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*Invited article.
The Working Paper series, Navigating Careers in the Academy: Gender, Race, and Class, was started in fall 2018. Since then, we have put out four volumes of the series including two special issues related to COVID-19 and higher education. This issue in volume 5 brings together three interesting articles in which the authors consider amplifying marginalized voices through storytelling, calling for a critical lens to pedagogy that is inclusive of international students, and traversing careers by thinking through the two-body problem.

Romero-Ivanova uses storytelling as the means for uncovering deeply rooted traumas of women’s experiences. As a Latina, she weaves her own experiences into storytelling that unravels the trauma she encountered as a youth. This act of divulging details itself demonstrates her resilience. As noted in the article, her writing led to the offering of a digital storytelling workshop to students in her university. Additionally, she lists ways in which “educators can un-silence through the privilege and promotion of digital storytelling in their classrooms” (p. 11). Such pedagogical innovations can enhance learning not only as knowledge but as a basis for making sense of one’s own experiences as well as for understanding others experiences (different than one’s own). In a related vein, Anwer considers the “implications of embedding equity-mindedness into a pedagogy that centers the experiences of international students in US universities” (p. 13).

Somewhat related to the broader themes in Romero-Ivanova’s and Anwer’s articles, Samarsky continues to examine the relocation strategies adopted by German academic couples in the UK. This research provides insights into the ‘two-body’ challenges in academia and the implications this may have for productivity. Academic institutions in the US and Europe have addressed partner/spousal hires in only a limited way leading to coupled academics adopting a variety of strategies to manage life and work.

In addition to the three articles, this issue includes a special section, Preparing for Promotion/Tenure: Top Tips, which is based on the panel session organized as part of the 12th Annual Conference for Assistant Professors titled, Institutional Resources to Soar to Promotion, held in October 2021. The session comprised six speakers and a moderator. Three of the speakers opted to write up their remarks which we have included in this issue. This is

*Corresponding Author: Mangala Subramaniam, Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence, 155 S. Grant Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907. Email: msubrama@purdue.edu.
particularly useful because the sessions were not recorded considering the conference was both, in-person and virtual (outside Purdue attendees paid a registration fee to attend).

As I stated at the outset, the journey to provide a peer reviewed publishing outlet for experiences in higher education has been challenging and at the same time rewarding. I had the opportunity to see good ideas become powerful ones as the submissions went through the review process. Thanks to the current and past editorial board members for their time, insights, and contributions to the review process. Combining research with practices and experiences to inform policy is key for change in higher education. Therefore, initiatives such as the Working Paper series can be meaningful. I hope the series will continue to grow and flourish under new leadership as I move forward to new opportunities in my career. I feel honored to have led and expanded the activities of the Butler Center; and especially to have been able to support faculty in different ways. All of this was, no doubt, possible because of Provost Jay Akridge’s commitment to the mission of the Butler Center.
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Installing a Dia de Los Muertos Altar to Teaching a Digital Storytelling Workshop for a Kokomo Experience and You (KEY) Trip

Christina L. Romero-Ivanova*
Indiana University Kokomo

Women divulge crucial events from their lives by “voicing” their narratives, and this can be the voicing of one’s smaller stories (Pahl and Rowsell 2010) within significant events, which can be reflected upon through the power and practice of storytelling. The storytelling itself uncovers deeply rooted traumas of women’s experiences. The intrusion of the feminine wound - a metaphorical wound that oppresses women’s identities, voice, behaviors through contexts of silencing (Kidd 1996; Romero-Ivanova 2020) emerges in women’s storied narratives.

In this article, I present my own backstory within the grand narrative of becoming and claiming identities of free woman, Latina, narrative researcher, and narrative teacher and weave in storytelling as an empowering meaning-making practice (Medina 2018). I purposefully subtitle different sections in Spanish to add emphasis to my identity claims and the becoming I am still experiencing, by providing reflections on traumatic experiences from my youth.

In this manuscript I share writing connected to traumatic experiences from my youth, which serve to magnify women’s crucial experiences, the importance of creating spaces to honor their pivotal experiences, the embodiment of stories through artifacts and artifactual practices, such as the construction of a memorial altar as an identity-claiming practice and teaching digital storytelling as a practice of mentorship, and the power of women’s storytelling to resist, testify, and demonstrate resilience. My writing culminates with the story of my teaching a digital storytelling workshop to university students prior to attending an Indiana University Kokomo Kokomo Experience and You (KEY) campus Spanish cultural field trip to Dia de los Muertos altar displays at the Indiana State Museum.

La Doncella
The Maiden
Dreamdust

Gather out of stardust
Earthdust
Clouddust
Stormdust
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And splinters of hail, 
One handful of dreamdust 
    Not for sale. 
- Romero 1989

Though this poem does not reveal my identity as a survivor, during my growing up years, I identified early on as one. As a rape, sexual assault and domestic violence survivor, like many other young women who experience physical and emotional violence, I lived my life invisibly and numb for many years, just as Melinda, a young woman from *Speak* (Anderson 1999) does - silenced by a marginal existence and fearful of speaking my story:

> When I was experiencing that sexual assault, from touching to comments to physical hurt, I didn’t think about reporting because I was truly afraid no one would believe me. I tried to report. I tried telling my mother and she did not believe me. So for years I’ve carried this inside myself and it just became a really traumatic secret *(WHTR.com 2019)*.

Only recently, in 2019 (as referred to above) did I decide to claim and project my identity as a survivor, when I was invited as a panelist on a domestic violence panel at Indiana University Kokomo *(WHTR.com 2019)*. From this point forward, I decided to dynamically advocate for women and for the power of storytelling. My literacy work began to soar and move me into spaces of teaching and research that involved work at the state level. I was soon invited by the Howard County Family Services Association to create digital stories centered on rape survivors’ storytelling. As I began gleaning stories, these involved my own daughter’s story being raped during her senior year of high school as well as a close friend’s experience of rape during the time period of being a single mother. I was able to present each of these digital stories at the fall 2020 state senate session, which helped, along with many others’ testimonies, to move Indiana rape law forward to include the language of consent. Many others, myself, and my daughter celebrated with the organization Women for Change at the Indiana Statehouse in April 2022.

As an educator who worked closely with different individuals in the secondary classroom for multiple years, I realized years ago that there are many individuals who have embodied stories of their crucial experiences. A few years ago, my own storytelling on the domestic violence panel sparked conversations with others, and it sparked an advocacy and honed a focus within me to become more deeply engaged with storytelling, and not just within my writing and in my own classroom. As I reflected on my own students in years past who had narratives they embodied through their attitudes and classroom behaviors to private conversations and testimonials on bathroom stalls, I began to think of storytelling as a crucial campus practice. Thinking about my university students carrying stories into my classroom as transitive artifacts *(Pahl and Rowsell 2010)* upon their bodies in clothing they wear, tattoos inscribed, rememberings they discuss, I realized that others on my campus could use digital storytelling within multiple disciplines to allow for students’ storied experiences to emerge.

**La Maestra**  
**The Teacher**

During one fall semester I decided to embed aspects of Artifactual Literacies *(Pahl and Rowsell 2010)* into my course, *Methods of Teaching Sr High/Jr High/Middle School English*. Years
before, I had used artifacts and storytelling as an English teacher at an urban high school. That year as a secondary English teacher who was new in her school, I faced an exceptionally large class of 55 juniors. Trying to imagine how to connect with so many students and engage them in the writing process, I asked each of my students to bring an artifact to class (I also brought an artifact - a Holly Hobbie candle) and through communal storytelling, we each shared artifacts of our lives and their important connections.

**Figure 1**
Replica gift from Tomorrow’s Teachers High School Students

![Holly Hobbie Memory](image)

_A Holly Hobbie Memory_

During one fall semester, I decided to use a similar method of teaching writing to my college students as I had used with my secondary students. I needed my students to understand that writing can easily flow with the uses of engaging practices such as artifactual mediation talk - using artifacts to mediate storytelling. During one class I encouraged my students to bring a significant artifact from their lives, one that had been connected to a crucial event of some kind. The next class, we formed mentor circles in which we each wrote for 15 minutes about our artifacts and the meanings that were connected to them and then shared our writing in the circles. Below is an excerpt from my own classroom writing about a Hollie Hobbie candle my aunt had given me as a child:

> The periwinkle-colored candle, which rests on the second shelf of my gray steel bookshelf in my memory, still comforts me when I think of its scent and flickering light. I would sit there in my room, my small book space of Harlequin Romance novels – ones that I had ordered and never paid for. In the quiet space, I felt the candle’s glow from its shadows that flickered from the shelf to the wall. I could melt away in my room just being in that quiet, peaceful space, wishing that somehow Hollie Hobbie could transport me to her world – a world where young girls could smile and stay beautiful and untouched. I would sit and dream of such a place for hours. I rarely left my room during the years of pain – those years started when I was very young and continued until I left for college. It was only in my teen years that I was able to craft a place of thinking and
being in my room that I understood the need to remain in my room. Too many harsh forces had interacted with my head, arms, legs, breasts, and mind.

I remember going into my room and not leaving once for three days. My room became a place of solace, as the rest of our house and my life was a prison. My Hollie Hobbie candle’s scent and glow set a calm for me to cry, think, and be beautiful and untouched.

The candle provided an entry point to my life, and through the storying of this remembered artifact, I was able to talk about pain and trauma. The candle, as an artifact of memory (Pahl and Rowsell 2010) allowed me to share pieces of my life and habitus with my students and made our class experience a humanizing one.

**Story Habitus**

As artifacts, individuals’ stories help to reveal their habitus, or ways of being and living their experiences. Since young women are the individuals of focus for this article, I continue to frame the writing so that it centers on their experiences. As ways of living and being are unearthed, stories reveal how women navigate issues they have confronted related to others’ comments or perspectives imposed on their bodies as social and political spaces (Pitts 2003; Woods 2012). My poem “Dreamdust” (initially presented in this article) does not necessarily reveal a grand mosaic of a life. What it does reveal is a habitus of hope for a better life. The Hollie Hobbie memoir offers an entry point into my identity as a young woman who had experienced different kinds of trauma. Young women sitting in classrooms, dwelling in settings that can offer spaces for voicing experiences, can begin revealing their own difficult or joyful experiences, and as ways of moving beyond their spaces of hardship, can develop writings that offer hope and strengthen future aspirations.

*Digital Storytelling as an Empowering Digital Literacy*

Digital storytelling involves using images, text, a voiceover, or textual narrative (Romero-Ivanova, Cook, and Faurote 2021), and symbolic meanings to convey a story. My experiences teaching digital storytelling in the college course Using Computers in Education and having taught high school students in past years has provided me the wisdom to do crucial event storytelling, which is a narrative practice involving the storytelling of a highly impactful event from one’s life (Romero-Ivanova, Cook, and Faurote 2021).

