

Appendix 1:
External Reviewers' Joint Report



November 6, 1997

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE OFFICE
LOS ANGELES DIVISION
3125 MURPHY HALL
405 HILGARD AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024-1408

TO: Adrienne Lavine
Russell Schuh
Teresa Cordova
Luisa Fraga
Evelyn HuDeHart

FR: Luisa Crespo, Coordinator, Academic Senate Program Review Process

Re: Final Report for the Cesar Chavez Center for Interdisciplinary Instruction

Please find enclosed the final report for the Cesar Chavez Center for Interdisciplinary Instruction. The report will be appended to the final report of the Internal Reviewers, and will not be distributed until the Internal Reviewers' report is formally adopted by the Undergraduate Council.

Once again, I would like to thank the external consultants on behalf of the Academic Senate for their contributions to the review process. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (310) 825-1162 or via e-mail, crespo@senate.ucla.edu.

Enclosures

**1997-98 ACADEMIC SENATE REVIEW OF THE
CESAR CHAVEZ CENTER FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' REPORT**

**Teresa Córdova, University of New Mexico
Luis Fraga, Stanford University
Evelyn HuDeHart, University of Colorado**

INTRODUCTION

The University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) is uniquely positioned to be the home of a major center for Chicana and Chicano studies. It has one of the oldest centers for Chicana/o research in the Center for Chicano Studies Research. It has one of the largest groupings of nationally recognized scholars doing research on issues affecting Chicana/o and Latina/o communities including health, politics, immigration, art, literature, and language use. It enrolls more Chicana/o and Latina/o students than almost any other major university in the country. It is located in a city that contains the largest aggregation of Chicana/os and Latina/os in the entire United States. Lastly, UCLA is one of the premier research institutions on the West Coast.

The establishment of the César Chavez Center for Interdisciplinary Instruction (CCCII) is a major step towards establishing a center of Chicana/o Studies. The accomplishments of the Center in its four years of existence have been substantial. It has been able to hire a core of senior and junior faculty of impressive intellectual caliber. This faculty brings expertise in a range of analytical approaches and disciplines including art, art history, cultural studies, urban planning, socio-linguistics, literature, and history. It has established its own by-laws of governance as an academic unit. It has identified its primary goals and objectives for the next few years. It has developed a core curriculum that is coherent, cumulative, and inclusive of the most current research in Chicana/o studies. It has captured substantial student interest reflected in the number of majors and those choosing Chicana/o studies as a specialization. It has now even recently secured appropriate office space.

All of these accomplishments have been made in extremely difficult circumstances. There has been no consistent leadership for the Center since its establishment having had five different chairs in four years. Necessary administrative staff support has not been provided. Direction from the Dean's office has not been consistent. It is the first center for interdisciplinary instruction established at UCLA and has had little tradition on which to build. It has not received very much direct support from the Center for Chicano Studies Research.

Nonetheless, building upon the commitment of the core faculty, substantial success has been obtained. We are fully confident that if appropriate support is provided by the University administration, especially the office of Dean Scott Waugh, the Cesar Chavez Center has every possibility of becoming one of the premier programs of Chicana/o studies

in the nation. The three external review committee members offer the following recommendations that, in our view, will further contribute to the success of the Cesar Chavez Institute for Interdisciplinary Instruction.

Vision. As an academic program in Chicana and Chicano Studies, it is paramount that the Cesar Chavez Center operate from a clear concept of how it defines the discipline. There is no clear statement of how the Center views the discipline of Chicana/o Studies, where it fits in the development of that discipline, and how aspects of the program tie into that concept. This is especially critical in light of the interdisciplinary nature of Chicana/o Studies and its unique origins, and particularly important if the Center wishes to achieve its stated goal of becoming a model for Chicana/o Studies. Similarly, though the self-report contains a statement of academic objectives, there is a lack of stated vision as tied to its role in the field of Chicana/o Studies. The absence of either a clear concept of Chicana/o Studies or a stated vision hampers the ability of the Center to evaluate itself and its faculty in terms of that vision. It further handicaps the Center in developing a clear identity of its value to the UCLA academic community and the field of Chicana/o Studies.

