

The
model ins
pare that
tion in the
the central
either jun
universit

The
with data

The
three ITV
origin, ne
communicat
cedures, c

Twelve
in the st
did each c
selected <

ABSTRACT

THE OPERATION OF THREE INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION CONSORTIA IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By

Guy Earl Warner

The purpose of this study was to construct from the literature a model instructional television consortium for higher education and to compare that model with three ITV consortia now in operation in higher education in the State of California. The consortia selected are located from the central to the northern portions of the State and are comprised of either junior and community colleges, or junior, community colleges and universities in the California State system.

The case study method was used in investigating the three consortia, with data drawn from interviews and available consortia documents.

The ITV consortium model and the subsequent investigations of the three ITV consortia concentrated on the following areas: consortium origin, needs and goals, intra-consortium cooperation, intra-consortium communication, finances, ITV teachers, registration and promotion procedures, delivery systems, and course and consortium evaluation.

Twenty questions are formulated, the answers to which were sought in the study. They were: (1) With whom, and under what circumstances did each consortium originate? (2) What methods of implementation were selected for each consortium? (3) What were the originally determined

needs and

(5) What

stitutions

How was a

visions re

methods of

means of

offerings

selected?

(15) How d

receive or

promote to

systems,

(19) What

method, r

of each

Co

Consorti

highest

degree

ture su

coopera

consort

period

ture,

tion c

Q 121027
 needs and goals? (4) By what process were needs and goals determined? (5) What methods were used to gain cooperation among participating institutions? (6) Along what lines was each consortium organized? (7) How was authority distributed within each consortium? (8) How were decisions reached? (9) What terms of membership were selected? (10) What methods of communication were used among consortium members? (11) What means of financing each consortium were chosen? (12) How were course offerings determined? (13) From what courses were televised courses selected? (14) How were television teachers selected and compensated? (15) How did students enroll in televised courses? (16) How did students receive credit for televised courses? (17) What means were derived to promote televised courses to the public? (18) What delivery system, or systems, were selected to make televised courses available to students? (19) What method, or methods, of course evaluation were used? (20) What method, or methods, of evaluation were selected to determine the success of each consortium?

Conclusions and recommendations arising from the study were: (1) Consortia which originate at the administrative level, and preferably the highest possible level, of educational institutions appear to enjoy a high degree of administrative involvement and support; (2) although the literature suggests that educational crises provide the most fertile ground for cooperation among institutions of higher education, it appears that ITV consortia can be organized and become viable, at least for a limited period of time, apart from crises conditions; (3) contrary to the literature, the study demonstrated that ITV consortia which lack legal organization can apparently function as efficiently as those which have drawn-up

legal agree

the direct

from normal

those with

representa

tions, or

basis, pre

gevity and

penses and

should con

should est

or lease

and adequ

ed and an

ed at tre

laws--to

ally agr

their d

livery s

and cab

ing cap

evaluati

and the

insure

nifica

course

legal agreements of organization; (4) ITV consortia which are led by full-time directors, or by those who have significant amounts of released time from normal institutional duties, appear to function more smoothly than those with directors who have little or no released time; (5) consortium representatives should be selected on the basis of agreed-upon qualifications, or should undergo an indoctrination process; (6) a stable financial basis, preferably combining state and local monies, is essential to longevity and efficient consortium operation; (7) in order to hold down expenses and keep financial demands from becoming exorbitant, consortia should consider producing a minimum number of ITV courses locally and should establish communication with other consortia in order to exchange or lease television series; (8) guidelines which guarantee compensation and adequate released time for ITV teachers should be carefully constructed and adhered to at the consortium level; (9) agreement should be reached at the consortium level--with results to be included in consortium by-laws--to guarantee financial remuneration, released time, or other mutually agreeable compensation to on-campus representatives in exchange for their duties in connection with ITV courses; (10) multiple television delivery systems, including commercial open-circuit, public broadcasting and cable TV, offer a greater amount of flexibility and audience-delivering capability for ITV than any single delivery system; (11) formal evaluation methods and instruments should be determined for the consortium and the television courses offered by it; (12) steps should be taken to insure that opportunities are provided for faculty members to play significant and meaningful roles in the planning and production of television courses; (13) the poorest communication links in consortia appear to exist

between the

the course

last time

provided

courses w

sentative

resistance

ties of t

courses u

are admin

produce g

efforts;

the title

of credi

duction

lessons,

times o

viewed,

campus

address

between the consortium staff and the individual faculties and/or between the consortium representatives and their faculties; (14) alternative contact times beyond the normal office hours of faculty members should be provided for the convenience of those student enrollees in television courses who are employed or otherwise unable to contact on-campus representatives during the normal work day; (15) in an effort to lessen their resistance to ITV, public relations efforts are needed to apprise faculties of televised courses; (16) diverse promotional methods for ITV courses utilizing as many of the mass media as finances permit and which are administered sufficiently in advance of the first telelesson, seem to produce greater course enrollments than meager and late promotional efforts; (17) printed promotional materials should include, at a minimum, the title and a brief description of the television course, the number of credits it carries, a brief description of the consortium, an introduction of the ITV teacher, or teachers, a complete list of the telelessons, including the exact dates they are to be aired, a list of the times of day and the television stations on which the telelessons can be viewed, the names, telephone numbers and times of day during which the campus course representatives can be reached, and a simplified self-addressed registration form.

THE OPERATION OF THREE INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION CONSORTIA
IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By

Guy Earl Warner

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Speech

1973

9

DEDICATION

To my wife Laurel, and to my children James, John, and Angela
who, more than I, deserve this degree.

57

E.
persons
gratitude
committee
Lewis, D
sistent
this st
Q
at diff
Highla
State
three
study
They
Sien
Coll
the
Reg
Dir
In
Is

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Every dissertation is ultimately the result of the efforts of many persons rather than just one. This study is no exception. My personal gratitude is extended to those five men who constituted my guidance committee, Mr. David C. Ralph, chairman; Dr. Kenneth G. Hance, Dr. Colby Lewis, Dr. Gordon Thomas; and Dr. Paul W. F. Witt. Without their persistent guidance, criticism, and encouragement, there is no doubt that this study would not have been completed.

Others also contributed various degrees of assistance to the study at different stages of its development. I am indebted to Dr. John P. Highlander, chairman, Department of Radio-Television-Cinema, California State University, Fresno, for suggesting the basic topic of the study.

Likewise, I am in the debt of those persons associated with the three instructional television consortia which are the subjects of the study who gave willingly and generously of their time and information. They are, in alphabetical order: Marion Akers, Dean of Instruction, Sierra College, Rocklin, California; Fritz Blodgett, Instructor, Sierra College, Rocklin, California; Holly Brackmann, Instructor, College of the Sequoias, Visalia; Stuart Cooney, Director, The Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium; William Davidson, Program Director, KMJ-TV, Channel 24, Fresno, California; Wilson Dillard, Public Information Officer, Yuba College, Marysville, California; Arthur Evans, Associate Dean of Instruction, West Hills Community College, Coalinga,

California

Visalia,

State Ger

of Contr

California

California

Coalinga

Modesto

Continu

fornia;

John O'E

Dean of

Associat

fornia;

Educatio

Nonnetad

Instruct

Sacramen

ate Dean

Williams

fornia;

Californ

fornia;

lege, Sa

Feedley

California; Lincoln Hall, Dean of Instruction, College of the Sequoias, Visalia, California; Jack Hansen, Assistant Superintendent of Education, State Center College District, Fresno, California; John Hennessy, Dean of Continuing Education, California State University, Humboldt, Arcata, California; Ronald Lane, Instructor, Modesto Junior College, Modesto, California; Jerald Livesey, Instructor, West Hills Community College, Coalinga, California; Edward McClarty, Dean of Instructional Services, Modesto Junior College, Modesto, California; Ralph Meuter, Dean for Continuing Education, California State University, Chico, Chico, California; James Mitchell, Butte Junior College District, Durham, California; John O'Brien, Instructor, Reedley College, Reedley, California; Earl Orom, Dean of Instruction, Yuba College, Marysville, California; Queen Randall, Associate Dean of Instruction, American River College, Sacramento, California; Connell Roberts, Associate Dean of Liberal Arts and General Education, Sacramento City College, Sacramento, California; Edyma Sischonownejad, Instructor, Merced College, Merced, California; Alfred Walsh, Instructor, Butte College, Durham, California; David Warren, Instructor, Sacramento City College, Sacramento, California; Franz Weinschenk, Associate Dean of Humanities, Fresno City College, Fresno, California; Jack Williamson, Vice President, Instruction, Merced College, Merced, California; Jorome Winterman, Instructor, Cosumnes River College, Sacramento, California; Walter Witt, Instructor, Fresno City College, Fresno, California; Robert Wyman, Associate Dean of Instruction, Cosumnes River College, Sacramento, California; and Norman Zech, Dean of Instruction, Reedley College, Reedley, California.

File
is owed
and fail
for succ

1

Finally, an enormous debt, one to be repaid in the coming years, is owed to my wife and children who bore with me in times of frustration and failure and rejoiced with me in times of accomplishment, and to God for supplying the opportunity and energy necessary to reach this goal.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION

II. GENERAL

III. THE
ST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Justification	
Scope	
Limitations	
Methodology	
Sources and Materials	
Definition of Terms	
Organizations	
II. GUIDELINES FOR A MODEL INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION CONSORTIUM . .	21
Needs and Goals	
Cooperation	
Organization	
Communication	
Finances	
ITV Teachers	
Registration and Promotion	
Academic Standards	
Delivery Systems	
Evaluation	
Summary	
III. THE CENTRAL VALLEY CONSORTIUM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A CASE STUDY.	66
Background	
Needs and Goals	
Cooperation	
Organization	
Communication	
Finances	
ITV Teachers	
Registration and Production	
Delivery Systems	
Evaluation	
Appraisal	

IV. TE

V. THE
CON

VI. CO

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

IV. TELEVISION CONSORTIUM OF VALLEY COLLEGES: A CASE STUDY. . . .	99
Background	
Needs and Goals	
Cooperation	
Organization	
Communication	
Finances	
ITV Teachers	
Registration and Promotion	
Delivery Systems	
Evaluation	
Appraisal	
V. THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION CONSORTIUM: A CASE STUDY.	133
Background	
Needs and Goals	
Cooperation	
Organization	
Communication	
Finances	
ITV Teachers	
Registration and Promotion	
Delivery Systems	
Evaluation	
Appraisal	
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	164
Conclusions	
Implications for Further Research	
APPENDIX A	173
APPENDIX B	179
BIBLIOGRAPHY	185

Ev

the New

the new

interrup

part of

Zworykin

televisi

commerci

Th

Laborato

Washingt

set up a

closed-c

begin br

station,

1933 to

duction

1-

Televi-

1971), a

2-

in The

(Mad:sc

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Even before commercial television had its "coming-out party at the New York World's Fair in 1939",¹ the instructional implications of the new medium had been seen and exploration had begun. Except for the interruption of World War II, instructional television (ITV) has been a part of American education since 1933,² just a decade after Dr. V. K. Zworykin patented the iconscope, the forerunner of the image-orthicon television camera. Its development runs almost parallel with that of commercial television.

The principle of television was first proved workable in the Bell Laboratories in 1927 when a sight-and-sound broadcast was made between Washington, D.C. and New York. Four years later the University of Iowa set up an exhibit at the State Fair to demonstrate an elementary closed-circuit television system and two years later went on the air to begin broadcasting instructional programs. The University television station, W9XK, broadcast 389 programs over a seven year period, from 1933 to 1940. They included "Elementary Art", "Home Planning", "Introduction to Astronomy", and "First Aid". Purdue University and Kansas

¹Giraud Chester, Garnet R. Garrison, and Edgar E. Willis, Television and Radio (4th ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971), p. 43.

²Beverly J. Taylor, "The Development of Instructional Television," in The Farther Vision, ed. by Allen E. Koenig and Ruane B. Hill (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 134.

State Univer

The co

except for i

two important

(1) the ent

imposition d

Six months d

television d

sets stoppe

commercial

By 19

and the mar

FCC that se

going to oc

Consequent

constructio

drafted.

On As

officially

portance to

educational

increased t

37ay
pp. 133-134

4-1bid

State University also experimented with similar television services.³

The continuation and development of ITV, however, were halted, except for isolated instances, for a period of eleven years due to two important events, one international in scope, the other national: (1) the entry of the United States into World War II; and (2) the imposition of a "freeze" by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Six months prior to Pearl Harbor the FCC had authorized full commercial television on a black and white basis. The production of television sets stopped completely during the course of the war and only six commercial stations were broadcasting.⁴

By 1948, with the resumption of commercial television broadcasting and the manufacture of television receivers, it became apparent to the FCC that serious signal interference between television stations was going to occur with the certain proliferation of station construction. Consequently, in September, 1948 a "freeze" was imposed halting further construction of new stations altogether until allocation plans could be drafted.

On April 14, 1952 the FCC issued its "Sixth Report and Order", officially lifting the "freeze." The "Report" was of particular importance to educators because it set aside 242 channel assignments for educational noncommercial television stations. Later, that number was increased to 309.

³Taylor, "The Development of Instructional Television," pp. 133-134.

⁴Ibid.

Almos
noncommerci
In 1952 the
television
public scho
grade gramm
a week.⁵

As ear
equipment a
casts.⁶ One
ITV, or ETV
tinenta] Cla
a full cours
viewing aud

By 194
universities
poses.⁸

Howev
was not mee

5" A H
Report. 4

6" Mary
York: McGr

7" A H

8 Ibid

9" A H

Almost simultaneously educators began putting both commercial and noncommercial television facilities to use for instructional purposes. In 1952 the State of Alabama developed the first state educational television network in the nation. Three years later the St. Louis public schools were using KETC, a noncommercial station, to teach 9th grade grammar and English composition thirty minutes a day, five days a week.⁵

As early as 1947 the public schools of Philadelphia used the equipment and facilities of commercial station WPTZ for in-school telecasts.⁶ One of the national networks, NBC, joined early attempts at ITV, or ETV as it was then called, as it brought to the air the "Continental Classroom". The series represented the first attempt to put a full course on national television. The series had an average daily viewing audience of 270,000 persons.⁷

By 1961 an estimated 560 school districts and 117 colleges and universities were employing commercial channels for instructional purposes.⁸

However, by 1961 it became apparent that open-circuit television was not meeting in-school education needs.⁹

⁵"A History of the Development of ITV," Educational Product Report. 4 (January 1971): 19.

