The Chicano Studies (CS) Program at Cerritos College (California) is administratively recognized but instructionally dependent, with courses offered through four of the college's divisions. Pressure has been brought to bear by the Citizens' Resource Committee to grant the program administrative autonomy, a separate instructional budget, and a full-time Coordinator. This study examines the reorganizational needs of the CS program in light of these demands and the college situation. Employment trends of part-time and full-time CS instructors and instructor turnover rates were analyzed. A comparison of part-time instructor attrition in regular and CS sections of the same courses revealed that both exceeded the 33 percent limit regarded as essential for program stability. A descriptive survey of 10 urban community colleges with CS programs in California was conducted; three programs were administratively autonomous, half had independent budgets, and all 10 reported that most classes were taught by full-time faculty. On the basis of the findings, employment of a full-time Coordinator, full-time faculty, and central budget coordination are recommended, but administrative autonomy is not recommended. A review of the literature is included. (BB)
ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATIONAL NEEDS IN CHICANO STUDIES AT CERRITOS COLLEGE

BY
KEITH A. HINRICHSEN, M.A.
CERRITOS COLLEGE

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY
APRIL 25, 1975
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Problem</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Problem Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Problem</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications of Related Research on the Study</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHOD</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the Instruments</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and Recommendations</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table | Description | Page
---|---|---
1 | Number of CS sections and percentage of instructor turnover by classes, Spring 1971-Fall 1974 | 17
2 | Comparable part-time instructor turnover rate for classes with both regular and CS sections, Spring 1971-Fall 1974 | 17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty teaching in CS day program</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty teaching in CS evening program</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

"Voices today emerging from the ethnic community speak with a self-righteous criticism, a bitter alienation toward the dominant society and a zealous morality about the validity of their expressed views (Cabrera, 1972, p. 51)." Intervening years may have partly dulled the "bitter alienation" alluded to by Cabrera, but there is no denying that "self-righteous criticism" of the dominant majority utilizing "zealous morality" is still characteristic of the ethnic studies movement.

Within the last five years all ethnic studies programs have undergone considerable internal and external re-evaluation concerning both goals and programs. Discussion has largely centered around two problems inherent in all minority studies programs, academic integrity of the curriculum and administrative direction of the program.

It is not the purpose of this study to analyze whether Chicano Studies curriculums are educationally valid, but how they should be organized; not whether there should be a Chicano Studies administrator, but what his responsibilities should be if there is one; not whether there is need for budgetary re-evaluation, but what directions this should take.

Evaluation of the organizational needs of Chicano Studies from an administrative point of view is seldom undertaken. It is assumed, educationally, that once a program is instituted it will evolve according to plan. As Pennsylvania’s State Department of Education re-affirmed in 1971, administration at the two year college level needs to be more sensitive in both identifying and selecting students who might have a chance for academic success. They cited that financial limitations, emotional
Instability, and lack of academic motivation directly caused the considerable attrition most minority students, as "high risk" disadvantaged, face educationally. The disadvantaged student entering college, it was pointed out, often took as much of a risk financially and emotionally as the institution did academically (p. 14).

Five recommendations concerning Chicano Studies development in higher education were submitted to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education of the California State Legislature by Lopez and Enos (1972). Their report may have been somewhat biased in stressing the need for Chicano Studies, but is certainly worth considering. Among the things they requested the Legislature do was to require that all administrative heads at the college level endorse Chicano Studies courses and programs; set up state wide advisory committees at every level of higher education; develop Chicano Studies courses and maintain faculty awareness of the need for them; require Chicano Studies courses for state certification at all instructional levels; and mandate that every public institution of higher education in the state establish a minimal Chicano Studies curriculum.

Basic to the organizational needs of all ethnic studies programs are questions each college must ask. Should it start an autonomous program or simply develop a variety of inter-related curriculums?, Should it grant the minority studies program separate identity, or integrate it into existing departments and divisions? Should it create a distinct administrative head for the program, or let existing department and division chairmen administer the program? Does it need separate financing, and financing independent of present national and state funding programs?