As Pahl and Rowsell (2010:3) state, literacy “involves many different scripts, and it can exist in many different languages and settings.” Literacy is dynamic and cultural: it reveals identities, connections of oneself and identities to others and to the world. One of my first-year students in the Tomorrow’s Teachers (TT) program (a program in which I teach high school students pre-teacher education college courses) created a digital story about coming out as a bisexual youth (Romero-Ivanova 2020):
Erryn’s story, which centers on her transcendence from hidden to empowered, relates Erryn’s choice to come out to her parents. However, the larger issues that emerged focused on acceptance and Erryn’s identity as a bisexual youth. This digital story, along with others which students have created in my classes through the years, continue to influence the ways in which I continue to advocate for the power of narratives as dynamic cultural and experiential practices in classrooms. In Spring 2021, I was asked to create and present a digital storytelling workshop for Indiana University Kokomo prior to taking students on a multidisciplinary Kokomo Experience and You (KEY) trip to the Indiana State Museum’s gallery of Dia de los Muertos (Day of the Dead) memorial altars in Fall 2021. Before creating a digital storytelling workshop that would be thematically connected to Dia de los Muertos, I felt an urgent need to honor those in my own life who had passed away.

Encontrar la Identidad a través de la Creación de un Memorial  
Finding Identity through Creating a Memorial

Starting with memories and images of loved ones who had untimely passed, I gathered photographs for my aunt Thelma who had passed in spring 2020 and my oldest daughter’s friend who had ended his life in 2021. I obtained a small table, jeweled photo frames, Halloween candy, a velvet black cloth, a sugar skull candy dish, and masks.

Putting these together, I laid out battery-operated candles which surrounded the different objects and created a simple but beautiful memorial altar which I placed outside of my office in my school of education. I began a daily tradition of “lighting” each candle daily to honor my loved. This memorial literacy practice allowed me to embody important facets of my Hispanic identity of sacredly and spiritually connecting with those who had passed, as well as speaking to colleagues, students, and others about this practice. I felt that displaying this cultural and artifactual memorial would invite students to pause at my altar as they passed through our halfway and to ask questions.
Constructing the memorial altar allowed me to connect with my Latina self, immerse myself in the cultural practice of honoring my loved ones, and helped me to purposefully authenticate the reasons I considered storytelling a cultural practice, especially in preparation for helping students to understand digital storytelling prior to going on a KEY field trip to visit a display of sacred, artifactual, memorial storytelling.

**Otra Forma de Realizacion: La Ensenanza de la Narracion Digital**

**A Further Embodiment: Teaching Digital Storytelling**

As I began making preparations for teaching the digital storytelling workshop on campus, I considered its core purpose: experiential learning. Students would be attending a KEY trip that centered on Dia de los Muertos memorial altars. The reason for this trip was to provide a cultural experience for students to understand more about the Latino culture. I used Google Slides to design and format my presentation accordingly.

**Figure 4**
First Slide, Digital Storytelling for the Fall 2021 KEY Trip
As presented above, the Google Slides I created for my presentation included a design that centered on Day of the Dead kinds of images. I included a definition of digital storytelling, background of the 7 elements of digital storytelling (Robin 2016) with examples of each from sample digital stories, and examples from my teaching of digital storytelling within the course “Using Computers in Education.” These elements, along with my presentation of a few students’ example stories, as well as news stories of how my students’ artifacts in their lives (tattoos) mediated their digital stories, helped my audience to understand the importance of purposes of storytelling in a digital mode: some stories are more difficult to mediate than others and experiential learning, as in the above slide in figure 6, is visually presented so that others can see artifacts from one’s life, and this process helps to create empathy and build rapport.

**El Curacion**

**The Healing**

The process of creating digital stories is therapeutic (Romero-Ivanova 2020; Romero-Ivanova, Cook, and Faurote 2021) and allows the storyteller to be able to reveal experiences and various identities and habitus or ways of living and being (Pahl and Rowsell 2010), as previously described in the storytelling that emerged in my own secondary English classroom with 55 juniors and in my own life as I wrote stories and poetry. Also, it allows the listener and watcher of the digital story to commune with the storyteller. When individuals commune with self and
others through writing their lives, there is a testimony that emerges and strengthens their efficacy as a human being and creates empathy in the listener. Artfactually displays, such as memorial altars extend one’s lived experiences to cultural identifications and sacred literacy practices. Digitalizing stories goes further to provide lived experience storytelling that is multimodal, descriptive and emotive.

As hooks (2001) posits, human beings are meant to be in communion with one another and listening to another’s story allows us to be able to understand their background and empathize with their experiences.

Below are listed ways in which educators can un-silence through the privilege and promotion of digital storytelling in their classrooms.

1. **Use storying as a way to understand students’ textured and differentiated lives.** Allow students to free-write on a crucial event - any crucial event they would like to story. Crucial events are impactful events in lives that have caused shifts (Ivanova 2014). The event can be joyful or traumatic but allow them to freely choose their event. Elementary students could write about a special event in their lives such as a favorite birthday party or the birth of a younger sibling.

2. **Encourage students to bring a significant artifact/object into class that relates to a crucial event in their lives.** Artifacts carry with them embedded stories (Pahl and Rowsell 2010; Ivanova 2014; Romero-Ivanova 2020). Artifacts can help to mediate stories and/or allow students who find writing challenging, to freely story the meaning their artifacts hold. Younger students can bring in a significant object from a special time in their lives.

3. **Promote digital storytelling in your classroom.** Digital stories can easily be created using PowerPoint, iMovie, Prezi, or other digital applications and programs. Allow students to choose the format and whether they would like to provide a voice-over or text to narrate their stories. Digital storytelling involves critical thinking in which larger social issues emerge, uses the writing process, and allows audience members to read the stories that are shared. Elementary students can be assisted with digital story creating through online applications such as Storyboard That or Gotcha Life.

4. **Allow small group/large group sharing of digital stories in your classroom.** Allow students choice to present their story in small groups, pairs, or large groups.

**References**
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Equity-Minded International Education

Megha Anwer*
Purdue University

Estela Mara Bensimon, the Director for the Center of Urban Education at University of Southern California, has done crucial work on “equity-mindedness,” offering scholars and faculty a critical framework to develop inclusive and culturally relevant pedagogies that center the lived experiences of Black and Latinx students in higher education. Bensimon argues that an equity-minded pedagogy calls attention to patterns of inequity in student outcomes; it takes personal and institutional responsibility for the success of our students; it entails critically reassessing our own practices; and, requires us to be race-conscious and aware of the social and historical context of exclusionary practices in Higher Education.

Here, I consider the implications of embedding equity-mindedness into a pedagogy that centers the experiences of international students in US universities. This short reflexive essay emerges from an intersection of my own identity as an international scholar, who first came to the USA as a graduate student, and my administrative work to expand diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives in pedagogical contexts. In particular, the ideas explored here are a result of a retroactive reflection on my own needs and experiences as an international student in the USA; my observations and practices in my own classes to engage international students; and the professional development workshops I have developed and facilitated for faculty around inclusive and equity-minded pedagogical practices. In offering recommendations for how to develop an equity-minded approach to teaching and engaging international students, my goal is to cultivate an explicit and intentional pedagogy that:

1) is aware of the intercultural networks within which we are all imbricated
2) recognizes and addresses the multidimensional flow of power in a global context
3) engages the heterogeneously complex contexts from which international students join our programs and institutions.

These recommendations could posit the initial building blocks for a pedagogy that is categorically inclusive of international students and aligns their learning with the principles of equity-mindedness. These could be valuable for all faculty, academic advisors, and more broadly, all those acting in some capacity as mentors to international students.

*Corresponding Author: Megha Anwer, John Martinson Honors College, 1101 3rd Street, West Lafayette, IN 47906. Email: manwer@purdue.edu.
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1. Be aware of the historical exclusionary practices in American higher education as it relates to international students:

Two years ago, when the Trump administration announced a ban on student visas, creating mayhem for the educational prospects of thousands of international students in the USA, or those preparing to come here, many of us expressed anger at the callousness and xenophobia articulated through these governmental policies. It seemed especially cruel to create bureaucratic complications during a pandemic that had already left many students feeling precarious and uprooted. And yet, it’s important to remember that this exclusion-on-the-dime - a pivoting by the powerful in a sudden, disorienting way - has, in fact, been at the core of the USA’s relationship to international students for a long time. In “Conditioned Inclusion: The Student Visa as History,” Abigail Boggs has done important work to show that the USA has, for a century now, treated international students as simultaneously “desirable and dangerous:” desirable for the tuition money they bring; dangerous because they pose the threat of becoming immigrants. As teachers, administrators, and/or advisors, we need to contend with how this suppressed history continues to inflect the experiences of international students, not only in moments of crisis (when arbitrary policy changes are announced, for instance), but also in an ongoing, everyday way. The pandemic-related escalation in hate-crimes against Asian and Asian-American students has impacted their mental health, exacerbated their isolation on university campuses, and reduced their enthusiasm for coming to the USA to pursue their degrees (Zhai and Du 2020; McGee 2022). These developments cannot be decontextualized from the longer history of American policies such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 or the Immigration Act of 1924, restricting Chinese and Japanese immigration to the USA; or the 149% increase in anti-Asian hate crimes against South and East Asian communities after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. As equity-minded practitioners, we have an ethical imperative to stay alert not only to contemporary political contexts that contribute to the vulnerability of our international students, but also to the histories of discrimination that, both sporadically and consistently, inflect their experiences, and their sense of belonging within American higher education.

2. Investigate the nomenclature “international students”: We have to grapple with the fact that the designation we assign to students not born in the United States does the work of wiping out the extremely divergent economic, political, cultural contexts from which these students join us. I am deliberately not using the word “diverse,” because it has a taming effect. The cohering appellation “international students,” rather than fostering a community between these students, instead gives us permission to treat them like a singular entity that stands jointly on the other side of “Americanness.” This “tendency towards over-generalization” (Jones 2017) is inaccurate in its homogenizing tendency, and counter-productive, because it leads to a “reductionist” otherization” (Holliday 1999:237) of the needs and experiences of international students. The truth is that even in the ways that international students are united – for instance in that they all need student visas and are vulnerable to the whims of immigration laws here, there’s a huge discrepancy in their vulnerability. Someone seeking a visa in South Asia, or the Middle East will have a very different experience of navigating the USA embassy abroad than a student from Europe, for instance. Conflating the extreme heterogeneity of “educationally-mobile students” (Carroll 2015) is also rooted in a deficit conceptualization of international students as inferior, lacking, needing to change so that they can adapt to American standards of education (Hanassab 2006; Heng 2016). and to proactively, as Jones (2017) suggests, to “problematize and reimagine the notion of international student experience” as a monolithic, or even a productive category.
We have to reject the assumption that there is some essential difference between domestic and international students, as well as think about/treat international students in a way that is alive and attentive to the heterogeneity of their contexts – just as we ought to be alive to the diversity among our domestic students (Jones 2017).