⁶Mary Howard Smith, ed., Using Television in the Classroom (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 6.

⁷"A History of the Development of ITV," p. 18.

⁸Ibid., pp. 18-19.

⁹"A History of the Development of ITV," p. 19.

As e

Advancement

a closed-c

Thro

campus.

The res:
reduce t
plishmen
decrease
if the s

Three

was carried

teaching, s

and improve

By 19

installatio

stallations

number rose

One d

and certain

town, Mary

Fund for th

by the Elec

10**ib**

11**ib**

12**ib**

As early as 1954, by means of a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education, Pennsylvania State University had initiated a closed-circuit television (CCTV) project.

Through it televised courses for credit were offered on its campus.

The results indicated that the use of television did not reduce the quality of instruction or lower student accomplishment and that, once a CCTV system was installed, a decreased cost of instruction per student could be realized if the system was used efficiently.¹⁰

Three years later the Chelsea Closed-Circuit Television Project was carried on in a New York ghetto aimed at using "CCTV for direct teaching, school enrichment, teacher training, language instruction, and improvement of community integration...."¹¹

By 1958 there was seen a sharp increase in the number of CCTV installations around the country. In 1956 there had been 64 such installations, but two years later, in 1958, 119 were in existence. That number rose to 185 by 1960.¹²

One of the first CCTV installations below the college level, and certainly the most publicized, was initiated in 1956 at Hagerstown, Maryland. It was funded, as was the Penn State Project, by the Fund for the Advancement of Education. In addition, money was given by the Electronic Industries Association, and Chesapeake and Potomac

¹⁰Ibid., p. 20.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 20-21.

¹²Ibid., p. 21.

Telephone C

wired into

A unit

62 school y

area of Ill

was known a

WPAI. The

a Westingho

service, in

transmitter

The s

tions of cor

the least o

tors to see

authorized

tional Tele

channel del

tens. With

Thirty ITFS

to 65 by 19

13 Feb
p. 142.

14 Nov
tional Broa

15 Dec
Educational
1971): 36-2

Telephone Company. Over 800 television receivers were eventually wired into the classrooms of Washington County Schools.¹³

A unique kind of CCTV operation had its beginning during the 1961-62 school year in a 200 mile radius covering portions of the six-state area of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin. It was known as The Midwest Program on Airborn Television Instruction, or MPATI. The concept of airborne broadcasting found its original roots in a Westinghouse project called "Stratovision".¹⁴ After eleven years of service, including that of a video tape library, as well as a broadcast transmitter, MPATI officially "died" on June 20, 1971.

The sundry problems surrounding the use by educational institutions of commercial television stations for instructional purposes, not the least of which was lack of scheduling flexibility, prompted educators to seek alternative delivery systems. In July of 1963 the FCC authorized such an alternative with the establishment of the Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS). It constituted a multiple-channel delivery system, and reduced the cost as compared to cable systems. Within three years over 100 applications had been submitted. Thirty ITFS systems were in operation by 1967, and that number increased to 65 by 1971.⁵

¹³Taylor, "The Development of Instructional Television," p. 142.

¹⁴Norman Felsenthal, "MPATI: A History (1959-1971)," Educational Broadcasting Review, 5 (December, 1971), 37.

¹⁵George Hall, "ITFS and the Economic Implications of the New Educational Accountability," Educational Product Report, 3 (January 1971): 36-48.

Still
invention of
casting, e
that year
As technol
of recordin
recorders,
has been f
of the case

While
inevitable
gram produ
was made i
video recor
came into e
of video ta
Regional I
National I
MPATI, Inc

Thus
video tape
ters have b

16 Ri
Clearing H

17 Ga
tion," in
(Madison:

Still another milestone in the development of ITV has been the invention of video tape equipment. Prior to 1956 all television broadcasting, either commercial or noncommercial, had to be done live. But, that year the breakthrough came that broadcasting had been awaiting. As technology advanced and video tape equipment was refined the size of recording units shrunk, and by the mid 1960's portable video tape recorders, especially suited for classroom use, were marketed.¹⁶ This has been followed with a further refinement, introduced in 1972, that of the cassette video tape recorder.

While the technical aspects of ITV were undergoing development and inevitable refinement, strides were also taking place in software--program production, and storage/retrieval. Up to 1956 whatever progress was made in the area of software was made only in production because video recording was not yet possible. Subsequent to 1958 organizations came into existence whose purpose was the production, rental and/or sale of video taped telelessons. One of the earliest was the Great Plains Regional ITV Library, which began in 1962. It was followed by the National Instructional TV Library, the Northeast Regional ITV Library, MPATI, Incorporated, and others.¹⁷

Thus, ITV appears to be a threshold: sophisticated portable video tape units are available for the classroom; flexible delivery systems have been developed, tested, and are being used; and software is

¹⁶Richard Gilkey, "Television: A Medium in Transition," The Clearing House, April, 1970, p. 510.

¹⁷Gary Gumpert, "Closed-Circuit Television in Training and Education," in The Farther Vision, ed., by Allen E. Koenig and Ruane B. Hill (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 146.

available

where to no

Wilbu

al radio an

change".18

There

scene even

educators.

said:

TV in e

it has

effecti

simulta

in a ti

resound

As IT

however, se

and recurrence

Elementary

They are, a

ability of

ment requir

channel fle

the excepti

18 Will
vision," Ed

19 Jan
From Here?"

20 Dor
Educational

available for local, regional, or perhaps even more extensive use.

Where to now?

Wilbur Schramm, long-time spokesman for ITV, says: "Educational radio and television are entering upon a period of considerable change".¹⁸

There is little doubt but that it will remain on the educational scene even though it has not succeeded in winning the support of all educators. James Zigerell, Dean of TV College, Chicago City College, said:

TV in education, at all levels, is here to stay, not because it has won enthusiastic acceptance, but because it can be an effective and economical and labor-saving way of bringing simultaneously to large numbers simulated classroom performance in a time of expanding college population and dwindling faculty resources.¹⁹

As ITV continues to be a part of the educational picture it must, however, seek solutions to some identified problems. Five significant and recurrent ones were set forth by Dr. Donald Nylin, Director of Elementary Education, Aurora West School District, Aurora, Illinois. They are, according to him: (1) technical arrangements; (2) availability of classroom television sets; (3) the extensive initial investment required; (4) lock-step programming resulting from insufficient channel flexibility; (5) the high cost of program production.²⁰ With the exception, and then in only some instances, of portable video

¹⁸Wilbur Schramm, "The Future of Educational Radio and Television," Educational Television International, 4 (December 1970): 285.

¹⁹James J. Zigerrell, "Televised Instruction: Where Do We Go From Here?" Educational Technology 9 (September 1969): 73.

²⁰Donald W. Nylin, "TV or Not TV: What is the Question?" Educational Leadership 28 (November 1970): 139.

equipment,

One a

the applica

been an int

One of the

together 42

closed-circ

WEATI proje

Shortly the

(TEMP) was

separated b

Concu

large, even

tion. Acti

a conferenc

fornia. 21

station in

Two p

interested

schools to

boards of s

contractua

public sch

21 pr
vision, (S

22 Ed

equipment, these problems are common to all forms of ITV.

One approach to solving these basic problems confronting ITV is the application of the principle of cooperation. This principle has been an integral part of the history of ITV almost from its inception. One of the earliest examples was the Hagerstown experiment which linked together 48 schools and 18,000 pupils in Washington County Maryland by closed-circuit television. It was followed three years later by the MPATI project which served almost 2,000 schools in six midwestern states. Shortly thereafter, in 1961, the Texas Educational Microwave Project (TEMP) was initiated to link together 11 colleges and universities separated by 200 or more miles.

Concurrent with cooperative ITV developments in the nation at large, events in the State of California were turning in the same direction. Action began in December, 1952 when Governor Earl Warren called a conference to discuss the future of educational television in California.²¹ Two years later the first successful educational television station in the State, KQED, was on the air.

Two pieces of legislation significant to educators in California interested in ITV were passed in 1957 and 1961. The first permitted schools to participate financially in ITV by empowering governing boards of school districts or county superintendents to enter into contractual arrangements to procure television broadcasts for use by public schools or colleges.²² The second permitted the same agents to

²¹Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Educational Television, (Sacramento: The State of California, 1953).

²²Education Code, Section 8857.

own, lease

ing televi

In 1

instructio

counties.

and closed

to Redding

The

in the Sta

iations" h

vision Adv

al Televis

tional Tel

Instructio

San Joaqui

Anot

establishm

College Br

the State'

The

ment:

Of all
vision
develop
council
of cour
usually
to the

own, lease, and operate broadcast facilities for the purpose of providing television services to the schools.²³

In 1958 KQED in San Francisco began producing and broadcasting instructional television programs for public schools in 10 Bay Area counties. Thereafter ITV broadcasting in California mushroomed. Open and closed-circuit systems were established from San Diego in the south to Redding in the north.

The movement toward cooperative ITV systems was firmly established in the State by 1966. At that time six "advisory councils", or "Associations" had been formed. They were: the Regional Educational Television Advisory Council (RETAC), at Los Angeles; the Valley Instructional Television Association (VITA), at Sacramento; the Bay Region Instructional Television for Education (BRITE), in San Francisco; the Northern Instructional Television Advisory Council (NITAC), in Redding; and the San Joaquin Educational Television Association, in Fresno.

Another milestone in cooperative ITV was marked in 1969 with the establishment in the Los Angeles area of the Consortium for Community College Broadcast Television. Ten area junior colleges were joined in the State's first college-level ITV consortium.

The growth of ITV cooperatives in California has lead to statement:

Of all the patterns which have emerged in instructional television in California, one of the greatest significance is the development of regional instructional television advisory councils of associations. These cooperative systems of offices of county superintendents of schools and school districts usually perform the same general function; namely, to supply to the schools of the region, over broadcast television,

²³Education Code, Section 8857, as amended in 1961.

program
to adm
program

Coop

called, br

ary instru

a "promisi

addition t

mental sta

the con
to meet
If the
of the
school
its are

The

accountabi

consortia.

Educat:
Telecom
pose o
as rela
efficie
this wa
demand
variabi
ception

24G
vision for
Department

25R
vision,"
ington:

26I

27H
tional Acc

programs appropriate to the schools' courses of study and to administer cooperatively the funding for getting the programs broadcast into the classrooms.²⁴

Cooperative ITV projects, or consortia as they are sometimes called, bring about a sharing of the planning and problems inherent in any instructional undertaking. The consortium concept has been called a "promising development"²⁵ in the instructional planning process. In addition to offering a greatly expanded input of ideas at the developmental stage

the consortium approach also provides a broader financial base to meet the costs of production in instructional television. If the consortium idea prevails, it should help eliminate much of the current duplication of programs, since each station, school district, or state does essentially the same kind in its area.²⁶

The decreased demand for educational economy and educational accountability would seem to point toward the rapid development of ITV consortia. It has been urged that:

Educational agencies of all kinds should organize new Public Telecommunications Consortia (PTC) for the constructive purpose of operating ITFS broadcast and cable systems (as well as related technologies) toward the far higher cost of efficiency made possible through joint task assignments. In this way, reception points, auditors, spatial ranges, traffic demands, investment dollars, and the other pertinent efficiency variables could be brought to an interacting intensity of exceptional vitality and great mutual benefit.²⁷

²⁴Guy M. Helmke, Emerging Patterns of Instructional Television for California Public Schools (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1966), p. 7.

²⁵Richard C. Burke, "Some Questions About Instructional Television," Instructional Television, ed., by Richard C. Burke (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), p. 120.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Hall, "ITFS and the Economic Implications of the New Educational Accountability," p. 9.

The
tation of
the Depart
Public Bro
Only
educational
the broader

The
the operat
California
the study.

Init
garding each
circumstances
mentation w
nally deter
sortium org
sortium? (f
were select
(9) How wer
televised c
and compens

28 Ibi

29 Ibi

The principal agencies that should be involved in the implementation of the consortium concept, it has been suggested, are the FCC, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and other policy-making agencies.²⁸

Only by means of the consortium concept, it is asserted, "can our educational establishment make efficient use of telecommunications in the broadest range of the learning management tasks".²⁹

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to investigate, analyze, and evaluate the operation of three ITV consortia in higher education in the State of California based on an ITV consortium model developed in the course of the study.

Initially the study sought to answer the following questions regarding each of the three consortia: (1) With whom and under what circumstances did each consortium originate? (2) What methods of implementation were selected for each consortium? (3) What were the originally determined needs and goals? (4) Along what lines was each consortium organized? (5) How was authority distributed within each consortium? (6) How were decisions reached? (7) What terms of membership were selected? (8) What means of financing each consortium were chosen? (9) How were course offerings determined? (10) From what sources were televised courses selected? (11) How were television teachers selected and compensated? (12) How did students enroll in televised courses?

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid., p. 10.

(13) How d

did studen

(15) How

(16) What

courses av

evaluation

selected t

A se

importance

(1) By wh

were used

(3) What m

(4) What

Then

Firs

process.

evidence p

portable v

larger CCT

taken plac

Seco

sortium co

Television

production

employing

- (13) How did students receive credit for televised courses? (14) How did students fulfill course requirements for televised courses?
- (15) How were academic standards maintained for televised courses?
- (16) What delivery system, or systems were selected to make televised courses available to students? (17) What method, or methods, of course evaluation were used? (18) What method, or methods, of evaluation were selected to determine the success of each consortium?