The answers to these and other administratively related questions should not obscure the primary reason for setting up all ethnic studies
programs, especially Chicano Studies. Negrete (1973) expressed this reason when he said, "Freedom of choice in ethnic and cultural identity is a cornerstone of Chicano Studies. Chicano Studies motivates students to learn about the world while simultaneously experiencing self-discovery (p. 7)."

As Cheeves pointed out as far back as 1969 during the inception of the Mexican-American Studies movement, "The Anglo needs to understand and appreciate his Mexican-American neighbor better. This factor alone is sufficient justification for Mexican-American Studies in the junior and senior colleges (p. 10)."

**The Problem**

On July 7, 1970, interested citizens, identifying themselves as Chicano residents of the Cerritos College District attended a Board of Trustees meeting and requested the creation of an autonomous Mexican-American Studies Department for the Fall Semester, 1970. The Board took the motion under consideration, and directed the College's administrative staff to work with this ad hoc citizens' group.

A series of meetings were held from mid July through August, 1970. Consultants from local state colleges also appeared, and confusion as to requests resulted.

By mid August, 1970, this ad hoc Chicano citizens' group, now constituted into a Board of Trustees recognized Citizens' Resource Committee (CRC) expressed great displeasure with the "run-around" they claimed they were getting. It became clear to all concerned that a fully developed Mexican-American Studies (MAS) program by the Fall, 1970, was an impossibility. A compromise was reached. A very limited number of current courses and Community Service offerings were tried this semester, with
the program officially commencing during the Spring, 1971.

A number of requests and accusations were exchanged by the two elements on the CRC during this Fall Semester. The Chicano members had requested an autonomous department at the November, 1970, Board meeting which was tabled until January, 1971. During December, 1970, the Chicano chairman of the committee requested a full department with chairman and staff in the Humanities Division, and with the President and Board representatives sitting as ex officio members on the committee. Further requests were made for more Spanish-speaking counselors and instructors.

At a very emotionally overcharged Administrative Council session on January 8, 1971, the College’s President intoned that the institution was facing its most serious administrative and instructional crisis to date. It was decided to nominate a certificated Humanities Division instructor of Puerto Rican descent to be the part-time co-ordinator of the upcoming MAS program. Disregarding the CRC’s request entirely, the program was begun on this limited basis in February, 1971.

During the Summer, 1971, screening procedures for part-time MA staff positions were decided upon. Contravening Chicano requests, it was decided to follow faculty recommendations that the CRC be limited to nominating applicants and advising the divisions on curriculum development.

In December, 1971, it was finally decided by the Board of Trustees that the MAS Co-ordinator would have a portion of his load involved with programs associated with aid to minority and disadvantaged students. State and federal monies were not available to fund a full-time co-ordinator in MAS.

Throughout 1972-73, the MAS program, by now renamed Chicano Studies (CS) (1973), continued to request more staff and a full-time co-ordinator.
An intern was hired during this period to help in program development and recruitment.

Specific Problem Areas

The general goal of this study was to synthesize the requests and analyze the feasibility of implementing the CRC's administrative recommendations with regard to budgetary contingencies and existing departmental-divisional alignments.

Specifically, this study examined: (1) whether current instructional innovations with interdepartmental-divisional curriculum scheduling should be extended to include an interdivisional curriculum under an autonomous CS Department; (2) whether existing divisional budget formats needed to be revised to include specific CS capital outlay and supply budget items, or whether this department should assume complete financial autonomy; and (3) whether it is philosophically and practically desirable to grant the CS Co-ordinator full-time status to work on administrative, staffing, programming and recruiting needs inherent in this program.

Significance of the Problem

As of this date, the Chicano CRC has made three major recommendations for granting greater autonomy to the CS Department. Added to their initial 1970 demand for departmental-divisional administrative autonomy were 1974 requests for a separate instructional budget, and for a full-time CS Co-ordinator.