Recommendation #1. We understand that a process was begun to develop a mission statement and because of the many turnovers in leadership, not continued. We recommend that the process of establishing a mission statement be completed. This statement should include a clear articulation that defines Chicana and Chicano Studies as understood by the Chavez Center. This statement should be developed through a process which includes core faculty, joint faculty, student representatives, an incoming chair, and staff as appropriate. The assistance of a professional facilitator is recommended. A statement of goals and objectives can follow and be broken into several categories, including teaching, advising, research, and community outreach.

Leadership provided by the CCCII Chair. The inability of Dean Scott Waugh to appoint and maintain a consistent chair for the Chavez Center must be remedied immediately. It has had five different chairs over a four year period. This lack of stability has limited the capacity of the Center to establish a unified vision of its role within the University, prevented the junior faculty from having the mentorship and guidance that can be critical in their capacity to secure tenure, limited the capacity of the Center to negotiate for additional resources necessary for it to grow, and has resulted in the junior faculty having the primary responsibility for curricular development, establishment of organizational infrastructure, and virtually all core teaching responsibilities. It is unfortunate that this situation has not been effectively resolved over such a substantial period of time. Again, this situation must be resolved immediately.

Recommendation #2. It is encouraging that a concerted effort is being made to hire Professor Reynaldo Macias, UC-Santa Barbara, to be the next chair of the Cesar Chavez Center. We strongly recommend that every effort possible be made to bring him to the Center. The history of unstable leadership, in our view, mandates that Dean Waugh take all means necessary to make the position attractive to Professor Macias. It is apparent that past incentives and means of support provided to earlier chairs have been

insufficient. This cannot be repeated. It is also recommended that Professor Macias be made fully aware of the expectations of all relevant divisions of the University and all relevant constituencies of the Chavez Center. Organizational, curricular, and research expectations should be fully outlined. In particular, expectations of the need for his presence at the Center and at the UCLA campus generally should be clearly specified. We also recommend that the Dean's office develop a specific plan of programmatic, budgetary, and curricular support with Professor Macias as soon as he accepts the position. This plan should include a mentor, such as Professor Don Nakanishi of the Asian American Studies Center, to fully orient Professor Macias to the UCLA campus. It is the responsibility of the Dean's office to learn from its past history regarding the Center, and do everything possible to make sure that elements of this history are not repeated. It is recommended that this plan be made known to all members of the Chavez Center faculty for appropriate input.

It is also recommended that the Dean's office develop an alternative plan for the nationwide recruitment of a chair should the appointment of Professor Macias not be possible. The Dean's office should not wait to develop such a plan after it hears from Professor Macias. This plan should seek to identify the strongest candidate for this position and individuals from both inside UCLA and outside UCLA should be considered. The use of interim chairs must be stopped. It is unfair to UCLA, to the faculty of the Chavez Center, and to the students whose interests are tied to the Chavez Center to have such instability in leadership.

Junior Faculty. The CCCII currently has 4 untenured faculty members, representing four distinct disciplinary backgrounds and research interests (American Studies/Cultural Studies; Urban Planning, Sociolinguistics, and History). Three of the four were hired three years ago, and have already undergone their second-year review (conducted by then chair Guerin-Gonzalez); they are currently preparing their dossier for their fourth-year review. According to Chair Paredes, one of the four, Prof. Gaspar de Alva, may be recommended for an early tenure decision next year. Prof. Otto Santa Ana is currently on leave with a Ford Foundation postdoctoral fellowship.

These four untenured junior faculty members of the CCCII currently make up the majority of the CCCII faculty, and constitute four of the original six lines allocated to the Chavez Center. They represent clearly the core of the CCCII and the future of the program, its hope and its promise. Between them, they have assumed a large, if not major, responsibility for developing the undergraduate curriculum in Chicana/o Studies, to implement the new curriculum, and to teach its large new core introductory and other courses as well as the innovative new courses. They fully recognize their commitment to teaching and to student needs in general, as well as respond to community issues and needs. At the same time, they are fully aware of the institution's high expectations of their scholarship and research productivity, in line with all other assistant professors at UCLA, and fully intend to meet and even exceed these expectations.

