

JOINT FACULTY APPOINTMENTS:
AN ADMINISTRATIVE DILEMMA
IN CHICANO STUDIES

EUGENE E. GARCIA
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
SANTA BARBARA

A comprehensive proposal for an academic program in Chicano Studies for the University of California, Santa Barbara, was submitted to the Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science on April 4, 1969. The program evolved from an extensive investigation of the assessed needs of the local Chicano community, the role of the University toward that community, and the general responsibility of the University to the student community with respect to educational and research endeavors related to the Chicano. Specifically, the Chicano Studies proposal of 1969 included:

1. A full range of undergraduate offerings in a Chicano Studies Department, functioning as a regular academic department, and
2. A major research component (Center for Chicano Studies).

In 1969, President Hitch authorized the establishment of a Department of Chicano Studies as a regular academic department in the College of Letters and Science. The department began to function in the fall term of that same year.

The academic validity of a Chicano Studies Department, like that of any department at an institution of higher learning, is a complex issue. At the most general level, it seems appropriate for the University to respond academically to the multifaceted nature of our society. Universities have responded to recent social and educational interests, which are multifaceted in nature, by establishing academic departments in Law and Society, Environmental Studies, Communication Studies, and even individualized, interdisciplinary majors. Therefore, the logic of interdisciplinary programs, which call for a multidisciplinary focus on a socially and educationally significant area, has been recognized by the University of California. The Ethnic Studies area is yet another area which deserves the same form of academic attention. In fact, attention has already been translated programmatically as indicated by the establishment of both Black Studies and Chicano Studies Departments on the UCSB campus.

Like other interdisciplinary areas of study, Chicano Studies is a "disciplinary" by-product of traditional disciplinary emphases which converge on any one area of interest. Chicano Studies focuses disciplinary perspectives on the specific character (cultural, linguistic, artistic, literary, economic, political, and educational attributes) of the Chicano/Mexicano/Latino community of this country. It is important to point out that as the disciplinary perspectives converge, a new "discipline" has potential of being conceived, nurtured, and developed: the total has the possibility of being much more than the individual sum of its parts. To further extend this conceptualization, an academic background provided by this emphasis provides a broad but flexible exposure to the study of the Chicano. In addition, a department allows an academically valid emphasis in Chicano Studies for those students who wish a more extensive exposure. For Chicano students, such departments provide a strong sense of self-awareness and strongly encourage these students to become scholars, professionals, and artists. Moreover, such departments provide still another academically rich area of inquiry offered by the university to all its students in hopes of generating an academically sound and well-rounded curriculum. Students enrolled in these departments, like those in other departments, will prove or disprove its continued validity and will continually redefine its nature and goals. Without the department, *los estudios de Chicanos* will remain an offspring of political whim by those who conceive of its legitimacy only on political and not academic grounds. This, we hope, is the history of Chicano Studies and not its future.

The intent of this article is to address the issues surrounding Chicano Studies with respect to its faculty, more specifically, the issue of joint faculty appointments with emphasis on the positive and negative attributes of this administrative form. The article will focus on the specific University of California, Santa Barbara, departmental structure, since it is the one with which the author is most familiar.

From its inception, the Chicano Studies Department at UCSB has functioned with different forms of faculty appointments, including the use of senior graduate students as full-time faculty. Since the spring of 1975, the department has moved away from this practice and has adopted a "joint-position" faculty appointment policy. Under this policy, all permanent ladder-rank appointments are to serve 50 percent in Chicano Studies and 50 percent in another UCSB academic department. In July of 1976, a tenured chairperson, 50 percent in Chicano Studies and 50 percent in Psychology, was appointed. In addition to this faculty member, Chicano Studies has a similar appointment arrangement with the Department of History and with Political Science. The department will be seeking similar joint arrangements with the Departments of Spanish, Anthropology, and Sociology and the Graduate School of Education. The department has a suitable core of faculty and is in the process of strengthening itself academically with the addition of new faculty members.