Since the College's administrative staff has chosen not to grant the advisory group's request in these three critical areas of governance, and since the department requested one full-time CS instructor with both inter and intra-divisional teaching loads for 1975-76, a potential conflict of allegiance and administrative supervision has arisen.
Above all, if the College granted the request for full-time Chicano instructors, and decided not to provide the ancillary administrative support generally assumed with separate departmental status, further explanation as to why such a decision was reached is needed for all areas of the campus associated with the program.

Assumptions

This study of CS re-organizational needs had three basic assumptions relative to Cerritos College.

First, that a full-time co-ordinator would not be approved by our current administrative staff because it would be easier to divide the individual's load with Economic Opportunity Program supervision as at present.

Second, that departmental autonomy would not be accorded based upon past events and intimations. This initial request of the Chicano community no longer appeared to be a primary consideration.

Third, that full-time Chicano Studies faculty would be hired, if enough classes were available to constitute a full instructional load (15 units). It also appeared likely that faculty would be expected to teach in a multitude of related disciplines, and across divisional lines.

Limitations

Two unexpected problems have emerged from this study relative to outside source guidelines.

First, the initial survey of related literature has proven to be a great disappointment. Very little has been written on the community college level concerning CS organizational goals and needs. What little there is in ERIC and other journal sources relates more to curriculum than to governance, although the two are not mutually exclusive. Much of
the literature is localized in individual district resource files, or patterned after Black Studies programs which usually preceded CS programs on most campuses.

Second, the select descriptive survey of neighboring community colleges has reinforced what was already expected. Each community college district, indeed each campus, has organized their programs differently. Existing curriculum offerings appeared to be subsumed under existing divisional alignments, and there are, at present, no organizational trends which can be discerned.

Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that: (1) Cerritos College will continue to administer the CS program through existing divisions, with a co-ordinator responsible for student and staff recruiting, and for curriculum recommendations, rather than create an autonomous CS Department; (2) future full-time faculty in CS will continue to face the part-timer's dilemma of divided allegiances between division and CS offices, responsible to neither completely; (3) CS budgets within existing divisions will continue to be largely a divisional concern instructionally, although closer co-operation between division chairmen and the CS Co-ordinator should result, and (4) the divided job classification for the CS Co-ordinator will continue for budgetary reasons rather than reflect curriculum needs for a full-time co-ordinator.

Definition of Terms

Administrative Council, Cerritos College. The College's highest administrative body, composed of the President, Vice Presidents of Instruction and Business Services; Deans of Academic Affairs, Community Services, Student Personnel Services, and Vocational Education; and
Chairman of the Faculty Senate. The Council formulates agenda submitted to the Board of Trustees.

Citizens' Resources Committee, Initially an ad hoc community advisory committee, now a legally constituted advisory committee to the administration and Board. The Dean of Academic Affairs, CS Co-ordinator, faculty, students and community representatives meet once a month.

Chicano Studies (Mexican-American Studies). An administratively recognized but instructionally dependent (upon existing division practices) ethnic studies program leading to an A.A. degree. At present there are four required and ten recommended courses in the curriculum.

Chicano Studies Co-ordinator. As constituted in 1971, approximately one-third of this full-time (12 months) certificated person's program load was to be devoted to supervising the Chicano Studies Program; that is, to recommend courses to the divisions, to evaluate staff needs, to relate budgetary needs to the divisions involved, and to counsel students.

Division-Department Relationships-Chicano Studies. At present, Cerritos College has four divisions which provide course offerings in the CS program: Humanities Division; English, Speech and Spanish Departments; Social Science Division: History, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology Departments; Fine Arts Division: Art Department; Health-Physical Education-Recreation Division: Recreation Department. Full program autonomy now resides within these four divisions.

Released Time-Administrative Increment. With fifteen teaching units constituting a full-time certificated instructor's load, released time for co-ordination duties are usually calculated in multiples of three unit blocks. The Administrative Increment is a percentage over-and-above the administrator's regular salary placement to cover responsibil-
ities not adequately compensated for otherwise.