Despite their diverse disciplinary training and degrees, they have clearly made a professional commitment to the interdisciplinary Chicana/o Studies field, and have staked their academic careers as Chicana/o Studies scholars. In the face of enormous leadership and senior faculty problems, they have kept the CCCII going. It is therefore incumbent upon UCLA and the CCCII senior faculty (including those jointly appointed) to nurture these young scholars, to mentor them professionally, socialize them into the field of Chicana/o Studies, in short, successfully guide them towards promotion and tenure in the Chavez Center. Without a successful retention effort of these junior faculty members in the CCCII, the program's future and its potential move towards departmental status will be seriously jeopardized.

As a group, the untenured faculty have expressed enormous optimism in the future of the Chavez Center, despite its turbulent beginning and unstable leadership situation, and great satisfaction in their work at the CCCII. At the same time, they have expressed great concern over their impending promotion and tenure in regards to both process and criteria.

The external review team is fully aware that much of this anxiety is common to all untenured faculty members. At the same time, the external reviewers wish to emphasize the fact that the CCCII untenured faculty face a unique set of circumstances not usually shared by their counterparts in more established and stable units: the unstable leadership situation which has essentially denied them consistent, strong, clear and necessary guidance over half of their careers (for three of the four); the extraordinary demands on junior faculty to develop the program and curriculum of a new major and minor (specialization); the higher than usual demand on their time and attention from students and the community. In addition, working in an interdisciplinary unit with a very small core faculty means that each works essentially in a research area by him/herself, has no other colleague let alone senior colleague who can truly relate to his/her work, appreciates and understands it, and can thus adequately and appropriately evaluate it.

Recommendation #3. Beyond the university and college's general guidelines and criteria for promotion and tenure, a specific set of procedures and criteria for CCCII untenured faculty should be drawn. We understand that Prof. Guerin-Gonzalez in her brief tenure as chair had drawn up a set of procedures for junior faculty in conjunction with their second-year review. This document should be located and built on, to include the fourth-year review and promotion and tenure review. The criteria should take into consideration the extraordinary and unique set of circumstances under which CCCII untenured faculty labor, take into consideration the explicitly interdisciplinary nature of their work, provide proper credit for unusual amounts of service to the unit, and factor in the disruption caused by the near absence of leadership from chair and senior faculty (this last directed not at any individual so much as the set of unfortunate circumstances that have beset the chairship and senior faculty). Creative approaches should be considered, such as possibly extending the tenure clock when warranted, giving greater credit to department service (particularly for program and curriculum development work), granting more release time in the remaining pre-tenure period. Great care must also be taken well

before promotion and tenure time to clearly spell out the nature of the candidate's work, where he/she expects to publish and otherwise disseminate research findings, who within and without the Chavez Center and UCLA will constitute the candidate's review committee, how and from whom to solicit external letters (given the interdisciplinary nature of the candidate's work as well as its significance to the field of Chicana/o Studies). These decisions and preparations should be undertaken in full consultation with the junior faculty, and with all relevant senior faculty affiliated with the Chavez Center (see section on "Joint Appointments and Collective Leadership for more recommendations related this issue). The Dean must sign off on these agreements to indicate his knowledge and approval.

Role of Joint Faculty in the CCCII. The founding document for the Chavez Center requires that joint faculty have a central role in all operations. In fact, half of the faculty directly affiliated with the Chavez Center must not be core faculty whose sole appointment is within the Center. The joint faculty, whose status is likely to be senior, can play a critical role in the establishment of a vision for the Center, assessment of junior faculty in fourth year and subsequent tenure reviews, and can contribute directly to further curricular development. Initial efforts to integrate joint faculty to the Chavez Center have been made.

Recommendation #4. We recommend that the Dean's office, together with the faculty of the Chavez Center, develop a strategic plan for the full integration of joint faculty into the operations of the Center. The Dean's office must provide incentives to potential joint faculty to meet and determine if they want to be affiliated with the Chavez Center. This can be done with as simple a gesture as hosting a brief retreat where this can be discussed. We recommend, however, that the Dean's office also develop an incentive structure to encourage faculty to affiliate with the Chavez Center. Absent incentives, faculty who choose to affiliate with the Center do so at the risk of limiting their responsibilities in their home departments and making only short-term commitments to the Center. We also see it as unreasonable for the Dean to expect faculty to affiliate with the Center simply out of their own good will. Lastly, the Implementation Committee of the Center should be officially disbanded.

