest in the cultures and practices of all three professions that contribute to the academic publishing endeavor, working in concert to uphold a master narrative that centers knowledge that adheres to dominant (white) topics of inquiry and methodologies.

RESEARCH TOPICS AND METHODOLOGY

Academic publishing serves to define the limits of "legitimate" knowledge. Higher education professor Christine Stanley (2007, 14) argues, "There is a master narrative operating in academia that often defines and limits what is valued as scholarship and who is entitled to create scholarship. This is problematic, because the dominant group in academia writes most research and, more often than not, they are White men." Similarly, Dolores Delgado Bernal and Octavio Villalpando (2002, 177) propose that "by marginalizing the knowledge of faculty of color, higher education has created an apartheid of knowledge where the dominant European epistemology is believed to produce 'legitimate' knowledge, in contrast to the 'illegitimate' knowledge that is created by all other epistemological perspectives."

White Americans are uncomfortable talking about race and the impact of racism on People of Color in the United States (DiAngelo 2018). This discomfort erects barriers to publishing for scholars who conduct research on race and racism or employ activist perspectives and methodologies. In discussing the experiences of four LIS faculty of color, Nicole A. Cooke and Joe O. Sánchez (2019) write, "All of the authors

have previously had their work and personal experience dismissed, minimized, and ignored because these experiences raised upsetting questions or conclusions about how the field and the professoriate treat people of color” (169). The pressure on scholars of race to adopt mainstream (white) subjects and methodologies serves to highlight the prevalence of white fragility in academia.

The methodological norms of a discipline can also hinder research on communities of color. In psychology, for example, studies of underrepresented populations may be considered methodologically flawed if they do not have a white control group, whereas studies of whites are never required to include African American control groups (Korchin 1980). Psychology professor Stanley Sue (1999, 1073) states that psychological research often assumes universality of research, and “the burden of proof is placed on researchers concerned about race, ethnicity, and bias to show that there are ethnic differences.” Such attitudes toward race in science reinforce the construction of whiteness as the default and standard, with scholars researching communities of color having to push against the pervasiveness of color-blind attitudes.

Scholars with a social justice orientation and others who conduct research on communities of color often receive feedback that their work is too narrow, biased, activist, descriptive, and/or lacking intellectual or scientific rigor (Sue 1999). Thus, faculty of color with an interest in social justice scholarship may be dissuaded from taking an activist approach, and instead utilize mainstream methodologies or focus on nonracial forms of oppression (such as gender) (Simpson 2010). CRT’s focus on intersectionality, however, stresses that scholars do not have to choose between researching race, gender, or other forms of oppression, because these forms of oppression are interlinked and overlapping.

When scholars of color interested in researching race and racism succumb to this pressure and avoid race-based research, they give up a part of their identity and purpose (Del Carmen Salazar and Rios 2016). This approach is assimilationist and implies that faculty of color are unable to develop their own research agendas (Stanley and Lincoln 2005). Within our field of library and information science (LIS), faculty of color have shared experiences that they are expected to be experts in diversity-related issues, while being dissuaded from pursuing research agendas in diversity to avoid being “pigeonholed” (Ceja Alcalá et al. 2017).

The pressures to adhere to dominant research topics and methodologies work to uphold White Supremacy in the formation of knowledge. Color-blind attitudes toward research negate the reality of White Supremacy in American society and give scholars and institutions a pass on confronting their complicity in systems of racial oppression.

PEER REVIEW

When an article is submitted to a journal, it is first reviewed by an editor who does an initial review. The editor then assigns the article to peer reviewers. Most peer reviews are either single-anonymous, in which the identities of the reviewers are hidden from the author, but the reviewers are aware of the author's identity; or double-anonymous, in which the identities of the authors and reviewers are hidden from each other.¹ The peer reviewers make recommendations on whether to accept or reject a submission or request revisions, with the final decision lying with the editor. Viewing peer review through CRT's critique of liberalism helps us see that peer review does not result in objective evaluations of scholarship.

By making the identity of authors available to reviewers, single-anonymous review opens the process to biases held by reviewers. In describing the history of peer review for the Royal Society, Aileen Fyfe (2018) writes, "Certain surnames could conjure up stereotypes about, for example, Indian or Japanese researchers and there was never any doubt about which authors were female, thanks to the allegedly chivalrous insistence upon giving the first names (and/or gender specific titles, such as 'Mrs') of female authors." Although double-anonymous peer review is designed to protect a work from reviewer bias, neither process protects the work from any biases that may be held by an editor. Triple-anonymous reviews, in which the identity of the author is also hidden from editors, and open peer review, in which the identities of reviewers are made available to authors, have been proposed as more equitable approaches to peer review.