**Select Community College Survey-Chicano Studies.** Ten community colleges in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Ventura Counties were selected based on the following catalog criteria: courses in CS leading to an A.A. Degree, independent departmental status, or an acknowledged administrator. (one or more criteria)

**Review of Related Literature**

After three searches of ERIC files and related periodical educational literature, one conclusion is unavoidable. Considerable information is available about the need for special bicultural and bilingual education, some literature is available on CS curriculums in higher education, but almost nothing has been written relative to the topic of CS governance patterns.

Certainly the most applicable study for the CS program at Cerritos College was Negrete's (1973) report submitted to the Rio Hondo Board of Trustees. Since Cerritos was the primary parent institution in the development of Rio Hondo, common social, educational, and economic conditions exist. Typically, Negrete's proposal for a midway Chicano Studies Center leading to an eventually autonomous CS Department has run into many of the same pitfalls as at Cerritos.

Acuna's article in *La Raza* (1973) was a literate and argumentative pronouncement on the Chicano's self conceived needs for CS programs, written in a style that he has made particularly his own. Cheeve's graduate study (1969) on MAS was badly outdated, but does contain interesting commentary on the duplicity and intransigence of college administrators who create these CS programs. This latter study, perhaps naïve today, was
interesting more for what it leaves unsaid in implications.

Lopez and Enos (1972) have compiled an exhaustive report for the California State Legislature relative to Chicano educational needs. Although the study was primarily an overview of existing programs, it did make a strong case for separate LS departments because of the inbred resistance of traditional academe toward their needs.

Lopez claimed ethnic self consciousness was a necessary step in biculturalization. Crouchett (1973) carried this theme even further, tracing biculturalization in education back to colonial times, refuting those who claim the movement toward ethnic studies is modern.

Both of Franc's articles (1972) dealt only superficially with CS programs. Interestingly, in discussing the need to train Chicanos for public administration managerial positions, Franc noted that administrators of CS programs were often the most assimilated of the educationally oriented Chicanos, and yet were the most vocal in emphasizing the need to teach special Chicano culture in their programs.

Green and Hernandez (1974) found little enrollment inequity in ethnic studies programs due to the ethnic background of the counselors. While their study was fairly inconclusive, it did provide an update on the sorry state of CS literature at the community college level.

Both Ballesteros (1972) and Mech (1972) analyzed aspects of testing and placement of Chicanos in CS programs. The implication Mech posed was that Chicanos can do better in their own programs academically (in contrast to Negroes), while Ballesteros adamantly insisted that what was needed were more evaluative standards for Chicano performance in all programs.

Cabrera's article (1972) assessed the complacency of existing college faculties toward minority studies in general. Faculties seem to either
question the academic pretensions of the program, the need, or the
instructional methods. Above all, they are suspicious of pro-
grams cutting across traditional-departmental lines.

Buschetto and Arciniega (1972) upheld the controversial Coleman
thesis that family and peer environment, not the schools, mold minority
student educational patterns. They did, however, make a strong case for
group equality as the best way of permitting the individual to realize
less inequality of achievement. Perhaps this group equality would be
enhanced by CS courses, although the implication was not clear.

Both the Arizona (1969) and Pennsylvania (1971) State Department of
Education studies pointed accusing fingers at district administrators who
don't find the necessary funds to support minority study programs after
conceiving them. As might be expected, both studies were far too general
to provide effective organizational guidelines for this study.

Bengetdorf (1972) and Kroepsch-Thompson (1973) were primarily inter-
ested in national bibliographic listings for CS programs, not especially
helpful for the California community colleges. Fernandez (1970) did
relate more specific curriculum patterns in the California community col-
leges, but failed to analyze the governance patterns inherent in these
CS programs.

Finally, Benitez (1973), Lara-Braud (1969), the Santa Barbara Plan
(1971) and Palomares (1971) emphasized bicultural, bilingual educational
solutions in curriculum matters rather than governance of CS programs.

Implications of Related Research on the Study

The paucity of literature dealing with organization and governance
of CS on the community college level led to two inevitable conclusions.

First, the programs which have been created have not been fully
analyzed, or, if they have been, records have been kept in district files.