3. **Recognize not just the differences but also the continuities across national contexts:** It is not enough just to learn about the varied contexts of our students, and create space for the differences that exist in our classrooms. We must also invite our students to articulate the continuities in our experiences. I am speaking of an overlap in the precarities that are brought forth by our conjoined existence under globalization and neoliberalism. This is not just about learning that American fast-food chains exist in far-flung corners of the world. Instead, it entails recognizing that while we all live, breathe, eat, die, we do so differently because the same systems of oppression and exploitation operate on us, and interpellate us, differentially. It’s to recognize, for instance, that the USA and India both have McDonalds, but in India, the burgers are “more flavorful” (as the students said), the chain offers vegetarian options, and caters exclusively to the upper classes. In my study abroad course to India, I worked with my students to unpack this simple revelation to equip them to see the similarities and the differences between the two geographical settings - similarities and differences that are born out of the workings of neoliberal capitalism intermixing with global corporate power and local culinary, race-caste, and class particularities. To help our students learn about the repetitions and overlaps in how racism and colorism manifest across the globe, or about the casteist nature of racism in America, for instance, could yield powerful cross-cultural connections that grapple as enrichingly with differences as they do with the shared structural conditions of existence that shape realities across global contexts. In post-COVID-19, this is more urgent than ever before. How else can we support our students to understand the deeply disparate outcomes of the pandemic – both, for different racial and ethnic communities within the USA, and between countries across the world?

Our goal must be to bring the grief, challenges, and tolls of the pandemic experienced by domestic students, in dialogue with the dislocation, fear, isolation, and tragedies faced by international students. We must recognize, for instance, that the challenges faced by economically underprivileged students in the USA to cope with the educational disruptions caused by the pandemic resonate with the chaos caused for international students. The shared trauma of a global pandemic offers a critical opportunity to lay bare the differentially distributed operations of global power, that must be extended to understand issues and contexts beyond/beside the pandemic. In this context, another interesting possibility is to open up, in our courses and classrooms, comparative-collaborative frameworks not just between the USA and another country, but between countries that are not the USA at all, or frameworks in which the USA exists as one among many nodes of investigation.

4. **Develop skills that helps students reflect on privilege in a global context:** This recommendation is born out of the conviction that as teachers our goal is not simply to give students what they want, but to surprise them (and in the process, often, ourselves too) with critical perspectives, radical modalities that empower us to collectively conceptualize and materially realize a world in which no-one is ‘wanting’. This requires that we develop the political clarity and be brave to steer away from the depoliticized versions of intercultural learning that abound, which confuse “respecting” other cultures while not critically interrogating systems of oppression that exist in other parts of the world. This, of course, needs a lot of care on
our part as faculty, because if done carelessly it can all too easily devolve into USA exceptionalism, and result in a lot of ahistorical, prejudiced knowledge about other countries we know little about. But this doesn’t mean it cannot be done right. And, here are two quick points that can help us do this in a way that is pedagogically equitable and productive:

a. Always attend to the histories of colonialism and American hegemony that have contributed to whatever oppressive structure you are critiquing in another country and bring that knowledge into your engagement with domestic and international students.

b. Never adopt a “not in the USA” attitude; go for, instead (and this is what I always say to my students) “all countries are messed up; it’s only a matter of how.” This means exploring with your students how some version of the oppressions that operate in a different country also exist within the USA, and vise versa.

But how does this connect to supporting international students, like all other students, to understand, reflect on, and challenge privilege – including their own? As equity-minded practitioners, who challenge the privileges of students from dominant groups (and I would argue we should all strive to do that), we must develop the skills to do so even with and for our international students. This means encouraging our international students to learn about the subaltern histories from the contexts that they’re coming from. Sometimes, these are histories that their domestic contexts would have worked hard to mute; much like the anti-Critical Race Theory campaigns aim to silence the histories of racism and anti-racism in the USA. As instructors, it is our responsibility to make our international students feel safe and seen, so that they can be encouraged to seek out worldviews, voices, and perspectives they might not have encountered previously, including about and from their own countries. We cannot do this by acting like experts about others countries, but it does mean that we don’t assume our international students’ automatic expertise either. We must embody and model a cultural humility, and inculcate the same in our students too, so that they can come to consider the possibility that their experiences in/of their own countries are perhaps neither exhaustive or representative of the diverse realities that constitute their national-ethnic context.

This means also that we have to recognize the complicated ways in which international students are sometimes implicated within economic, cultural, and educational structures of privilege. We have to recognize that the homogeneities born out of globalization have created educational structures in other countries where students learn more about USA popular culture than the complex power differentials of class, religion, caste, ethnicity etc. that exist in their own countries. This is why, it is important that we don’t romanticize international students. As equity-minded practitioners, we need to push them to think about disparities, inequities within their own lives as well as in their USA educational contexts. And, as with privileged students in the USA, international students too need and deserve to learn how to dismantle hegemonic worldviews they have inherited from their national contexts. We must not perpetuate the idea that we can only criticize our own countries because, in reverse, that’s a way of silencing anything international students and scholars might have to say about the USA. And, we must not do the disservice to our international students by assuming that, unlike USA-born students, we cannot support them to develop a critical consciousness towards their own identities and national contexts. Otherwise, we risk participating in what is called the pobrecito syndrome: the misguided policy of having lowered expectations and goals for certain students (Cepeda 2013).
At the same time, we must be cognizant of the challenges that international students face not only in spite of their privileges (their experience of racism, for instance), but also precisely because it is uniformly assumed that international students are privileged. The fact that 65% international students self-finance their education leads them to being treated as “cash cows” (Stein and Andreotti 2016). This means also that even when international students are financially or meritoriously eligible, they rarely receive university scholarships, or tuition waivers. Rates of currency exchange mean that even when they are from middle or upper-class contexts, they do not enjoy the same financial means as their domestic, wealthy counterparts. Further, visa restrictions make it nearly impossible for international students to hold jobs to supplement their finances while they study in the USA Bhojwani et al (2020) offer a detailed study of the kinds of financial constraints, housing and healthcare challenges international students faced on university campuses during the pandemic, as well as their concerns about future employment. Treating them as a homogenously privileged ignores the fact that it is the west who invites precisely the privileged students to help with the finances of their institutions of higher education. It also mutates the reality that thousands of international students and their parents take loans to pursue education in the USA.

5. Journey from international education to an internationalist education: Explore what it means to push international education out of the vague and opaque generalities of “learning about different cultures” and into a more radical direction, towards a solidarity-building pedagogy. Such an internationalist education would push against the white-hegemonic discourse and myth of “model minorities,” often internalized and weaponized by said minorities themselves (Jin 2021; Blackburn 2019; Chow 2017; Nguyen 2020), and instead invest energies in teaching and learning about oppressions shared between underrepresented and underserved USA students and international students. It would mean, for instance, that all students learn about the Black Lives Matter (BLM), but also BLM’s global resonances. An internationalist education would be vigilant against the induction/co-option of international students into USA-specific histories of violence. When we do programming for international students around Thanksgiving, for instance, let’s be wary of normalizing the forgetting of genocides. Let’s find alternatives that bring us together without making invisible the context of our gathering, in which we can share not just food, but also ideas for building a more just and equitable world. An internationalist education can open the pathway in which students can explore a process of “self-formation within conditions of disequilibrium” (Marginson 2014) that may be largely beyond their control, but which, they can nevertheless, learn to identify, critically analyze, and cross-culturally and collaboratively learn to find alternative modes of being in and engaging with the world.

And, in that sense, what I am proposing in internationalist pedagogy is an occasion and opportunity to do better than we have in the past, not just for our international students, but for, and with, all students!
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Variation in Relocation Strategies Among Coupled Mobile Academics: Moving together or staying apart in pursuit of combining academic career, mobility, and family life.

Elena Samarsky*

Introduction
With mobility becoming a normalization of professional academic life, the scholarship on academic mobility has flourished (Åkerlind 2005; Cantwell 2009, 2011; Kim 2009, 2017; Başak and Van Mol 2017; Gimenez and Morgan 2017; Antoschyuk 2019; Nikunen and Lempiäinen 2020; Cañibano et al. 2020; Pustelnikovaite 2021). In the EU context, scholars examined the experience of mobile academics and the reasons for mobility, the opportunities, and challenges that such mobility entailed as well as its outcomes (Ackers 2004; Musselin 2004; Bennion and Locke 2010; Leemann 2018; Samarsky 2020, 2021). Various research projects focused explicitly on the mobility of coupled academics (Vohlídalová 2014, 2017; Giorgi and Raffini 2015; Schaeer, Dahinden, and Toader 2017; Schaeer 2021) and examined relocation strategies within the broad existing framework, namely moving together or engaging in long-distance relationship. This paper aims to add to the existing framework and to showcase variation in relocation strategies of coupled academics. By demonstrating several sub-categories, it seeks to enrich our understanding of the relocation decision, as well as the reasons behind selecting specific relocation strategies.

In the context of the EU, mobility of academics is facilitated on national and EU levels and is simplified through freedom of movement, which may ease the relocation of individuals well as that of the entire households (Marimon, Lietaert, and Grigolo 2009; Ivancheva and Gourova 2011; Leemann 2018)². However, despite simplification of the legal and practical aspects of intra-EU mobility, empirical data show that coupled mobile academics do not always relocate together with their families and in some cases engage in long-distance relationships (Giorgi and Raffini 2015; Vohlídalová 2017; Murray-Close 2019).

Moving Together
Using the large body of literature on family migration (cf. Wills and Yeoh 2000; Eby 2001; Kofman 2004; Skrbiš 2008; Ryan et al. 2009; Tenn 2010; Melzer 2013; Ryan and Sales 2013; Kloc-Nowak 2015; Clerge et al. 2017; Toader and Dahinden 2018; Murray-Close 2019) contributes to our understanding of relocation strategies of couples. Among documented reasons
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for couples to relocate is a strong desire to recreate family life in the new location and to solidify their partnership (Eby 2001; Hiller and McCaig 2007; Cole 2012; Bernard 2014; Clerge et al. 2017). In their study, Clerge and colleagues (2017) found that solidifying a partnership was important for both male and female participants and have led some couples in academia, in the sample, to relocate together. Other scholarship suggests that couples may decide to relocate together in an attempt to avoid lowering the quality of their relationships and to reduce the likelihood of their mobile partners having an extramarital relationship while abroad (Eby 2001; Wills and Yeoh 2000; Ryan and Sales 2013).