While research on the impact of gender on peer review has generated mixed results (Darling 2014), the journal *Behavioral Ecology* noted a significant increase in female authors after switching to double-anonymous peer review in 2001 (Budden et al. 2008). This finding has been cited by other journals that have switched to double-anonymous reviews. While the literature lacks studies on the impact of race and ethnicity on peer review, peer review is not immune to the biases that exist in society that disadvantage communities of color. Economics professors Marianne Bertrand and Sendhil Mullainathan (2004) found that job applicants with Black-sounding names were less likely to receive callbacks from job applications than applicants with white-sounding names. Authors with Black-, Latinx-, or Asian-sounding names may similarly be impacted by systemic biases in peer review.

In addition to bias toward authors of color, there is also significant bias toward research on race and racism, as noted in the previous section. Communications scholar Jennifer Lyn Simpson (2010) points out that "authors who push the boundaries of the

discipline may both disrupt foundational assumptions that undergird the field and challenge people's core beliefs about their identity. Meritocratic review holds up poorly in these circumstances" (151).

When receiving submissions or publications for review about communities of color, there is no guarantee that the editor will try to send the submission to reviewers who are engaged in, knowledgeable about, or even receptive to studies of race and racism. There is also nothing stopping those who are unfamiliar with studying race and racism from accepting invitations to review articles on the subject. Katherine Grace Hendrix (2002, 161) frames her analysis of peer reviews that question the legitimacy of methodologies used by scholars of color in terms of "(a) a lack of knowledge regarding validity and reliability issues for scholars of color and (b) the power to judge the merit of research by scholars of color versus the ability to do so."

Indeed, there are examples of editors assigning publications to reviewers with histories of supporting racist theories and views. In 2017, the *American Historical Review* published a book review of Ansley T. Erickson's *Making the Unequal Metropolis: School Desegregation and Its Limits*. The author of the review, known for publishing in white nationalist venues, included a critique that Erickson doesn't mention sociobiology—widely discredited for naturalizing racism and justifying racist viewpoints—in her work (Jaschik 2017). Readers without prior knowledge of sociology may be led to believe Erickson failed to include an important methodological approach in her work. Biased reviews can lead to poor evaluations of research in tenure and promotion decisions or lead librarians to decide to not purchase the book for their library's collection, limiting the scholar's career trajectory and readers' access to the work.

Part of the issue is that the pool of potential editors and reviewers (i.e., the professoriate) is not diverse—a direct result of the pervasive role of systemic racism in academia. A demographic survey of editorial board members of ACRL publications demonstrates how the lack of diversity within a field (in this case, academic librarianship) impacts the diversity of editorial boards who make decisions on what content gets published. The survey found that the demographics of editorial board members is closely aligned with the demographics of librarianship, as measured in the ALA's "Diversity Counts" survey, with 88 percent of respondents identifying as white (Ford, Kaspar, and Seiden 2017). Increasing representation, however, is not the only answer. As Stanley (2007) argues, editors and reviewers need to educate themselves on the ways privilege and oppression manifest in the review process and to recuse themselves from reviewing scholarship that they are unfamiliar with. Simpson (2010) stresses the importance of not overburdening the limited pool of experts conducting race-related research, writing:

Editors might choose to have manuscripts reviewed by scholars outside the discipline of communication who specialize in race-related research and should expect reviewers within the discipline who have expertise germane to some but not all of the content to follow-up and review citations that complement their existing knowledge. (157)

These calls place the burden of work on editors and peer reviewers to educate themselves on systems of white privilege and racial oppression when reviewing works on race. It is not the role of scholars of color to educate their editors and reviewers on theories and methodologies that underpin research on race and racism (beyond what is outlined in an article's methodology section), which places on these researchers additional expectations that are not shared by white scholars.

KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION

Many publishers are driven by market forces, with the selection of books or journals to publish determined in part by the perceived market for publications and the alignment of the publications with the mission of the press. This can make it hard for scholars conducting research on communities of color or other marginalized communities to find a publisher—these topics may be considered to be too “niche” or specialized by publishers who are concerned with recouping publishing costs and turning a profit.

Once faculty of color are published, the ability of their publication to reach readers is heavily dependent on libraries. The collection-building policies and practices and discovery tools employed by libraries has a significant impact on whether the research will be read and used. The selection of titles to add to a library's collection may impact citations, with articles published in journals carried by a library cited more often by the library's users (Corby 2003). Past and present library policies and practices in collection development, description, and cataloging have made libraries complicit in the development of a scholarly record that privileges white voices, perspectives, and experiences.