Second, because CS followed the inception of Black Studies programs, most of the curriculum and certainly most all of the administrative patterns of, CS programs emulated Black Studies ventures. The result was that few have deemed CS worthy of analyzing once a program has been created.

The need for CS, and its essential curriculum have been discussed, in part, but there has been almost nothing written about the program’s internal and external governance. Most programs are, understandably, in the formative stages, so more hopefully may be forthcoming by way of critiques as programs mature.

Method

Procedure

In order to examine the feasibility of implementing the above-mentioned purposes, six procedural investigations were conducted.

Since the CS program has emerged as a synthesis between administrative Council and CRC viewpoints, a search of the College’s minutes and records for both bodies relative to the emergence of a MAS program was carried out.

Interviews were conducted with three other division chairmen involved with CS programs to determine the degree of difficulty in administrative supervision involved in the current CS program where part-time staff teach in different divisions and are responsible to at least two administrative offices.

Comparisons of full-time and part-time faculty employed in CS curriculums for the four year period were made to determine if there were demonstrable trends to support the co-ordinator’s claim that more full-
time staff were needed to provide program stability.

Since the College has presumably had a high turn-over in part-time Chicano instructors since 1971, a search of divisional records was made to determine the reasons for this problem. Whenever possible, reasons given for terminating a teaching contract with the part-time instructor, or the instructor's decision to seek employment elsewhere were considered. The part-time CS instructors attrition rate was contrasted with that for part-time instructors teaching in traditional sections of comparable courses.

A survey was taken of administrative organizational placement of CS at select community colleges in Southern California. Comparative trends in program autonomy versus departmental integration, full versus part-time co-ordinators and faculty, and responsibility for Budgeting and staffing were analyzed.

A literature review search was conducted to ascertain whether any organizational patterns for CS programs have emerged.

Development of the Instruments

Important on-campus instruments of evaluation were the records of the Chicano Studies Co-ordinator. An in-depth listing of semester and yearly reports on the progress and limitations of the program, correspondence, and calculations on instructor turn-over and enrollment projections provided a picture of Cerritos' situation.

Records from the Humanities and Social Science Divisions provided most of the information on the comparative attrition (turn-over) rates for part-time CS and traditional section instructors. Dictionary of Class Schedules for each of the eight semesters were used, and when necessary, individual teaching assignments were consulted. All instructors who taught at least once in either program for comparable courses
were listed beginning with the Spring Semester, 1971. If the individual was no longer employed, not teaching in this course area during the Fall Semester, 1974, or had not been on the staff for at least two consecutive semesters preceding the Fall, 1974, they were considered as having been terminated for the purposes of this comparative study.

The ten Southern California community colleges polled in the select survey were chosen because of their CS curriculums, their tendency to consider CS as a separate program of studies, and their tendency to represent certain key geographic urban areas with known concentrations of Chicanos. Although catalogs were examined for over twenty-five colleges, only ten seemed to either have programs which might give direction to Cerritos College, or were not themselves influenced directly by the existing Cerritos program. The survey was divided into three basic question areas relating to Cerritos College re-organizational needs (Appendix "A"). Answer "a" in each question was intended to separate those institutions which have co-ordinator/chairman, autonomous curriculums, or separate budgets for their CS programs from those which don't.

Results

Administrative Council minutes proved to be little help in ascertaining the reasoning behind administrative decisions concerning CS. In most instances, an outline narrative summarized the discussion since votes were not recorded.

Records of CRC undertakings were more helpful. Presentations to the Board of Trustees, community directives, and guidelines for the governance of the Program comprised the nucleus of historical information.

Interviews with division chairmen relative to administrative diffi-
cultures inherent in existing CS curriculums proved enlightening. Two of the divisions with limited programs (two courses) had not experienced instructor turn-over and had no scheduling problems with the CS office. In the case of both the Humanities and Social Science Divisions, the latter chaired by the author, problems concerning administrative split authority have emerged. A general agreement has evolved between these two chairmen and the CS Co-ordinator. The division, or respective department, screen all CS teaching candidates, and are responsible for basic curriculum. The CS Co-ordinator recommends dismissal of part-time staff if program compatibility is threatened, but must find an acceptable academic replacement if the course is to be offered. Legal administrative supervision resides with the division chairmen; the CS Co-ordinator being a source person for teaching candidates, and an advisor to both students and the curriculum.

