Counting Publications: A Curriculum of Metrics Across Intersections of Tenure

Boni Wozolek, Penn State University, Abington College

Contact: Email: bfw5188@psu.edu

Abstract: Tenure and promotion, regardless of context, can be an anxiety-filled experience for many scholars. Thinking along the intersections of a data-driven tenure and promotion process at a large state institution, this paper conceptualizes the curriculum of metrics as it emerges from the author's critical feminist autobiographical narrative. This curriculum, like many dialogues in the field of curriculum studies, carefully considers the iterative and recursive nature of curricula that are imbricated with local and less local sociopolitical and cultural norms and values. Finally, this paper argues that the curriculum of metrics, like all curricula, is agential in that it forms and informs sociopolitical and cultural norms and values across the academy by emphasizing measurement over a prolonged engagement with ideas.

Keywords: curriculum studies, curriculum of metrics, tenure and promotion, autobiography

Biographic sketch: Dr. Wozolek is an associate professor of education at the Penn State University, Abington College where she also serves as the Director of Inclusive Excellence. Dr. Wozolek's work examines race, sexual orientations, and gender identities through qualitative research methods and teaching practices across educational contexts. Dr. Wozolek's recent publications include her monograph, *Assemblages of Violence in Education: Everyday Trajectories of Oppression* (Routledge, 2021), an edited volume, *Black Lives Matter in US Schools: Race, Education, and Resistance* (SUNY, 2022), and *Educational Necropolitics: A Sonic Ethnography of Everyday Racisms in U.S. Schools* (Routledge, 2023).

Counting Publications: A Curriculum of Metrics Across Intersections of Tenure

I vividly remember holding my first publication. It was a paper on m/othering that I submitted to the *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy's* annual conference proceedings. As I noted in the paper, it was a manuscript born from wreckage from my worlds colliding (Wozolek, 2012). Namely, the exhaustion of being a first-time parent of a baby with colic, working full time as a K-12 teacher, and experiencing the intellectual whiplash that often accompanies doctoral programs. Although I submitted the paper with the assumption that it would be massively rejected, I was thrilled to learn that it was not only accepted but selected to receive the 2012 James T. Sears award. I arrived in New Orleans for the annual convening, giving myself about 2 hours to relax before I had to leave for the conference's town hall and associated awards ceremony. I closed my eyes for a quick nap and woke up six hours later, missing the afternoon sessions and town hall.

The next day, I was greeted by folks who were amused to hear a story about a napping parent who missed accepting an award that recognized her paper on m/othering and exhaustion. After receiving my badge, along with the award and the associated book from the *Curriculum and Pedagogy* series where the paper was published, I found a quiet hallway to open the book. There it was—*my* name, in print, for the first time. Perhaps it was some combination of bone-weary exhaustion that collided suddenly with a quiet childhood dream of becoming a published author, but I was moved from tears that quickly dissipated into panic as I wondered: Would anyone, aside from the editors and awards committee, read this? What would they think? I was able to produce this paper but, would there be others? What if my subsequent scholarship was deemed a comparative failure?

This past May, I earned tenure and was promoted. As I thought about the spaces that I've occupied between holding that first publication and becoming an associate professor, I found myself drifting between questions like "What have I done in and for the field?" and, predictably, "What's next?" Without the immediacy and anxiety associated with the tenure track, I have specifically found myself ruminating on the pressures of publication that I have experienced since receiving my doctorate in 2015. In what often feels like a scholarly existential crisis, I am left wondering if my desire to engage in research was sublimated by the necessity to publish and, relatedly, the intellectual impact that the tenure push has on scholars.

Following the questions above, the purpose of this paper is to explore what I would call a "curriculum of metrics," which underscored my experiences prior to and during my time as an assistant professor. Through a curriculum of metrics, I am theorizing the

feedback loop of what is taught and learned when both individuals and institutions value the measurement of scholarly production over a diverse engagement with ideas. The iterations and recursions of any curriculum—including one that focuses on the many ways that metrics can impact scholarly spaces and places—are complex. This is because, as curriculum studies scholars have continually argued, curricula are never siloed (e.g., Flinders & Thornton, 1997; Malewski, 2010). What we learn from a context; where we learn across space, time, and place; when we learn; why lessons resonate with us; and how we are all sociopolitical educators is an entanglement of curricula.

To better theorize the curricular assemblages that form and inform a curriculum of metrics, this paper begins with a short dialogue about the forms of curriculum. This section not only "does the work," so to speak, of theorizing a curriculum of metrics, but also makes the case that curricula are agential. This discussion is important because it argues that curricula are never passive. Rather, they are socio-politically active bodies that are central to the co-constitution of agencies. Understanding the agency of curricula becomes necessary when describing ideals that are emergent from a curriculum of metrics, its impact on scholars, and how this curriculum might be interrupted. Next, I will briefly explicate the methodology used in this paper—which is a critical feminist autobiographical lens—before turning to a section where my narrative is supported through this methodological design. The methods selection is intentional (as all methodological decisions should be) in that it is aligned with the field of curriculum studies. As William Pinar (2004) argues, "Curriculum theory is, in effect, a form of autobiographically and academically informed truth telling" (p. 17). The intent of my narrative is to show how I was impacted by the curriculum of metrics described in the section on curriculum. It is also meant to re-connect and reflect on my experience as an assistant professor, which often felt like a dis-embodied rush of research, writing, and publishing. This turn toward events honors the tensions one often feels in these moments while understanding what was produced by them; a form of reflexivity that is common to the field.