Once publications enter a library's collection, the ability for researchers to find the publications is impacted by metadata, cataloging, and descriptive standards and the discovery tools offered by the library. Research has shown that the algorithms behind the search engines, library discovery tools, and social media sites that drive today's information seeking reflect societal biases (Bozdag 2013; Noble 2018; Reidsma 2016; Reidsma 2019). Although technological solutions are often viewed as objective, they retain the biases of their human creators, and through machine learning, they can inherit the biases of their users. The controlled vocabularies applied by librarians to organize information reflects societal biases, making it difficult to locate resources on marginalized populations (Olson 2001). In describing the three predominant indexing

and classification systems used in law, critical race scholars Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic (2000) note: “The systems function rather like molecular biology’s double helix: They replicate preexisting ideas, thoughts, and approaches. Within the bounds of the three systems, moderate, incremental reform remains quite possible, but the systems make foundational, transformative innovation difficult” (217).

Our classifications systems are slow to change—efficient at finding existing and dominant knowledge but slow to incorporate new ideas, theories, methodologies, and vocabularies. As Hathcock notes, this chapter would be challenging to find using the Library of Congress Subject Headings, as “there is a heading for *White Supremacy Movements* but not *White Supremacy* (as an ideology) or *White Privilege*” (2016; emphasis in original). Likewise, there is no heading for Critical Race Theory. Hathcock points to the bias present in the available terms around whiteness—by including White Supremacy movements and omitting White Supremacy and white privilege, the headings adhere to the notion that racism consists of individual acts, instead of a structural norm in American society. The lack of a heading for Critical Race Theory also illustrates the slowness of change in classification systems, as the framework has been in existence for over thirty years. Although today’s library discovery systems are built on standards and technology, these systems are neither universal nor unbiased, and they help to contribute to the invisibility of research by scholars of color, limiting their ability to be read and cited.

FACULTY EVALUATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

In addition to research and scholarship, faculty are also expected to perform other duties, including teaching and service. Teaching and service, however, are not weighted as heavily in faculty evaluations. Research has shown that faculty of color spend more of their time on service, which is given little value in making promotion and tenure decisions. Education professor Amado Padilla (1994) developed the term *cultural taxation* to name the increased expectations placed on faculty for service, especially service around issues of diversity and climate. A study of faculty at the University of Oregon found that nonmarginalized assistant professors were able to dedicate *four times* the mean of marginalized assistant professors (including faculty of color, sexual minorities, and those from disadvantaged class backgrounds) of their awake time on research (Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group 2017). With more time dedicated to research, white faculty have an advantage in the publication numbers-counting game in consideration for tenure and promotion.

Measures have been built into the faculty evaluation process with the intention of increasing the objectivity of evaluations, including providing criteria and standards for evaluators for qualitative approaches and using multiple data sources for quantitative approaches (Whitman and Weiss 1982). The reliance on quantitative data, such as citation counts, however, is not objective, as such data reflect the biases inherent in academic publishing (Reece and Hardy 2017; Jensenius et al. 2018). Meritocracy “negates the importance of raced experience and holds everyone to a standard originally and primarily defined by Whites and biased in favor of the status quo” (Simpson 2010, 151). Thus, tenure and promotion, processes that are allegedly based on merit, instead work to uphold White Supremacy in academia.

With the growth of open-access publishing and library publishing programs, there has been a growth of opportunities to create journals dedicated to publishing subjects and methodologies that are ignored by the dominant publications. These journals can help to build communities of researchers and practitioners and provide publishing opportunities for emerging scholars. Yet, “while providing essential outlets for new perspectives and developing areas of research, publications in these journals may be devalued in standard decision-making processes for moving faculty up the career ladder” (Turner 2003, 118). The growth of library publishing provides our profession with an opportunity to reenvision and implement new modes of publishing that center communities of color.

With a faculty member’s promotion and tenure dependent largely on their research productivity and publication output, the obstacles scholars of color face in publishing at each step of the career ladder and research life cycle accumulate to form a significant barrier. Promotion and tenure data from the University of Southern California demonstrates the challenge facing faculty of color—while 81 percent of white junior faculty were awarded tenure between 1998 and 2012, only 47.6 percent of junior faculty of color received tenure (Junn 2016). As English professor Patricia A. Matthew (2016) writes, “Even though personal processes are inherently subjective at every level, those who are part of those processes deploy the language of meritocracy in the belief they are being objective” (9). Standards, criteria, and procedures are claimed to be objective and meritocratic, but a CRT lens tell us that claims to liberalism allows systems to ignore and perpetuate past and current injustices. Edward Taylor (1998) notes, “By relying on merit criteria or standards, the dominant group can justify its exclusion of blacks to positions of power, believing in its own neutrality” (123). Concepts such as “best” as “qualified” have been constructed in a white worldview, and the perspectives, approaches, and knowledge of scholars of

color are marginalized and devalued. The result is a professoriate that continues to lag behind society and a student body that is increasingly diverse.

THE LIBRARY'S ROLE IN PROMOTING ANTIRACISM

With the increase in critical approaches to librarianship, there has been a growing call for librarians to adopt a social justice mindset and actively embrace their agency to make library collections and services more inclusive, serving as agents of change (Morales, Knowles, and Bourg 2014; Inefuku and Roh 2016). As experts in information, librarians are in a prime position to challenge the systemic biases in academia that hinder the careers of faculty of color.