Within the CS program, full-time certificated staff (mostly non-Chicános) peaked for the evening courses during the Spring, 1971, and the following semester for the day sections. In both instances, nine sections were covered in this manner (Figures 1 and 2).

The part-time staff situation has oscillated with changing course offerings. The evening program has been dominated by this group since the Fall, 1971. Again in the Fall, 1973, twelve sections were taught by part-timers. Since the day program has been cut back periodically, no discernable trends are evident (Figure 1).

The attrition (turn-over) rate for all instructors in the CS program was considered in Table 1. Generally, faculty turn-over of 33.3% is considered grounds for concern by the college. Two history courses (History 27 being required), Political Science 5 (also required), and
Figure 1. Faculty teaching in C.S. Day Program.

Figure 2. Faculty teaching in C.S. Evening Program.
### TABLE 1

NUMBER OF C.S. SECTIONS AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTRUCTOR TURNOVER BY CLASSES
SPRING 1971 - FALL 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art 11(6)</th>
<th>Engl 1</th>
<th>Engl 25</th>
<th>Engl 50.1</th>
<th>Engl 50.2</th>
<th>HPER 42.3</th>
<th>Hist 27</th>
<th>Hist 30</th>
<th>Pol Sci 5</th>
<th>Pol Sci 7</th>
<th>Psyc Soc 1</th>
<th>Soc 1</th>
<th>Span 1</th>
<th>Span 21</th>
<th>Span 45</th>
<th>Spch 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Semesters Run</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Day Sections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Evening Sections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Turnovers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Turnovers</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 24 turnovers in 117 sections, 20.5%

### TABLE 2

COMPARABLE PART-TIME INSTRUCTOR TURNOVER RATE
FOR CLASSES WITH BOTH REGULAR AND C.S. SECTIONS
SPRING 1971 - FALL 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engl 1</th>
<th>Span 1</th>
<th>Spch 1</th>
<th>Hist 27</th>
<th>Pol Sci 5</th>
<th>Psyc Soc 1</th>
<th>Soc 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Sections</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psychology 1 (required for transfer students) met or exceeded this rate. These offerings are all in the Social Science Division where full-time CS staffing has been requested by the CS Co-ordinator.

Comparative turn-over rates for part-time instructors in classes with both CS and regular sections proved inconclusive (Table 2). As was indicated in the Methods section, part-time instructor attrition was calculated after initial employment started by whether the instructor continued to teach in that tract for the duration of the survey period. Only in CS Speech 1 and Sociology 1 were there no part-time instructor turn-overs, and the instructor in Sociology 1 has continued for the entire four year period. In every other subject the combined attrition rate exceeded the one third turn-over rate guideline alluded to above.

The resulting turn-over of certificated part-time staff was examined and accounted for. Of the twenty-one part-time CS instructors terminated from the Spring 1971, through the Fall, 1974: four acquired teaching positions; two went on to co-ordinate CS programs elsewhere; three returned to graduate school; two on loan from a state university's CS Department quit; four accepted employment in non-related areas; four were administratively dismissed; one was replaced by a full-timer, who desired to teach the course; and one died.

The select survey of CS organizational patterns at ten community colleges (Appendix "A") indicated that 60% (6) of their programs had a co-ordinator or chairman, equally divided between full-time and part-time status. Of the six responding that they had a designated administrative head, only two provided an additional salary increment. CS curriculums were integrated into existing departmental/divisional alignments in 70% (7) of the cases, but split equally as to who on the division/department
level, was responsible for curriculum and staffing. Two indicated that an outside source, higher administration, made these decisions. Nine (90%) indicated that they had faculty whose primary teaching assignment was in CS. The respondents split equally on the question of program autonomy in budgeting. Five (50%) whose CS departments were financially dependent all indicated that their budgets were integrated into divisional accounts.

