

REPARATIVE JUSTICE, RACIAL RESTORATION, & EDUCATION SERIES

Race Talks for 'Likes'

By Thierry Elin-Saintine and Joe Cirio

We are assistant professors at a Predominantly White Institution (PWI). There's nothing special about our PWI or our working there. Nothing special about its mostly White college students, its familiar flavor of White liberals who make up most of our colleagues, and certainly nothing about this section of the American Northeast that has not been explained and has been intentionally misunderstood countless times before ([Theoharis, 2019](#)). To be clear, we are not suggesting, nor do we believe in any unitary white identity or white liberal way of being. Any all-encompassing or grand theory premised on the existence of race has only been used and is only useful as a tool for stratification and hierarchization ([Zuberi, 2001](#); [Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008](#)). What we are referring to is "whiteness." The combination "white-liberal" often presumes and assumes --thus, struggles to imagine beyond--an entitled sense of innocence when it comes to racial injustice.

What has been odd to us, and at times downright infuriating, is the ubiquity of race talks for "likes" at our PWI and our helpless complicity in kindling and rekindling them. In comparison to Facebook's 'like' feature, "race talks for likes" allows conversations around race and racism, whether in the form of institutionally sponsored events or more ad hoc and informal activities or gatherings, to function in a quick, easy, and non-committal way. The organizers and facilitators of these race talks feel good about raising awareness and performing allyship without having a deeper commitment to social justice. With race talks everyone comes away feeling good but no more interested or able to imagine roles or responsibilities different from the ones they've always assumed.

Race talks at our PWI, predictably, intensified in the aftermath of the public lynching of George Floyd as these talks normally do after a cell phone captures or social media broadcasts a reminder of this country's history and ongoing practices of marginalizing, criminalizing, and government-sponsored killing of Black bodies. We welcome the growing awareness and attention that institutions have been given to anti-Black racism; however, there's a catch. Corporate-morality, economic interests, neo-liberal ideals disguised as social justice work, and empty rhetoric are the tools most used to respond to, and in our view co-opt and hollow, moments like the aftermath of the killing of George Floyd. As faculty, we have noticed this move in higher education; a move in which we play a pivotal role in reconciliatory performances.

As a Black academic and an Asian-American academic, we functioned as brokers "who can simplify what is endemic to [us] as human being[s]—race—and blow it up to cartoon proportions, thereby making [it] 'clear' to a white audience" ([Als, 2019, p. 108](#)). This essay is our attempt at making sense of, and hopefully, shedding some light on the inevitability of our and other BIPOC's complicity in helping "race talks for likes" cycle in and out of PWI (and other predominantly white spaces) without any real institutional actions or commitment to change.

We frame our participation in these race talks as an invisible labor of "compliance or resistance to dominant narratives about marginalized groups" that BIPOC perform daily as a requisite and constitutive aspect of their membership to a PWI ([Melaku, 2019, p. 17](#)). We have, at different times and sometimes together, sat at those meetings about student retention, diversity, or strategic planning where the talk is all about closing the so-called "achievement gap." We have worked on committees tasked with getting Black and Brown students caught up to their White counterparts. We have yet to attend a meeting focused on what the

university can learn or benefit from communities of color: “Educators who deal with the urban are constructed as sophisticated, but the urban students and families themselves are not” ([Leonardo & Hunter, 2007, p. 782](#)).

The laborious part is not so much the frequent and continual occurrence of this invisible task. It’s the fact that it cannot be otherwise. It’s the realization that belonging means paying this inclusion tax. A tax and price that we never seriously considered before this essay. How could we? “[S]o much care is taken not to scare White people simply with my existence [and resistance], and it’s as if they don’t want to deal with the care, either” ([Als, 2019, p. 111](#)). Als reminds us of one of the most critical reasons why this labor is invisible—it is meant to never be acknowledged or appreciated (not even by us); it is simply expected. The care required to perform this labor is our membership fee. It’s a pre-condition for our expected contributions to those race talks. It’s also protection, to some extent, against being labeled or turning into—which is to say the same thing—the “angry BIPOC” always complaining and simply “too radical” to be taken seriously. The care is a requirement to board and remain on the train to a more perfect union, and en route to a more diverse PWI.