Relocating together may also have practical reasons. Willis and Yeoh (2000) suggest that the success of relocation depends on the successful management of both the workplace and the home sphere. As such, accompanying partners contribute to the success of their mobile partners by organising the life of the entire household after the relocation. The discussion on accompanying partners has brought out the criticism on the concept of “trailing spouse” and demonstrated the active role that accompanying partners take in migration decisions, relocation, and integration processes (Kofman 1999; Eby 2001; Ackers 2004; Ryan and Sales 2013; Ryan and Mulholand 2014; Kofman and Raghuram 2015). While most of the projects examined female partners, more recent research on male accompanying partners in mobile households has shown similar results (cf. Cole 2012; Bernard 2014; Clerge et al. 2017).

**Long-Distance Relationship**

Data indicate a growing share of dual-career couples, including coupled academics, who choose long-distance relationships (henceforth, referred to as LDRs) as a strategy to deal with mobility (Elliott and Urry 2010; Reuschke 2010; Neustaedter and Grenberg 2012; Giorgi and Raffini 2015; Vohlídalová 2017; Murray-Close, 2019; Schaer 2021). LDRs refer to living arrangements adopted by couples who reside in different geographic locations while maintaining some functionality as non-mobile couples. Analysis of the census data from the USA and Germany supports the data and shows that LDRs are more likely to occur for couples transitioning from graduate schools to professional employment (Reuschke 2010; McFall and Murray-Close, 2016).

The increasing numbers of LDRs may be attributed to the rising share of women’s participation in the labour market and changing gender roles (Smits, Mulder, and Hooimeijer 2003; Tenn 2010), as well as limitations associated with employment and labour market, financial constraints, and legal barriers (Kofman 2004; Reuschke 2010; Beauchemin et al. 2015; McFall and Murray-Close 2016). Indeed, in the non-EU context legal aspects are mentioned as one of the reasons for LDRs (Beauchemin et al. 2015). A large body of literature attributes the growing number of dual-earning or dual-career couples engaging in LDRs to the lack of employment for each partner in a household and the temporary nature of employment contracts (Levin 2004; Reuschke 2010; Giorgi and Raffini 2015; Vohlídalová 2017; Murray-Close 2019). In her empirical research, Reuschke (2010) showed that three out of five respondents identified employment-related aspects as the main reason for engaging in LDRs. By choosing to engage in LDRs, these couples seek to reconcile career demands and family life. Indeed, in their empirical research on couples who earned doctoral degrees, McFall and Murray-Close (2016) have found that LDR arrangements were the preferred strategy compared to the option to break up or reject the job due to a location conflict.
Finally, the literature suggests that circumstances surrounding academic mobility, partners’ employment opportunities and career aspirations, financial resources, and legal aspects, as well as children, may all impact relocation practice. Indeed, in her empirical research Vohlídalová (2017) showed that female researchers who take on a prestigious fellowship abroad are more likely relocate together with family, while those with less prestigious fellowships are more likely to relocate alone and engage in long-distance relationships. Similarly, scholars document how having children impacts academic mobility and living arrangements. In their empirical research on early career academics in the UK and Switzerland, Schäer and colleagues (2017) observed that after having a child, all participants who were in long-distance relationships decided to reunite and live in the same location.

While the literature has some examples of mobility of academics, our understanding of the variation in relocation strategies beyond the two mentioned earlier, as well as reasons behind selecting each, is still limited. Examining the specific case of German academics in Britain, I suggest that the current framework (Moving Together vs LDRs) is too narrow and that adding sub-categories will contribute to a better understanding of relocation practices. In order to do so, I first introduce my study sample and its key aspects in methodology and data. I then proceed to present empirical data in four empirical sections. Each section is devoted to a specific relocation strategy, such as moving together immediately, moving together in stages after one partner found employment, moving together after both partners found employment, and, finally, engaging in long-distance relationship. The final section presents the contribution to the wider literature.

Study: Data and Methods
The case study of German academics in the UK is particularly intriguing. First, mobility of German scientists and academics to the UK has a rich history (Steinert and Weber-Newth 2008; Duxbury-Neumann 2017). Indeed, the UK was one of the main destination countries for German’s students and academics for decades (Remhof 2008; Ette and Sauer 2010; BMF 2015, 2019) which resulted in a large number of German academics in the local academic labour market (ONS 2016, 2017). Furthermore, both countries were members of the EU until 2021 (before the UK left the EU) which contributed to facilitation of mobility of academics as well as simplified the relocation of individuals and their entire households.

To examine the relocation strategies, I use qualitative data from in-depth interviews with German academics in Britain and some of their partners. The term “academic” refers to a wider range of occupations including researchers, post-doctoral researchers, and teaching staff employed by British higher education institutions. The term “German” refers to a German national who obtained their highest degree in Germany or elsewhere outside the UK. To ensure anonymity and confidentiality, pseudonyms were used. The specific age of participants was substituted by a reference to an age-group category. Finally, while I omitted the names of the universities, I used location references, such as London and Oxbridge. Note “Oxbridge” is a term used as a portmanteau of Oxford and Cambridge Universities.

My sample comprises 35 participants. Out of the 35 participants, 26 (six female and 20 male participants) were core participants, namely German academics who were in relationship at the time of their relocation and moved to the UK following a contract at one of the UK’s higher education institutions. Out of 26 core participants, 17 were married and nine were in a
relationship, and 13 participants had at least one child at the time of the relocation. The sample of 26 participants varied in terms of relocation practices: 14 participants moved together with their partners immediately after one has secured employment in the UK, two moved together only after both have partners have secured employment in the UK, five moved in stages, namely, one relocated after obtaining employment in the UK and the other followed within the next few weeks/months. Finally, five participants engaged in long-distance relationship. At the time of relocation, the average age of core participants was mid-30s. (See Appendix A for a profile of participants).

In addition, I have also conducted interviews with nine partners of core participants of whom seven were female and two were male. The subsample of partners includes four participants from couples who moved in stages, two participants from couples who moved immediately after one partner has secured employment, one participant from a couple who moved together after both found employment in the UK, and two participants from couples who engaged in LDRs.

I conducted the interviews in 2015-2016 in East England. When couples were interviewed, separate interviewing techniques were used. For those in long-distance relationships the interview took place over Skype. Interviewing partners separately allowed each partner to express their opinions and explain their actions and thoughts (Hertz 1995; Valentine 1999; Taylor and de Vocht 2011; Bjørnholt and Farstad 2014). However, conducting interviews with both partners raised methodological and ethical questions and required sensitivity to reports of conflicting data as well as caution to avoid revealing what was described by the other partner during their interview.

I coded and analysed all the transcribed interviews and used NVivo to simplify data organization. A preliminary coding scheme was developed around two relocation practices: “Moving Together” and “LDRs.” The first reading was based on a preliminary coding scheme while themes that did not fit were coded separately. During the second and third readings, preliminary codes were subdivided into more specific codes. This was the case for the “Moving Together” category, which was re-examined and subdivided into three categories: “Moving Right Away,” “Moving in Stages,” and “Moving after Both Found Employment.” Deconstructing the data helped to document variation in relocation practices as well as the reasons behind it.

**First Strategy: Moving Together After One Partner Secured Employment in Britain**

Family members of fourteen participants moved to the UK immediately or within a few weeks. This strategy was adopted by participants both in single- and dual-earner households. In fact, seven partners of mobile academics in the sample have resigned before they relocated, two could work remotely, and others were economically inactive.

For those 14 participants, moving immediately together with family members was the only way of accepting mobility. As a result, they had to ensure that the partner would be willing to move as well. This was the case for Sebastian a researcher in mid-30s who relocated together with his wife, and a small child, following a post-doctoral position. Sebastian has always prioritized relocating together and had declined mobility if moving together was impossible. Indeed, a few years before the family relocated to Britain, he was offered a post-doctoral position in the
Netherlands. While he was keen on a post doc abroad, he decided to decline the offer as his, now, wife would be unable to join him. He did not want to jeopardize the relationship. As a result, he declined the offer and stayed in Germany for a few years until a new opportunity emerged. He said,

One of the first post-doctoral offers was from the Netherlands, which was remarkably interesting. But at that time my now wife then girlfriend had just started a new job in Germany, and we were beginning to settle down and it was just a bad time to move. And so, it didn’t happen (Sebastian).

A similar account is provided by Clemens, a language tutor in his early-30s. Clemens together with his wife and two children has moved to Britain after securing a four-year position at Oxbridge University. For Clemens, the opportunity to travel to and to live in different countries was one of the main reasons for teaching German as a second language at universities. As a single breadwinner and a father, he was keen on relocating together with the whole family. In his interview, he not only spoke about the practical aspects of relocation but explained the role of his wife in the migration decision. He said,

She knew I wanted to go somewhere else. I always asked her what do you think about Brazil? Or how about Spain? And when she said yes then I thought about applying for it. When she said ‘no - I don’t want to go there with my children’, or ‘I would not be able to learn the language’, or ‘that’s not the quality of life I need’ - then I didn’t even apply (Clemens).

This was not an isolated case. Analysis of the interview data showed a clear pattern and highlighted the role of partners in location choices of many mobile academics in the sample. Indeed, while much of the scholarship demonstrates the impact of partners on migration decisions and relocation practices (Ryan et al. 2009; Brandén 2014; Kloc-Nowak 2015), this study contributes to this body of literature by showing the influence of partners on the choice of destination country.

For many participants who relocated together, a desire to recreate family life and ensure the survival of the relationship was one of the main reasons to adopt this strategy. Among others, it allowed maintaining physical closeness and reducing opportunities for extra-marital relations and deterioration of relationships. Demian’s interview is exemplary in this regard. Demian, a post-doctoral researcher in his early 30s, moved to Britain together with his wife after she received a tenure-track position. Since both were early-career academics searching for a permanent position, they decided that once one of them secures such a position, the other will follow and seek employment after the relocation. When taking about their relocation strategies, Demian was emotional and spoke about a strong desire to be together with his wife. He said,

I mean this is a very personal choice. It feels very awkward to me to be away from someone you want to be with. We are now in our mid-30s, we wanted to start a family. In fact, she is pregnant now. I want to see my child grow up.
I see people deal with mobility in diverse ways and engage in long-distance relationships for a while. And for some, it works very well. But some – divorce. I don’t know what they do, do they cheat on their partners, or they just leave their partner. To be very frank about this, I don’t understand people who will put their career over everything else in life (Demian).