Of special interest are the relationships established between the Chicano Studies Department at UCSB and other academic units on campus. For instance, courses in Chicano Studies are accepted by other departments, either by petition or by formal curriculum agreement, as fulfilling major requirements. (The Departments of Psychology, History, Sociology, and Anthropology are examples.) Additionally, the Graduate School of Education, in its newly adopted Bilingual/Cross-Cultural Emphasis Certificate Program, requires specific courses in Chicano Studies at the undergraduate level. These major and/or certificate requirements are in addition to University and College of Letters and Science requirements which courses in the department help to fulfill. It is clear, then, that on the UCSB campus, Chicano Studies has begun to serve an academic and service role for other departments and programs.

One might legitimately ask the following questions: Why joint appointments? Is not the department (or its subject matter) of significant academic soundness to stand on its own? To what extent does such an arrangement compromise the department at the macrolevel and its faculty at the microlevel? In order to begin to answer such significant questions, it seems appropriate to consider the specifics behind the birth and development of the department and its present academic status, in addition to its future and that of other departments like it.

As indicated earlier, the Department of Chicano Studies program at UCSB was born out of a concerted political struggle between the University administration and Chicano students, faculty, and staff. Its goals were numerous but its strength in academic circles nonexistent. There were no Chicano Studies superstars or tenured faculty, nor was there the likely possibility of having any for quite some time. There was no curriculum and, like anything new at the UC, the program was constantly under review, re-review, and evaluation. The program faculty worked twice as hard as most and were rewarded by either not getting tenure (if they were on a tenure track) or were placed in a situation which did not allow, or severely put off, the finishing of their dissertation. Therefore, it was improbable for the department to have any confidence of permanence. It was within this context that the students demanded some indication of long-term commitment. The result of this "request" led to a compromise agreement between the administration and Chicano Studies. The agreement called for the appointment of a tenured department chairperson, but all future ladder-rank appointments in Chicano Studies were to be joint appointments. It is this particular administrative format within which the program operates at present. It is this administrative format which presents both positive and negative attributes and which influences all sectors of departmental activity. It is this administrative format which presents particular administrative concern as it relates to faculty recruitment, retention, tenure, and development.

Most would agree that Chicano Studies, to date, has been multidisciplinary in nature. It has not been interdisciplinary. That is, Chicano Studies is a "discipline" made up of traditional disciplinary paradigms focusing on one specific population. (In fact, most interdisciplinary ventures are actually multidisciplinary.) Some might argue that Chicano Studies is interdisciplinary and that this coming together of disciplines creates a new and distinct paradigm as a function of the merger. It does not seem that such an argument is defensible as long as we do what we are doing today: using sociological, psychological, educational, linguistic, historical, political, artistic (*ad infinitum*) paradigms to consider those issues of theoretical and applied importance to *nuestra raza*. At an academic level, this multidisciplinary character of Chicano Studies suggests a joint appointment framework.

At an historical level, joint appointment administrative forms in ethnic studies provides an alternative to the problems associated with such departments nationwide. In a recent article (*Saturday Review*, February 1978), Theodore L. Gross, Dean of Humanities at the City College of New York, describes his own account of the birth and final destruction of ethnic studies departments at his own university. The description is representative of many such accounts.

As Gross points out, ". . . well-intentioned liberals agreed to the creation of these departments out of no deep ideological impulse, with no real purpose or passion." In reality, they accepted it at the end of a conjured-up gun barrel; to do so was easy. With such an "acceptance" by university faculty, ethnic studies departments grew sporadically but, in the end, were becoming completely isolated. To their moral benefit, but academic detriment, they drew primarily students who were poorly prepared by earlier educational experience. Gross concludes: "Creating ethnic studies departments was wrong and those with empty hands are the minorities for whom they were created." University administrations are not totally displeased with the isolation and predictable death of such departments.