Counting and Curricula

Aligned with the field of curriculum studies, a curriculum of metrics is understood as enmeshed across the forms of curriculum; formal, enacted, hidden, and null. While the curriculum of metrics has iterations in many places that use quantitative means of evaluating "successful" work, this section will explicate how the forms of curriculum function in places like schools and then give one of many examples of how the curriculum of metrics can emerge for pre-tenure faculty. This is not to overlook how a curriculum of metrics can otherwise be expressed. Rather, it is at once a way to reflect

on the connections between K-12 and higher education while theorizing how this curriculum impacted me as an assistant professor.

The formal curriculum is theorized as the "official" knowledge taught in any context (Apple, 2014). Common examples of this would include course objectives outlined in a syllabus. The formal curriculum of metrics often includes artifacts like faculty handbooks that attach quantitative standards to scholarly work, like impact factor or h-index. The formal curriculum is nested and layered with the null curriculum, or the lessons that are un-intentionally not taught through the formal curriculum. For example, although many students do not learn much (if anything) about queer communities in social studies classes, they might attach value to voices that are present and unintentionally learn to devalue those perspectives that are absent. There are several inroads to all forms of curriculum, with the hidden curriculum of metrics being no exception. Not only are equity measures for minoritized people often absent from faculty handbooks[1], but inequities are also often falsely flattened through metrics. This is a claim that the metrics a university deems appropriate for tenure and promotion cases are somehow equitable, ignoring how such metrics are not only devoid of experiences and broader oppressions (Wright, 2023) but, in many ways, engender and maintain them.

The hidden and enacted curricula are de-and-re-constructed in relation to the formal and null curricula. The enacted curriculum can be understood as what is learned through interactions one has with human and nonhuman bodies (Page, 2006). This is often observed through what one learns by interacting with spaces carved out in schools for students with disabilities, which are generally lackluster at best. These interactions are instructive about the value of people and communities. Scholars are consistently interacting—or, as I will argue below, intra-acting (Barad, 2007)—with the curriculum of metrics and the many bodies that co-constitute power relations. Finally, the hidden curriculum is cultural norms and values that are learned, but not always openly intended, especially as they are hidden from those enacting and maintaining it (Giroux & Purpel, 1983; Jackson, 1968). In schools, the hidden curriculum can be subtle, like the practice of expecting that a child must raise their hand to speak and wait until the teacher recognizes their voice. This follows the curriculum of metrics as a normalized academic practice where the value of scholarship is not seen as having merit until it has been recognized by certain measurements. Additionally, expectations of productivity as they intersect with how publications are rendered quantifiable can

---

[1] For example, many faculty handbooks do not mention policies on gender affirming names for dossiers or how the university plans to collect affirming pronouns prior to the administration seeking external letters of evaluation. When the null curriculum allows voices and perspectives to be overlooked, the metrics that disproportionately harm minoritized people through how they assess "success" are also often not interrogated for their inequities.

establish a hierarchy that places metrics over intellectual engagement with ideas. As metrics become more central to schooling in general but, as discussed here, to tenure and promotion, so too are measurements over ideas.

As curriculum theorists have noted, teaching and learning is ubiquitous, which is why attending to curricula as intra-connected and multifaceted is significant (Brown & Brown, 2015; Doll, 2008; MacDonald, 1982; Williams, et al., 2020). While one might temporarily attend to one form of curriculum, ultimately, it is folded back into curricular assemblages. Central to this discussion is the idea that agency is not inherent to someone or something, but, rather, emerges from events (Barad, 2007). Therefore, by noting curricula as "intra-connected and multifaceted," this paper similarly argues that curricula have co-constituted agency through what Barad (2007) calls intra-actions or Tsing (2005) discusses as friction. This is not to say that curricula can make plans on their own. However, aligned with Rosiek's (2018) work on the agency of racism, this argument includes the many socio-political and cultural curricular connections that have the agency to shape local and less local norms and values. The faculty handbook did not write itself, but it is central in how the university does business-as-usual. In sum, while the field is open in terms of how curricula are conceptualized and the tools through which they are theorized, there are general understandings that curricula are always political (Appelbaum, 2010), they are enmeshed across contexts (Snaza et al., 2014), and they are are more than simply ideas and ideals that are produced for the sole purpose of consumption (Pinar, 1997). Curricula are always in-action (Schwab, 1969); they are agential.