A strong preference to move together immediately was also prominent for participants with small children. All participants who had children, except one, have moved together. The case of Maria, a research fellow in her late 30s, continues the topic. Maria, relocated to Britain following her husband’s appointment as a professor. She explained that although some years ago she and her husband engaged in an LDR due to her husband’s academic mobility, relocating together as a family and recreating family life became a priority since the birth of their child Maria said: “I think priorities change a bit. I could not imagine my husband being away from our son.”

This was not an isolated case. Such data fit in with earlier research and suggests that accounting for the presence of children might provide an additional explanation for choosing a specific relocation strategy among mobile couple academics.

Second Strategy: Following the Partner at a Later Stage
While most participants relocated together with their partners or were followed shortly afterwards, five participants decided to adopt a different strategy. In practical terms, they relocated ahead of their partners who followed them to the UK within the next six to twelve months.

For a few of those participants the decision rested on a desire to evaluate their new job and life in Britain before relocating the entire household. The interview with Christof, a senior lecturer in his early 40s, provides insight into this topic. He was one of those who relocated following a new position while his wife followed him almost six months later. When asked to elaborate on the decision, he explained that this was a “responsible” practice on his behalf; only after he felt confident in this new position, did he feel he could ask his wife to relocate. He said,

I went over and then it was up to me to say, ‘I think this job is secure.’ And then she would start making other arrangements such as terminating her job, selling the flat or renting the flat which is what we did in the end (Christof).

For a few other participants, choosing this strategy provided the necessary time to organize the relocation of the entire household. Analysing these interviews shows a clear pattern. In these cases, the partner who stayed behind had to address the practical aspects of organizing the relocation of the household, such as selling or renting out the apartment, terminating his/her own employment contract, as well as various utility contracts. This was the case for Bernhard, a researcher in his early 30s, who relocated to Oxbridge six months ahead of his wife. He said,

I think it was relatively clear from the point where I accepted the offer that she would join me, but it was also clear that it won’t be on the day that I moved. Because she had a job (Bernhard).
Similarly, in her interview, Ula, a lecturer in her late 20s, explained that she had to move within a few weeks of accepting the offer. Her partner had to stay in Germany to manage the relocation and organize the shipment of their belongings. Only after almost eight months the couple reunited in Oxbridge. She said,

Because of the shortness of time. I wanted to start as early as possible because I really wanted to get a job right away, but at the same time, my partner wasn’t ready and we had a flat in Germany, and you have those practical issues. I wanted to have those things as planned to minimise costs (Ula).

While these couples intended to relocate together, their relocation practices also included some element of LDRs. By highlighting the spectrum of experiences and complexities within relocation strategies the paper adds to the existing framework and helps to better understand relocation decisions.

Furthermore, such data, although anecdotal, highlight the active role of partners in managing the relocation as well as practical nuances of mobility of coupled academics. By organizing and managing the practical issues in Germany, partners who followed at a later stage provided the necessary assistance and practical support for the mobile academic. Such a strategy minimised the financial costs and reduced the overall stress associated with relocation. Although the literature has ample examples of how partners contribute to the recreation and reorganisation of family life after relocation (Kofman 2004; Ryan and Sales 2013; Ryan and Mulholland 2014), my findings illustrate the role of partners before the relocation of the entire household. Such observations challenge the simple notion of a “trailing spouse” as a blind follower and highlight the active role of those partners in managing the relocation of the entire household.

**Third Strategy: Moving Together after Both Having Found a Job in Britain**

Two participants in the sample decided to relocate only after both partners in their household had secured employment in the same city. Although a rare strategy in my sample, the two cases are very informative. Not only does it showcase a variation in relocation strategies among mobile academics who relocate together, but it also provides insights into a strategy that goes beyond the traditional model of a leading migrant and a follower.

The two participants were in dual-career households, and both had small children at the time of the relocation. According to the analysis, the main reason to choose such a strategy was to ensure the relocation of the entire household while also guaranteeing the career development of each member. However, choosing to relocate together only after both have secured employment in the destination country required both spouses to actively seek and apply for positions at the same time and cooperate in their job search.

This is the case of Franziska, a post-doctoral researcher in her early-30s. She and her husband were searching for jobs as their contracts could not be extended. The desire to move together without compromising their careers guided their decisions and practices. They decided to apply separately for two positions at the same institution or the same city. During their first attempt, while her husband received an offer, Franziska did not. They decided to decline his offer and...
continue the search. Soon enough they applied for two positions at Oxbridge University, and each was offered a position in a different department at the same university. She said,

[Before we came to Britain] my husband was offered a position in Hamburg. I sent [my CV to the same place] but I did not get an interview. I discovered two jobs in Oxbridge, we both were invited, and we both got jobs.

When asked to elaborate on why they declined her husbands’ offer and whether she considered following her husband to Hamburg and search for employment after the move, Franziska replied,

I didn’t like the idea to go and have no job. I hated it. The worst time was maternity leave. I need a job to feel like a person (Franziska).

Judith and Adam were the other couple in the sample who moved together after both having found employment. Both lecturers in their late-30s and parents to two small children, they decided to apply together for a “joint position.” In a practical manner, they applied for one position and asked for each to be employed part-time. Despite considering it to be unconventional with a high degree of uncertainty, Adams and Judith’s application was successful, and they were both were offered part-time contracts. This is how she explained it,

Since we work in the same area, one possibility would’ve been to apply to two positions which are very close. But when this position here came out, what we did instead – and that was really an experiment because we wanted to see how people react to that – we applied jointly to one position and said we are happy with half the position each of us. We were successful and it worked well (Judith).

Adopting this relocation strategy required not only similarities in their work portfolios but also willingness of the department to accept such arrangements and/or provide employment for the other partner. The question, therefore, remains as to how common such a scenario is among dual-career academic couples and to what extent universities are willing to accommodate it.

While relocating together after both having found employment was not a widespread strategy in my sample, some other participants acknowledged this would have been an ideal type of relocation. Indeed, in recent years some companies as well as universities have begun to offer positions for both partners of the mobile household. Despite being a relatively new and occasional practice, one might wonder whether this is an emerging trend corresponding to a new need in a mobile society of professionals.

**Fourth Strategy: Long-Distance Relationship (LDR)**

Although at the time of the interview only five participants were in LDRs, almost a third of participants acknowledged this would have been an ideal type of relocation. Indeed, in recent years some companies as well as universities have begun to offer positions for both partners of the mobile household. Despite being a relatively new and occasional practice, one might wonder whether this is an emerging trend corresponding to a new need in a mobile society of professionals.
To illustrate the topic, consider the case of Mona and Theo. When Theo, a professor in his mid-40s, got a permanent job offer in London they hoped that Mona, a researcher in her late 30s, would follow him at a later stage. On her end, she had to finish her commitments and terminate her contract at a research institution, which also gave her time to find employment in London. However, she was unable to secure employment in the city and eventually, secured a lucrative position as a team leader at Oxbridge University. During the interview with Theo, he spoke about their relocation strategy and the fact that although he was happy that Mona wanted to follow him, he also encouraged her to pursue her own career goals. Therefore, when she got an offer from Oxbridge University, he was supportive of her decision to accept it even though it meant not living together. Currently, they both rent apartments in their respective locations and have what they described as a “weekend relationship”. He said,

We were discussing options how we can find a place where we both can work at our career stage. The higher the career stage, the more difficult it gets to find a place for both. It is not an easy solution; we must be flexible and accept living apart for a while. For example, like it is now, we live in two different cities (Theo).

For a few other participants, LDR was chosen to mitigate the insecurities with short-term contracts offered at the foreign academic institutions. This was the case for Angelika and Carl. After finishing her studies, Angelika got a temporary position as a post-doctoral researcher at Oxbridge University while Carl stayed to finish his program and was consequently offered a post-doctoral position in the USA. According to Angelika, because of a three-year contract and the fact that she was unsure whether she will stay in Britain, asking Carl to relocate was counterproductive. By the time Carl would have finished his studies and secured employment in Britain, she might have had to move again to a new location. During the Skype interview with Carl, he explained that they always considered LDR as a strategy to maintain a relationship while also pursuing their academic careers. He noted,

We did our graduate programs together; I had another year when she already finished. We are currently living in different countries which is just basically part of how’s the job process goes. But basically, in three to five years down the road, if we can find permanent positions, then living together and starting a family would be top priority (Carl).

Carl and Angelika’s case is exemplary in showing the precarious situation of early-career mobile academics and the challenges of combining academic mobility, short-term contracts, and family life. Indeed, one wonders about the impact of the increasing trend of having short-term positions in academia on relocation strategies of coupled early-career academics. This data highlight the challenges in combining both career and family, which, among others, may lead to a large share of LDRs, dissolvement of couples, postponing family formation, and/or childbearing.

In a similar manner to other participants who engaged in LDRs, Carl and Angelika planned to move together again in a few years when they decide to start a family. This data resemble other projects (cf. Schaer et al. 2017; Schaer 2021) by showing that – when children enter the picture – mobile academics who were previously in LDRs prefer to share dwelling even if it means one partner choosing a less lucrative or desired employment condition.
When LDRs were discussed, the supportive nature of partners as well as trust in the survival of the relationship were often mentioned. This type of reasoning was articulated by Rudolf, a research associate in his late 30s, who moved to Britain while his girlfriend stayed in Germany. In his interview, he explained that choosing LDR to deal with their career goals was not considered to be threatening for the relationship nor was it considered an unexpected decision. He said,

We both knew that a long-distance relationship it highly likely to happen if we both wanted academic jobs after the graduate program. You must be incredibly lucky to find two jobs in the same city. We expected it [LDR]; it was not a very big discussion. It was never a question of not doing it for the sake of the relationship. We were confident that the relationship could cope with it (Rudolf).

While most participants spoke about LDRs as a seemingly easy and expected choice, maintaining this type of relationship was not always an easy task. Indeed, participants who were in LDRs at the time of the interview and many of those who had engaged in LDRs previously acknowledged emotional difficulties and frustrations, uncertainty about when the situation will change. The pattern highlights the emotional costs and challenges which individuals who engage in LDRs must overcome and showcases the downside of the hypermobility of early career academics.

Conclusion
In this paper, I examined the variation in relocation practices of couples as well as underlying reasoning behind the strategy adopted by analyzing data from mobile academics who were in a relationship at the time of the relocation. Such examination extends the framework (Moving Together vs LDRs) and suggests that adding sub-categories contributes to better understanding of the relocation practices. Understanding the nuances of relocation strategies, as well as challenges associated with each relocation can be informative for academic hiring committees as well as mobile coupled academics.