Curriculum. Previous reports indicate that "the Program is a random collection of courses, a collection with no coherence, no depth" and without a lower division course, a theoretical course and a senior seminar. The Chavez Center for Interdisciplinary Instruction has most certainly gone a long way towards remedying these weaknesses. Specifically, both 10a and 10b are stable courses and 101, the theoretical course, is being taught again. Yet to be developed is the Senior Seminar, which we recommend that all majors take. While the responsibility of the introductory core courses were not shared among the core faculty, this situation seems to have been corrected. The shared responsibility of these courses among the core faculty is important for several reasons: it provides students an opportunity to know the core faculty and vice-versa; it provides core faculty, trained in an array of disciplines, the opportunity to be familiar with the foundations of thought within the field of Chicana/o Studies; and it spreads the

responsibility among the faculty of the larger classes. An important aspect of the instruction within the Center is its emphasis on rigor, critical thinking, and creativity. In addition, there is a stated commitment among faculty and a strong desire by the students for the curriculum to reflect a community and problem solving component. The academic objectives stated in the self-report reflect some important pedagogical values that will serve as the basis for further development of a clear, coherent curriculum tied to the Center's Mission. The Center faculty have begun many of these discussions, though again interrupted due to transitions in leadership, indicating its understanding of the importance of curricular coherence. Undoubtedly, these discussions will continue.

Recommendation #5. We recommend the following to aid in this process:

- a. As a way to aid in the development of a coherent curriculum and build on the expertise of faculty, adopt the proposed classifications of courses as described in the document "Chicana/o Studies UCLA: A Proposed Curriculum," developed by junior faculty. These categories are Preparation of the Major, Language, Research Methods, Foundation Courses, Caminos, Electives from Related Departments, Thesis, and Independent Study. We are particularly compelled by the coherence that the concept of caminos brings to the curriculum. These four caminos reflect the current expertise and strengths of the program: a) gender and sexuality, b) cultural studies, c) urban and community studies, and d) aesthetic practice. Defining the curriculum in terms of these tracks provides coherence and focus. At the same time, a comparison of courses within each track provides a basis to determine where courses and faculty need to be added.
- b. Consider amendment of the major along the lines described in the above mentioned document. The description of the major in this document reflects rigor and coherence and could become the basis for a well defined major which reflects the mission of the Center. It is also clearly laid out. In any event, a clearer description with a better layout is essential for the Chicana/Chicano Studies Major.
- c. Consider adding 10c to address both the faculty academic objectives and student needs. This third course in the introductory sequence could be designed specifically around issues of community problem solving or community action. Such a course could be designed to help students define a problem, develop research questions, gather information, assess that information, and provide a set of recommendations. This course could be a valuable mechanism to connect academic study and the needs of the communities from which these students originate. Such a course is consistent with the original intent of the Center and meets the student need for a relevant education.
- d. Establish connections with other units on campus such as the Labor Center or the Center for the Study of Urban Poverty to place students in meaningful internship experiences. Both of these Centers and the Asian American Studies Center can become the basis for development by the Caesar Chavez Center for the development of its own internship or field studies program.
- e. Seek funding and establish the Community Scholars Program as a way to enhance the university/community connection.

- f. Add an additional course in Research Methodology. No such course currently exists which reflects the methodological principles of Chicana/Chicano Studies. Again, a clear articulation of the discipline can be the basis for establishing these methodological principles. A joint effort among the faculty will go along way toward establishing the consensus necessary for the coherence of the program.
- g. Convert the specialization in Chicana and Chicano Studies to a minor.
- h. Since the term Chicana and Chicano Studies is clearly stated, it is important that the program reflect the study of the field of Chicana Studies. There are basic texts, a well-defined history, and a number of issues that comprise the field and should be reflected in all aspects of the program. Simply to state Chicana Studies is part of the curriculum is not to guarantee it. Again, it is important that all faculty share an understanding of the basics of Chicana and Chicano Studies. Similarly, gender equity among faculty should be sought and maintained.
- i. Improve the coordination and scheduling of classes. While flexibility should be allowed for faculty circumstances, there is still a need to spread the classes throughout the week and to establish the schedule in ample time for students to register for them. For example, many students register for classes for the fall in the previous spring quarter.