Before continuing I would like to briefly pause and make two points clear. First, it is not my desire to participate in a dialogue about perceived binaries of productivity. This is not a claim that scholars with a robust production record have inferior work or that those who publish less than a university's threshold for tenure are somehow less significant than their peers or do not have important work to share. This kind of false binary is precisely the kind of narrative I would like this paper to avoid and interrupt. Minoritize people are consistently asked to do additional service activities and hidden labor that often negatively impact publication records (Taliaferro Baszile, Edwards, & Guillory, 2016) while, at the same time, be criticized for doing "too much" or being "too successful" (Berry & Mizelle, 2006). As Wright's (2023) work shows, scholars of color tend to be underrepresented in editorial boards, as authors, in citations, and their papers are often under review for longer periods of time than their white counterparts. Although it is not often discussed this way, one can argue that there is a null curriculum of barriers significant to achieving tenure, especially through the quantitative lens used to evaluate dossiers. Rather than reinforce binaries that maintain harm and are woven through a curriculum of metrics, this paper reflects on how publications are counted,

valued, and deemed "significant" by institutional spaces. As publications are "counted," scholars are frequently positioned to rush papers to submission, effectively truncating the time one might spend reading others' work and thinking about ideas as they are in resonance and dissonance with their own.

Second, it is important to note that the central points of this paper are not specific to my institution or any specific interaction itself; though institutional context is always significant, especially in terms of tenure and promotion. My pre-tenure experiences were underscored by supportive administration and many helpful colleagues. I remain deeply appreciative for the care I received as an assistant professor, especially since much of my pre-tenure time was deeply impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite this care, it is important to remember that the expectations explicated in the faculty handbook for successful tenure and promotion seems to emphasize an attention to the number of publications produced and the associated metrics that deem each publication significant to the field. In other words, despite what might be read as an interruption to the curriculum of metrics, hidden curricular values were consistently present, pervasive, and enacted unintentionally. This does not negate care, but it is important to think about how such care is always already touched by oppressions (e.g., Berlant, 2011). Much to my disappointment (but, frankly, not my surprise), as I discussed similar processes with colleagues at other institutions across the United States, it became clear that my experience was not unique. Before re-turning to my narrative, I will now delve into the methodology used to explore my experiences.

Messy Intra-actions: Writing Autobiographically

To unpack my time as an assistant professor at a large state institution, this paper uses a critical feminist autobiographical lens (e.g., Collins, 2002; Miller, 1998). I came to writing this with uneasy feelings. This is because, like other critical feminist autobiographical work, this paper seeks to interrogate the conditions of observation that have historically underscored oppressions in the academy—in this case a curriculum of metrics (Smith & Watson, 1992). The purpose is not to narrow paradigms or pose a collective "I," but to call the authority of this curriculum and its tendrils throughout the academy into question. Calling norms into question, what Pinar (2004) discusses as "informed truth telling" (p. 17), can come with uncertainty, even with the security of tenure. It was suggested by a colleague at another institution that I wait to publish this paper for a few years as I decide when I will seek promotion to full professor. Informed truth telling, as minoritized people and their accomplices know, means also being informed of the consequences of standing with/in one's truth.

While I thought about leaning on studies that show how algorithms guide the ideas to which we are exposed on social media (Beer, 2018), the metrics that explicate confirmation bias when sharing articles across media sources (Gabielkov et al., 2016), or recent dialogues that cast doubt on the publishing industry all together (Kafka, 2018), centering my narrative was an intentional and carried out for several reasons. On one hand, I have included my own voice at both the beginning of this paper and in the following section because, as research has shown (Johnson, 2015; Peña, 2022), first-generation queer women of color like me are often minoritized further through tenure and promotion systems. Sharing our narratives against systems of oppression is important to interrupting such injustices and for creating spaces of community (Smith & Watson, 1992). On the other hand, the purpose of thinking autobiographically in this paper is to critically and reflexively approach questions of erasure, gatekeeping, and co-constituted agencies (Barad, 2007) that emerged from pre-tenure metric-driven curricula. Finally, autobiography is used in this paper as a nod to the rich histories of autobiographical work in curriculum studies and its relation to the focus of this special issue, data science and algorithms.

It is important to note that autobiography, like most qualitative research, "recognizes its own social construction and cultural conditioning" (Miller, 2000, p. 254). As such, an autobiographical lens is tied up in one's emotional memory, an act of re-membering (Dillard, 2008) that is entangled with what Toni Morrison (1990) wrote was what the "nerves and skin remember as well as how it appeared" (p. 305). While the notion of algorithms can falsely flatten the human element, layering my autobiographical perspective is a resistance to what many minoritized folks consider dehumanizing acts prevalent across tenure process (e.g, Fraser-Burgess et al., 2022). This does not mean that power structures are somehow suddenly absent. They are fully at play and, following Foucault (1978), there is a strong argument to be made that there is no outside of power. Although my home institution worked to make the process as supportive as possible, the curriculum of metrics remained, even within what was perceived by some as an ethical approach to tenure and promotion.