Foremost, the data highlight variation in relocation strategies even among coupled academics who relocated together. Indeed, while some participants relocated together with their partners immediately after one found employment in Britain, others relocated in two stages, or relocated only after both partners had found employment in the same city. Disentangling the broad theme of “moving together” and observing such variation within the theme showcases complexity in relocation decisions and extends our knowledge of relocation practices.

Furthermore, the findings contribute to the emerging field of research on long-distance relationships of academics. Participants in LDRs described it as a voluntary and low risk option and were confident in the survival of their relationship over distance and time. However, such living arrangements were always associated with limitations in the labour market, such as fixed-term contracts or lack of proper employment for the accompanying partner. The growing number of temporary positions as well as expected high levels of mobility for early-career academics, raises questions about the extent to which LDRs will become more popular in the future, and how they will affect both the individuals involved and the society in general.
Finally, while the data highlight the role of partners on relocation practices for both dual- and single-earner households, in dual-earner households the employment perspective of partners had even larger impact on relocation practices. Following the data, it can be suggested that aiding in employment search and/or providing employment for the accompanying partner of mobile academics may facilitate relocation of such households at the macro level. At the individual level, such practices may ease the relocation itself and allow the individual to combine career goals and employment perspectives of each member of the household without compromising family life.
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## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Partner's characteristics</th>
<th>N. children</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>mid 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married (Elsa)</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Franziska</td>
<td>early 30s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together/ both found jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Angelika</td>
<td>late 20s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In a relationship (Carl)</td>
<td>LDRs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bernhard</td>
<td>early 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rudolf</td>
<td>early 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In relationship (Erica)</td>
<td>LDRs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>mid 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>mid 40s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In relationship (Jenni)</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jens</td>
<td>mid 40s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>early 40s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>LDRs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Andreas</td>
<td>late 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>LDRs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ula</td>
<td>late 20s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Christoffer</td>
<td>early 40s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mathias</td>
<td>mid 40s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lutz</td>
<td>late 20s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In a relationship (Alicia)</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Steffen</td>
<td>mid 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married (Philipa)</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>late 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>mid 30s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married (Adam)</td>
<td>Moved together/both found jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Demian</td>
<td>late 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In relationship</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Christof</td>
<td>early 40s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married (Steffi)</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sebastian</td>
<td>mid 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Helga</td>
<td>mid 40s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Clemens</td>
<td>early 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Language Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rene</td>
<td>early 50s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>LDRs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Steffen</td>
<td>mid 30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Theo</td>
<td>mid 40s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In a relationship (Mona)</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>late 30s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Manner of Moving</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona</td>
<td>late 30s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In a relationship (Theo)</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippa</td>
<td>late 30s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married (Steffen)</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>mid 20s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>In a relationship (Lutz)</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td>PhD student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>mid 30s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Married (Judith)</td>
<td>Moved together/ both found jobs</td>
<td>2 Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>mid 30s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Married (Gilbert)</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>1 Librarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>late 20s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>In a relationship (Rudolf)</td>
<td>LDRs</td>
<td>PhD student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenni</td>
<td>mid 40s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>In a relationship (Martin)</td>
<td>Moved together</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>late 20s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>In a relationship (Angelika)</td>
<td>LDRs</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steffi</td>
<td>late 40s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Married (Christof)</td>
<td>Moved in stages</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This short paper is based on the remarks made at the Conference for Assistant Professors in October 2021 which was organized by the Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence and the Office of the Provost, Purdue University.

The fact that you are in a tenure-track position says that you have already done much to prepare for promotion: most institutions want their hires to succeed in the position. So, congratulations to you! And congratulations to your institution for hiring you!

But you still need to work towards tenure and promotion and then the subsequent promotion to full professor.

Why do we have this time-consuming process of promotion? The point is to give you validation for your professional work, validation that you are doing something worth doing, and that you are appreciated by the external world. At the same time, promotion of individuals is an examination and validation of the institution that it has the right people actively doing good things. So, you are not the only entity getting evaluated or getting feedback on its workings! Institutions grow and adapt from evaluating their hires.

Promotion is a serious matter, enough to be somewhat stressed about it. Self-doubts creep in, you work hard and long hours, you want to submit two papers this summer, and you agreed to organize a conference.... You have a certain tenaciousness, curiosity, drive, you do not stop at a job half done... But I want to stress that you should not be only about serious work, I hope that you enjoy your work and that you should take time to enjoy life! You might ask me if enjoying work and life is now a new requirement for tenure? No, it is not something directly for your portfolio, but you want to be a wholesome person, so that you can stay in your endeavors for the long haul. Take time for yourself. I’ll push this joyfulness a little further - when you are putting together your promotion portfolio, you may have an idea of how many papers in what venues and how many conference talks you need, but this joyfulness is only to be measured by you inside (or possibly by other people you snap at when you are overworked). I do hope for you and for the world that on average you feel content with what you are doing.

On a related matter, about thirty years ago, my husband and my sister, in different parts of the world, were both in the software industry, working very long hours and weekends. It seemed to be the thing to do. But when my sister moved to Switzerland for a new software job, her new
boss told her to work at most five days a week, preferably four, and that she should work at most eight hours a day and be efficient during that time. I still find this outlook on work very refreshing: work when you can be efficient, then take time off and refresh. I also learned from my German collaborator to work well during the day and to spend evenings with others or reading good books. My hours are longer, but I do take substantial down time.

Promotion is not a given, of course, you need to put in much work. Research matters most (I am in mathematics). I break down my more detailed advice below into several subgroups, Publications, Funding, Service and Teaching.

**Publications**

One of the biggest research validation markers are publications. You need to know what counts in your discipline. In some disciplines, journal papers carry the most weight, in some it is conference proceedings, in some books. In some subdisciplines, they write longer papers than in others; in some they publish with lesser frequency. All this contributes to the fact that at most institutions, promotions are not about candidates competing against each other, but we only consider the merits of each individual. But do know what counts in your discipline and publish accordingly. And it is fine to publish some items that count for less!

Professional habits change, and I find it very refreshing when somebody does something quite outside the norms! (Examples are of computer science research in mathematics departments and other departments in the 1980s, 1990s, eventually leading to departments of Computer Science; or before that it was Statistics and before that Physics, but there were also minor revolutions in specific departments that did not result in major new disciplines, such as algebraic statistics.) But some work outside the norm is not acceptable, perhaps at least not until tenure. When research leads you down a new modality, you just may be a trailblazer for something different and powerful but do talk to your mentors and your department head whether you should pursue that at your current stage.

Publish consistently, at pretty good quality. The important words here are “consistently” and “good”. Nobody really counts the number of papers when it is past some threshold, but the papers should not be all in the first few years or in the last few years in your tenure-track job, and there should be some really good papers in the mix that make you proud. (You should be proud of all papers, but more of some of them.). Universities want to see consistency at pretty good or better quality. Not every paper can be or should be ground-breaking. Sometimes you have a minor result that should nevertheless be published for accumulation of knowledge. Do publish it.

Another reason for why you should be publishing some minor papers is the following cautionary true tale #1: Do not work exclusively on the hardest problem in your discipline without publishing anything until the big picture is revealed. --- This is a gamble, and I have seen this attitude destroy at least one promising research career (and I have heard of a few others). This attitude is akin to taking an exam and focusing solely on the one extra hard problem. Do the more easily doable problems first, publish those. While you are working on the easier problems, the back of your mind may still be on the hard problem and solving the easier problems can build up your repertoire of methods, it does build connections in your head and in publications.
So, publish consistently and at pretty good quality. Aim for higher-impact journals. Your articles will not be published in the higher-end journals if you do not submit to them. You may receive rejections, do not dwell on rejections, thoughtfully incorporate the feedback from the referees and editors, then submit to the next journal.

About writing: take time to write your papers and grant proposals. Finish the writing, then set it all aside for two weeks. When you come back to it with fresh eyes, you will be able to improve the presentation, clarify the meaning... Then set it aside again, repeat improving as necessary. Yes, professional papers need to be written well for their intended audience. Referees get annoyed by repeated careless writing and may reject your paper or your grant proposal on that basis. You cannot blame them for it.

I mentioned consistency in publishing. But there are some exceptions to this. Maybe you will become a parent and will have nights without much sleep, maybe you or somebody in your family will get ill, this pandemic is disrupting how we function and is affecting some people more than others. It is understandable that your productivity takes a dive. For much of my pregnancy and several months afterwards, my brain seemed to have left me, I could not remember words, I could not remember proofs of easy exercises, it was horrible, especially since everybody else’s kid slept through the night, ate and needed changes on a regular schedule, ... or so they said, and I believed them. Anyway, do have life, family, do not postpone having children indefinitely, well, if you want them! And having a child taught me to be much more efficient in my in-between times.

**Funding**

Do apply for funding. In some disciplines no work can be done without funding, in others it is an important validation that allows you to do more than otherwise, to get access to resources, to travel to conferences…. Writing grant proposals gives you an opportunity to step back and evaluate your accomplishments and future directions. So do apply for funding, and you may want to seek out multiple venues and get ideas for where else to use your ideas.

Cautionary tale #2: Carefully follow the instructions - grant proposals get rejected simply for not following the instructions, no matter how brilliant your ideas are.

Most applications are through the university offices rather than on your own; those offices need time to do their bit as well, so give them plenty of time to process your proposal (as well as proposals of everybody else on a given day). There may be some back and forth with the office on proper wording, and if you do not give them enough time, they will not be able to transmit their feedback to you, and your grant may be rejected for technicalities. (This is cautionary tale #3.)

Once you are successful for a grant, you may be invited to be a reviewer of grants in subsequent years. Serving on grant panels gives you even more insight into what makes grant applications successful. For your first applications do rely on you mentors.
Something else about grant writing: You want to convey that your ideas are great, promising, on the cutting edge, but you should not use these words! Instead, convey all that with the content of your proposal, backed by your prior accomplishments.

Do not exaggerate your accomplishments in your grant proposals, papers, CV, promotion portfolio. Exaggeration invites and calls for further scrutiny.

**Professional service**

Professional service includes reviewing and refereeing articles. This work is usually done anonymously so you do not get explicit credit for it. Nevertheless, do it, and do it well and do it promptly. One benefit is that it forces you to read carefully somebody else’s work, you learn their methods, their focus, what still needs to be done in that area. This can benefit your own research. (But of course, be a responsible researcher and do not tweak the results that you are reading and publish them as your own!) Another reason for prompt refereeing is the long-term goal of getting on editorial boards. Members of editorial boards should be well organized and responsive to incoming submissions and referees; being a prompt and professional referee offers an indication of whether you can be on the editorial board.