Practically speaking and based on our, albeit relatively short experience, the care really means knowing when, especially during those race talks, to stop pushing back, and stop resisting. Know when you’re threatening to pull the veil off your institution’s innocence and challenge the liberal tradition—or the shortsightedness of your colleagues’ liberalism:

Racism does not simply hide behind a liberal façade, but rather is inherent to liberalism itself...the history of liberal philosophy... supports a type of abstract universalism that ultimately leads to hierarchy and exclusion... [In light of this,] racial/ethnic equity in the United States demands anti-racist projects guided by alternative social imagery that breaks from the typical trappings of liberalism/neo-liberalism ([Esposito and Murphy, 2010, p. 38](#)).

In academia, the care that Als talks about gets rewarded with tenure/promotion and other perks to make you feel needed, special, and indebted. A combination that not only regulates your contributions and membership, but also repurpose them to maintain PWI’s innocence and ‘liberal façade.’ The few who dare to perform the invisible labor without the care—i.e. they make the labor “visible” and refuse to perform it as a pre-condition for their membership—get hit hard with “tax evasion,” often framed as a fitness issue or an affront to collegiality.

Talks of equity, inclusion, and diversity that saturate every corner of most American campuses continue to exist in the shadows, thus, in lieu, of any serious reckoning with academia’s tradition of exclusion and ongoing supposedly meritocratic or color-blind practices, like using the SATs as an objective measure or predictor of students’ academic ability and college course placement, that have long been deemed discriminatory ([Atkinson & Geiser, 2009, pp. 665-666](#)). Those talks are still by and large expected to be initiated or led by BIPOC faculty, staff, and students only to be disciplined, or sanctioned as divisive when pushing against institutional wisdom and tradition.

We are professors on tenure-track paths, highly coveted and socially respected positions. We do recognize our privileges. We are incredibly grateful (and lucky). In spite of the global health and economic devastations caused by COVID-19, we had health and a job—and never had to choose between them. However, this invisible labor and care required to fit in (for tenure), and our having to support and help usher in yet another cycle of empty promises and toothless actions predate and will likely outlive COVID-19.

What follows is our reckoning with our involvement and complicity with the race talks on our campus. We offer three vignettes—at times scholarly, at times introspective—that narrate each author’s experiences and reflections on the oftentimes emotional labor involved in making contributions to “race talks” that occurred on our PWIs campus since George Floyd’s killing. Our individual reflections and analyses will explain what we mean by the inevitability of our fanning the flame under those talks. We will discuss some of the consequences of our inability to do anything else.

Joe: Social Justice Book Clubs

I understand the value of a book club. Reading from a shared corpus of texts can be a way for communities to orient themselves toward common ideas. Especially in discussions about campus- or department- wide policy changes to address racist systems, it's helpful that stakeholders are aware of the same set of shared premises about how race and racism operates in educational institutions. However, over the past year, it's been frustrating and difficult finding common consensus with White, liberal academics who hadn't done the reading. It's hard to agree on material changes about race and racism when key stakeholders on campus are woefully unprepared to address these problems.

So, when given the opportunity, I welcomed the invitation to participate in a campus-wide book club with faculty and staff on issues of social justice. The book club, initiated by an organization on campus named the "Allies Group," was billed as a bi-monthly meeting (i.e. every other month) where any employee on campus can join to discuss a book or film on the topic of social justice. The book club seemed like a great way for me—a still-new faculty member—to build community with colleagues on campus through regularly scheduled meetings and with a set of texts that could change our communities' perspectives about race and racism at our institution. Yet, the book club never panned out as advertised: after one awkward meeting, no other meeting was organized or planned. The failures of this book club left me frustrated—but not necessarily because I wanted more group meetings. Rather, I was frustrated because I had wrongly assumed that I would gain something meaningful from the discussions; because I had wanted the book club to be more than a performance; and because I do actually love book clubs and had taken it seriously when others had not; and because I volunteered my time to contribute to a half-baked race talk for likes.

I enthusiastically volunteered as one of the discussion group leaders for our inaugural meeting in August 2020—a time when faculty, still reeling from the summer's racial unrest, were designing their syllabi for the Fall semester and seemed ready for a new perspective. Like many other universities, libraries, and groups across the country, our campus' Allies Group selected Ibram X. Kendi's *How to be an Antiracist* as our first book. Kendi's book received a surge in popularity in the wake of the murder of George Floyd and has been lauded by *The New York Times* as "our best chance to free ourselves from our national nightmare" (Stewart 2020). However, I couldn't help but be disappointed by the choice—yet another pop-soc, textbook-like beginner's guide to racism. I recognize that my hang-ups about this genre of book is a matter of my professional and personal situation: I don't need another beginner's guide to racism. But why should the academic community on my own campus be complacent with the basics? Many of our jobs on campus are predicated on our deep engagement with scholarly conversations in our respective fields, yet when it comes to issues of race and racism, we "gotta start somewhere." And yet, we never seem to go beyond that.