As was mentioned earlier under Limitations in the Introduction, literature-review searches failed to provide either distinctive organizational trends or governance patterns that could provide direction for Cerritos College.

Discussion

It is difficult to positively assess the future status of CS administration and remain optimistic. The lack of meaningful guidelines or adaptable governance patterns puts the full responsibility for what each college does squarely on the shoulders of the highest level administrators. If they move decisively and humanistically when problems arise relative to CS, many of the bifurcated administrative dilemmas outlined in this study could be avoided.

Of the authors cited, Cabrera (1972) was the most pessimistic when he warned, "I do not see significant change coming through spontaneous intervention of educational administrators. I do not see too much hope for meaningful alteration as a result of governmentally approved and funded programs (p. 6)." As blunt as his assessment was, he did more than simply condemn. All involved in setting-up non-traditional, often dogmatically aggressive CS programs have experienced the dodgeful art of administrative "buck-passing." Community college administrators may not
be the "academic cowards" William Moore Jr. contended in Blind Man on a Freeway, but there is no denying that they often prefer indecision as the course of least resistance when controversial issues such as CS arise.

There are times when the only logical and educationally viable thing for an educator to do is equivocate, diplomatically of course! Far too often, however, when governance patterns can be reassessed without traumatic consequences to any one, administrators still do what Cabrera (1972) accused them of when he said, "A multitude of educators in the public schools and universities are either contrary, consciously indifferent, or totally dormant on issues of education for the Mexican-American. (p. 7)."

But to end this study with such an accusation would be unfair to those administrators who have borne patiently the intransigence and changing goals of the ethnic community. It would also be counterproductive.

The one incontrovertible message this study has for Cerritos College is that we are running behind sister institutions in the hiring of Chicanos and CS staff members on a full-time basis. Part of the reason for this, ironically, is that Cerritos is also in the vanguard in CS curriculum trends. At the start of the program at Cerritos College mostly full-time faculty were involved. As the program evolved through separatist and integrationist counter trends in attitudinal philosophy, many became disillusioned and returned to the traditional curriculum. Some full-time Chicano instructors, or those with bilingual abilities, have declined to teach in the CS program. The college also has an admitted dearth of Spanish surname faculty in key curriculum areas, such as in the Social Sciences, because there has been no hiring in some disciplines for over ten years. It was inevitable that Cerritos face this situation when
the Chicano community's ascending educational aspirations became vocal and clashed with the institution's full-time instructor quota freeze. Few deny that the stability of CS, or any program, would be enhanced if more full-time instructors could be hired.

The turnover rate for CS part-timers is high, as Table 2 delineated, but frankly no higher than for other sections which part-timers teach in comparable courses. In many instances, job security for CS part-timers exceeds that for regular section part-timers, as in the basic English program, due to changing enrollments, curriculum changes, and vagaries in full-time staff teaching preferences. For the most part, these unforeseen scheduling variables affect regular section part-timers more drastically than CS part-timers, and make percentage comparisons difficult, statistical analyses meaningless.

Few would deny the conclusions Lopez and Enos (1972) reached in their report to the California State Legislature. As they implied, "This body of knowledge (CS) must be built from within. That is, it must be constructed primarily by Chicanos in order to have the intellectual integrity that is critical to provide a basis for understanding . . . the cultural matrix of Chicanos (p. 55)."

Rather than continue to belabor such inequities in the existing organizational system at Cerritos College, this study would be remiss if other alternatives were not discussed.

The first necessity is to restructure educational attitudes concerning administrative needs of both the CS program and the Chicano student. Ballesteros (1972) dealt primarily with the need to reassess admission, placement and performance standards for Chicano students. When he emphasized, "What was needed is not fewer standards, but better standards (p. 1),"
he unwittingly touched upon, the biggest dilemma faced in organizing any ethnic studies program. These 'better standards' may very well have to be different standards.