Be professional with your reports, even when recommending a rejection. Stick to facts, do not insult the whole sub-subdiscipline for existing. And do not accept every submission either! You were asked to referee because of your expertise, use it to be good and fair.

Organize conferences, special sessions at the meetings of your professional society, invite speakers there and also to speak in your department. Cultivate potential mentors and potential letter writers at other institutions.

Be visible! Make yourself visible. Give great talks at conferences. People are more likely to remember great talks (or really bad talks, but those are in a different memory bucket). When going to a conference, look ahead of time who else will be there. Have you read one of their papers recently and do you have some contributing questions? Do you have a follow-up idea? Talk to them at the conference. They may like your ideas and invite you for a visit at their institution or to collaborate with them. You cannot simply go up to a professor and say that you would like to be invited to their institution or to a conference. You need to give them reasons to make them want to invite you. You want to convey that you are great and that you are a visitor with high potential, without using those words.

Back in the old days we would bring stacks of paper preprints and reprints to conferences and distribute them, possibly with some words of explanation: “This is related to your paper on X.” Now we are more likely to send emails with links to arXiv papers, and explicitly marking the connection with recipients’ interests. It is a lot easier to deal with links than stacks of papers, but make sure to convince your audience that they really want to click on the link, that there is something of very high interest to them in there.

In short, make yourself and your work seen. Enlist your mentors to help you be visible. Make it known that you would like to give a talk at institution X, that you would like to be an editor, or serve on a specific national organization office.
In addition to seeking connections with potential mentors and letter writers, do cultivate also connections with professional peers at other institutions. What opportunities and activities and conferences are they working on? What opportunities are open for you? Collaborations on specific disciplinary projects are great, and you can also have camaraderie projects, important for one’s well-being and perspective.

**Department service**
Be a good citizen of the department and of the university too. In your first few years you are not likely to be asked to serve on much, but once you know the needs and strengths and deficiencies, do contribute. If you agree to serve on a committee, do not be just a passive observer collecting CV items. Committees usually need to accomplish some work, do help the team.

Departments thrive on new energy from new hires! New hires are doing refreshing new research, teach in refreshing new ways, have great professional service ideas... But, beware: do not tell your department soon upon your arrival that you know better than they how to do things, or worse. Some departments are more open to change than others, but you may want to do some observing first and bring in your suggestions judiciously.

**Mentoring**
Mentoring can be very enriching. As professors, we have power and knowledge and experience that can make a difference in a young person’s life. Most of us had (perhaps unwitting) mentors who told us this or that which then helped our career. We can pay it forward. If you agree to mentor someone, do it mindfully; do not be just a passive observer collecting CV items.

But do write about your mentoring activities in your CVs and in your annual reviews.

I repeat my message from before: do seek mentors for yourself. Most people are willing to mentor in their own department, but getting external mentors may require some special work or luck. Well, make it so that your potential mentor has a good reason to invite you to their institution to give a talk, or have lunch together at a conference, ... Ask specific questions. It is easier to get a flow of advice from someone after a good prompt. Mentoring from outside the department builds networks within the institution or expands discipline-based networks. The Coaching and Resource Network (CRN)\(^1\) at Purdue has an initiative that enables faculty members to select mentors outside their departments and even colleges.

**Teaching**
You are at your stage of the career because of the inspiring teachers and role models you have had in the past. Pay it forward: be a good teacher. It pays to hone your presentation skills, to elicit the most wonder and curiosity, even to beginner classes, or perhaps especially to beginner classes! Practice that clarity of thought, of the flow... it will help your research and your writing of papers and grants.

Prepare for your classes well. There is no such thing as “overpreparing” for class (just like there is no such thing as “overstudying” for an exam). One bad minute in your class, multiplied by the

---

\(^1\)For details about CRN, see [https://www.purdue.edu/butler/crn-support-circle/crn/index.php](https://www.purdue.edu/butler/crn-support-circle/crn/index.php).
number of students present or in absentia, is a lot of wasted time. Each great or good minute in
class can make a huge difference in understanding of the specific topic, of the whole class, and
of the students’ lifetime trajectory. This is a powerful role that teachers play, and it is rewarding
to see the students’ development.

**Summary**
Do well in your research, publishing, funding, teaching and service. Make professional
connections, seek advice, mentors, professional opportunities. Enjoy your time with that work
and also take refreshing time for yourself and your family.
The Influence of Faculty Background on Preparing for Promotion and Tenure
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Diversity in Faculty Backgrounds
Some years ago, I was guilty of eavesdropping on a conversation. I was in Ethiopia, working on a research project and staying on the campus of an international research center. At breakfast one morning, a family of four, also visiting, was seated behind me. The two parents at the table were discussing emotions with their children. I listened as they explained how words can affect others. The mother then said, “The server is coming. Why don’t you say this to him?” She provided a sentence. The server approached, had a brief exchange with one of the children, and left. The mother asked, “How did he respond when you said that? How do you think that made him feel?”

This conversation was one of the clearest examples in my experience of how families differ. My parents would not have the capacity to bring a spouse and two children on an international work trip, and we certainly never had casual coaching sessions about emotions or influencing others over breakfast. What struck me most were the skills the children were learning at a young age: they were building their vocabulary on emotions and learning how to communicate with others. As an adult, I was still building those skills.

Success in academia requires more than hard work, technical skills, and excellence in research, teaching, and service. Communication, management, leadership, networking, and a host of other skills make a difference during the promotion and tenure process, but they are not taught at any level of schooling. These skills are largely acquired by experience from family, community, and culture. Faculty with different backgrounds, especially those who are immigrants, members of an underrepresented group, first-generation, or from a family with limited resources (socioeconomic status or SES), may enter academia with different pressures, beliefs, and behaviors that can influence their progress through the promotion and tenure process. In this article, I will discuss some tips for promotion and tenure while considering the diversity in faculty backgrounds.

Time and Mental Resources
Much has been written about the need to manage time well. “Protecting” one’s time includes regularly scheduling time for activities that are important for promotion and tenure (for most,
research and writing), then using that time as planned, even when other demands arise. If this sounds difficult, note that faculty are very good at rigorously protecting their time for classroom instruction. Similar strategies can be used to protect time for other important activities. Creating a weekly plan with scheduled time for these activities, along with time for meetings and teaching, can be very helpful, and working on important goals on a daily basis, even for a very short amount of time, can reduce stress and lead to progress in the long run.

Many people underestimate the time required for a task, and adding some “grace” into one’s schedule can help. Time tracking, which can be done on paper, in a spreadsheet or calendar, or using an app, can be valuable. It provides data on how your time is spent, allowing you to identify when your time use does not align with your goals and priorities and to make adjustments. If this type of data causes stress, it can be helpful to view changes as experimentation. One can make a change in behavior, collect more time use data, and if the change does not improve time use, consider why it did not work and try something else. This data-driven approach to behavior change can be appealing to researchers and can lower the stakes and the stress associated with having inadequate time for priorities.

Productivity, however, is not purely a function of time; attention and focus are also critical. Several strategies exist to maintain focus, such as turning off electronic notifications and scheduling meetings and time replying to emails so that work hours are less fragmented. Keeping larger goals and values in mind is helpful, as ambivalence and lack of clarity can drain energy. Time spent in planning (for the week, month, semester, or longer periods) and periodic reflection on progress take time but are worth it. The tenure track often encourages short-term thinking, but it can be helpful and motivating to create time and space for longer-term plans and strategies.

Some work activities also carry emotional weight, and consequently, they take longer than the hours and minutes recorded on a calendar. Examples of such activities from my research area (global public health) include data collection in malnutrition or maternity wards in low-resource settings, reading qualitative interviews of individuals from disadvantaged groups, and analyzing child mortality data. In teaching, emotional labor is involved in one-on-one interactions with students in need. In service, this is embedded in diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts. Your own examples will vary, but the additional requirements of such activities are important to consider when deciding to take on new assignments or setting a schedule.

**Perfectionism**

Perfectionism can stall productivity. One study of psychology professors found that perfectionism was negatively associated with the number of total publications, the number of first-authored publications, the number of citations, and journal impact rating (Sherry et al. 2010). Perfectionism is often not about striving towards excellence; it can be a method for coping with risk and uncertainty. Depending on your background, failure in your job or on the tenure track can have major consequences for your family as well as for you. The response may be to “work harder,” even to extremes and an unattainable standard. Most faculty have high endurance, but just because it is possible to work long hours does not mean one should. Not all activities in an academic role have to meet the same high standard. For example, the standard of writing typically required differs between a journal article, a routine document for a departmental
committee, and an email. Selectively relaxing some standards can lead to greater productivity with low risk.

Mentoring
Mentorship is vital in an academic career, and you are not limited to only one mentor. Each faculty member has a variety of needs, and everyone is busy, so it can help to have a network of mentors. You may have some people you contact when you need advice on a new research direction, and a different person with whom you discuss the design of a new course. Reaching out to new potential mentors can be difficult, and run counter to personal inclinations or cultural upbringing. However, mentors can be a valuable source of information, including the “unwritten rules” of your department or institution, direct you to new opportunities, and advocate for you when you are not in the room. Peers (including those at other institutions) can also serve as mentors and provide opportunities for accountability as you each work toward your goals. If you have not previously had much support or mentoring, you may be less aware of your needs or the support available to you. Talking to others can help.

However, developing relationships in the workplace, mentoring or otherwise, requires some degree of self-disclosure. This is another activity that people from minority and underrepresented groups may tend to avoid, as it can draw potentially negative attention to your differences from the larger group. However, self-disclosure can also be beneficial: it can help build stronger relationships and make you more included, allow people to get to know you, help them remember you when an opportunity arises, and advocate for you in an informed way (Harvard Business Review 2018). Institutions can support faculty by making mentoring the norm for all faculty at all ranks, and formal mentoring programs can address specific needs of faculty. At Purdue University, for example, the Butler Center’s Coaching and Resource Network (CRN) aims to provide mentoring for faculty who may be isolated, face unique challenges that may not be disclosed within a department or college, or are otherwise needing support (Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence 2022).