In my conversations with those who were involved in the selection, the decision was indeed due to accessibility. Though many involved in the book club are full-time or part-time instructors, it may not be the case for everyone: some staff are not involved with either research or teaching. The alternative book, Iheoma Oluo's *So You Want To Talk About Race*, was also considered for similar reasons. Given that this would be our first meeting among others, I believed the rationale for selecting Kendi's book was fair and reasonable.

We were given about four weeks to read the book. As a discussion leader, I generated a list of potential questions and passages that might help us engage in our conversations—similar to what I might do to facilitate discussion in my courses on readings. On the day of discussion, it was fairly well attended via Zoom. Participants were given a small introduction by the book clubs' organizer, and we were eventually split into separate breakout rooms for small-group discussions. As promised, I led the book discussion with about 10 other attendees: as predicted, my group included a mix of tenured faculty members, university administrators, part time instructors, and staff. We were given about one hour to have an open discussion. As I anticipated, the start to our conversation was a bit awkward given the content of the book and the newness of the club. I tried to get our bearings by asking border questions about what we agreed on, but it soon became clear that this initial awkwardness was not going to disappear. We touched on some ideas, but frankly, it was a tepid, forgettable discussion. Our conversation consisted mostly of extended pauses and general agreement

on the basic premises of the book. I attempted to lead our discussion to areas of ambiguity or potential disagreement—indeed, I agree with Randall Kennedy’s review of Kendi’s book in *The Washington Post* that the book has some conceptual flaws and contradictory claims (2019). But attempts to engage these nuances fell flat. The context of the discussion prevented the deep engagement that I wanted: the differing institutional roles of participants, differing levels of expertise when it comes to institutional racism, and time constraints posed as obstacles. In other words, if I wanted a deeper level of conversation, I wouldn’t have gotten it here. My role was, instead, to affirm to my (White) colleagues that they learned something valuable from reading one book.

We were eventually ushered back into the main Zoom room for a round-robin reporting from each small group—there were plenty of overlapping ideas that were shared by discussion leaders so we all must have been having the same conversations. In all, the whole meeting fell under two hours. As the meeting concluded, we were given a weak promise to continue again with a different book in the next coming months. Of course, no such meeting ever manifested.

A few months later, a well-meaning White colleague sent an email asking if faculty in our department would like to have a reading group, ourselves, about anti-racism and social justice. The suggested book? Ibram X. Kendi’s *How to be an Antiracist*.

Thierry: ‘We appreciate your point of view’—then, white silence.

This past summer’s national and international social unrests and demands for racial justice have inspired my PWI to form a university-wide “retention working group.” I was invited and happily joined. The group’s mission is “to identify and close equity gaps.” COVID-19’s disproportionate impact on Black and Latinx under-served communities was used as context and a reminder of the urgency and necessity of such effort. It’s a year-long commitment.

However, a quarter of the way through and three meetings later, it’s unclear if this group will or can go beyond race talks for likes. Thus far, out of the 50 or more members, the same small number of BIPOC faculty and staff account for most of the comments, anecdotes, and reflections around racism in academia. This is not a revelation. Nor is it intended as insight or an indictment. It is just the way these talks go. In my experience at this PWI and others before it, people of color’s voices, experiences, and perspectives are expected or supposed to fuel and dominate race talks; very much how white silence, albeit often approvingly and supportively, is expected to follow.

White silence is white privilege; the “silences and denials surrounding privilege... keep thinking about equity incomplete” (McIntosh, 1988). Zoom allowed white silence to make its support visible during those meetings (e.g. ‘thumb up’ and ‘applause’ reactions). But, the videoconference tool could not get my White colleagues to venture out of their comfort zone, or to consider their roles in PWIs’ purposing of talks around race, equity, and diversity as publicity stunts and default positions that have allowed institutions and most White Americans to cling to and reassert a presumed innocence each time a Breonna Taylor or Michael Brown or Trayvon Martin happens.