In this paper I am imagining the messy, nested, and layered process of memory that is central to autobiographical work and qualitative research in general. I am also leaning on this work to argue that a greater emphasis on power relations and their relationship to agency should be present in tenure and promotion dialogues, especially as it relates to scholars' capacity to read, digest, and implement others' work. Returning to Barad's (2007) discussion on intra-actions, I would like to briefly note my attention to autobiographical processes as relational layers. Not only are there intra-actions (Barad, 2007) and frictions (Tsing, 2005) between human and non-human bodies during the initial event, but there are intra-actions in re-calling events as synapses literally map

memories across old and new connections of the brain. How and what we re-tell others is an intra-action where one is, to borrow from Cynthia Dillard (2008), socio-politically and culturally re-membered. A telling of truths that are at once socio-political, cultural and, as one might imagine, deeply personal.

Finally, there are overarching intra-actions across each of these layered moments. As one's experiences are in friction (Tsing, 2005) in an among themselves, agency, and the related curriculum—what we learn through the co-constitution of subjectivities—is always in-action (Schwab, 1969). Afterall, as Tsing argues, friction—like curriculum—is productive. Tsing uses the image of a tire on a road and the friction caused by its movement. She explains that both the tire and the road are worn down by the process, though the rate of wear is unequal. A critical feminist autobiographical lens is used here to better conceptualize what both emerges from a curriculum of metrics while listening deeply (Oliveros, 2005) to the intra-actions themselves. The purpose is to think about what is produced by curriculum but, also, what is lost through a metric-driven curriculum for assistant professors. As such, this paper refuses to be "tidy" in that there are few clear lines between my narrative as it was braided with a curriculum of metrics during the tenure and promotion process. This is because, as curriculum scholars have noted (Hendry, 2007), even in the act of storytelling, analyzing, and discussing these experiences—even in the hopes of publishing this paper—I am contributing to these messy curricula. A few months post-tenure, I feel the entirety of the events and their tensions, a complex and yet common position that I am articulating here.

Publish or Perish: Metrics, Motivation, and Tenure

Six years ago, I transitioned from teaching in K-12 schools to higher education. Although there were many reasons for my departure from public schools, one consideration that solidified my decision was the quickly eroding barriers that once hindered harmful practices, like performance-based pay. For example, under the "Race to the Top" act, districts were encouraged to tie teacher evaluations and students' test scores to educators' pay and, potentially, to job stability (Hunter, 2010). As a world language educator, I was disappointed when the district's curriculum rapidly shifted from the many contours of culture as they were braided with language to a near-hyper fixation on grammar and vocabulary. From my position, we were urged to produce students who were adept at reading, writing, and speaking languages without fostering cultural connections. In many ways, my job was akin to teaching language without a cultural home. As I wrestled with this notion, a senior colleague urged me not to make waves, stating that attending to quantifiable grammatical points might be one of the few ways to ensure students passed the tests, which focused on a numerical evaluation of language production. In other words, as schools continued to bend to neoliberal

ideas and ideals of education (Giroux, 2019), what counted was only what one could count.

The possibility of be(com)ing a scholar after this experience was seductive because, from my position,[2] the academy was entangled with the privilege of engaging with ideas, rather than being consumed by inane metrics. Upon leaving K-12 schools, I wanted to develop a relationship with the art of publishing. I quickly found that this connection engendered a kind of intimacy with affectively touching and feeling (Sedgwick, 2003) institutional spaces. These spaces are imbued with what many scholars might describe as the ordinary affects (Stewart, 2007) that are in constant circulation across academia. Shame, relief, excitement, joy, fear, and a host of other everyday affects have felt like the poles of a magnet in my professional life, pushing me toward or pulling me away from ideas with varying degrees of force. These affects are often most palpable as I write, a process that Denise Taliaferro Baszile once described as an act of focusing thoughts that are akin to children running wildly in one's head prior to writing. The act of assembling these children can be exhausting. For me, it has meant affectively engaging with a desire to express my thoughts in ways that provoke hope; a hope that someone will accept not just the ideas but how they are expressed for publication and, ultimately, a hope that those ideas will be taken seriously enough that others might read them and, perhaps, use them in their own thinking-writing process.

There were moments when hope dissipated into feeling overwhelmed. I began my position in fall 2019, a few months prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. As someone who was relatively unknown to my new campus community, the local service in which I participated that first semester was largely one-off events, like helping the admissions department on college open-house days. When the pandemic began, I was still relatively unknown and was unaware of local service opportunities in the face of a pandemic. I was also reminded that national service opportunities were important because they were central to increasing my name-recognition in academic fields and, as a result, growing community interest in my scholarship, which could lead to stronger metrics. During the pandemic, I was also told by a senior scholar that with the lack of face-to-face opportunities, I needed to "get my media blast going" and consider "hiring someone for promotional purposes." As the pandemic became less emphasized in public spaces, I was told that I needed to be more active on campus and, as one senior colleague reminded me, this was especially true for a woman of color. She noted that since our voices are limited, being present was important for additional representation, especially on search committees where we could "limit the foolishness" and ensure that

---

[2] It is important to note that during my doctoral studies, I was working full time as a K-12 teacher. This meant that while my student-colleagues went to school full time, and largely held graduate assistant positions that provided them with a more intimate relationship with the academy, I often felt excluded from this knowledge, including the possibilities and challenges therein.

strong candidates of color felt welcome. I was also informally told that if "people don't know who [I am], it might negatively impact the tenure and promotion committee's ability to read [my] dossier." The tension between local and national service meant that I needed to be strategic about my visibility, thinking foremost about the future adjudication of my file or to the measurement of my publications, rather than considering which service opportunity might mean the most to me as a queer woman of color in and across community contexts.