A search of the literature yielded four additional questions of importance, thus expanding the list to twenty-two. They are as follows:

- (1) By what process were needs and goals determined? (2) What methods were used to gain cooperation among participating institutions?
- (3) What methods of communication were used among consortium members?
- (4) What means were devised to promote televised courses to the public?

Justification

There are three main justifications for this study.

First, ITV continues to be an integrated tool in the educational process. There is no indication that it will be scrapped; in fact, the evidence points to its continued growth, especially in the use of portable video equipment. Even though growth is less dramatic in larger CCTV operations, and in open-circuit broadcasting, growth has taken place nonetheless.

Second, there has been an upsurge in the application of the consortium concept, viz., at the college level. The National Instructional Television Center in Bloomington, Indiana is currently engaged in the production of "Inside/Out", a "nationwide health education consortium employing television to help eight-to-ten-year-olds understand and cope

with social

Thirty U.S.

one Canadian

NIT had in

primary gr

by the Nor

sortium of

In 1

junior col

ing engine

via Televi

Colorado S

colleges i

The

at the col

the Los An

Consortium

broadcasts

courses as

30 NA
Associatio

31 Da
5 (June, 1

32 Le
College Jo

33 The
expanded t

with social, emotional and physical problems they face."³⁰

Thirty U.S. educational, broadcasting, and metropolitan agencies, and one Canadian agency constitute this most recent consortium. Earlier, NIT had initiated and coordinated a series for kindergarten and early primary grades entitled, "Ripples". The 36 program series was produced by the Northern Virginia Educational Television Association, a consortium of fourteen member agencies.³¹

In 1968 an ITV project began in Colorado to tie together five junior colleges and one four year institution for the purpose of teaching engineering courses. It was called Project CO-TIE, or Cooperation via Televised Instruction in Education. Video tapes are produced at Colorado State University and sent by parcel post or courier to the six colleges involved in the project.³²

The following year in California the largest continuing consortium at the college level was formed. It brought together 18 colleges³³ in the Los Angeles area into a legally constituted organization called the Consortium for Community College Broadcast Television. The consortium broadcasts open-circuit in the Los Angeles area and has offered such courses as astronomy, art, history and psychology. In the fall of 1971

³⁰NAEB Newsletter, January 14, 1972 (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Educational Broadcasters), p. 1.

³¹David L. Crippens, "Ripples," Educational Broadcasting Review, 5 (June, 1971): 59.

³²Lee Maxwell, "Cooperation Via Televised Instruction," Junior College Journal, 41 (November, 1970): 27-28.

³³The number of colleges in the consortium has since been expanded to 26.

approximately

by the Cons

The f

college in

of a consor

for Public

tem. The

present ter

Third

institution

state in th

Beginning

operation

This does

both Calif

If t

tinued gro

new ones c

Then

organizati

34 J
Dr. Leslie
tatives f

35 J
Junior Co

approximately 8,000 students enrolled in two televised courses offered by the Consortium.³⁴

The following year, two county junior colleges and one city junior college in Maryland began televising courses for credit as the result of a consortium they had formed. The facilities of the Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting, Channel 67, were employed as the delivery system. The consortium was later joined by a fourth community college. At present ten different courses have been offered.³⁵

Third, there are more established ITV consortia among educational institutions at all levels in the State of California than in any other state in the nation, and still more are at various stages of development. Beginning in 1973 an additional college-level consortium is to begin operation in the San Bernadino area bringing the state total to six. This does not take into account a seventh consortium which operates in both California and Nevada.

If the past is at all useful in predicting the future the continued growth of present consortia and the initiation of still more new ones can be expected in California and in the rest of the nation.

Scope

There are in the State of California at present five ITV organizations formed among institutions of higher education which fit

³⁴Unpublished notes on December 3, 1971 meeting between Dr. Leslie Wilbur, University of Southern California, and representatives from six community colleges and Fresno State College, p. 1.

³⁵Jerry M. Cohen, "Maryland's Community College of the Air," Junior College Journal, 42 (October, 1971): 33, 36, 40.

the defin

Bay Area

sortium c

College B

Regional

vision Con

Thre

study bas

(1) C

e

b

(2) C

(3) C

a

c

(4) C

i

Thos

Consortium

Regional

Television

establishe

higher ed

while the

the definition of consortia.³⁶ They are, in alphabetical order: (1) the Bay Area Television Consortium, San Mateo, (2) the Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges, Visalia, (3) the Consortium for Community College Broadcast Television, Los Angeles, (4) the Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium, Sonoma, and (5) the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges, Sacramento.

Three consortia were ultimately chosen as the subjects of this study based upon the following criteria:

- (1) Consortia chosen should represent institutions of higher education exclusively, whether two or four year, or combinations of the two.
- (2) Consortia chosen should possess some unique feature.
- (3) Consortia chosen should evidence availability of written and/or human sources of information from which the study could be drawn.
- (4) Consortia chosen should evidence willingness to cooperate in the study.

Those chosen were, in alphabetical order: (1) the Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges, Visalia, (2) the Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium, Sonoma, and (3) the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges, Sacramento. They met the established criteria in that: (1) they each represent institutions of higher education; the first and third consortia unite two year colleges, while the second brings together both two and four year institutions;

³⁶See "Definition of Terms" for a detailed definition of a Consortium

(2) the Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges is the only consortium in the State making exclusive use of packaged television courses, the Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium is the newest in the State and potentially the largest, and the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges currently covers the largest geographical area of any of the consortia in the State.

The study, then, sought to investigate, analyze, and appraise the operation of the three representative ITV consortia according to:

(1) background, (2) needs and goals, (3) organization, (4) finances, (5) ITV teachers, (6) registration and promotion, (7) academic standards, (8) delivery system(s), and (9) evaluation.

Limitations

Although there are in existence other types of television consortia in California, viz., those involving public elementary and secondary schools, this study focused only upon those which pertain to higher education and which function exclusively within the State of California.

Furthermore, it was limited to the operation of the ITV consortia as opposed to their histories, except as such background material is essential to their origin, successes, failures, etc.

Methodology

The design of the study was fourfold: (1) to design from the literature, published and unpublished, an "ideal" ITV consortium model; (2) to carry out case studies of each of the three consortia selected for the study; (3) to analyze and evaluate the three consortia by

means of
to draw c
tion.

Dat
ments, an
The
articles,
and report

Cas
sources w
chures, a
college, a
deans out
follow in
to the Pro
series, c
rolled te
memoranda
business a
of the cor
forms use

Each
Questions.
persons or
sortium, u

means of the ITV consortium model; and (4) to make recommendations and to draw conclusions as a result of the foregoing analysis and evaluation.

Sources and Materials

Data gathered were from two primary sources: (1) written documents, and (2) interviews.

The written documents consulted included journal and magazine articles, reports, books, and published and unpublished descriptions and reports of consortia.

Case studies of the three consortia began from whatever written sources were available. These sources consisted of promotional brochures, a copy of a letter from a dean to the board of trustees of his college, a copy of a mimeographed letter sent by a dean to his fellow deans outlining the advantages of a consortium and listing steps to follow in initiating one, a copy of a letter from a consortium director to the Program Director of the television station carrying the ITV series, copies of letters sent by instructors of record to students enrolled television courses, minutes of ITV consortia meetings, copies of memoranda from a consortium director to interested academic personnel, business and professional persons, a copy of the Master Plan of one of the consortia, copies of Joint Powers agreements, and evaluation forms used by one consortium.

Each document was scrutinized for answers to the 22 stated questions. This examination was followed by interviews with those persons on each participating campus who were connected with the consortium, usually the dean of instruction, the consortium director, the

instructed
ceive con
teachers,
of accurate
scribed.

Two
yielded a
minutes.
yielded +
be sought
ied, data

Se
reasons d
deserves

CC

IT

37G
New York

38-

instructors of record, those persons appointed on each campus to receive contact from students enrolled in the ITV course, and the ITV teachers, if the consortium produced its own courses. In the interest of accuracy, all interviews were audio tape recorded and later transcribed.

Two of the three consortia, the subjects of Chapters IV and V, yielded an abundance of written data, including memoranda and meeting minutes. The remaining consortium, however, the subject of Chapter III, yielded few written sources from which answers to the 22 questions could be sought. Although interviews were conducted in all three cases studied, data for the latter one was drawn heavily from these interviews.

Definition of Terms

Several terms are used in the course of the study which, for reasons of clarity, need defining. The most crucial one, "consortium", deserves special note.

CCTV	"Closed-Circuit Television, any system of transmitting TV and sound which cannot be taken 'off the air' by conventional TV receivers". ³⁷
ITV	"Instructional Television, programs produced and designed at any level of schooling for use in formal education". ³⁸ ITV is used in one or more of the following ways:

³⁷George N. Gordon, Classroom Television: New Frontiers in ITV. (New York: Hastings House, 1970) p. 236.

³⁸Ibid., p. 237.

ITV

ITFC

PTV

39
This represents
literature

1. Total teaching, i.e., where the entire burden of instruction is carried by the telelessons, and the classroom teacher plays a subordinate role to the television teacher.
2. Cooperative teaching, i.e., where the telelessons share with the classroom teachers a portion of the instructional load.
3. Enrichment, i.e., the occasional use of television to clarify and expand upon ideas introduced into classroom instruction.

ITV CONSORTIUM An organization of agencies, usually educational, formed, generally by legal agreement, for the purpose of pooling resources to plan, produce, and/or obtain and distribute instructional television programming.³⁹

ITFS "Instructional Television Fixed Service, a system of up to four channels for short TV transmission over the air but not received on home TV".⁴⁰

PTV "Public Television, A recent synonym for educational and instructional television, referring to non-commercial TV as defined by the Carnegie Commission".⁴¹

³⁹No one satisfactory definition could be found in the literature. This represents a composite of several of those to be found in the literature.

The
guidelines
the Centre
Chapter I,
Colleges,
formia Ins
tains Cond

Organization

The study is organized in the following manner: Chapter II states guidelines for a model ITV consortium. Chapter III is a case study of the Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges, Visalia, California. Chapter IV is a case study of the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges, Sacramento. Chapter V is a case study of the Northern California Instructional Television Consortium, Sonoma. Chapter VI contains Conclusions and Implications for Further Research.

CHAPTER II
GUIDELINES FOR A MODEL INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION
CONSORTIUM

Consortia have been a part of American education since the 1920's when Claremont, California, and Atlanta, Georgia, university centers each formed group arrangements with other institutions.¹ Real impetus, however, was given the cooperative movement by the surge in college enrollments which followed the end of World War II. By 1949, for example, sixteen southern states had formed a higher education compact known as the Southern Regional Educational Board (SREB).² In 1953 the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) was formed.³

The number of cooperative arrangements continued growing so that in the academic year 1965-1966 over one thousand consortia could be counted in the United States.⁴ At approximately the same time there existed at least twenty-five regional consortia with a combined membership of 319 institutions.⁵ Some of these joined institutions as diverse

¹Raymond S. Moore, Consortiums in American Higher Education: 1965-66. Report of an Exploratory Study (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1968), p. 1.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵William F. Stier, Jr., A Look in Retrospect--A Consortium. Colleges of Mid-America (Sioux City, Iowa: Briar Cliff College, 1971), p. 3.

and geographically separated as the University of Michigan and Tuskegee Institute. Others spanned state boundaries to link institutions of higher education in several states.

Most of the consortia in higher education, however, have been, and continue to be, intrastate arrangements binding together educational institutions, generally public, which are in the same state system and often are in fairly close proximity. One such cooperative arrangement, called The Inter-Institutional Program of Television Instruction, existed in Oregon from 1957 to 1962. It joined four institutions of higher education in that state: Oregon State University at Corvallis, Oregon College of Education at Monmouth, Portland State College at Portland, and the University of Oregon at Eugene.⁶

An even more widely known and publicized consortium is TEMP, Texas Educational Microwave Project, which began distributing college courses by television in 1959. It joins eleven colleges and universities in central Texas and was the nation's first television network of higher educational institutions.

New York and California have been two of the more active states in the development of higher educational consortia. At one time in New York nine local consortia were identifiable,⁷ with the number additionally swelled by the existence of regional consortia. California currently can point to six consortia at the higher education level,

⁶Leland L. Johnson, Cable Television and Higher Education: Two Contrasting Experiences (Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1971), p. 16.

⁷Glen Starlin, Inter-Institutional Communication Networks (Prepared for the Feasibility Study of Inter-Institutional Television, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1966), pp. 12-13.

involving

Alt

TEMP and

the basic

over half

has passe

by the te

past and

form and

In

as employ

only loos

he said,

to emulat

successes

Obviously,

attemptin

best that

from cons

choose an

new consc

expected

involving predominantly junior and community colleges.

Although most of the consortia in higher education, unlike the TEMP and Oregon projects, have not employed instructional television, the basic concept of cooperation involving colleges and universities is over half a century old. One would expect that the consortium concept has passed through its formative stages and would, therefore, be proved by the tests of experience and time. The accumulated experiences of past and present consortia can yield valuable guidelines by which to form and determine the success of cooperative ventures in the future.

In the light of a statement by Patterson, the term "guidelines", as employed in the title of this chapter, is used deliberately to denote only loose and broadly stated principles. "Consortia directors argue", he said, "there is not and should not be a model consortium for others to emulate, although planners can benefit from acquaintance with the successes and failures of other institutional arrangements."⁸

Obviously, then, it is both unwise and impossible to be proscriptive in attempting to fashion a model ITV consortium for higher education. The best that can be done is to arrive at generally stated principles drawn from consortia experiences from which developing cooperatives may choose and apply to their peculiar needs, goals, and limitations. Each new consortium will be unique and no one pattern, or model, could be expected to fit every situation.

⁸Lewis D. Patterson, Consortia in American Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, 1970), p. 3.