I, along with other colleagues of color, filled the white silences during those meetings with impassioned remarks. They ranged from personal affronts, the ubiquity of deficit-minded language at the university, to the institution’s seeming inability or unwillingness to design and support proactive measures to address race-based differences in students’ academic performance and success. Again, no revelation or insights here: nothing was said or brought up that I, and presumably my White colleagues, have not heard before. Yet, I always feel compelled to fill in those silences. So, I did during many of those meetings. At one meeting I rehashed an argument that has been made many times before: “all scientific endeavors transpire in a world where race, gender, and class are important not only as subjects for investigation, but as structural factors [rooted in a white logic] that partly shape researchers and the scientific gaze” (Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008, p. 18).

I argued that the absence of Black and Brown students' voices, perspectives, and lived wisdom from the data and analyses being used to address racial inequality is a reflection of the limits of what academia deems possible. I referenced briefly the work of philosopher [Kristy Dotson \(2012\)](#) to describe the idea of epistemic oppression in academia. I got some "likes." An email from a long-time and high-ranking staff member appeared in my inbox the next day: "I appreciated your comments... you are completely correct that one of the fundamental issues is an epistemic one." I was very surprised and genuinely flattered by the message. But, this staff member, a White male in his fifties or sixties and with considerable clout at my PWI, was silent throughout that meeting. In his email, he expressed concern that the working group would not give any serious considerations to the idea of epistemic oppression. However, during the meeting, he chose silence. It was a somewhat long email; I replied with an even longer message and amplified my position:

Data does not tell us a story. We use data to craft a story that comports with our understanding of the world. If we begin with a racially biased view of the world then we will end up with a racially biased view of what the data have to say ([Zuberi and Bonilla Silva, 2008, p. 7](#)).

Silence. To be fair, I did not ask the staffer to turn his "likes" into involvement or actions. I did not ask to meet and discuss how his experience and institutional knowledge can be put to work against epistemic oppression. But, why didn't he volunteer? Why wasn't there an offer to force the working group to take students' voices seriously and use their lived experiences to craft a different story?

Not sure how many more meetings before the retention group's mission is realized. And, as mentioned earlier, I cannot in good faith make any predictions as to whether this initiative will amount to institutional changes—I sincerely hope it does. But, I am already worried that I and other BIPOC, assuming responsibility for those white silences, will continue to fan the flame that makes it possible for this well-intentioned and much needed initiative to just be a year-long race talk for likes.

Joe: Policy Talks

Towards the end of Summer 2020, I was twice asked to present to university faculty on the topic of labor-based grading contracts as an anti-racist, decolonizing approach to classroom assessment: first on a panel on decolonizing the curriculum, organized and hosted by our faculty union and second to instructors of our university's first-year seminar. I always welcome the opportunity to contribute my research and field-knowledge to a broader audience. However, I also needed to confront the limitations of these one-off, uncompensated (both for presenters and attendees) presentations. Half a year later, I cannot meaningfully identify the gains—the material policy changes—that these talks have made in how we approach teaching at my institution. While I recognize the small gains such presentations can make in terms of changing perspectives of instructors, what is less clear are the material changes of these talks.

The focus of each presentation was on labor-based grading contract, a system of determining students' final course grades through the labor that students complete for the class rather than based on the quality of their work. Researchers in the field of Rhetoric and Composition, a field that is often centrally interested in the teaching of writing, have championed labor-based contracts as a way to deemphasize the weaponization of grades and to value writing process as the central feature of the course rather than solely on good and correct products ([Danielewicz & Elbow, 2009](#)). [Asao B. Inoue \(2012\)](#) has observed that such labor-based contracts were particularly beneficial to students of color in both passing writing courses as well as improving their writing. In a 2012 study of his writing program's use of grading contracts, he found that Asian-Pacific Islander students, Black Students, and multilingual students seemed to most benefit. He broadly found that, students for whom grading contracts were most effective were those who either see grades as punishment, as limiting their choices and decision in writing, as producing pressure to get things right, as reducing freedom to write, or as de-motivating in some way, or those who see themselves as not being good writers already. (p. 93).