This section draws on the CRT commitment to social justice tenet, identifying ways libraries can partner with campus stakeholders, dismantle White Supremacist policies and practices in our libraries and across campus, and create systems of knowledge that values and centers the stories, experiences, and perspectives of communities of color. These recommendations require a deep commitment to antiracism and antioppression, not just on the part of individual librarians, but in a system-wide effort that includes our institutions, organizations, and educators.

ANTIRACIST COLLECTIONS AND SYSTEMS

One of the significant sources of power a library holds is its collections budget—as stated earlier, collections decisions not only influence the market for academic publications, but also can also impact citations. “The decisions made about... what books and journals to buy are inevitably biased, based as they are on some combination of judgments and interests of individual libraries and librarians and on those same librarians’ sense of the tastes and needs of patrons” (Morales, Knowles, and Bourg 2014, 446). Libraries must ensure that their collections include the voices of scholars of color.

The shape of library collections must be reenvisioned to include and highlight the breadth of knowledge of communities of color. Libraries should develop clear definitions and goals for diversity, and staff engaged in collection development should be trained to understand the importance of diversity to collections (Ciszek and Young 2010). Understanding the role libraries play in upholding white privilege in knowledge production, and learning strategies for disrupting it, should be part of the education and training of library workers. Audits should be conducted to identify gaps in the collection, and librarians should work with vendors to develop purchasing programs

that proactively identify titles by authors of color to add to the collection. Journal cancellation and weeding projects should employ data points beyond circulation and usage statistics, including qualitative measures and subject expertise, to ensure titles by authors of color are not further erased in library collections (Baildon et al. 2017).

Antiracism must be included in library collection development policies that explicitly state that works by authors of color and those that center their perspectives and experiences are to be added to the collection. By doing this, libraries can begin to rectify the propagation of work that libels our communities, creating and perpetuating damaging stereotypes. In chapter 4 of this volume, Miranda Belarde-Lewis and Sarah R. Kostelecky describe information projects that respect and center Zuni knowledge systems, in contrast to scholarship on Indigenous communities written by outsiders that violates the norms and ethics of Indigenous communities.

As I illustrated in the previous section, the descriptive and discovery systems employed by libraries—our controlled vocabularies and indexes—are slow to change, and reflect the biases of our society. Our reliance on standards and technology, which have been created by dominant groups, and Library of Congress Subject Headings in particular, which are subject to political influence, renders the work by and about communities of color invisible. In chapter 5, Vani Natarajan describes encounters with white librarians and professors who have minimized scholarship on Asian Americans, and their efforts to engage in collection development that centers QTPOC authors. Sujei Lugo Vázquez in chapter 7 provides action items libraries can use to build racially inclusive children's collections—these action items can easily be applied to collection development in academic libraries, too.

In addition to building collections that are inclusive of authors of color, we have technology available in libraries, including LibGuides, publishing platforms, and social media, that enable us to increase the visibility of scholarship about communities of color. These platforms also allow us to respond quickly to current events and provide access to sources that counter the misinformation spread by talking heads and foreign bots. The Charleston Syllabus is a prime example of how social media has been deployed to promote the spread of race-related knowledge in response to contemporary events. Williams, Williams, and Blain (2016) recount how, following the 2015 Charleston church shooting, in which African Americans attending bible study were murdered by a white extremist, the #CharlestonSyllabus hashtag was used on Twitter to point to resources about the shooting and its historical context. They describe the engagement of librarians Cecily Walker, Ryan P. Randall, Melissa Morrone, and Elliot Brandow, who organized and linked the list of titles generated

by the hashtag to WorldCat and created tags in WorldCat to enhance their discoverability (3–4).

ENGAGING LIBRARY PUBLISHING

As libraries move into the publishing arena, librarians have gained the power to directly insert the voices of faculty of color, as well as communities of color outside academia, in the published record. As part of the effort to transform scholarly communication, academic libraries have started establishing programs that publish journals, conference proceedings, and books on behalf of faculty and students. These programs often focus on open-access titles and publications that would be considered unprofitable by commercial publishers and university presses.

The Library Publishing Coalition's *An Ethical Framework for Library Publishing* (2018) calls on library publishing programs to “intervene and reduce the impact of bias in content selection and create hospitable environments for a diversity of identities, viewpoints, and approaches” (35), by providing publishing opportunities for authors from underrepresented backgrounds and supporting efforts to make metadata and indexing standards and practices more inclusive. In regards to traditional publishing, Paul Royster (2008) notes, publication decisions are made in the self-interest and preservation of the publisher, with the scholarship they publish forming salable units in the bookselling business. As many library publishing programs operate without a profit motive, they present an opportunity to publish scholarship that commercial publishers have considered too niche to be marketable.