Or

sortia in

thus: to

tending

Silverman

for coll

climates

Ernest L.

ing the

not beca

the ratio

Un

grows

to be

and fo

prior

This sug

the prev

9p

havior in

York: Co

10E

to Work:

sities (w

porated,

11p

College T

of the Fi

Needs and Goals

One principle stands out clearly through the experiences of consortia in higher education. It is almost axiomatic and can be stated thus: the more urgent the felt need existing within institutions intending to consort, the greater the opportunities for cooperation. Silverman put it this way: "Shared crises tend to create conditions for collaboration."⁹ Crisis conditions tend to create more favorable climates of cooperation in higher education than do noncrises conditions. Ernest L. Boyer, Chancellor of State University of New York, is assessing the needs of higher education, said: "The need is to cooperate, not because it's the 'gentlemanly' thing to do, but rather because it's the rational and urgent thing to do."¹⁰

Unless a cooperative program

grows from within a college as a deeply felt need, it tends to be viewed as competing for scarce, internal resources, and for this reason often is rejected or given a secondary priority in the allocation of the institution's resources.¹¹

This suggests that marginal or undefined needs lead to the converse of the previously stated principle, viz., lack of cohesiveness.

⁹Robert J. Silverman, A Study of the Inter-Organizational Behavior in Consortia. Final Report (Cornell University, Ithaca, New York: Cooperative Extension Service, 1969), p. 253.

¹⁰Barry Schwenkmeyer and Mary Ellen Goodman, Putting Cooperation to Work: A Survey of How Cooperation is Helping Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, Incorporated, 1972), Preface.

¹¹Patterns for Voluntary Cooperation. Self-Study Report of the College Center of the Finger Lakes (Corning, New York: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1971), p. 6.

Silverman also found that "there is a positive association between initiation and commitment."¹² When institutions became involved in consortia to achieve goals they felt to be important, their output was greater than when their involvement could be traced to environmental forces, such as wealthy institutional trustees or donor corporations. In the latter case consortia involvement and output were found to be peripheral.¹³

What, then, are the goals, or needs, which bring institutions of higher education to cooperate through the use of ITV?

The basic motivations behind consortia have been identified by educators and researchers. Some of them are age-old and constant problems facing education in general, and higher education in particular, while others are cyclical and are based on changing national and world conditions. Schwenkmeyer and Goodman identified five basic need areas: (1) the rising demand for education and the runaway costs associated with it; (2) the knowledge explosion; (3) the influence of technology; (4) education and social ferment; and (5) renewed pressures from funding agencies.¹⁴

To this list can be added (1) the quest for qualified instructors; (2) the desire for expanded graduate education; (3) the need to meet larger obligations to society; (4) stark concern for survival; (5) the need to make optimum use of highly sophisticated or costly facilities

¹²Silverman, A Study of the Inter-Organizational Behavior in Consortia, p. 245.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Schwenkmeyer and Goodman, Putting Cooperation to Work, p. 1.

or servi
uate aca
need to
regional
to assis

Mo

many of
producti
behind c
producti
higher e
only fea
has been
universi
vision."

Mi

has succe
tion and
of higher
consists
course.

15
Inter-Ind
Lawrence
for Human
D.C., 196

16

or services; (6) the pooling of existing resources to strengthen or evaluate academic programs to increase administrative efficiency; (7) the need to develop new sources of revenue; (8) the need to meet local, state, regional, or national needs; and (9) the desire of larger institutions to assist developing ones.¹⁵

More particularly, consortia have seen ITV as a vehicle to meet many of the above-mentioned needs. In that connection the sharing of production costs accruing from ITV consortia operation is a prime motive behind cooperation in higher education. Since the need for high quality production dictates that production costs be high, many institutions of higher education look to trade, lease, or purchase agreements as the only feasible way to form consortia around television. Once programming has been produced, the reluctance to share it by and among colleges and universities is "one of the most serious problems in instructional television."¹⁶

Miami-Dade Junior College is one modern example of a college which has succeeded in producing high quality television programming for instruction and which is presently sharing its product with other institutions of higher education. Its pilot program series, "Man and Environment", consists of 30 half-hour documentaries, sufficient for a two semester course. While the course was originally produced only for local use,

¹⁵Raymond S. Moore, "Cooperation in Higher Education," in Inter-Institutional Cooperation in Higher Education, ed. by Lawrence C. Howard (Wisconsin University, Milwaukee: Institute for Human Relations. Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C., 1967), pp. 97, 307, 313-314.

¹⁶Johnson, Cable Television and Higher Education, pp. 16-17.

it has s

Californ

gaged to

parts of

Burlingt

On

is an IT

Communit

Orange C

called "

to provi

college

courses

ecology,

tural ar

In

and disc

cooperat

"know it

each

light

stuc

17

College,
14-16.

18

and Comd
(November

19

it has since become "nationalized". Five consultants from Tennessee, California, Michigan, Massachusetts, and North Carolina have been engaged to broaden the course. Currently, it is being used in sixteen parts of the nation, from Miami to Portland, Oregon, and between Burlington, Vermont, and Los Angeles, California.¹⁷

One of those institutions using the "Man and Environment" series is an ITV consortium in southern California operating in the Coast Community College District. The venture, joining two community colleges, Orange Coast in Costa Mesa, and Golden West in Huntington Beach, is called "Communiversality", which indicates its objectives, among which is to provide a wide segment of the population the opportunity to go to college by television.¹⁸ It has produced, or is producing, telecourses of its own in behavioral psychology, music, art, shorthand, ecology, biology, and law enforcement. In developing a course in cultural anthropology camera crews traveled to the Mideast and England.¹⁹

In the essential process of determining institutional priorities and discovering deep-seated needs, each institution contemplating cooperating with other colleges or universities should first come to "know itself". In so doing

each must determine what it wants to be, and can be, in the light of its traditions, location, resources, and the students who are actually attracted to its mission, and

¹⁷Betty Garnet and Maurice Thompson, "Man and Environment and TV College," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (November 1972): 14-16.

¹⁸Norman E. Watson and Bernard J. Luskin, "Cables, Cassettes, and Computers at Coast," Community and Junior College Journal, 43 (November 1972): 12.

¹⁹Ibid., 13.

each must continually discover how well it does what it says it does. If this theory is shared widely among participating colleges, a consortium can design programming that contributes to the most feasible mission of each college and promote a better understanding of the impact and effectiveness that each has with its own students.²⁰

When individual institutions have taken this step, they will be in a better position to determine the collective goals of the consortium.

Those goals were perhaps best capsulized by Hughes, who said:

The primary function of voluntary cooperatives seems to be to engage in those activities and to provide those services that cannot best be done individually by school districts [or institutions of higher education].²¹

Illustrative of the goals which might be reached by a consortium are those which were arrived at by the previously-mentioned Coast Communiversity in southern California. They are as follows:

1. To take higher learning out to the community instead of requiring that all students come to the college campus.
2. To match the state of education's art with the art of technology.
3. To combine televised programming, correspondence materials, individual tutoring, study-center-based activity, and counseling.
4. To decentralize learning and facilitate more effective cooperative relationships between the community, its population, and the school.²²

The largest ITV consortium in California, and perhaps in the nation, exists also in the southern part of the state. It came into

²⁰Patterns for Voluntary Cooperation, p. 7.

²¹Larry W. Hughes, Interpretive Study of Research and Development Relative to Educational Cooperatives. Final Report (Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee, 1971), p. 87.

²²Watson and Luskin, "Cables, Cassettes, and Computers," p. 13.

being in 1970 and within three years was composed of 23 colleges.

From its experience come the following consortium goals:

1. Saving of student transportation costs; those normally incurred in commuting; an important item to students at the lower end of the economic ladder.
2. Reaching all segments of society via television, which is "totally impartial about such matters as neighborhoods or ethnic origins".
3. Provision of a "unified body which can request station broadcast time and production assistance, if the members of the consortium do not have their own facilities".
4. Provision for coordination of efforts between colleges which in turn reduces competition among institutions, and avoids course duplication.
5. Spreading costs, viz., those of course production, course rental, publicity materials, secretarial help, etc.²³

Whenever possible consortium goals, such as those just given, should be identified and arrived at cooperatively. This means that institutions intending to cooperate will be well advised to sit down at the outset, in the initial stages of cooperation, to relate their needs to each other in order to discover if those needs make for compatibility. Patterson observes:

Two or more institutions considering the formation of a consortium should determine their mutual needs and goals as a collective base from which the actual cooperative structure and programs might flow.²⁴

Gumpert reached a similar conclusion in his experience with consortia.

²³Leslie Wilbur, "A Look At Televised Courses...Before Consorting," Community and Junior College Journal 43 (November 1972): 21-22.

²⁴Patterson, Consortia in American Higher Education, p. 3.

The development and production of course materials with inter-institutional exchange in mind, should consider the needs of those other institutions. If joint use is the aim, joint planning would facilitate the process.²⁵

A third, and last, principle applicable to the determination of needs and the formation of goals is that identified needs should be closely related to institutional long-range objectives.

Frequently cooperative agreements have been instituted to accommodate immediate and short-lived needs. Much in the way of experience and resources is lost when mechanisms are not available to assist these programs from contributing to continuing needs.²⁶

The commitment of institutional resources, human, financial, technological, and otherwise, so essential to the successes of any cooperative venture, seems far more likely when based upon extended goals and needs of both a consortium and the individual institutions of which it is comprised.

Cooperation

Cooperation is the very essence of consortia efforts. In its absence there are no consortia: there can be none. It is especially important in voluntary consortia because the

coordination of independent institutions leans much more heavily on the voluntary cooperation, and even subordination of the individual institutions than does coordination

²⁵Gary Gumpert, "Inter-Institutional Exchange and Media," in Inter-Institutional Cooperation in Higher Education, ed. by Lawrence C. Howard (Wisconsin University, Milwaukee: Institute for Human Relations, Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 28.

²⁶Inter-Institutional Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education in New York State (Corning, New York: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1970), pp. IV, 1-2.

of a
dist

careful

institu

It shou

dents.

exist a

level i

other a

top-to-

It i

of t

leve

getr

pate

This is

formed

is c

prog

by s

esse

depe

tion, I

(Berkele
Educati

of a group consisting of several campuses within the same district, unified by one chief administrator.²⁷

It is recommended, therefore, that cooperation be nurtured very carefully. Patterson, in fact, suggests a "courting" period in which institutions, before officially consorting, get thoroughly acquainted. It should begin where the power is vested--with institutional presidents. If cooperation does not exist at that level, it is unlikely to exist at lower levels. Once it has been established at the highest level it should be followed by progressive stages of involvement by other administrators, and by faculty members and students.²⁸ This top-to-bottom involvement is endorsed by Paltridge, who notes:

It is highly important that the chief administrative officers of the member institutions be directly involved in the top level policy decisions of the consortium and that they, together with members of their faculty and student body, participate as broadly as possible in the activities of the consortium.²⁹

This is especially important, according to Starlin, when consortia are formed around ITV because it

is closely related to the problems of any inter-institutional program which requires complete cooperation and acceptance by several institutionally dominate communities that have essentially been indoctrinated to operate on a locally independent basis.³⁰

Even though there is a trend toward consortia in higher education, ITV, when used for inter-institutional instruction,

²⁷Wilbur, "A Look At Televised Courses", p. 21.

²⁸Patterson, Consortia in American Higher Education, p. 3.

²⁹James Gilbert Paltridge, Urban Higher Education Consortia (Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971), p. 54.

³⁰Starlin, Inter-Institutional Communication Networks, p. 11.

has not been warmly accepted by faculties at various participating institutions. There has been limited acceptance, some strong resistance, and rather wide-spread apathy toward its use.³¹

Initial and unilateral cooperation in its use, therefore, is critical.

Case studies have revealed that, in a number of instances,

consortia did not have the opportunity to fully succeed for the primary reason that they were conceived and conducted by a small group of people without the strong participation of principal administrative officers or a larger segment of the academic communities.³²

Special emphasis is to be placed upon faculty acceptance of inter-institutional ITV, historically a dominant factor in its success or failure. Faculties, experience has shown, must believe in the medium and must be given voice in its use. A case in point is the Texas Educational Microwave Project (TEMP), which began distributing college courses by television in 1959. By the mid 1960's a new organization had to be developed in response to problems which grew out of charges of excessive administrative pressure and control. The reorganization gave campus faculty committees "as much power as possible in determining use, course offerings, and evaluation."³³

The Southern California Consortium for Community College Television, presently composed of 23 community colleges, evidently learned well from the experiences of other consortia in the matter of cooperation because they report making efforts to involve faculty members in

³¹Ibid., p. 14.

³²Paltridge, Urban Higher Education Consortia, p. 53.

³³Starlin, Inter-Institutional Communication Networks, pp. 21-13.

the planning and oversight of televised courses.³⁴

Lack of faculty acceptance of ITV is just one of the obstacles to cooperation which can face new consortia. A New York self-study concluded that cooperation, especially voluntary cooperation, can be different because: (1) it is a secondary institutional commitment; (2) institutional resources are always limited; (3) institutional rewards normally are not designed to make participation in cooperative programming attractive to faculty members; (4) it makes institution decision-making more complex; (5) the organization of academic life within institutions tends to inhibit cooperation among them; (6) attitudes about institutional status and prestige exist within every cooperative association, and these can become major impediments to programming.³⁵

The same study also drew conclusions regarding characteristics of effective cooperation. They are as follows:

1. Cooperation will always be undertaken voluntarily because each participating college must preserve its individual and cooperative autonomy.
2. A decision on the theoretical limits of institutional autonomy need only be one of principle. Complete authority over an individual program will be ceded voluntarily when an institution selectively chooses to participate with other institutions in a cooperative program.
3. Each of the participating colleges possesses considerable strengths and all possess certain limitations. Cooperative programs will be productive when they are designed to assist each college to achieve that which it wants to do but cannot accomplish as well within

³⁴Lynne Gross, "The Southern California Consortium for Community College Television," Educational/Industrial Television 5 (January 1973): 117.

³⁵Patterns for Voluntary Cooperation, pp. 6-7.

the limits of its own resources. This concept of complementarity leading to mutual advantages will be the leading criterion for cooperative programing.