When I received my first faculty handbook, I began to peruse the section regarding tenure and promotion. I quickly noticed that the criteria section for "scholarship of research" was rather vague. One portion read that candidates must "initiate, conduct, and sustain a high-quality research program…This research and scholarly work is expected to have had or to be likely to have significant impact in the field. While outlets may vary, given the diverse disciplinary and interdisciplinary interest of our faculty, evidence of quality is expected." The handbook further stated that it was "up to the candidate to establish the importance of their work/publications. For example, one might give citation count, the acceptance rates of journals, or the impact factor if the field uses that measure." Concerned with ideas connected to "high-quality" and "significant," I spoke to my administrator, hoping for some clarity. I was told that because committee members outside of each professor's home field would eventually evaluate each dossier for the university tenure and promotion committee, making a strong case should include at least three metrics that spoke across fields to demonstrate "evidence of quality" and "significant" achievement for publications and one's career. The vague wording was apparently meant to protect fields, like the humanities or some disciplines in the social sciences, where classification indexes might not be clear indicators of impact for certain fields. After thinking with several mentors across institutional spaces, I decided to include the acceptance rate for the journal, the journal tier, citation data, and how often the article had been viewed and downloaded.

I quickly became engrossed with "the game" of earning tenure. Rather than seeing tenure as a process—a way to become more intimately connected with ideas and community—I felt consumed by the metrics that I had chosen to provide as evidence of my scholarly significance[3]. I found myself frequently looking at how other academics promoted their work and wondered how I should participate in these practices. I also began to explore how "influencers" create content. Content creators and those in fields like marketing and communication were clear that consistency was key, as was finding

---

[3] I would like to note that although these pressures were rather present in my scholarly life, I have delighted in my work as a scholar and the ability to read, write, and theorize for a living. What I am highlighting here is how those pleasures can become subsumed by a perceived necessity to attend to metric-based evaluations of scholarly worth.

a balance to not "overdo" new posts (Peters et al., 2013). I returned to the colleague's suggestion to find a company that could assist in promotion but quickly decided that any efforts toward tenure should be personally performed. I also quickly found that I was not alone in my concern (Ale Ebrahim et. al., 2014; Schilhan et. al., 2021). Like many colleagues of my scholarly generation, I felt worried that a lack of self-promotion would equal a lack of clicks, that a lack of hashtags would lower my online presence, and that not being present across spaces and places would negatively impact name-recognition.

Since the faculty handbook does not clearly state the number of desired publications, the ambiguity, along with the pressure to "stay relevant" in an era of social media, often left me wondering how many papers would keep a scholar relevant. Speaking with an administrator at another institution during a conference, he referenced a faculty member who had "over produced." He questioned the faculty member's ability to "do good work" with so many publications. I asked how many publications he felt were necessary for a "steady" publication record. He was unsure but mentioned that "when you know, you know, but there is a balance. Write enough, but not too much."

I was also acutely aware of the tensions minoritized people and communities face when managing their professional images. Women, for example, often find that being too self-assured in their public image often cuts against expectations of modesty (Smith & Huntoon, 2014). People of color and, especially Black individuals and communities, are often told that self-promotion can engender negative outcomes in terms of being perceived as arrogant, especially by white colleagues (Wayne et. al, 2023). Finally, intergenerational tensions frequently emerge when increasing a scholar's visibility is viewed by senior scholars as narcissistic, rather than a necessary tool for surviving in the academy (Holmes, 2022).

With these tensions in mind, I began to post across media and, as predicted, my visibility increased, positively impacting the data points for my dossier. Also, as predicted, I had multiple colleagues complain directly and indirectly about my increased presence. I was given public praise by some peers, while being quietly reprimanded by senior scholars for using social media. I was told that every minute spent posting was time that I could be writing, and I was reminded several times of the adage, "publish or perish" and the associated conversations around this notion (e.g., de Rond & Miller, 2005). When my publications reached the tipping point of "too much," I was reminded of that too, and it was suggested by more than one scholar that I should post less about my successes because it was "overwhelming to others," "a bad and narcissistic look for someone so accomplished to be so public about their publications," and "setting an unhealthy bar for younger scholars by giving an unrealistic

expectation." Around my fourth year as an assistant professor, I was told that I needed to "gain more recognition from the field through grants or awards," since the awards I received prior to my time at this institution "no longer counted" and could not be included on my dossier.

I could not escape the idea that "if you are not data, you don't exist" (Bowker, 2013, p. 170) and wondered how quickly I would perish as an academic. If the data validated the significance of my work, even with several publications and growing recognition in the field, I found a constant need to "declare my [scholarly] self alive" (Bowker, 2013, p. 70) through the curriculum of metrics. Worse, while I had moved away from the K-12 obsession with metrics, I found the same, if not very similar, fixations on data. It therefore came of little surprise when I learned that pay increases were tied to the overall scores that faculty received on the annual review that, like most institutions, focused on teaching (40%), scholarship (40%), and service (20%). Practically speaking, this means that 80% of a faculty member's annual review is determined by the associated, and highly problematic, metrics of teaching evaluations[4] and scholarly data. In short, what counted is what folks could count.