Library publishing programs are an ideal platform for the publication of scholarship that resists dominant white ideology and uplifts the knowledge and experiences of communities of color. By virtue of being connected to academic libraries, these programs lend the reputations of their host libraries and universities to these publications and can help to increase the perceived legitimacy of the scholarship.

These programs can also create a pipeline of emerging scholars of color who understand the processes, politics, and power dynamics of academic publishing. Academic libraries with library publishing programs can leverage their programs to help socialize students of color in academic publishing by providing them with hands-on experience. Library publishing programs can provide paid assistantships for graduate students of color to serve as managing editors of journals and teach all student assistants best practices to minimize the impact of bias and center voices of color in publishing. The provision of managing editors can also support faculty of color who

want to launch new journals but lack the funding to hire assistants and the time to manage the projects. By providing emerging scholars of color with experience in academic publishing, library publishing programs can give them a foundation to challenge and opportunities to disrupt White Supremacy in publishing.

VALUING SCHOLARSHIP BY AND ABOUT COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

Where academic publishing silences research on race and racism, CRT places value on the experiential knowledge of communities of color and embraces counterstorytelling as a methodology. Through counterstorytelling, communities of color share their experiences with oppression. This is an important intervention, “because of their different histories and experiences with oppression, black, American Indian, Asian, and Latino writers and thinkers may be able to communicate to their white counterparts matters that the whites are unlikely to know” (Delgado and Stefancic 2017, 11). CRT also promotes interdisciplinarity and draws from ethnic studies, gender studies, history, law, and other disciplines to understand race and power and to challenge systems of oppression (Solorzano and Yosso 2001). By promoting interdisciplinary approaches and uplifting the experiential knowledge of communities of color, CRT creates space for perspectives and methodologies that challenge the white-dominated worldview privileged in academic publishing. Libraries must join the call to uplift the knowledge of communities of color.

Awe (2006) argues that “to help remove the marginalization and the devaluation of African American faculty research, departments should publicize the academic and scholarly achievements of African American scholars” (48). Academic libraries can help to spearhead this effort. Many academic libraries already pursue initiatives to recognize and celebrate faculty authors, from building bibliographies and databases of faculty publications to holding receptions and other celebratory events (Bonnet, Alvarez, and Cordell 2014; Stringfellow and Armstrong 2012). Libraries can host similar events to specifically celebrate the publishing accomplishments of faculty of color, raising their visibility on campus.

Because research on race and racism is often dismissed and devalued, libraries must leverage these events to demonstrate the value in this type of scholarship. In examining the changing roles of academic libraries, Wegner and Zemsky (2007) assert that library professions must have “the ability to educate faculty members, helping them to understand the power and applicability of resources and modes of inquiry that have come about since the time of a professor’s own graduate training.”

These events can demonstrate the value of approaches utilized by those studying race and racism, such as counterstorytelling. Hosting a panel of local faculty and students who can share their reactions to an article on microaggressions in the classroom, for example, can bring a close, human connection to the scholarship. Likewise, for faculty whose scholarship is based on community engagement, members of the community can be invited to share the impact the work of faculty has had on their communities, providing evidence of research impact that can't be captured by citation counts and journal impact factors.

These can be done in partnership with the university's diversity and inclusion office, as well as the provost's office. These events can help boost the visibility of scholarship of faculty of color and normalize the theories and methodologies they employ and the perspectives they bring to the scholarly record. Libraries can play a significant role in reinforcing the message that faculty of color, and researchers studying race and racism are productive and their work and methodologies are legitimate and valuable.

LEVERAGING LIBRARIAN EXPERTISE AND AGENCY

Education has been a central role of libraries, through the offering of information literacy courses, computer literacy sessions, and workshops on all aspects of information, knowledge, and learning. Libraries can expand their offerings through workshops on academic publishing, targeted to students and faculty from marginalized groups (Baildon et al. 2017). Charlotte Roh (2016) hosts brown bag lunches for graduate students of color where she provides an overview of the publication process and describes the lack of diversity in academic publishing, helping to socialize these students in the publishing endeavor should they choose to pursue careers in academia. At Iowa State University, I led a workshop for undergraduate male students of color where we discussed the lack of representation of People of Color in the media and stressed the importance of telling one's stories. These workshops can also help address the lack of mentorship for students and junior faculty of color by providing an alternate avenue to receive information on how to successfully navigate the publishing process.

Libraries should also educate faculty on campus tasked with evaluating scholarship—whether as editors, peer-reviewers, university administrators, or members of tenure and promotion committees—on the implications of White Supremacy and bias in academic publishing and the value of critical approaches to scholarship. As Stanley (2007) argues, the publication of nonmainstream approaches requires work on the part of reviewers, “includ[ing] deep reflection on understanding White privilege, including

uncovering taken-for-granted assumptions, premises, and values of Whiteness in higher education and voice” (22). Such education can help decision makers understand the choice of research topic, methodology, and publication venue, instead of relying on metrics and concept of “high-impact” publications that privilege researchers who adopt dominant approaches.