4. Mutual accessibility will be the corollary of institutional complementarity. Each of the participating colleges may have access to the strengths of others if its own strengths also are to be made available to others.
5. Cooperative programing will be developed and evaluated primarily on the basis of its educational effects on students.³⁶

Organization

Organization of consortia, as one might expect, yields the least amount of unanimity from the literature. It is obvious that no one type of organizational pattern can be pointed to as "best" for cooperative arrangements in higher education. Also, it is probable that no single type would suit all circumstances or perhaps work under all conditions.

Moore identified six types of consortia:

1. Single bilateral--an organization to meet specific needs without reference to other bilaterals.
2. Fraternal bilateral--similar to the single bilateral in that it is constituted separately from any other consortium. But it has a common partner institution with one or more other bilaterals, and is virtually identical in purpose with them. It most often concerns a single disciplinary area.
3. Federation of bilaterals--possesses the same characteristics as the consortium of fraternal bilaterals except for one important distinction: the federation's bilaterals, while separately constituted initially, tend to work together closely in planning and evaluation with the common partner institution.
4. Multilateral--may be (a) simple and centered . . . (b) simple and dispersed . . . (c) complex and centered . . . (d) complex and dispersed.
5. College and university center--may be bilateral or multilateral, but its chief distinction lies in the fact that it is a cluster

³⁶Ibid., pp. 7-8.

of colleges and/or universities . . . geographically contiguous or within daily commuting distance of each other.

6. Constellation of consortia--two or more clusters of institutions around a teaching, research, and/or service center or program or a central consortium.³⁷

He further classified consortia according to the extent of their activity. Those which are concerned with only one area he calls "simple", while those involved in more than one he names "complex".³⁸

Whether simple or complex, the question of the formality of organization inevitably arises. Should a consortium incorporate? On the one hand it is argued that incorporation: (1) contributes permanence to the organization; (2) separates the consortium and its activities from individual members; and (3) establishes a legal entity that can enter into contracts and take responsibility for grants and other financial contributions.³⁹

On the other hand, there are those who urge a relatively loose structure for cooperatives. They must, in order to serve effectively, "constantly guard against becoming too bureaucratic", because "institutionalization may offer temporary stability and security, but it diminishes flexibility and creativity--a consortium's greatest strength".⁴⁰

Whether or not institutions choose to formalize their relationship, the wisdom of drawing up an agreement of some type among participants seems evident. In this agreement the members should detail the

³⁷Moore, "Cooperation in Higher Education," pp. 315-318.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 314-315.

³⁹Paltridge, Urban Higher Education Consortia, p. 52.

⁴⁰Patterson, Consortia in American Higher Education, p. 9.

object

how

fund

and

repr

the

Formal

usually

ments

The hig

of the

Beneatr

serving

council

each in

sortiur

a direc

body, s

cept is

yields

I

it shou

proximi

4

4

4

4

objectives of the consortium. It should specify such details as:

how to join, how to resign, and how to disband. If there are funds involved, how are the amounts established; who collects and holds them; how are they disbursed? What is the basis for representation? Is there to be an executive board? How is the chairman selected?⁴¹

Formal agreements are often known as "joint powers agreements" and are usually drawn up with the assistance of an attorney.

The kind of organization specified in the agreement, like agreements themselves, can vary. It might contain as many as five levels. The highest body could be the Presidium, a board of directors composed of the president and each institution represented in the consortium.⁴² Beneath it might be found the Collegium, with deans of each college serving in executive positions.⁴³ A variation of this is the executive council made up of representatives, either elected or voluntary, from each institution.⁴⁴ It can serve as the governing body of the consortium. Some consortia have employed the central office concept with a director or coordinator in charge, but under the authority of a higher body, such as a board of directors, or its equivalent. Since this concept is often subscribed to in consortia organization, the literature yields details not always available on other organizational patterns.

If a central office is chosen as part of the consortium structure, it should be geographically centrally located because "the physical proximity of member institutions to a central headquarters is related to

⁴¹Wilbur, "A Look at Televised Courses," p. 22.

⁴²Stier, A Look in Retrospect, p. 9.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Gross, "The Southern California Consortium," p. 16.

the . .

The pro

tionshi

A

ficatio

man of

His

to t

ber

appr

Patters

incl

of i

pete

the

role

His ro

upon hi

papers,

determi

T

Silverm

consort

45

46

47

48

49

50

the . . . desire of the colleges to administer a joint program."⁴⁵

The proximity to central headquarters "has implications for the relationship among members if they are conceived to be 'equal'".⁴⁶

As for the executive director, or coordinator, a number of qualifications have been laid down. Paltridge suggests that he should be a man of proven ability in an academic administrative position.

His credentials should be such that he will be acceptable to the administrators, faculties, and students of the member institutions. He must be of a stature that will ensure appropriate access and effective communication.⁴⁷

Patterson recommends that the director's background

include broadly based training and experience and evidence of interpersonal competence comparable to substantive competence. Resourcefulness and innovativeness would enhance the director's ability to serve effectively in his important roles of change agent and program developer.⁴⁸

His role is to implement policy, and in that capacity he should take it upon himself to "raise questions, make recommendations, provide staff papers, and offer compromise solutions to his board when policy is being determined."⁴⁹

The importance of the director's position is clear, according to Silverman, in that it is related to the "viability and growth of the consortium".⁵⁰ If he is a "synoptic thinker, an idealist with drive"

⁴⁵Silverman, Inter-Organizational Behavior in Consortia, p. 241.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 242.

⁴⁷Paltridge, Urban Higher Education Consortia, p. 56.

⁴⁸Patterson, Consortia in American Higher Education, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 5.

⁵⁰Silverman, Inter-Organizational Behavior in Consortia, p. 251.

he will

of such

office.

person

office.

be some

preside

tration

periphe

secc

who

requ

ment

consort

vantage

the ong

that of

certain

some wa

5

5

5

he will then "be associated with organizational growth". The "absence of such qualities . . . leads to stultification".⁵¹

There is, however, a distinct danger in the power of the director's office, and it almost appears a contradictory situation. For, while a person of the highest qualifications should surely be sought to fill the office, it is suggested that the person ultimately employed should not be someone comparable in stature and competence to an institutional president. The consortium director may then become a threat, and frustration and conflict may result.⁵²

For this reason, when consortium programs are determined to be of peripheral concern, the executive director should be a

second or third echelon administrator, perhaps a secretary, who understands his or her role--that of responding to campus requests and instructions, coordinating the program's implementation, and remaining behind the scene.⁵³

While there are alternative organizational patterns from which new consortia can choose, and thus, for instance, avoid some of the disadvantages inherent in the central office concept, there is an element of the organizational structure which is virtually indispensable. It is that of the institutional representative. He can be viewed as being certainly as important in his role as the consortium director, and, in some ways, perhaps even more important. Hoopes, in fact, calls him the

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Patterson, Consortia in American Higher Education, p. 5.

⁵³Ibid.

Heart

caution

boliner

guidance

is the

through

If he

tho sa

be efi

of con

re: res

1.

2.

3.

attempt

5

Institu
Fin
In

5

5

"heart of the campus operation".⁵⁴

The campus liaison may often serve as the only channel of communication between his campus and the consortium and tends to become an embodiment of it on campus.⁵⁵ He is looked to as a source of information, guidance, and leadership relative to consortium affairs. On campus he is the consortium. Perceptions, therefore, of the consortium will come through him. His success or failure will reflect on the organization. If he is perceived negatively, the consortium will be looked upon in the same manner. If perceptions of him are positive, then the consortium benefits.

By reason of his importance in the over-all organizational pattern, of consortia, relatively detailed qualifications of the institutional representative are to be found. The following is an example:

1. Must be energetic, willing and able to put time and effort into the consortium.
2. Must be respected by his colleagues, and able to get their ear when necessary. He must also be able to get tangible support from the administration, including adequate financial backing and reduction of his teaching load, to accomplish his mission.
3. Must work at understanding the consortium, be forceful in presenting his institution, its needs and interests, to the central office.⁵⁶

In addition to the campus representative, ITV consortia usually attempt to involve faculty members from those departments which have

⁵⁴David S. Hoopes, and others, A Study of the Dynamics of Inter-Institutional Cooperation for International Education Development. Final Report (Pittsburg University Pennsylvania: Regional Council for International Education, 1971), p. 49.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 161.

courses

televis

peciall

case in

College

ment at

ulty pi

outline

S

ed is t

pending

student

from tr

tain pu

those c

tors of

if they

F

Examina

the min

type(s)

to be f

ship is

The exp

courses being televised. Since faculties normally resist the use of television in instruction, successful consortia seek their advice, especially in the planning, production, and execution of the courses. A case in point is the Southern California Consortium for Community College Television in the Los Angeles area, which seeks faculty involvement at the earliest stages of televised course development. The faculty play a part in formation of the instructional objectives, course outlines, and course standards, as well as in overseeing the courses.⁵⁷

Still another facet of ITV consortium organization to be considered is the selection of one or more faculty members on each campus, depending on the number of televised courses being offered, to act as student contacts. These faculty members are selected, or volunteer, from the departments offering the televised courses. They usually maintain publicized office hours during which students who are enrolled in those courses can either come in or call in for assistance. The instructors often, also, administer mid-term and final examinations on campus, if they happen to be course requirements.

Finally, membership in a consortium should be a consideration. Examination of it raises two pertinent questions: (1) What should be the minimum length of time of institutional membership? and (2) What type(s) of membership should be provided? There is no definite answer to be found to the first question. The usual minimum length of membership is one year, with other terms running to three years in some cases. The experience of the College Center of the Finger Lakes in New York

⁵⁷Gross, "The Southern California Consortium," p. 17.

led i
viabi
the m
finan

have
insti
It wo
in th
of as
insti
to pa
relat
ocrat
servi

ture
succe
tion'
views

plex,

led it to conclude that a minimum of three years was necessary for a viable consortium. The longer the commitment by member institutions the more secure the base of the consortium, especially in the area of finances.

As to the kind of membership to be chosen, three types, or levels, have been suggested. The first type which could be offered to member institutions is full membership, with access to all consortium programs. It would call for payment of dues, and would provide voting membership in the governing body of the consortium. A second level would be that of associate membership. This would be designed for non-degree granting institutions, such as hospitals, schools, libraries, etc., which desired to participate in a consortium. The third level, that of contractual relationships, would be designed for education, service, or other corporate entities contracting to, either receive or provide specific services.⁵⁸

In the final analysis, however, it is not the organizational structure of the ITV consortium that will be the most important factor in its success. It is rather, "the willingness of the participating institution's administrations, faculties, and students to modify traditional views and methods to meet their needs through consortiums".⁵⁹

Communication

Whatever organizational form is adopted, whether simple or complex, an effective system of communication appears to be essential to

⁵⁸Patterns for Voluntary Cooperation, p. 13.

⁵⁹Moore, Consortiums in American Higher Education, p. 20.

success

system

the s

ity o

catic

both

access

of th

member

expand

been

both

colle

a cal

tive

An el

was t

trial

and a

the W

instr

studen

successful cooperation among institutions of higher education. Such a system is needed to tie together members of the same institution and at the same time all member institutions of a consortium. As the complexity of consortium structure increases, the effectiveness of its communication system must develop commensurately. The lines of communication both within and between member institutions ought to be "clear and accessible", especially in the decision-making process.⁶⁰ The failure of the central office, when one exists, to communicate with consortium members dissipates their capacity or inclination to serve as a force to expand the consortium.⁶¹

Several methods of communicating with member institutions have been used by consortia. The Finger Lakes consortium of New York used both the print and electronic media to maintain contact with its member colleges and to keep the organization in the public eye. A newsletter, a calendar of events, a scholarly journal, reports on various cooperative programs, and an annual summary report of activities were used. An electronic communication device which was employed by the consortium was the WATS line, a telephone system which linked the consortium's central office and member colleges to encourage students, faculty members, and administrative officers to have easy access to each other. Since the WATS line also had amplification capabilities, it was used as an instructional tool by giving two-way contact in the classroom between students and a guest lecturer located many miles away.⁶²

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 21.

⁶¹Hoopes, The Dynamics of Inter-Institutional Cooperation, p. 64.

⁶²Patterns for Voluntary Cooperation, p. 19.

tion)

rado w

"bicyc

by a 2

a resu

partic

engine

six co

The

and

con

wit

and

las

res

project

school

ducts

develo

to giv

transc

Year C
sented
Educat
ington

p. 4.

The CO-TIE project (Cooperation via Televised Instruction in Education) joins five Junior colleges and one four-year institution in Colorado with the College of Engineering of Colorado State University in a "bicycle"⁶³ television network. The colleges are also bound together by a 24-hour-a-day telephone network and blackboard-by-wire system. As a result of the latter system, which allows immediate contact among participating schools, "an excellent rapport" was developed among the engineering faculty at Colorado State University and instructors at the six colleges.

The two groups are now much better aware of common problems and are much more willing to hold group meetings at various convenient geographical locations to deal in great detail with current issues. Most important is the mutual confidence and respect developed by the COE-TIE participants and the lasting friendships among displaced colleagues which have resulted.⁶⁴

Still another project utilizing a telephone network is the COGEN project (Cooperative Graduate Education in Nursing), which joins eleven schools of nursing in California and Nevada. In addition, COGEN conducts periodic workshops to keep its members informed on consortium developments.⁶⁵ It even encourages those in attendance at workshops to give feedback to the Project Director on the meaningfulness of the

⁶³A bicycle network is one in which video tapes are physically transported to participating institutions via the mails, couriers, etc.

⁶⁴L. M. Maxwell, W. Lord, and R. J. Churchill, "University Two Year Cooperation Through Direct Communication Linkages" (paper presented at the National Science Foundation Division of Undergraduate Education in Science. Combined UES Project Directors Meeting, Washington, D.C., February 12, 1970), p. 7.