What is distinct about my attention to labor-based grading contracts is that it is not simply attentive to the

content of the course, but rather on the ways course policies can be altered to redefine our relationship to our students, particularly students of color. Certainly, I support approaches to redefining the classroom by including more course content by diverse authors and on issues of social justice. But an attention to anti-racist course policies raises questions about whether there is equity in the students we are passing in our courses, in the students we retain in our programs, and in the ways we discipline our students. I have been pleased to see, for instance, that there have been moves in certain programs on my campus, including the first-year seminar, that have sought to include diversity in course content. Less attention has been given to policies.

I approached each of my presentations with the understanding that labor-based grading contracts may not be familiar to faculty and such unfamiliarity may result in skepticism and doubt. In other words, I recognized that I was tasked with some degree of persuasion—but not simply persuading faculty to use this particular kind of assessment practice. Rather, I saw as my goal to persuade faculty to reflect and potentially rethink the assessment practices that they may have inherited or are based on lore. Lore grounds teaching practices in personal experiences or stories about what has worked for themselves or others rather than in prevailing pedagogical theories or scholarship. Lore is a breeding ground for pedagogical mechanisms that uphold white supremacy: it is a means of uncritically circulating and reproducing unchecked practices that have historically disadvantaged students of color and multilingual students. It's difficult to get faculty to rethink practices based on lore: lore mediates a potentially overwhelming complex of scholarly knowledge into something manageable. And also, as [Stephen North \(1987\)](#) describes, practices based on lore can take on an almost ritualistic adherence: “those patterns of practice which acquires what amounts to ceremonial status, and which gets passed along mostly be an example” (p. 29). The origins of our most sacred policies may not be clear, but we keep them because our classroom policies are our classroom policies—just as a rose is a rose is a rose. In this sense, lore takes the place of prevailing scholarly theories of teaching.

Over the past year since I've given these talks, I've spoken to faculty about more systematically altering our classroom policies. In fact, in my own program (First-Year Studies), we initiated conversations at the beginning of the Fall 2020 semester to enact classroom policies that reflect anti-racist frameworks. Our initial discussions seemed promising—particularly in policies related to attendance—but eventually the talks stalled out and came to a complete halt by the end of the semester. Faculty bemoaned that imposing program-wide anti-racist policies may be a violation of faculty's academic freedom. Also, that these anti-racist policies would prevent teaching (i.e., disciplining) students about professionalism and respectability—a pedagogical approach that has been challenged by researchers like [Higginbotham \(1993\)](#) and [Baker-Bell \(2020\)](#). But at the core, White faculty members were not willing to let go of the policies they've cultivated over their years of teaching. They were not willing to abandon policies that have been passed down through generations of education. And these concerns get to the heart of why I no longer have faith in these one-off, teaching talks to a small group of faculty: a few faculty may change minds and may change their policies, but what difference do these small gains make against the policy heirlooms that define White faculty's academic identities? Put another way, teachers are products of educational institutions that thrive and encourage whiteness, and to ask teachers to rethink those institutional mechanisms shatters the substance of their own professional upbringing. [Kathleen Blake Yancey and Brian Huot \(1998\)](#) distill this problem succinctly,

Teachers, typically, become faculty because they compiled good grades, lots of good grades. The grades, seemingly, confirm the fact that these people should become teachers, should exercise authority, especially in a classroom. So right from the start, teachers are determined by grades: having 'earned' good grades ourselves, we have the right to become part of the institution: to grade others (p. 49).

I understand that institutional change is a marathon, not a sprint. But why can't it be a sprint? Why must I try so hard to persuade my colleagues that they are the product of grading systems that reflect white epistemologies? Why is it so difficult to persuade my colleagues to consider grading and assessment policies that do not disadvantage their students of color? Why is it so difficult for my White colleagues to see that this is personal? These are the questions I am confounded by.

Conclusion

Maybe we should be more grateful that institutional figures across campus are putting in the effort to move the needle closer towards social justice on campus. Nestled within each of these reflections are people that are putting good, well-intentioned efforts to learn and to acknowledge that changes are needed at the institution. And within each of our vignettes, we express these initial moments of gratitude: happy to join, happy to participate, happy to contribute. We are incredibly grateful, and willing, to share our professional expertise and our personal experiences with our colleagues on campus. But over the course of our participation, we each have a visceral, affective response to some of these efforts, these moments that don't seem quite right. We've used this essay to try to put into words some of those feelings of disappointment, frustration, bewilderment, sadness, and confusion that signal that these initial commitments for social change at our institution may not be enough.