Health and Well-being
Health needs change over time. Often, discussions of health and personal needs, especially for female faculty, revolve around reproduction. However, pregnancy, childbirth, and parenthood are not the only personal issues that faculty face. Some faculty will struggle with infertility or pregnancy loss, some will have other health concerns, both acute and chronic, and some will need to provide care for children with special needs or for aging relatives (elder care). For faculty who are immigrants or come from low-resource backgrounds, this may involve providing financial support as well. Some faculty struggle with the “two-body problem” – finding adequate, desired employment for both themselves and their partner – while others struggle to meet new people and establish relationships. Many faculty face mental health challenges. Most of these difficulties are not disclosed in the workplace for fear of how they may be judged, leaving many to juggle burdens with limited or no support.

Prioritizing health, broadly defined as physical, mental, and social well-being (World Health Organization 1946), is key to long-term productivity. Prioritization involves changing behaviors and habits, which can be difficult, especially when time, energy, and “bandwidth” feel limiting. Barriers are valid even when small. For example, you may resolve to exercise at mid-day but not
follow through because it takes too much time to wash, dry, or style your hair before returning to the office. Clearly articulating this as a problem (exercise messes hair, and I need to meet a self- or externally imposed standard of appearance at work), rather than a failure (I did not exercise today), makes it easier to find and experiment with solutions. Academia involves continuous failure: manuscripts are critiqued, grants are rejected. It can be helpful to develop strategies specifically to boost your confidence and mood, such as setting achievable daily goals and allowing yourself repeated small wins or taking time to celebrate small daily successes. Such strategies are beneficial, even after promotion and tenure.
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Reflections on Equity in Scholarship, Service, and the Tenure and Promotion Process

Liz Wuerffel*
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As faculty and higher education institutions consider strategies and expectations for a successful tenure and promotion process, we must also consider the broader institutional culture that is often heavier and more costly for minoritized (or underserved) individuals moving through the T&P process, or whose creative work and research is nontraditional. In this short paper, I will consider three areas: 1) methods of creative work and research that can be viewed as non-traditional; 2) the increasing pressure (perhaps especially at smaller or less wealthy institutions) to engage in service work; and 3) the tenure and promotion process itself, which may be in contradiction to diversity, equity, and inclusion. While I do offer specific takeaways, I will mostly advocate for all of us to start or join conversations that need to be happening in departments, colleges, and faculty governing bodies. This paper is based on remarks made at the October 2021 Conference for Assistant Professors organized by the Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence and the Office of the Provost at Purdue University.

Creative Work and Research
I am an Associate Professor of Art at Valparaiso University (Valpo), a small, private, Lutheran, tuition-dependent institution in the Midwest. At Valpo, teaching is the primary role of the faculty, although research and creative work are an important part of tenure and promotion. I will use my own creative work and research to illustrate the way in which legitimate scholarship can be called into question because it is interdisciplinary in nature, or because it does not strive for narrow dissemination through peer-reviewed journals.

I co-direct a story collection called the Welcome Project (welcomeproject.valpo.edu) that began as an on-campus project at Valpo where we interviewed students about belonging. It quickly grew to the city – we partnered with nonprofits to help the community better understand what homelessness looked like in Porter County. It then grew again to include a deep look into the declension narrative of Gary, Indiana. We have conducted hundreds of interviews over the past decade, and edited those interviews into short video and audio stories to use in facilitating campus and regional conversations. Our work is also broadcast on Lakeshore Public Radio.
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Here is the problem: this work is not traditional gallery exhibition work that most art departments are looking for in their pre-tenure faculty; it does not easily classify as a solo show, an invitational, or a juried exhibit; and it does not even sit firmly in the discipline, as it blends arts and humanities. This work falls under the framework of publically engaged scholarship – it is participatory, civic, and community-oriented. Publicly engaged scholarship is a framework and method used across different fields that women and faculty of color are more likely to engage in, and it often gets dubbed “community service.” Yet this method is consequential, both in terms of scholarship and in terms of co-contributing alongside community members to the public good – two goals most universities aspire to but do not usually recognize as being able to happen in tandem. Publicly engaged scholars often have to also prove themselves through traditional methods and, even so, can face bias from colleagues and tenure and promotion committee members who view publicly engaged scholarship as unorthodox or even illegitimate.

While I successfully achieved tenure and promotion, I did so and by meeting and exceeding all of the traditional requirements for my field (maintaining a strong exhibition record) in addition to my publicly engaged work. In advance of applying for tenure, I spent time translating the process and impact of Welcome Project creative work and research into art terminology for my department colleagues so that it would not be primarily viewed as service work. Finally, I provided sufficient context in my tenure and promotion documents to alleviate concerns that committee members may have had regarding the appropriateness of counting publicly engaged work as scholarship.

Service
At Valparaiso University, one of the qualities we look for when hiring new faculty is a desire to engage in building community and serving the university campus. While we do try to limit the kinds of service work that pre-tenure and non-tenure faculty engage in during their first few years, as we better recognize the value of non-tenure and pre-tenure perspectives, as budget cuts reduce staff and faculty positions, and as we are called to do more and varied forms of service, service obligations multiply.

At Valpo, we have just under 200 tenure-track faculty members; these faculty by and large (though certainly not exclusively) shoulder the most service, as service is required as part of our tenure and promotion process. During our mascot change, one of the most fitting ideas I heard for the new mascot was “the committee on committees” – we are still tabulating the number of faculty seats on university, Senate, and college committees, but as of now we are up to 520. This does not count departmental committees, or all the other forms of service faculty are called – or required – to do (mentoring, advising, hiring committees, etc.). This level of committee work is unsustainable. Visible effects are more vacant seats, more uncontested elections, and a drop in attendance; less visible effects must include higher stress, fatigue, burnout, and lower morale.

There is an additional burden for many minoritized faculty – I know this from experience as a member of the LGBTQ community, and I notice it even more for our faculty of color. In addition to regular service work, we often get nominated for standing committees that “need diversity” or on search committees that are representative or need to appear representative. We are also called upon to educate the campus community more broadly through panels, events, and student life programming. We become the go-to people who get the email, phone call, or hallway conversation when administrators or colleagues need advice or want to reach a certain student
demographic with which they are not already engaged. Additionally, we routinely become emotional support systems (and sometimes crisis responders) for our BIPOC + LGBTQ students.

All of this is on top of an already overflowing plate. While parts of it may be energizing to some individuals who enjoy educating and advocating for diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice, it also comes with an emotional toll that will compound for faculty (and students and staff) in places that lack strong, supportive, and regenerative BIPOC + LGBTQ communities. Additionally, it is work that has little or no value in the tenure and promotion process. In fact, it takes away time from course preparation, creative work and research, professional development, and the types of academic committee work that do not need justifying remarks in one’s tenure and promotion application.

**Tenure and Promotion**

There is mounting evidence that evaluations of teaching (or SETs) are complicated by bias, bias coming from students and in the evaluation tool itself, and that the use of evaluations in employment decisions is discriminatory against underrepresented faculty (Mitchell and Martin 2018). I posit that the vast majority of higher education institutions still rely on student evaluations in tenure and promotion.

Ryerson University’s faculty association and university went into arbitration around student evaluations, and the resulting ruling by William Kaplan in 2018 found that many factors skew SET results, “especially personal characteristics … such as race, gender, accent, age and ‘attractiveness’” (6). The ruling also found that it is near impossible to adjust for these biases. “The expert evidence…demonstrates that the most meaningful aspects of teaching performance and effectiveness cannot be assessed by SETs. Insofar as assessing teaching effectiveness is concerned – especially in the context of tenure and promotion – SETs are imperfect at best and downright biased and unreliable at worst” (2018:5).

Despite the persistence of clear and mounting research, academic departments and tenure and promotion committees continue to use student evaluations in the tenure and promotion process (as well as the hiring process). And while some institutions – Valpo included – have revised the evaluations and added language aimed at helping faculty members and chairs best read the evaluation (or, I might argue, read it in the “least worst” way), the fact remains that they play an outsized role in tenure decisions and an even more troubling role in “on the fence” cases or in cases where a decision to terminate is being justified.

Students are not the only people who have bias. Until we look deeply at our tenure and promotion process, from hiring through promotion, we will continue to perpetuate inequities. It is critical that we address this immediately because decisions that are being made in the tenure and promotion process impact the long-term future makeup of the institution, in essence ensuring that Predominantly White Institutions (PWI) remain PWI. It is a subtle way that racism, sexism, homophobia and other isms can continue to shape the institutional identity in ways that not only harm the people in them (or who are rejected by them), but, potentially, the very survival of the institution itself.
What to Do
If you are at an institution that is not yet moving the needle, one of the first steps is to begin a departmental conversation to discuss the role of service in tenure and promotion, and to revise tenure and promotion guidelines regarding what scholarship and publication methods are deemed legitimate and desirable. Codify definitions and establish criteria for documentation and evaluation to be used in faculty review processes. Methods like publicly engaged scholarship ought to be recognized, even as such methods question the allure of Tier 1 publications or venues. Such publications are reputable for a reason, but the gatekeeping has also been akin to neighborhoods with racially restrictive covenants, whether intentional or not. We need to enter into honest conversations about the importance of broadening our disciplinary definitions of scholarship. By broadening, I do not mean less deep – publicly engaged scholarship goes deep, tends to leave fewer people out, and tends to meaningfully engage many more people. For pre-tenure, tenure, and promotion, this may also mean expanding review processes to be inclusive of community members who may have more insight on the public impact of engaged scholarship activities than faculty members. It also means developing institutional capacity to support such projects just as traditional scholarship is supported; this may include identifying, expanding, or creating publication opportunities for publicly engaged scholarship at university presses, especially at R-1 institutions where the “publish or perish” mentality is deeply engrained.

Regarding student evaluations, depending on your institution, it may be a departmental-level conversation or a college- or faculty-wide conversation, depending on who holds the reigns of evaluations. But it goes much deeper than the evaluation tool itself. Research shows that bias may decrease with better representation of minority groups in the university workforce (Fan et al., 2019). Yet, minoritized faculty often begin in more vulnerable positions; our institution provides an example. We had been working hard to hire more underrepresented (or minoritized) faculty and had been modestly successful. We have had some faculty of color leave by choice, but due to a recent and dramatic budget cut and because of the protections of tenure, many pre-tenure faculty lines were cut. Because we had spent the last decade hiring more faculty of color, these cuts were even more devastating for our faculty of color.

Ultimately, this means we also must engage in a conversation about tenure. Academic freedom is essential. Job security is a byproduct of safeguarding academic freedom, and that means that in times of major budget cuts and financial crises, the privilege of that job security makes those of us with tenure in part culpable. If we want to advocate for underrepresented faculty, then we have to question the privileges inherent to tenure, because tenure has reproduced inequity. In advocating for underrepresented faculty, how do we protect academic freedom while also protecting emerging faculty – the most diverse group of faculty yet, and the future of our institutions?
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