It is with respect to this particular problem of academic isolation that joint faculty appointments seem to be advantageous. Such is especially the case in a "discipline" which is multidisciplinary in nature and, in so being, cannot afford "disciplinary" isolation. In essence, such appointments do not guarantee, but ameliorate, the possibility of academic and, therefore, administrative isolation. It supplies the Chicano Studies department a "foot in the door" while continuing to strive for its own goals as a teaching, research, and community oriented department.

The advantage stated above is the only one which joint appointments provide. The obvious disadvantage is the loss of autonomy. Yet, at the present time, autonomy for Chicano Studies departments seems equivalent to isolation. We cannot afford

isolation without the academic (faculty) muscle which most of us lack. This is not to say that the future does not hold the potential for developing strong faculty enclaves, for that is what the UCSB Chicano Studies Department is attempting to do.

It is imperative to point out that joint appointments do pose some dangerous constraints on the development of a viable department. In almost all cases, a joint appointment administrative framework places Chicano Studies in the position of an initiator and traditional departments in the position of reactors. This is the case because Chicano Studies is the fledgling, the weak, the struggling department, while colleague departments are already established. Therefore, within the present academic philosophy of "limited" growth, recruitment of new faculty becomes primarily the responsibility of Chicano Studies.

At an administrative and program level, the current retrenchment situation dictates that the Chicano Studies department must initiate and substantiate the need for new faculty. In addition to such a request being considered by all the myriad agencies and committees of the university, the request must first be considered by the potential joint-sponsoring department. Of course, this creates yet another potentially devastating stumbling block. Additionally, departments which do cooperate must first deal with their own internal political struggles. That is, before any recruitment can take place, these departments must define for themselves their own academic needs. In almost all departments, attempts at reaching such definitions lead to power struggles among faculty groups who see an opportunity to gain power and those who see a potential decrease in power. The Chicano Studies department typically can be victimized by such struggles in more than one way:

1. The colleague department decides it has no needs due to the negative consequence of a potential struggle by faculty groups.
2. The colleague department selects a "safe" area for academic expansion (recruitment), which does not correlate with the needs of the Chicano Studies department.
3. The colleague department does not define its needs specifically, thereby putting off the intradepartmental struggle until candidates are actually seriously being considered. This may result in good candidates being identified, but no action taken on them because of the delayed intradepartmental bickering.

An even greater constraint concerns the predictable negative, almost never positive, interaction with colleague departments during the process of faculty recruitment. With this administrative

framework, each department has veto power. Of course, any negative stance with other departments puts Chicano Studies at a disadvantage. At a theoretical level, veto power seems appropriate. That is, each department has a say on who the other department cannot hire. The negative relationship places each department on the defensive. Each attempts to guess which candidates the other department will say "no" to. In doing so, the Chicano Studies department finds itself critically handicapped because its best candidates may be vetoed by the other departments. What one does instinctively in such a position is to approach the whole recruitment process from a negative perspective; i.e., "We'll never get our best to be accepted by them." Such a psychological perspective has the nasty habit of being self-fulfilled. In other words, it is difficult to engage in a joint recruitment effort without being relatively pessimistic due to the veto power which someone else so clearly holds. Unfortunately, the power of veto which the Chicano Studies department holds is typically mythical. Since the department is in dire need of expansion and development, it is not in its best interest to exercise the veto. Doing so brings Chicano Studies closer to assuring the administration that the department is not concerned with academic excellence, but only in hiring friends. In sum, recruitment within this joint appointment framework is typically not a cordial process and, at times, is very frustrating.

Recruitment and hiring in the joint appointment format, although laborious, can be successful. In order for this to be the case, continual communication with colleague departments is necessary. Additionally, it has been in the best interest of the Chicano Studies department to clarify specific professional (research and teaching) areas which other departments will consider prior to any announcement of position openings. With such a concession, it becomes difficult for the colleague departments to argue academic duplication or for them to become involved in intradepartmental struggles after candidates are identified.

At a strictly administrative level, joint appointments do not achieve any greater assurance of departmental stability. That is, deans can limit the development of departments by limiting the scope of joint appointment searches by simply allowing such appointments with departments they already know are hesitant or unwilling to make such appointments. With this strategy, they can be perceived as supportive, since they are allowing recruitment. In the long run, the collaborating departments will do their dirty work. Although this has not been the case on the UCSB campus, it is predictable administrative behavior for those who wish the demise of Chicano Studies.