Libraries should actively engage faculty of color as allies with expertise in the creation and dissemination of knowledge. In chapter 6 about Ann Allen Shockley, Shaundra Walker provides an example of an important librarian who engaged with faculty and students to build collections that captured the Black experience. The Association of College and Research Libraries recommends that libraries should work with faculty and administrators to educate them on the limitations of research metrics and advocate for more inclusive tenure assessments (ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee 2019). Libraries can help faculty of color and white faculty interrogate existing journal rankings used in faculty evaluations; identify alternative methods for demonstrating research impact, including leveraging institutional repository metrics and providing testimonials; and explain the significance of journals with diversity and social justice orientations and the limitations of “mainstream” journals. In doing so, libraries can contribute to CRT’s rejection of liberalism, illuminating how faculty evaluation systems are neither color-blind nor objective and helping to build new antiracist and antioppressive structures.

CONCLUSION

A recent study indicates that there has been little progress in diversifying the professoriate. Between 2013 and 2017, the percentage of tenured white faculty members at doctoral-granting institutions has decreased 3.17 percent. However, this decrease is not matched by an equivalent increase of faculty of color—the number of tenured Black faculty members increased by only 0.10 percent and tenured Hispanic/Latino faculty increased by 0.65 percent. The number of tenured American Indian/Alaska Native faculty *decreased* by 0.01 percent (Vasquez Heilig et al. 2019). The inability of scholars of color to secure a place, persist, and thrive in academia is due, in part, to the significant barriers they face in academic publishing. With publishing a central determinant of a scholar’s ability to progress in careers in academia, the persistence of racism in the process creates a negative feedback loop that suppresses the number of faculty of color, resulting in a scholarly record that continues to be dominated by whiteness.

The construction of knowledge that privileges white experiences, methodologies, and perspectives has far-reaching effects. The perpetuation of a body of knowledge in which communities of color are marginalized means that our communities are not represented in our textbooks, curricula, media, public policy, and in many other spheres of society.

Libraries must recognize their role in upholding White Supremacist structures in academic publishing and scholarly communication and adopt a CRT lens in developing antiracist policies and practices. In discussing the changing roles of academic libraries in the twenty-first century, Wegner and Zemsky argue that libraries “have a major role in ensuring that they and their home institutions remain vital players in the changing terrain of information and education” (2007). Academic libraries can leverage their role in collecting, preserving, and providing access to knowledge to help advocate for and advance an antiracist agenda on their campus by ensuring that their collections and systems reflect a world of knowledge that centers the voices of communities of color and their publishing programs provide spaces for new and critical voices and perspectives; to educate the campus on how current policies and practices uphold institutional racism; and to promote antiracist alternatives.

NOTE

1. While the terms *single-blind*, *double-blind*, and *triple-blind* are the predominant phrases used to describe peer review, I use the terms *single-anonymous*, *double-anonymous*, and *triple-anonymous* in this chapter and my practice, in rejection of ableist language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACRL Research Planning and Review Committee. 2019. “Environmental Scan 2019.” Association of College and Research Libraries white paper. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org/acrl/files/content/publications/whitepapers/EnvironmentalScan2019.pdf>.

ACRL Scholarly Communications Committee. 2003. “Principles and Strategies for the Reform of Scholarly Communication.” Association of College and Research Libraries white paper. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers/principlesstrategies>.

American Library Association. 2012. “Diversity Counts: 2012 Tables.” American Library Association. <http://www.ala.org/aboutala/sites/ala.org/aboutala/files/content/diversity/diversitycounts/diversitycountstables2012.pdf>.

Awe, Clara. 2006. “Retention of African American Faculty in Research Universities.” *Metropolitan Universities* 17 (2): 33–57.

Baildon, Michelle, Dana Hamlin, Czeslaw Jankowski, Rhonda Kauffman, Julia Lanigan, Michelle Miller, Jessica Venlet, and Ann Marie Willer. 2017. “Creating a Social Justice Mindset: Diversity,

Inclusion, and Social Justice in the Collections Directorate of the MIT Libraries." MIT Libraries DISJ Task Force report. September 2, 2017. <https://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/108771>.

Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination." *American Economic Review* 94 (4): 991–1013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3592802?origin=JSTOR-pdf>.

Bonnett, Jennifer, Barbara Alvarez, and Sigrid Anderson Cordell. 2014. "Let's Get This Party Started: Celebrating Faculty Authors in the Library." *College and Research Library News* 75 (10): 550–559. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.75.10.9210>.