⁶⁵COGEN Progress Report, Number Two, Reno, Nevada, August, 1972, p. 4. (mimeographed.)

woi st

"di er

fa ,

be in

kei s

is ha

ing cr

loc 1"

\$46 00

whi h

of ig

Pei se

ca: ru

ca: co

th: ug

Li: ol

\$1 00

— —

P. 1/2

workshops. "Much of the success of COGEN", according to its literature, "depends upon effective communication."⁶⁶

These three general means of communication, electronic, face-to-face, and written, have been used by consortia in attempts to keep member institutions informed, to break down communication barriers, and to keep the spirit of cooperation alive.

Finances

Perhaps the single most persistent problem which plagues consortia is that of money. Lack of adequate financial support was the top-ranking criticism of consortia as reported in a study by Moore.⁶⁷

ITV consortia are especially vulnerable in this area because locally-produced programming which is well done is expensive. A figure of \$40,000 has been suggested for an hour of high quality ITV programming, which puts it well out of the reach of virtually any single institution of higher education.⁶⁸ Even the rental of packaged courses can be high. Per semester costs, figuring on the basis of 30 thirty-minute lessons, can run from several hundred dollars to several thousand dollars. Typical college-level courses produced by Chicago's TV College and rented through the Great Plains National Instructional Television Library in Lincoln, Nebraska, cost from a minimum of \$1,650.00 to a high of \$1,800.00 per semester. Renewal for a succeeding semester would amount

⁶⁶Undated COGEN mimeographed communication, p. 2.

⁶⁷Moore, Consortiums in American Higher Education, p. 18.

⁶⁸James R. DuMolin, Instructional Television Utilization in the United States (St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University, 1971), p. 10.

to an additional \$1,100.⁶⁹

These costs bring into sharp focus what is perhaps the basic reason institutions of higher education consort through television: to share costs. Johnson asserts that "the key to enhancing the instructional effectiveness of television may lie in spending a relatively large amount of money on the preparation of good programming" ⁷⁰ Instructional television has tried using the televised classroom lectures and similar "shoestring" productions, but found them unimpressive in their impact. There seems to be no alternative except the committing of relatively large amounts of funds in ITV consortia efforts.

These funds, according to Paltridge, must be promised at the inception of a consortium and for a substantial period in its future. He says:

To achieve any success, consortia must be sufficiently funded from their inception, with continuing resources for at least their basic minimum operating expenses.⁷¹

The way in which funds are committed to the long-range goals of a consortium, and the amount of those funds, will demonstrate "a measure of the strength and sincerity of the commitment of the member institutions".⁷² Those institutions which commit relatively small amounts of money as compared to other member colleges, would seem to be either harboring doubts about the viability of the consortium or its concept,

⁶⁹Prices based on the 1972 catalog.

⁷⁰Johnson, Cable Television and Higher Education, p. 15.

⁷¹Paltridge, Urban Higher Education Consortia, p. 56.

⁷²Ibid.

or expressing their own lack of commitment to its goals.

General insecurity in funding, and its accompanying uncertainty, results in a crippling effect.

Aside from fostering the impression of weakness and indecisiveness, financial instability makes it difficult to establish and maintain leadtimes necessary to generate maximum enrollments.⁷³

The selection of courses, course materials, staff, and the advance publication of schedules are all in jeopardy when funds are not in hand or when institution commitments are in doubt.

Consortia funding sources are of two types: (1) internal, and (2) external. Internal funds are usually in the form of fees assessed on students in the form of tuition and enrollment fees, and fees assessed to member institutions to belong to the consortium. Both classes of fees can vary, depending upon the per unit costs of colleges and the arbitrary amounts charged by consortia. The Southern California Consortium for Community College Television, for instance, levies a fee of \$3,000 upon new members.⁷⁴ Institutions which are a part of The Association for Graduate Education and Research of North Texas (TAGER) pay \$2500 per hour per institution for programs aired, in addition to system maintenance and operating charges.⁷⁵ In addition, internal funds may also arise from the sale of consortium publications and/or services.

However, even though the combination of these fees, in given consortia, might seem to generate a large amount of revenue, outside

⁷³Wilbur, "A Look At Televised Courses," p. 23.

⁷⁴Gross, "The Southern California Consortium," p. 16.

⁷⁵Schwenkmeyer and Goodman, Putting Cooperation to Work, p. 8.

funding sou

port for co

to guarante

plemented s

one or a co

necessary t

the form of

vate funds

One c

College Tel

side the co

assesses on

with succes

in federal

tributed by

television

tribute \$5.

the station

Regar

be borne in

never exist

76Int.

77No
fees for an

78Gro

funding sources will usually need to be sought. "Without external support for cooperation few joint programs can be sufficiently well-planned to guarantee the expectation of success needed for a program to be implemented solely on institutional funds."⁷⁶ Consortia, then, turn to one or a combination of the following sources for the additional funds necessary to carry on a quality program: (1) local district funds, in the form of grants; (4) private funds, in the form of grants; (4) private funds from industry and business in the form of gifts or grants.

One consortium, the Southern California Consortium for Community College Television, seeks most of its production funds from sources outside the consortium since it receives no student registration fees and assesses only one-time fees to member institutions.⁷⁷ It has turned, with success, to federal and private sources. Fifty thousand dollars in federal grants have been received. In addition, for each \$2.00 contributed by the consortium to each course produced, three commercial television stations in the Los Angeles area, KABC, KNBC, AND KHJ, contribute \$5.00. Conservative estimates put the total contributions by the stations for each program at \$50,000 in services.⁷⁸

Regardless of the amount of incoming revenue, however, it should be borne in mind that all of it will be spent. Surpluses will almost never exist.

⁷⁶Inter-Institutional Cooperative Arrangements, p. IV, 3-4.

⁷⁷No California two-year community colleges charge registration fees for any of their courses.

⁷⁸Gross, "The Southern California Consortium," p. 17.

A Parkinsonian Law operates within all organizations, including colleges and universities. Program needs seem always to rise to the level of available resources, regardless of whether these resources are financial or human.⁷⁹

ITV Teachers

Not all ITV consortia require the services of on-camera teachers. Those which choose, for reasons of economy, relevancy, etc., to lease, rent, or buy pre-taped ITV series automatically eliminate the necessity of hiring one or more persons to prepare and/or present materials via television.

Those consortia, however, which elect to produce their own television tapes primarily or solely for local consumption are faced with two significant questions: (1) Upon what criteria should the teacher(s) be selected? and (2) What compensation, if any, should be provided in exchange for services rendered?

With regard to the first question, there appears to be general consensus among ITV experts as to the importance of the on-camera role of the ITV teacher. The effectiveness of his or her presentation is regarded as one of the factors controlling the ultimate success or failure of ITV. There is also general agreement on the criteria for a successful ITV teacher. Gilliom's list of nine items encompasses nearly all of those mentioned by other writers. They are:

1. Self confidence.
2. Overall immunity to negative criticism.
3. Successful classroom experience in his or her subject area.

⁷⁹Patterns for Voluntary Cooperation, p. 6.

4. A willingness to learn new skills.
5. The ability to sense and to make use of the distinctive advantages of TV as a teaching medium.
6. The ability to work with others as a member of a team.
7. Possession of knowledge and contagious enthusiasm about the subject matter.
8. An excellent command of the English language and an interest in writing.
9. A general resonance of personality.⁸⁰

Diamond adds to the foregoing list three other criteria, viz., the ability to communicate, well-organized work habits, and a sense of humor.⁸¹ The National Education Association, in its Policy for Television Teachers, emphasizes that

television teachers should be chosen on the same basis of outstanding professional competence in a given area of instruction, as well as on the basis of those special attributes and proficiencies which are required by the medium.⁸²

In regard to the question of compensation for ITV teachers, there is almost unanimous agreement among experts that additional incentives should be offered to on-camera teachers over and above the compensation given to classroom teachers, if for no other reason than that the amount of preparation time for televised teaching has been found to be three

⁸⁰Bonnie Gillion, "The Television Teacher," in Instructional Television: Bold New Venture, ed. by Richard C. Burke, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), pp. 58-62.

⁸¹Robert A. Diamond, "The Television Teacher," in A Guide to Instructional Television, ed. by Robert A. Diamond (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 248.

⁸²Donald F. Mikes, "Contract Practices for ITV Teachers," Audio-Visual Instruction 13 (December 1968): 1094.

to six times the amount required for conventional lectures.⁸³

Five distinct approaches, or combinations thereof, have been, or are being used in instructional television.

The first of these is the payment of additional salary over and above that given for classroom teaching. In speaking to the issue of compensation, the NEA has gone on record as recommending

payment for additional services consistent with that of other teachers or faculty members on special assignment with enlarged areas of responsibility in other aspects of the educational program.⁸⁴

Siebert, too, has recommended additional compensation for those faculty members who appear on television. "It is recommended," he says, "that the teacher's contribution be recognized by appropriate (and in many cases) increased compensation for the time and talent necessary to produce an acceptable educational program."⁸⁵ It could be done, he suggests, in one of three possible ways:

1. Payment of an initial and a final sum of money.
2. An initial payment, or released time, plus a royalty or percentage of future revenues.
3. Royalty rights only with no initial payment.⁸⁶

⁸³Robert Dubin and R. Alan Hedley, The Medium May Be Related to the Message (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969), p. 52.

⁸⁴Mikes, "Contract Practices for ITV Teachers," p. 1094.

⁸⁵Fred S. Siebert, Copyrights, Clearances, and Rights of Teachers in the New Educational Media (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964), p. 43.

⁸⁶Ibid.

A second, and more often used method of rewarding the efforts of ITV teachers, is the provision of released time through reduced teaching loads. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education noted:

One of the heaviest investments needed immediately in the development of instructional technology is faculty time for development of teaching-learning materials.⁸⁷

The Commission specifically mentioned released time for faculty members as one vehicle available to achieve the goal. Both the NEA and college faculties agree. The NEA suggests that faculties be given "adequate time" for preparing ITV programs,⁸⁸ and in studies which have dealt with the issue of appropriate loads for ITV teachers, professors indicated overwhelmingly that they favored course load reduction rather than increased financial remuneration.⁸⁹

A step beyond the provision of released time is the employment of full-time ITV teachers. From a number of perspectives, this is the most ideal arrangement. For example, it becomes possible to secure the services of the so-called "master teacher", one highly skilled in his own academic area and one of proven ability both in the medium of television and in the classroom. This individual can also devote his full work load to preparation of telelessons, a task which normally requires eight hours of work for each thirty minutes before the camera.

⁸⁷The Fourth Revolution: Instructional Technology in Higher Education, A Report and Recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, June, 1972 (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company), p. 66.

⁸⁸Mikes, "Contract Practices for ITV Teachers," p. 1094.

⁸⁹Dubin and Hedley, The Medium May Be Related to the Message, p. 52.

However, due to such factors as the expense involved in hiring such a specialist, and the problem of almost universal resistance to ITV by faculties, the hiring of a full-time ITV teacher is the least common practice to be found in ITV.⁹⁰

A fourth approach, and one recommended by the NEA, calls for making available to the ITV teacher the assistance of a supporting staff.⁹¹ Such a staff often includes the services of a television director and crew, a graphics artist, photographer, and the research and secretarial help necessary to prepare lessons, lesson guides and class materials, to compose and grade examinations, and to, in general, carry on the multiple duties associated with the position of ITV teacher.

Even if an ITV teacher is employed only on a part-time basis, a support staff, whether part or full-time ought to be available to enhance his or her efforts and to assist in the production of more effective telelessons.

Finally, revision and reuse rights might be granted to creators of original ITV productions. Those rights could include: (1) the right to specify the life of the program or length of time within which it may be used; (2) the right to revise a part or all of a program or series of programs; and (3) the right to withdraw the program based on termination of employment, death, reassignment, or obsolescence.⁹²

⁹⁰Siebert, Copyrights, Clearances, and Rights of Teachers, p. 42.

⁹¹Mikes, "Contract Practices for ITV Teachers," p. 1094.

⁹²Siebert, Copyrights, Clearances, and Rights of Teachers, p. 50.

Whatever arrangements are ultimately reached between on-camera teachers and their institutions, it is suggested that "the faculty should establish and publish appropriate guiding policies and procedures."⁹³

Registration and Promotion

The method of student registration for televised courses presented by consortia in higher education is determined by the type of delivery system employed by a consortium. If a cooperative chooses to have the television signal broadcast closed-circuit to participating campuses via a 2500 megahertz system (Instructional Television Fixed Service), or a coaxial cable so that the signal is received only in designated classrooms, there are no registration problems. The same is true, of course, if prepared programs are stored on video tape and shipped to individual campuses to be played in selected classrooms for the exclusive use of those students who have registered for the courses. A case in point is the CO-TIE project in Colorado, mentioned earlier. Video tapes are produced at Colorado State University in Fort Collins and then delivered by parcel post or courier within 24 hours to the six other campuses using them.⁹⁴ In a case such as this one, tuition paid by students remains with their own colleges.⁹⁵

Registration problems do arise, however, when television courses are broadcast open-circuit over commercial channels, via public

⁹³"Statement on Instructional Television," AAUP Bulletin 55 (June, 1969) 271-72.

⁹⁴Lee Maxwell, "Cooperation Via Televised Instruction," Junior College Journal 41 (November 1970): 28.

⁹⁵Ibid.

television, or by cable television. The television signal is then relatively unrestricted and often reaches several communities which could be served by a number of colleges. When a student registers for a television course offered through a consortium of colleges, which institution shall receive his fees? If fees of member institutions vary, how will registration fees for televised courses be determined? Should students register through a central office or through the individual colleges?

The simplest solution is for each student to pay the regular registration and tuition fees at his home institution or at the institution through which he wishes to receive credit for the course. This procedure is being followed by a consortium of four community colleges in the Baltimore, Maryland area. Courses are broadcast over the local public broadcast station and students register in person or by mail at one of the four institutions. The student then receives credit through the institution at which he registered.⁹⁶

When registration takes place through a central source, fees can be placed in a central fund and distributed among member colleges according to the number of students who have indicated their desire to receive credit through each of them.