Conclusion: Curricula and Counting

Returning to Herbert Spencer's (1859) salient question, "What knowledge is of most worth?", alongside many scholars who have explored how dominant ontoepistemologies are prioritized over others (e.g., Breidlid, 2013; Cooper, 1892; Woodson, 1933), my narrative reflects the curriculum of metrics as it underscored my experiences as an assistant professor. This is not new. There are longstanding evaluative processes for faculty that have associated metrics. There are also continual oppressions that minoritized faculty experience in the academy that negatively impact their ability to thrive against a system where their failure is not only integral but, in many fields, expected (Harris, 2020). New to the curriculum of metrics are several points. First, there is a generational shift. This is aligned with Paris and Alim's (2012) work on culturally sustaining pedagogies that argues youth have their own cultural elements, as well as the work of scholars like Osgerby's (2020), as well as Calvo-Porral and Pesqueira-Sanchez (2020) who discuss social media as a potential bridge between people and communities. Younger generations use social media as a space to gather information in general (Aichner et al., 2021). This means that younger scholars might use social media as one place to gather information about new publications from their networks and to distribute information about their recent successes. Therefore, new to a curriculum of

---

[4] While not the focus of this paper, it is worth briefly noting the inequities in teaching evaluations and microaggressions that minoritized faculty often experience (Bernal & Villalpando, 2002). This practically means that 80% of merit-based pay in the academy can be tied to metrics that are designed to harm minoritized faculty.

metrics is the potential use of social media for both publicity of publications and as a tool to increase name-recognition, which can be integral to the citation process. The politics of citation is therefore in relation to traditional markers like race, genders, sexual orientations, and the like, as well as to online networks. The advice I received was to both boost name-recognition through national service and to find ways to promote myself through social media. Both were suggestions to increase future citation and other metrics, something I felt was akin to a business transaction, like yard signs functioning as a testimonial to encourage foot traffic and sales. As younger generations use social media to collect perspectives, it made sense that the combination of my service and a certain kind of buzz on social media meant that my overall metrics positively increased. This is, perhaps, why younger generations of scholars easily accepted me leaning into a generational shift toward sharing successes online while I was often chastised by more seasoned academics.

The hidden curriculum of metrics is well aligned with the formal curriculum stated in the faculty handbook that expected "high-quality" work as established through measurable tools. This is not to say that peer reviewed articles should not be valued. Indeed, the peer review process can be important to scholarly growth. In fact, I have strengthened this paper in response to generous peer review suggestions. It can also be deeply flawed (Merchant et al., 2021). The argument here is that the value of "high quality" scholarship is subjective and, in an era of social media, potentially tied to one's ability to successfully promote themselves across platforms. The intersection of the formal and hidden curricula through this generational shift is worth noting and asking how the academy will move forward in light of this change. What happens, for example, when "significance" can be determined by clicks, rather than ideas? Additionally, what does it mean when clicks becomes more important than the ideas that were produced before the clicks were necessary? It is worth wondering what a return to a relationship with ideas might mean for the curriculum of metrics and how institutions might adjudicate files as "significant" or "high quality" without a preoccupation with measurement. As data scientists have noted, just because a paper received a high click count, doesn't mean that that paper was read, critiqued, or otherwise helpful to other scholars (Gabielkov et al., 2016; Kafka, 2018; Shu et. al, 2017).

The ontoepistemological norms felt and learned through the enacted curriculum of metrics were similarly complex for at least the following reasons. First, as scholars like Krause, Baum, Baumann, and Krasnova (2021) have argued, one's self-worth can be skewed when filtered through the lens of digital media. This is an era when mental health has received much needed attention and respect. Following this trend toward mental health awareness, it important to consider the potential impact on scholars who are working to ensure their academic security through digital media platforms.

Although I did not tie my self-worth to my publications or the publicity connected to them, I found myself worried that a lack of engagement might lead to less recognized work, impacting my overall metrics.

Second, the perceived value of one's scholarly significance can be distorted when amplified through social media. This is especially true when one's ideas are no longer evaluated through (perceived) merit, resonance with a scholarly community, or other such factors but, rather, distilled to recognizing value through measurable factors, counting only what "counts" to a university. To be clear, I am aware that this is a potentially dangerous position to take because every community has some form of bias which disproportionately and negatively impacts minoritized communities in layered and longstanding ways. Additionally, how and by whom "merit" is defined is uneven terrain at best. One can correctly argue that social media provides a platform where marginalized voices can be heard and that increasing visibility is vital (Ciszek et al., 2023). This is especially true in scholarly communities that overlook and discourage voices of color, queer perspectives, people with disabilities, people who are bilingual, and the like. Rather, the concern is that one's voice and academic presence would be condensed to the access one has to media, the ability to negotiate media, and the ability to attract attention of one's peers solely through media.