Negrete (1973) assumed as much in giving his report to the Board of Trustees of a sister institution, Rio Hondo College. His plea for an unique interdisciplinary, integrated approach was succinctly realistic and prophetically sensible. All colleges with ethnic studies programs would be wise to heed his words:

Current and planned courses in Chicano Studies reflect an unsynchronized scrambled evolvement. This unsystematic approach leads to a wide dispersion of responsibility for the quality and direction of Chicano Studies. Chicano Studies belongs to all departments, it belongs to no department. There is a clear need for emphasis in co-ordination and direction for the commencement of a viable Chicano Studies program (p. 18).

Conclusions and Recommendations

Campus trends, developments in other minority study programs, and the realities of administrative and budgetary governance necessities at Cerritos College have very much influenced these recommendations. The absence of clear-cut guidelines in institutional governance of other CS programs at local community colleges would tend to force this study's recommendations back upon our district's requirements and resources.

Present institutional momentum toward integration of CS courses within existing departmental offerings should be continued. The survey of local institutions at least substantiated this trend.

If CS at Cerritos does not become organizationally autonomous, more full-time instructors must be found to present the program's curriculum. Where program growth within existing divisions permit, new staff with specialization in ethnic or minority studies should be hired, with special care taken to insure that minimal academic requirements are main-
tained. The latter is imperative because it seems inevitable that a portion of the instructional load will have to be in traditional courses.

Existing budgetary restraints placed upon the CS program need to be re-evaluated. The co-ordinator needs to be the first resource person each division turns to relative to CS courses. A much closer screening of part-time personnel needs to be undertaken by BOTH the co-ordinator and departmental screening committee. The Dean of Academic Affairs should have all information provided by the co-ordinator respecting Chicano staffing requests to best evaluate the total needs of the college. Existing budgetary formats now permit special interdivisional budget items for campus-wide programs, such as Audio Visual, to be first submitted to that office. The same needs to be done for those divisions with CS offerings. The co-ordinator would have a much clearer idea of what each division is requesting, and could make recommendations on how to better utilize limited instructional monies and minimize duplication of effort.

It is recommended that CS utilizing this integrated curriculum approach be accorded a full-time co-ordinator with 60% released time for supervision, and with 40% (two classes) devoted to instruction within the program. The co-ordinator must be certificated, and if the program merits, a 10% administrative increment could be granted. At present this seems unnecessary. This ten month contract would match the major instructional demands now found in the program. During the summer months (two), the co-ordinator could either be granted 100% released time for administration of this and other recruiting programs, or teach summer session with the 20% contract offered to full-time faculty.
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Dear Colleague,

Please pardon the informality of this inquiry, but a form letter survey seemed the most expeditious way of handling this situation.

According to the most recent catalog we have on file from your institution, a Chicano or Mexican-American Studies program is part of your curriculum.

An administrative problem has arisen at Cerritos College relative to our Chicano Studies program, and it is hoped your response will provide us with some direction.

1. a) Does your Chicano or Mexican-American Studies program (CS, MAS) have a co-ordinator or chairman? YES 6 NO 4.
   b) If you do, is the position FULL-TIME 3 or PART-TIME 3. (I presume some teaching units may be included within the job description)
   c) Does your chairman or co-ordinator receive an administrative increment? YES 2 NO 4.

2. a) Regarding the curriculum described in your catalog, is the instructional program in CS or MAS autonomous of existing departmental-divisional alignments? YES 3 NO 7.
   b) If 'NO' who is initially responsible for curriculum and staffing?
      DEPARTMENTS 3 DIVISIONS 2 OTHER 2.
   c) Are most of your CS or MAS classes taught by PART-TIME 0 or FULL-TIME 10 faculty.
   d) Do you have any full time instructors whose primary teaching load is in CS or MAS? YES 9 NO 1.

3. a) Does your college permit the CS or MAS program to budget for its own instructional and supply needs? YES 5 NO 5.
   b) If not, are budgetary itemizations handled within existing departmental-divisional accounts? YES 5 NO 0.

On behalf of the administrative staff and Chicano Studies Co-ordinator at Cerritos, many thanks,

Sincerely,

Keith A. Hinrichsen
Chairman, Social Sciences

Person responding
Position
College