The success of the registration procedure, and in a measure of the organization, rests with measures taken to promote televised courses. "Enrollments are determined largely by the effectiveness of

⁹⁶"September '71 Semester College Courses for Credit on Television," (Baltimore, Maryland: Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting, 1971), p. 1.

publicity", and "enrollments are a crucial factor in assessing and recovering costs per student."⁹⁷

Consortia, and other institutions which televise instructional programs, have explored a number of avenues of promotion. One of the often-used methods is the printing and distribution of brochures describing courses being offered. In addition to course description, these brochures usually contain information telling the student on which television channels the program can be received, in the case of open-circuit broadcasting, and at what times of day. They may also include information describing the student/institution roles in a televised course, i.e., whether or not the student must come to campus for examinations, if campus instructors are available for assistance, etc., plus an enrollment form which the student may either send or take to the nearest consortium member or to the central office, if one exists. Brochures are often mailed to persons on a permanent mailing list, composed of those who have previously enrolled in televised courses. Those list can be, and have been, expanded to include persons in rest homes, jails, hospitals, convalescent homes, and fire stations.⁹⁸

Consortia can also take other public relations steps, including releases to local news media describing new courses, and the production and distribution of radio and television spot announcements.⁹⁹

⁹⁷Wilbur, "A Look At Televised Courses," p. 23.

⁹⁸Gross, "The Southern California Consortium," pp. 17, 20.

⁹⁹TV Classroom. Report of the 1968-69 School Year (San Diego, California: San Diego Community College, 1969), p. 8.

Various means of reaching potential students should be sought vigorously, and to the point of saturating local communities served by consortia.

Academic Standards

The question of academic standards was not one of those raised in any of the studies consulted. The conclusion is that it was not of sufficient importance to merit discussion among the other issues inherent in the ITV consortia question. The assumption is that it would be understood that academic standards for televised courses would be maintained in the same fashion as for normal classroom instruction.

Delivery Systems

One of the most important decisions to be reached by an ITV consortium pertains to the delivery system, or systems, it will use to distribute its programs to course enrollees. Three significant criteria need to be kept in mind in reaching this decision: which system will (1) reach the largest number of prospective students (2) at varied times of the day (3) for the least amount of money.

A consortium has one of several options open to it. One of them is open-circuit broadcasting via local commercial television channels. Cost is an advantage here because commercial stations, in order to meet the public service requirements of their station licenses, often are in a position to donate air time to educational institutions. However, while the air time is free, it often may not represent the choicest times of the broadcast day for reaching the widest possible audience and at a time when most people have a psychological "set" to learn. Public

service time for education is often clocked between the hours of 6:30 and 8:00 a.m. weekdays. Nonetheless, there are consortia which have been offered, and have accepted, these broadcast times. In fact, they see that time period as an advantage for their courses. The Southern California Consortium for Community College Television has found the hours from 6:30 to 7:30 a.m. "a good time because it is before people go to work".¹⁰⁰

Many ITV consortia prefer more flexible schedules than those which are possible on most, if not all, commercial television stations. Some, such as the Community College of the Air in Baltimore, Maryland, have turned to public broadcast stations as an answer to the issue of scheduling. Without the pressures imposed by revenue and ratings, these television stations can usually offer an ITV consortium greater choice of air time within the broadcast day, even with options of broadcasting lessons in what are prime time periods on commercial channels. But, here, too, there are limitations, because even some public television stations are becoming more and more audience conscious, and may not, at times, be able to offer access to those time periods most desired for the greatest amount of course exposure. Then, too, public television does not serve all of those communities presently served by institutions of higher education.

An even more ideal arrangement would be, when possible, to combine all the virtues of both worlds, commercial and public, and utilize the facilities of both of the above-mentioned broadcasters in implementing

¹⁰⁰Gross, "The Southern California Consortium," p. 17.

an ITV consortium.

A third alternative is to establish an Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS) system for the express purpose of disseminating programs. This would circumvent the problems inherent in depending upon either commercial and/or public broadcasters by opening up the entire broadcast day for first, second, and even third showings of lessons. At the same time, however, it would also create problems, not the least of which would be monetary. The average cost of establishing an ITFS system for a ten school, or campus complex, reaching 150 classrooms has been estimated at over \$160,000.¹⁰¹ Over a period of ten years the cost, roughly estimated, would reach a quarter of a million dollars for maintenance.¹⁰² In addition to engendering high costs, ITFS has another built-in disadvantage: its signal cannot be received on home television sets. Special down converters have to be installed to receive and translate its signal for the standard television set. Thus, the audience is immediately restricted to classrooms or other designated viewing areas. Employing an ITFS system would be virtually self-defeating for an ITV consortium attempting to reach large segments of the population with college-level courses.

A variation of the ITFS approach is closed-circuit television (CCTV), which depends upon microwave or coaxial cable to distribute its signal. There are two varieties of CCTV: (1) domestic and (2) commercial. The domestic systems are those set up by educational or other

¹⁰¹George N. Gordon, Classroom Television: New Frontiers in ITV (New York: Hastings House Publishers, 1970), p. 64.

¹⁰²Ibid.

institutions to tie together given locations, such as classrooms on a campus, or geographically separated campuses. While, like ITFS, cable operators can plan the broadcast day around no one's needs except their own, all of the costs are borne by the operators themselves.

A much more ideal situation is represented by the commercial cable company, or CATV. Educators, in fact, envision CATV as an answer and an opportunity. Beckes says:

Colleges may have to develop programs cooperatively to meet and cut expenses. There is no question that CATV systems will provide most of the television of the future and offer opportunity for service which community colleges can ill afford to lose.¹⁰³

Johnson observes:

In the past, television has had little impact on formal education. It has tended to be inflexible in use, it has not reduced costs of instruction dramatically, it has suffered the disadvantages of being passive, it has faced a number of institutional impediments, and its programming has frequently not been of satisfactory quality. With respect to cable television, however, there is reason for optimism.¹⁰⁴

Nader says that the "deliberate use of cable would significantly assist the continual learning process for both educationally and economically limited adults and youth".¹⁰⁵

The National Education Association has gone on record as favoring the use of CATV for educational purposes as "essential to preserve the public interest, to afford opportunities for educational innovation, and

¹⁰³Isaac K. Beckes, "Vincennes University: Pioneer in Cable TV," Community and Junior College Journal 43 (November 1972): 11.

¹⁰⁴Johnson, Cable Television and Higher Education, p. v.

¹⁰⁵Shafeek Nader, "Cable TV and the Community College," Community and Junior College Journal 43 (November 1972): 9.

to encompass the learning needs of diverse society".¹⁰⁶ It recommended to the Federal Communications Commission that "twenty per cent of any CATV system's capacity should be reserved for educational, instructional, civic and cultural applications".¹⁰⁷ The NEA has also recommended that the FCD require two-way, both audio and video, capability in all CATV systems. The National Cable Television Association is on record as having a similar and supporting position.¹⁰⁸

Finally, the Carnegie Commission lists CATV as one of the new technologies which holds the "greatest prospects in the longer run".¹⁰⁹

CATV offers advantages for ITV consortia not found in other types of delivery systems. First, it provides the possibility of a wider variety of programing reaching more varied audiences. Second, it can be confined, if necessary, within given geographical boundaries. Third, when necessary, it has the capability of reaching small audiences which are geographically dispersed. And last, it offers in the future the possibility of interactive systems.¹¹⁰

With CATV a reality, institutions of higher education should

Negotiate agreements for joint operations that would
(1) make possible what alone would be economically unfeasible, and (2) prevent unnecessary duplication of

¹⁰⁶Schools and Cable Television (Washington, D.C.: Division of Technology, National Education Association, 1971), p. 1.

¹⁰⁷Schools and Cable Television, p. 1.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁰⁹The Fourth Revolution, p. 8.

¹¹⁰Schools and Cable Television, pp. 35-36.

services to contiguous geographic areas.¹¹¹

A last delivery system for ITV consortia, one which poses possibilities for the future, is the use of satellites.

With the development of satellite communications, the scope, flexibility, and immediacy of cooperative instruction can be increased. . . .A domestic satellite system could facilitate. . .a visual dialogue among colleges throughout the United States.¹¹²

Evaluation

In order to enhance the effectiveness of ITV consortia, and to possibly lengthen their life span, two aspects of the program ought to be the subject of periodic evaluation: (1) the ITV consortium itself, and (2) the ITV series aired by the consortium.

In evaluating both, the ITV consortium and the television series it airs, the objectives of each must be known. In the case of the consortium, ideally those goals will have been formulated (1) at the outset of the organization, and (2) in concert with each of the original cooperating institutions. As for the goals of the television series, they, too, (1) should have been formulated prior to production, in the case of locally-produced programs, or prior to airing, in the case of leased programs, and (2) formulated in concert with both administration and faculties of each cooperating institution.

Not only should they be known, but consortium and course objectives should be measurable. Brown observes that

¹¹¹Nader, "Cable TV and the Community College," p. 9.

¹¹²Gumpert, "Inter-Institutional Exchange and Media," p. 279.

a major problem facing instructional television research. . . is the lack of clearly stated measurable objectives. Without them it is impossible to measure whether or not a particular approach is a success or failure.¹¹³

When evaluation is an integral, and perhaps mandatory, part of consortium operation, only those objectives which are measurable at the outset will be considered.

When the objectives are measured they will need, moreover, appropriate instruments or techniques to collect and evaluate the data. These could include, when evaluating the consortium organization, written evaluations from the following personnel: administrators from each of the cooperating institutions; faculty members at each of the institutions represented in the consortium, especially those who participated in the consortium; the consortium staff; the ITV teachers; and other interested parties.

In evaluating the television course, weekly and occasional reports from teachers, sampling surveys, correspondence from students, and evaluation forms filled out by administrators, ITV personnel, and commercial television broadcasters and cablecasters would yield data from which an evaluation could arise.¹¹⁴

Wisdom dictates, too, that evaluation of the data should be placed in the hands of an evaluation staff or person, preferably independent of the consortium and its ITV staff. In this way a more objective picture

¹¹³Roscoe C. Brown, "Evaluation of Instructional Television," in A Guide to Instructional Television, ed. by Robert A. Diamond (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 166.

¹¹⁴K.V. Bailey, "Evaluating School Radio and Television: Some Problems and Methods," Educational Broadcasting International 6 (March 1973): 22-27.

would more likely emerge.

Finally, the evaluation should be a cooperative process involving the television staff, the teaching staff, the administrative staff, and the evaluation staff. In short, all aspects of the consortium should have input into the evaluation of the organization and its end product, the television course. At a minimum, the evaluation inputs should include the administration of each cooperating institution, the consortium officer(s) and representatives, the ITV staff, and the participating faculty members from each institution represented in the consortium. In evaluating the television course in particular, input from students enrolled in the course would seem essential. Additional data could be sought from those persons who viewed courses but were not formally enrolled in them, from faculty members who were not directly involved in either the teaching or monitoring of television courses, from administrators who were directly involved in the consortium, and from the television broadcasters and cablecasters who aired or viewed the television series.

Summary

As was noted at the outset of this chapter, it is not possible, nor is it desirable, to design an "ideal" ITV consortium model for higher education. None exists, nor can exist, because no one model can be overlaid on all circumstances and be expected to "fit". An attempt has been made to arrive at general suggestions from the literature capable of selection and application to more than one set of needs and circumstances confronted by ITV consortia.

What has been said in the previous pages can be summarized as follows:

1. The needs and goals which form the bases of an ITV consortium should be deeply felt, cooperatively arrived at, and long-range in nature.
2. Cooperation is essential to an effective ITV consortium and ought to exist in the initial planning stages and should involve every level--administration, faculty, and students--in each institution.
3. While no one overall pattern of consortium organization can be recommended, optimal involvement of each member college should take place, and there should be a corresponding freedom from over-organization and bureaucracy. Those personnel who are selected to take part in a consortium's organization should demonstrate effective communication skills and enthusiasm toward their duties.
4. Varied and effective human and technological communications systems need to exist from the outset. Their complexity will be directly related to the complexity of consortium organization: the more complex the organizational structure, the more complex the communication system.
5. A secure, long-range, and multi-input financial base will best meet the needs of well-planned, quality programing, efficiently distributed.
6. On-camera teachers, when employed, should be selected according to pre-determined criteria and should be given additional compensation, monetary or otherwise, beyond that given for normal classroom duties.
7. To encourage maximum registration in ITV courses, a wide variety of promotional methods ought to be employed, accompanied by procedures

which facilitate ease of registration.

8. The most desirable delivery system is one which combines the elements of low cost, flexible broadcast schedules, and mass distribution.

9. Evaluations of both a consortium and its ITV productions can best take place when known and measurable objectives are evaluated by a heterogenous and independent staff.

CHAPTER III
THE CENTRAL VALLEY CONSORTIUM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES:
A CASE STUDY

At the outset of the study 18 questions were formulated, the answers to which were to be sought via the study. Subsequently, however, as the result of a search of the literature, 2 of the original 18 questions, those dealing with the academic standards of televised courses were eliminated from consideration. They proved to be of no significance because none of the instructional television studies consulted dealt with the issue, thus indicating its irrelevance in the actual workings of ITV consortia.

The same search of the literature led to the formulation of 4 additional questions in the areas of needs and goals, cooperation, communication and promotion. Thus, the final number of questions upon which the study was based was 20.

The reader will discover that the following three case studies, which are the subjects of Chapters III, IV and V, are divided into 10 subheadings. The distribution of the 20 questions throughout the subheadings is accomplished in the following manner:

I Background

1. With whom, and under what circumstances did each consortium originate?
2. What methods of implementation were selected for each consortium?