Alongside these curricular complications, it is significant to return to the work of scholars like Barad (2007), Tsing (2005), Ortner (2006), and others who theorize the slippery, always already complex nature of agency and what is produced through events. The intra-action (Barad, 2007) and associated friction (Tsing, 2005) of my experiences have, in many ways, produced another layer of oppression central to the tenure and promotion process. Much to my joy and my dismay, I have successfully participated in a system that will reproduce violence for the next generation of junior scholars. However, as my agency has been co-constituted through this system, it is worth noting how post-tenure scholars might act to resist and refuse such systems while maintaining anything positive that is produced through them. This is a "both/and" moment, a re-turn to complicated conversations that seek to trouble what, who, and how we "count" in the academy.

References

Aichner, T., Grünfelder, M., Maurer, O., & Jegeni, D. (2021). Twenty-five years of social media: A review of social media applications and definitions from 1994 to 2019. *Cyberpsychology, behavior, and social networking*, *24*(4), 215-222.

Ale Ebrahim, N., Salehi, H., Embi, M. A., Habibi, F., Gholizadeh, H., & Motahar, S. M. (2014). Visibility and citation impact. *International Education Studies*, *7*(4), 120-125.

Appelbaum, P. (2010). Retrodictive Curriculum Reform, or, Imagination is Silly; It Makes You Go'Round Willy Nilly'. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (JAAACS)*, *6*(2).

Apple, M. W. (2014). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. Routledge.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.

Beer, D. (Ed.). (2018). *The social power of algorithms.* Routledge.

Berlant, L. (2011). *Cruel optimism*. Duke University Press.

Bernal, D. D., & Villalpando, O. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the" legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & excellence in education*, *35*(2), 169-180.

Berry, T.R. & Mizelle, N. (Eds.) (2006). *From oppression to grace: Women of color and their dilemmas within the academy.* Stylus Publishing.

Bowker, G. (2013). Data flakes: An afterword to '*Raw data is an oxymoron'.* In L. Gitelman (Ed.)., *Raw data is an oxymoron.* (pp. 167-171). M.I.T. Press.

Breidlid, A. (2013). *Education, indigenous knowledges, and development in the global south: Contesting knowledges for a sustainable future*. Routledge.

Brown, A. L., & Brown, K. D. (2015). The more things change, the more they stay the same: Excavating race and the enduring racisms in US curriculum. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(14), 103-130.

Calvo-Porral, C., & Pesqueira-Sanchez, R. (2020). Generational differences in technology behaviour: comparing millennials and Generation X. *Kybernetes*, *49*(11), 2755-2772.

Ciszek, E., Haven, P., & Logan, N. (2023). Amplification and the limits of visibility: Complicating strategies of trans voice and representations on social media. *new media & society*, *25*(7), 1605-1625.

Collins, P. H. (2002). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.

Cooper, A.J. (1892). *A voice from the south.* The Aldine Printing House.

De Rond, M., & Miller, A. N. (2005). Publish or perish: bane or boon of academic life?. *Journal of management inquiry*, *14*(4), 321-329.

Dillard, C. B. (2008). Re-membering culture: Bearing witness to the spirit of identity in research. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *11*(1), 87-93.

Doll, W. E. (2008). Complexity and the culture of curriculum. *Educational philosophy and Theory*, *40*(1), 190-212.

Flinders, D. J., & Thornton, S. J. (Eds.). (1997). *The curriculum studies reader*. Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1978). *Discipline and punish.* Pantheon Books.

Fraser-Burgess, S. A., Warren-Gordon, K., Humphrey, D. L., & Lowery, K. (2022). Scholars of

color turn to womanism: Countering dehumanization in the academy. In M. Tesar, M.A. Peters & L. Jackson (Eds.), *The University as an Ethical Academy?* (pp. 87-104). Routledge.

Gabielkav, M., Ramachandran, A., Chaintreau, A., & Legout, A. (2016). Social clicks: What and who gets read on twitter, *ACM Sigmetrics/IFIP Performance,* 1(1), 1-15.

Giroux, H.A. & Purpel, D.E. (Eds.). (1983). *The hidden curriculum andmoral education: Deception or discovery?* McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Giroux, H. A. (2019). Neoliberalism and the weaponising of language and education. *Race & Class*, *61*(1), 26-45.

Harris, A. P. (2020). *Presumed incompetent II: Race, class, power, and resistance of women in academia*. University Press of Colorado.

Hendry, P. M. (2007). The future of narrative. *Qualitative inquiry*, *13*(4), 487-498.

Holmes, T. A. (2022). It's all about me even if it appears to be about you: Narcissism and Facebook self-promotion through personal visual posting and corporate content sharing. *The Journal of Social Media in Society*, *11*(2), 330-363.

Hunter, R. C. (2010). Merit or Performance-Based Pay: A Look at Teacher Compensation. *School Business Affairs*, *76*(2), 20-26.

Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms.* Teachers College Press.