This essay is the product of a year (and more) of comparing notes between the two of us and our other colleagues of color on campus. This, we assume, is a familiar experience for most faculty of color at PWIs: coming together in the backchannels to compare notes, cross reference experiences, and find commiseration. Certainly, the global health crisis with COVID-19 has made incidental, backchannel communiques more difficult to facilitate—but not impossible. We've found comfort in text or private chat messages during difficult Zoom meetings: “Did they say what I think they said?” or “Am I hearing this right?” Or it's the Friday night Zoom to debrief from a week of invisible labor; to reflect on the amount of care required and exhausted during meetings just so our resistance can be collegial. This essay, in many ways, is likely representative of the kinds of backchannel conversations that colleagues of color have regularly across the country. But we also see these vignettes as a plea to those well-intentional, White colleagues who want to do better.

Reading across the vignettes, we can observe a set of common responses to these race talks for likes at our PWI. In light of these responses, we offer a set of considerations that institutional stakeholders may consider when envisioning and organizing events, committees, talks on race or racism. To avoid race talks for likes, consider the following:

a) Race talks must lead somewhere or to something. They must be part of an institutional plan or commitment to a new vision that not only champions racial equity, but also is serious about addressing the institution's history and ongoing role in normalizing or perpetuating racial inequalities. Talks cannot be limited to 'educating' those who can afford to be 'ignorant' about racism or oblivious to its real and devastating impact on the daily lives of Black and Brown faculty, staff, and students. Talks can serve as steps to somewhere, but they cannot be a destination.

b) Race talks are about shared labor and responsibility. We know that BIPOC are typically on the receiving end of racism and the myriad ways it adversely affects communities of color. We are also cognizant that many well-meaning White colleagues struggle seeing themselves as “unfairly advantaged” or “as participant(s) in a damaged culture” ([McIntosh, 1988](#)). So, race talks, as shared responsibility, is interested in honest conversations and explorations of the ways whiteness and racialized/minoritized status have functioned to ascribe the same roles and prescribe the same functions to the same groups during those talks. As shared labor, default positions as 'white silence' or BIPOC's assumed (moral) responsibility to fill those silences are brought to the fore; they are part of the race talks. Moving race talks beyond “likes” (or divisiveness) is a shared obligation.

c) Race talks are not about comfort. Racism is not only historical and structural, but it is also deeply emotional for those on the receiving end. Why should it be different for others born on the other side of American racism? In our view and based on our experiences, talks about race or racism preoccupied with people's 'comfort' will inevitably do just that—comfort. We are obviously not advocating for talks that blame or attack individuals or groups for this country's history and ongoing practices of segregating its population based

on race and socioeconomic status. What we are recommending is for talks to reach for something other than comfort, and to be concerned about more than feelings and “likes.” As mentioned above, talks should be driven by actionable and measurable goals. Race talks should motivate participants to implicate their personal and professional selves in the fight against racism, or to figure out concrete, yet sensible, ways for them to contribute to a more racially just tomorrow.

Taken together, these recommendations comprise our hopes for our future conversations at our institution. They are our wish-list. Will these recommendations solve all our problems? Certainly not—we recognize that progress takes time and care to craft. But these recommendations speak to creating the environment necessary to move us towards the changes we want to see at an institutional level. If these vignettes demonstrate anything, it’s that social justice requires constant reflection and an emotional intelligence to ensure that the well-intentioned events, committees, and conversations do not place undue burdens and tensions on your colleagues of color. We will continue to share what we can at these race talks because we can understand the value of any efforts put forth towards progress. At the same time, we also hope that stakeholders across campus also reflect on those labors from faculty of color and whether those labors can materialize into something tangible.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS



Thierry Elin-Saintine is an assistant professor of mathematics and First-Year Studies program at Stockton University who teaches courses on quantitative reasoning, algebraic modeling, and academic identity construction. His research focuses on identity as belonging, mathematics education, and urban education. His forthcoming book (scheduled to come out August 26th) *Racial Inequality in Mathematics Education*, with Emerald Publishing, join others in advocating for the de-racialization of math curriculum, classrooms, and learning experiences.



Joe Cirio is an assistant professor of writing and first-year studies in the First-Year Studies program at Stockton University. He teaches courses on rhetorical memory, professional writing and design, and race and gender in American Society. His research concerns community literacy and in particular, the functions of everyday and vernacular literacy activity within community contexts.