Shared Governance. Shared governance is a professed value at UCLA, and should be no less promoted at the Chavez Center. At the same time, its development at the CCCII has necessarily suffered with the unstable leadership at the chair and senior faculty level. Nevertheless, certain steps can now be taken to nurture and develop a sense of community and shared governance among all the faculty.

Recommendation #6. A set of by-laws were developed by the faculty during the brief tenure of Prof. Guerin-Gonzalez as chair. All but one of the faculty voted to approve it; the one was apparently absent and did not vote. We recommend that under the current chair, the faculty revisit these by-laws, make whatever necessary revisions, revote on acceptance, and begin to operate closely accordingly to these by-laws in order to build the process of collegiality, confidence, stability and shared governance. Developing a sense of genuine shared governance should also result in strengthening the position of the chair, thus paving the way for the incoming permanent chair to assume the position of leadership in as optimum a condition as possible. The by-laws as written and approved also clearly delineate the ways in which student participation and input in CCCII affairs are to be integrated. Thus by adhering to the by-laws, student demand for consistent and meaningful participation in CCCII affairs should also be satisfied. (See section on "Students".)

Departmental Status and Graduate Programs. The charter or founding document of the Chavez Center as a CII clearly allowed for the possibility of the CCCII eventually becoming a full-fledged department. Many if not all the faculty and students expressed a strong desire for moving eventually towards department status, although no one has insisted that it be accomplished immediately.

Recommendation #7. The Academic Senate or other appropriate governance body at UCLA should provide the CCCII chair and faculty the criteria as developed on this campus for petitioning for department status. These guidelines provided to the Chavez Center well in advance should help the CCCII in its own development plans should the faculty and students decide to move towards department status.

Similar guidelines if they exist for graduate programs (M.A., Ph.D., Certificate) should also be provided the CCCII faculty.

Student Issues and Needs. An impressive group of students, numbering 30-40, met with the reviewers and expressed strongly held and constructive comments towards strengthening the CCCII. The curricular concerns are discussed in the section on Curriculum in this report. Below are additional recommendations based on student views.

Recommendation #8. A central and attractive space should be found at the Chavez Center, with close proximity to faculty offices, to create a student lounge. Students expressed a great need for such a space to build community and relationships with each other and with the faculty, and to enhance the visibility of the Chavez Center at the UCLA campus, as well as provide a physical site for the community to identify with the CCCII. Many students expressed grave concern about the lack of visibility of the Chavez Center on campus as well as in the community, and felt that such a lounge will go a long way towards addressing these concerns and needs.

The students expressed great appreciation for the advising they receive from the one staff person assigned to that task. Not all of them avail themselves of faculty academic advising and mentoring, apparently because the CCCII currently does not require that all majors and minors (specialization) be assigned a faculty advisor. Thus we recommend that as soon as possible, the current chair assign all majors and minors evenly across the core faculty (bringing in joint faculty if necessary and if willing). This will take some of the load off the staff advisor, but more importantly, it recognizes the unique nature of faculty mentoring on academic, career and graduate school issues that cannot be adequately performed by staff. It will further bring students and core faculty closer together, building a stronger sense of community in the Chavez Center between faculty and students. The two kinds of advising—staff and faculty—should not overlap, but rather, complement each other.

Recommendation #9. We recommend that the chair adhere to the approved by-laws as a means to integrate student participation and input into CCCII affairs in a more consistent and meaningful way. (See section on “Governance” for more on this issue.)

Staff Relations. There has clearly been a turbulent history between some of the chairs and some current core faculty and staff. The situation was too complicated and convoluted for the review team to assess fully. However, it is clear to the review team that some of the relationships will not improve without intervention. Staff-faculty tension only adds to the many urgent issues that the CCCII must seek to resolve quickly. It should not be

allowed to fester and further complicate the environment for the new chair, who should invest his/her energies and attention on more substantive matters.

Recommendation #10. We recommend that the current chair work immediately with the appropriate university personnel office to examine and resolve relations between staff and faculty. A faculty-staff workshop with a trained facilitator may be a good way to start the building of a new relationship. The functioning of the Chavez Center can be greatly enhanced with a competent staff who has a positive relationship with the chair and faculty. Again, constructive relationships will pave the way for the new chair to step into an environment at the Chavez Center where he/she will not have to expend valuable energy dealing with these issues.

Final Revision: November 3, 1997