Johnson, M. L. (2015). Bad romance: A crip feminist critique of queer failure. *Hypatia*, *30*(1), 251-267.

Kafka, A.C. (2018). 'Sokal squared': Is a huge publishing hoax 'hilarious and delightful' or an ugly example of dishonesty and bad faith? *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from: https://www.chronicle.com/article/sokal-squared-is-huge-publishing-hoax-hilarious-and-delightful-or-an-ugly-example-of-dishonesty-and-bad-faith/

Krause, H. V., Baum, K., Baumann, A., & Krasnova, H. (2021). Unifying the detrimental and beneficial effects of social network site use on self-esteem: a systematic literature review. *Media Psychology*, *24*(1), 10-47.

Macdonald, J. B. (1982). How literal is curriculum theory?. *Theory into practice*, *21*(1), 55-61.

Malewski, E. (Ed.). (2010). *Curriculum studies handbook-the next moment*. Routledge.

Merchant, R. M., Del Rio, C., & Boulware, L. E. (2021). Structural racism and scientific journals—a teachable moment. *JAMA*, *326*(7), 607-608.

Miller, J. L. (1998). Autobiography as a queer curriculum practice. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.), *Queer theory in education* (pp. 301-308). Routledge.

Miller, J. L. (2000). What's left in the field… a curriculum memoir. *Journal of curriculum studies*, *32*(2), 253-266.

Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds.). (1981). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. State University of New York Press.

Morrison, T. (1990). The site of memory. In. R. Ferguson, M. Gever, T.T. Minh-ha, and C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary cultures (pp. 299-305).* The MIT Press.

Oliveros, P. (2005). *Deep listening: A composer's sound practice*. IUniverse.

Ortner, S. B. (2006). *Anthropology and social theory: Culture, power, and the acting subject*. Duke University Press.

Osgerby, B. (2020). *Youth culture and the media: Global perspectives*. Routledge.

Page, R. (2006). Curriculum matters. In D. T. Hansen (Ed.), *John Dewey and our educational perspective: A critical engagement with Dewey's democracy and education* (pp. 39–66). University of New York Press.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press.

Peña, L. G. (2022). *Community as rebellion: A syllabus for surviving academia as a woman of color*. Haymarket Books.

Peters, K., Chen, Y., Kaplan, A. M., Ognibeni, B., & Pauwels, K. (2013). Social media metrics—A framework and guidelines for managing social media. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *27*(4), 281-298.

Pinar, W.F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Routledge.

Puar, J. K. (2018). *Terrorist assemblages: Homonationalism in queer times*. Duke University Press.

Rosiek, J. L. (2018). Agential realism and educational ethnography. In D. Beach, C. Bagley, & S. Marques da Silva (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of ethnography of education* (pp. 403–423). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Schilhan, L., Kaier, C., & Lackner, K. (2021). Increasing visibility and discoverability of scholarly publications with academic search engine optimization. *Insights*, *34*(1), 2-16.

Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. The School Review, 78 (1), 1-23.

Sedgwick, E. K. (2003). *Touching feeling: Affect, pedagogy, performativity*. Duke University Press.

Shu, K., Sliva, A., Wang, S., Tang, J., & Liu, H. (2017). Fake news detection on social media: A data mining perspective. *ACM SIGKDD explorations newsletter*, *19*(1), 22-36.

Smith, J. L., & Huntoon, M. (2014). Women's bragging rights: Overcoming modesty norms to facilitate women's self-promotion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *38*(4), 447-459.

Smith, S., & Watson, J. (Eds.). (1992). *De-colonizing the subject: the politics of gender in women's autobiography*. University of Minnesota Press.

Snaza, N, Appelbaum, P., Bayne, S., Carlson, D., Morris, M, Rotas, N, Sandlin, J., Wallin, J., & Weaver, J.A. (2014). Toward a Posthuman Education. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 30 (2): 39-55.

Spencer, H. (1859). What knowledge is of most worth? *The Westminster Review, 16*.

Stewart, K. (2020). *Ordinary affects*. Duke University Press.

Taliaferro Baszile, D., Edwards, K.T., & Guillor, N.A. (Eds.). (2016). *Race, gender, and curriculum theorizing: Working in womanish ways*. Lexington Books.

Tsing, A. L. (2005). Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection. Princeton University Press.

Wayne, S. J., Sun, J., Kluemper, D. H., Cheung, G. W., & Ubaka, A. (2023). The cost of managing impressions for Black employees: An expectancy violation theory perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 108*(2), 208–224.

Woodson, C.G. (1933). *The miseducation of the Negro*. Africa World Press.

Wright, K. (2023). Racial Inequity in Key Publication Metrics. *Physics*, 16(1), 53-62.

Williams, K. T. E., Taliaferro Baszile, D., & Guillory, N. A. (Eds.). (2020). *Black women theorizing curriculum studies in colour and curves*. Routledge.

Wozolek, B. (2012). The nested nature of m/othering: Complicating curriculum conversations. In B. Sams, J. Job, & J.C. Jupp (Eds.), *Excursions and Recursions through Power, Privilege, and Practice* (pp. 97-114). Information Age Publishing.