Bozdag, Engin. 2013. "Bias in Algorithmic Filtering and Personalization." *Ethics and Information Technology* 15 (3): 209–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-013-9321-6>.

Budden, Amber E., Tom Tregenza, Lonnie W. Aarsen, Julia Koricheva, Roosa Leimu, and Christopher J. Lortie. 2008. "Double-Blind Review Favours Increased Representation of Female Authors." *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 23 (1): 4–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.07.008>.

Ceja Alcalá, Janet, Mónica Colón-Aguirre, Nicole A. Cooke, and Brenton Stewart. 2017. "A Critical Dialogue: Faculty of Color in Library and Information Science." *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies* 13 (2). <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1gq2s8q5>.

Ciszek, Matthew P., and Courtney L. Young. 2010. "Diversity Collection Assessment in Large Academic Libraries." *Collection Building* 29 (4): 154–161. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01604951011088899>.

Cooke, Nicole A., and Joe O. Sánchez. 2019. "Getting It on the Record: Faculty of Color in Library and Information Science." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 60 (3): 169–181. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jelis.60.3.01>.

Corby, Katherine. 2003. "Constructing Core Journal Lists: Mixing Science and Alchemy." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 3 (2): 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2003.0029>.

Darling, E. S. 2014. "Use of Double-Blind Peer Review to Increase Author Diversity." *Conservation Biology* 29 (1): 297–299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12333>.

Del Carmen Salazar, Maria, and Francisco Rios. 2016. "Just Scholarship! Publishing Academic Research with a Social Justice Focus." *Multicultural Perspectives* 18 (1): 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2016.1127073>.

Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. 2000. "Why Do We Tell the Same Stories? Law Reform, Critical Librarianship, and the Triple Helix Dilemma." Reprint in *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*, edited by Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, 214–224. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. 2017. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. New York: New York University Press.

Delgado Bernal, Dolores, and Octavio Villalpando. 2002. "An Apartheid of Knowledge in Academia: The Struggle over the 'Legitimate' Knowledge of Faculty of Color." *Equity and Excellence in Education* 35 (2): 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713845282>

DiAngelo, Robin. 2018. *White Fragility*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ford, Emily, Wendi Arant Kaspar, and Peggy Seiden. 2017. "Diversity of ACRL Publications, Editorial Board Demographics." *College and Research Libraries News* 78 (10): 548. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.78.10.548>.

Fyfe, Aileen. 2018. "Then and Now—Exploring Diversity in Peer Review at the Royal Society." Publishing blog, the Royal Society. September 10, 2018. <https://blogs.royalsociety.org/publishing/peer-review-at-the-royal-society/>.

Greco, Albert N., Robert M. Wharton, and Amy Brand. 2016. "Demographics of Scholarly Publishing and Communication Professionals." *Learned Publishing* 29 (2): 97–101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1017>.

Hathcock, April. 2016. "Open but Not Equal: Open Scholarship for Social Justice." *At the Intersection* (blog), February 8, 2016. <https://aprilhathcock.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/open-but-not-equal-open-scholarship-for-social-justice/>.

Hendrix, Katherine Grace. 2002. "'Did Being Black Introduce Bias into Your Study?': Attempting to Mute the Race-Related Research of Black Scholars." *Howard Journal of Communications* 13:153–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10646170290089935>.

Inefuku, Harrison W., and Charlotte Roh. 2016. "Agents of Diversity and Social Justice: Librarians and Scholarly Communication." In *Open Access and the Future of Scholarly Communication: Policy and Infrastructure*, edited by Kevin L. Smith and Katherine A. Dickson, 107–128. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jaschik, Scott. 2017. "The Wrong Reviewer." *Inside Higher Ed*, April 18, 2107. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/04/18/history-journal-apologizes-assigning-review-book-urban-education-and-inequality>.

Jensenius, Francesca R., Mala Htun, David J. Samuels, David A. Singer, Adria Lawrence, and Michael Chwe. 2018. "Benefits and Pitfalls of Google Scholar." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 21 (3): 820–824. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800094X>.

Junn, Jane. 2016. "Memorandum re: Analysis of Data on Tenure at USC Dornsife." In *Written/Unwritten: Diversity and the Unhidden Truths of Tenure*, edited by Patricia A. Matthew, 271–275. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Korchin, Sheldon J. 1980. "Clinical Psychology and Minority Problems." *American Psychologist* 35 (3): 262–269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.35.3.262>.

Library Publishing Coalition. 2018. *An Ethical Framework for Library Publishing, Version 1.0*. San Francisco: Educopia. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5703/1288284316777>.

Matthew, Patricia A. 2016. *Written/Unwritten: Diversity and the Hidden Truths of Tenure*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

McFarland, Joel, Bill Hussar, Jijun Zhang, Xiaolei Wang, Ke Wang, Sarah Hein, Melissa Diliberti, Emily Forrest Cataldi, Farrah Bullock Mann, and Amy Barmer. 2019. "The Condition of Education 2019." NCES 2019–144, National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, US Department of Education. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2019144>.