The above issues are all related not only to recruitment, but of course to other administrative and academic issues. Specifically, they are of relevance to faculty class load, committee assignments, and, most importantly, faculty development, retention, and tenure. Since part-time appointments are the exception

and not the rule in academia, individuals who fill these positions are often not perceived by administrators or colleagues as part-timers. If such faculty arrangements are to be academically successful, it is imperative that such perceptions be continually corrected. Of course, responsibility falls totally on the chairperson of the Chicano Studies department. Again, due to his fledgling status, the chairperson must be continually on the alert for "overloading," especially in the Chicano Studies department. In fact, this may be one of the most detrimental side effects of joint appointments. It is very difficult for a Chicano Studies chairperson to assign the many functions of the department to its faculty without being consciously aware that such assignments may be detrimental to the individual faculty members.

Close relationships with community, students, and other Chicano faculty and staff on campus become critical and the major responsibility of the chairperson. In order to limit the involvement of the Chicano Studies faculty, it falls upon the chairperson to take initiatives on behalf of the department, with faculty serving a consultant role. Such is not the picture of a dynamic department in which all faculty are involved. As for the chairperson, the responsibilities are great enough without asking him/her to be the single spokesperson for the department. Yet, in order to protect junior faculty in joint appointment positions, the chairperson is likely to become the sole spokesperson. It is clear that such a relationship is not in the best interest of the department.

It is, in particular, "overloading" of the chairperson which is predictable. It is for this reason that a chairperson must be tenured and be willing to lose a minimum of two years of normal promotion time. The chairperson becomes a full-time administrator, although only on a formal half-time administrative contract. Course load must be reduced for this individual during the time of service. In fact, the chairperson should not teach at all during the first year, during which time he must adjust to the new position.

The tenure issue is one which the UCSB Chicano Studies Department has not yet met within its joint appointment administrative structure. It is surely on the horizon and looms as the most important issue when considering departmental longevity and stability. Since faculty serve half-time in each of the departments, those departments' recommendations with respect to tenure should be weighted equally. Since most Chicano Studies departments are undergraduate departments, the faculty cannot serve its students in the same way as they do those students in other departments. More critically, in Chicano Studies, the view of its faculty comes primarily from their teaching, whereas in other departments research and publication efforts are weighted much more heavily. Therefore, the old problem of firing an excellent teacher who is not publishing becomes a potential administrative problem. Of course, Chicano Studies chairpersons and departments

should make it clear that research and publication are also of importance in Chicano Studies.

Further, the issues surrounding evaluation criteria are not yet resolved. The plan of the Chicano Studies Department at UCSB is to work closely with colleague departments and their committees during the review process. One strong recommendation for tenure resulting from a joint evaluation is more viable than two separate and independent recommendations. It is anticipated that the likelihood of split decisions will be diminished under collaborative effort, although the potential for such decisions does not warm the heart of any chairperson.

One issue successfully confronted at UCSB has been faculty development. Colleague departments have been supportive of joint faculty leaves of absence for junior faculty. Of course, products of such leaves are in their best interest, but they are also in the best interest of Chicano Studies, although at times absences of key faculty may be detrimental. In the long run, such efforts in the faculty development area pay huge dividends with respect to needed research, faculty advancement, and departmental stability.

An attempt has been made in this article to deal critically with the issues surrounding joint faculty appointments in Chicano Studies. Such an administrative format holds both positive and negative consequences. At this period of the UCSB Chicano Studies Department's history, such appointments seem to be paying off, although the price the department has paid for such payoffs is substantial. Like all educational endeavors, the author is about to conclude that what makes a program work at any point in time is the individuals within it. At this point in time, the department is functioning adequately and seems to be progressing. This is not to say that, with a change of time or players, such a statement may be completely inappropriate.