- Morales, Myrna, Em Claire Knowles, and Chris Bourg. 2014. "Diversity, Social Justice, and the Future of Libraries.2 portal: *Libraries and the Academy* 14 (3): 439–451. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2014.0017>.
- Noble, Safiya. 2018. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York: New York University Press.
- Olson, Hope A. 2001. "The Power to Name: Representation in Library Catalogs." *Signs* 26 (3): 639–668. <https://doi.org/10.1086/495624>.
- Padilla, Amado M. 1994. "Ethnic Minority Scholars, Research, and Mentoring: Current and Future Issues." *Educational Researcher* 23 (4): 24–27. <https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0013189X023004024>.
- Reece, Robert L., and Margaret C. Hardy. 2017. "Moving beyond Metrics: A Primer in Hiring and Promoting a Diverse Workforce in Entomology and Other Natural Sciences." *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* 110 (5): 484–491. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/sax059>.
- Reidsma, Matthew. 2016. "Algorithmic Bias in Library Discovery Systems." *Matthew Reidsma* (personal blog), March 11, 2016. <https://matthew.reidsrow.com/articles/173>.
- Reidsma, Matthew. 2019. *Masked by Trust: Bias in Library Discovery*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.
- Roh, Charlotte. 2016. "Inequities in Publishing." *Urban Library Journal* 22 (2). <https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ulj/vol22/iss2/2/>.
- Royster, Paul. 2008. "Publishing Original Content in an Institutional Repository." *Serials Review* 34 (1): 27–30.
- Simpson, Jennifer Lyn. 2010. "Blinded by the White: Challenging the Notion of a Color-Blind Meritocracy in the Academy." *Southern Communication Journal* 75 (2): 150–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417941003613248>.
- Social Sciences Feminist Network Research Interest Group. 2017. "The Burden of Invisible Work in Academia: Social Inequalities and Time Use in Five University Departments." *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations* 39:228–245. <https://digitalcommons.humboldt.edu/hjstr/vol11/iss39/21/>.
- Solorzano, Daniel G., and Tara J. Yosso. 2001. "Critical Race and LatCrit Theory and Method: Counter-storytelling." *Qualitative Studies in Education* 14 (4): 471–495. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390110063365>.
- Stanley, Christine A. 2007. "When Counter Narratives Meet Master Narratives in the Journal Editorial-Review Process." *Educational Researcher* 36 (1): 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X06298008>.
- Stanley, Christine A., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 2005. "Cross-Race Faculty Mentoring." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 37 (2): 44–50. <https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.37.2.44-50>.
- Stringfellow, Julia, and Michelle Armstrong. 2012. "The University Authors Recognition Reception at Boise State University: A Celebration of Scholarship." *Idaho Librarian*, May 9, 2012. <https://theidaholibrarian.wordpress.com/2012/05/09/the-university-authors-recognition-reception-at-boise-state-university-a-celebration-of-scholarship/>.

- Sue, Stanley. 1999. "Science, Ethnicity, and Bias: Where Have We Gone Wrong?" *American Psychologist* 54 (12): 1070–1077. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.12.1070>.
- Taylor, Edward. 1998. "A Primer on Critical Race Theory." *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* 19:122–124. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2998940>.
- Turner, Caroline S. 2003. "Incorporation and Marginalization in the Academy: From Border toward Center for Faculty of Color?" *Journal of Black Studies* 34 (1): 112–125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934703253689>.
- US Census Bureau. n.d. "ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates: 2013–2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates." American FactFinder, US Census Bureau. Accessed June 5, 2019. <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF>.
- Vasquez Heilig, Julian, Isabell Wong Flores, Alicia Eileen Barros Souza, Joseph Carlton Barry, and Selene Barceló Monroy. 2019. "Considering the Ethnoracial and Gender Diversity of Faculty in the United States College and University Intellectual Communities." *South Texas College of Law Houston Hispanic Journal of Law and Policy* 2019:1–31.
- Wegner, Gregory, and Robert Zemsky. 2007. "Changing Roles of Academic and Research Libraries." Association of College and Research Libraries. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/issues/value/changingroles>.
- Whitman, Neal, and Elaine Weiss. 1982. "Faculty Evaluation: The Use of Explicit Criteria for Promotion, Retention, and Tenure." AM-LE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report no. 2, American Association for Higher Education.
- Williams, Chad, Kidada E. Williams, and Keisha N. Blain. 2016. "Introduction." In *Charleston Syllabus: Readings on Race, Racism, and Racial Violence*, edited by Chad Williams, Kidada E. Williams, and Keisha N. Blain, 1–8. Athens: University of Georgia Press.