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| II Needs and Goals | 3. What were the originally determined needs and goals? |
| | 4. By what process were needs and goals determined? |
| III Cooperation | 5. What methods were used to gain cooperation among participating institutions? |
| IV Organization | 6. Along what lines was each consortium organized? |
| | 7. How was authority distributed within each consortium? |
| | 8. How were decisions reached? |
| | 9. What terms of membership were selected? |
| V Communication | 10. What methods of communication were used among consortium members? |
| VI Finances | 11. What means of financing each consortium were chosen? |
| | 12. How were course offerings determined? |
| | 13. From what courses were televised courses selected? |
| VII ITV Teachers | 14. How were television teachers selected and compensated? |
| VIII Registration and Promotion | 15. How did students enroll in televised courses? |
| | 16. How did students receive credit for televised courses? |
| | 17. What means were devised to promote televised courses to the public? |
| IX Delivery Systems | 18. What delivery system, or systems, were selected to make televised courses available to students? |
| X Evaluation | 19. What method, or methods, of course evaluation were used? |
| | 20. What method, or methods, of evaluation were selected to determine the success of each consortium? |

The reader will also note a difference of style between Chapter III, and Chapters IV and V. The difference rests in the fact that virtually no written records were available for the study of the first consortiums, the subject of Chapter III. Most of the data were drawn from personal

interviews with consortium personnel. The remaining two case studies, Chapters IV and V, were based both upon written records, including minutes of Board meetings, an official study of one consortium, letters from instructors or record to students, course brochures and memoranda, as well as interviews with administrators and faculty.

Background

Five community colleges in the central San Joaquin Valley of California, serving major portions of a six county area, cooperated in the spring of 1973 to air for credit a television course, Art History.

Roots of the Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges, as it came to be known, can be traced to two educators: Mr. Jack E. Williamson, Vice President in charge of Instruction at Merced College, Merced, and Dr. Lincoln H. Hall, Dean of Instruction, College of the Sequoias, Visalia.

Mr. Williamson reports that the idea of forming a consortium among area community colleges was discussed "informally and formally on some occasions" when two or three deans of instruction would get together and "get to talking about things that could be done".¹ The consortium concept "inevitably came up" in these discussions, he reported.

A more formal move toward cooperation came in 1966 in the form of a proposal for the activation of education channel 18 by Fresno State College, Fresno. Programing for the proposed station was to include:

Course instruction in general education areas as a cooperative venture between five junior colleges. Such

¹Interview with Mr. Jack E. Williamson, Vice President, Instruction, Merced College, California, April 30, 1973.

classroom uses of television will be designed to upgrade instruction and to provide a savings in personnel and instructional materials.²

The written proposal for activating the educational television station includes a letter from Mr. John S. Hansen, Assistant Superintendent for Education, for the State Center Junior College District, stating the endorsement of six public junior colleges, five of which ultimately formed the Central Valley Consortium.³

Hopes were high, according to the deans, for the cooperative effort through channel 18. However, lack of funds prevented its activation and efforts of the colleges to cooperate lay dormant for five years.

In 1971 Dr. Hall was in attendance at a conference held on the campus of San Jose State College. It was designed to acquaint California community colleges with new state legislation dealing with Coordinated Instructional Systems (CIS).⁴ The bill provides for reimbursement for community colleges of up to fifty per cent of costs incurred in CIS programs. A coordinated instruction system is defined as one

in which a variety of teaching methods, including the use of mechanical and electronic devices, self-instructional material and other similar teaching techniques, may be used to convey a particular area of knowledge or skills from the instructor to the students.⁵

²John P. Highlander, "A Proposal for the Activation of Educational Television Channel 18 at Fresno State College," (Fresno, California: Fresno State College, 1966), p. 3.

³Ibid., p. 9.

⁴Known in California as the Fong Bill, after the bill's originator, Assemblyman March K. Fong.

⁵California Administrative Code, Chapter IV, Article 1, Section 55301.

CIS programs, according to the bill, include television when used for instructional purposes.

A second input which ultimately led Dr. Hall to take initial action toward the formation of a consortium was a conversation at the aforementioned conference which he had with the acting dean of instruction at American River College, Sacramento. Dr. Hall was told of the recent formation of a consortium of eight community colleges from Modesto in the south to Yuba City in the north. The consortium was broadcasting television courses for credit using services offered to it by Sacramento area commercial television stations.

In August of the same year Dr. Hall wrote to the deans of instruction at six other community colleges in the Central San Joaquin Valley: Fresno City College, Fresno; Merced College, Merced; Porterville College, Porterville; Reedley College, Reedley; Taft College, Taft; and West Hills College, Coalinga. Dr. Hall specifically selected the seven institutions, including College of the Sequoias, as potential consortium members because the signals of Fresno television stations, whose services he hoped to use, are received in the geographical areas from which the seven colleges draw their students.⁶ In his letter to his fellow administrators of the six colleges he called attention to the need which existed at his institution, and presumably at theirs also, to have instructors "take greater advantage of the more modern technology, such as audio-tutorial methods, video tape, closed-circuit television, programed

⁶Interview with Dr. Lincoln H. Hall, Dean of Instruction, College of the Sequoias, Visalia, California, May 1, 1973.

materials, computer assisted instruction, etc."⁷ One reason for the lethargic acceptance of some of the more modern technology by faculty, according to Dr. Hall, was that "they are not aware of the more recent developments and how they may be applied to our teaching situation".⁸ As one approach to the problem, Dr. Hall suggested the joining of forces "with other community colleges which face similar difficulties" in a consortium "to make possible a number of joint ventures. . . ."⁹ "Because of their geographic proximity and common problems" it was suggested that the seven community colleges already named form the consortium. In it they "could find many advantages in such an association".¹⁰ A fall meeting was suggested to pursue the subject.

On December 3, 1971 twenty-two representatives of Fresno State College and of all the community colleges originally contacted, with the exception of Taft College, met in Fresno. The purpose of the meeting was to hear Dr. Leslie Wilbur of the University of Southern California speak on the experiences of the Los Angeles Consortium, a cooperative effort of twenty-two community colleges.

The following spring a meeting was arranged between the college representatives and representatives of Fresno's three commercial television stations, KMJ-TV, Channel 24 (NBC), KFSN-TV, Channel 30 (CBS),

⁷From a letter by Dr. Lincoln H. Hall to Mr. Jack E. Williamson, Vice President, Instruction, Merced College, Merced, California, August 16, 1971.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

and KJEO-TV, Channel 47 (ABC). The meeting was held in the office of Mr. John S. Hansen, Assistant Superintendent for Education, State Center Junior College District. Each of the three stations offered free air time to the Consortium. KFSN-TV, which has its own minority council and which is therefore sensitive to the needs of the large Mexican-American population of Central San Joaquin Valley, offered to pay rental fees on a television series, "History of Mexico", produced by the Los Angeles Consortium. However, since the series is tied up in litigation and is, therefore, unavailable, KFSN's offer could not be accepted. KJEO-TV ultimately failed to follow up its offer of free time thus leaving only KMJ-TV to air the proposed course. Its offer, however, was particularly attractive to the consortium because it carried with it the promise of free publicity in The Fresno Bee, the city's largest daily newspaper. The Bee owns KMJ-TV and is read in all of the districts represented by the Consortium.

Each member of the Consortium, with one vote per member, was polled for a decision. Votes, as expected, were cast in favor of accepting the offer of KMJ-TV.

A decision was also reached by the group that its first televised course would be "Art History", produced by Pasadena City College and one of several courses available for lease through the Los Angeles consortium. Having already discarded the idea of producing its own course, due to the substantial investments of time and money associated with quality local productions, the educators investigated a number of televised courses available in Los Angeles. "Art History" was decided upon because: (1) the course was immediately available, (2) the price was reasonable

and was consistent with the amount the Consortium had in mind to pay for a semester, (3) the texts, course syllabi, and course examinations were available, and (4) members of the Consortium had previously previewed individual lessons in the series and were favorably impressed with them.

When ultimately the first lesson of "Art History" was televised on February 7, 1973 the Consortium then consisted of five community colleges. Taft College had withdrawn because of its proximity to Bakersfield and university facilities there, and Porterville College dropped out because it was unable to pay its portion of the projected Consortium expenses.

Needs and Goals

In his initial correspondence to the deans of instruction at the other six community colleges, Dr. Hall articulated five goals which could be met, he felt, by a consortium in the Central Valley. They were: (1) acquaint faculties with modern technology for education; (2) develop courses for presentation on commercial television; (3) conduct cooperative research projects; (4) conduct programs for the disadvantaged; and (5) apply for State and Federal funds.¹¹ He also left the way open for the formulation of additional goals by the Consortium.

Accompanying this correspondence was a mimeographed sheet listing nine advantages of TV courses. They, too, constituted possible goals, as Dr. Hall saw them. They were:

1. The ability to serve people of our districts who would be unable to attend college. Barriers created by distance, travel time and expense, feelings of inadequacy,

¹¹Ibid.

- etc., can be lowered.
2. May encourage those enrolling to take advantage of additional services provided by the college in the future.
 3. Provide campus students an opportunity to obtain classes they are unable to take due to scheduling conflicts or closed classes.
 4. Provides an opportunity for participating staff to improve their professional skills.
 5. Some areas can be presented better and more completely by means of television. Provides a concentrated focus of attention. Each student can see clearly and a nearly one-to-one basis can be achieved for demonstrations. Cameras can go to locations classes can not and at reduced costs.
 6. A consortium would provide a pool of expert instructional staff not available on any single campus.
 7. Districts may take advantage of local resource people for many students while inconveniencing them only once.
 8. Video teaching offers a positive public relations image in the supporting community.
 9. Lessons can be repeated as frequently as desired through closed circuit or individual playback on the local campus.¹²

Dr. Hall said that for years he had had the feeling that somehow his institution had to "break the bounds" that were limiting it with respect to classroom space. When new courses were offered it became difficult, he reported, to locate classroom space on campus. Then, too, since the College of the Sequoias district covers many hundreds of square miles many of those persons who would like to enroll for college courses are hindered because of distance from the campus. He also saw the need to reach housewives, retired people, businessmen, and others who desired to take college courses but were unable or unwilling to take evening courses or to come at all to the campus. Television, he felt, could fill these needs.

¹²Lincoln H. Hall, "Proposed Southern San Joaquin Valley TV Consortium" (Mimeographed.)

An undergirding goal, which Dr. Hall expressed in his correspondence to fellow deans of instruction, was the general purpose for which colleges often cooperate, viz., the need to pool resources. He said:

What I had in mind, and I speak for myself alone, was the fact that, operating individually, because of enrollment limitations and also financial stringencies, few of us could accomplish very much.¹³

The only other Consortium representative who was able to articulate consortium goals was Mr. Williamson of Merced College. He pointed to the Fong Bill as lending impetus to a consortium, and, associated with it, the move toward developing coordinated instructional systems.¹⁴

Dr. Arthur Evans, Associate Dean of Instruction at West Hills College in Coalinga, stated that the goals of the Consortium were never stated. However, West Hills itself did have a "pragmatic" goal, he stated, which was to become a part of the greater effort to offer a televised course. Since it is a part of that geographical area served by Fresno commercial television stations, it seemed only "logical" to become a part of the group offering the course. "It was the sign of the times; it was the direction things were going."¹⁵ Since other colleges were offering televised courses, Dr. Evans felt West Hills should, too.

The Dean of Instruction at Reedley College, Mr. Norman Zech, holds the same view of the Consortium goals as that stated by his colleague Dr. Evans. "We never set down any goals or purposes in writing to be

¹³Interview with Dr. Lincoln H. Hall.

¹⁴Interview with Mr. Jack Williamson.

¹⁵Interview with Dr. Art Evans, Associate Dean of Instruction, West Hills College, Coalinga, California, May 1, 1973.

framed and hung on the wall,"¹⁶ he said. Dr. Hall had asked the college representatives if they thought a consortium should be tried in the Valley to reach a segment of the population then untouched by them, he recalled. They agreed it should be attempted.

Although he is not personally an advocate of formalized goals, he says, Mr. Zech was able to enunciate those which he felt Reedley College could fulfill in participating in the Consortium. The College, he said, sought to offer

a service for adults in the community who had not had occasion to come on campus; who might be challenged to be stimulated by something culturally that they could take via television. Our initial thrust at this college was just to participate in something that seemed worthwhile from a cultural standpoint as a community service.¹⁷

Although offering of televised courses was not the sole purpose for which the Consortium was conceived, and may not have been the dominant one, each of the institutions stated separately, and in concert, that their main motive was to offer another service to the communities they serve. At the same time each dean of instruction was sensitive to the need of maintaining a healthy on-campus enrollment and avoiding any innovation which poses a threat to the average daily attendance (ADA), upon which each college's reimbursement from the State is based. None felt that at present the concept of televised courses poses any real threat to on-campus courses. Early in the planning stages of the Consortium, Dr. Hall had tried to allay whatever fears were present among the cooperating colleges by pointing to the record of the Los Angeles

¹⁶Interview with Mr. Norman Zech, Dean of Instruction, Reedley College, Reedley, California, April 27, 1973.

¹⁷Ibid.

consortium. The facts reportedly showed that there were no drops in the enrollments of on-campus courses despite enrollments of several thousand students in televised courses.

Although none of the deans interviewed could then demonstrate any downward trend in the enrollment of Art classes on his campus as a result of the "Art History" series offered through the Consortium, at least one dean was quick to predict the demise of the cooperative effort should such a trend be detected.

Cooperation

Since the Central Valley Consortium brings together community colleges from four separate districts, and since there is in the State of California no legislation making cooperation among community colleges mandatory, the cooperation achieved among the five participating colleges was voluntary. Of the seven institutions originally invited to cooperate, those which accepted evidently did so because of the merits they believed were present in the proposed organization. No evidence of coercion, overt or covert, was discovered.

In the early stages of planning there was brief involvement of the presidents of two of the institutions, Reedley College and Fresno City College, the only two institutions representing the same junior college district. Thereafter, the planning and execution of the Consortium was handled by the deans of instruction. There seem to have been no attempts to involve directly the president of each of the cooperating institutions.

With but one exception, the cooperation between the institutions appeared to be excellent. Mr. Zech expressed what appeared to be the

consensus of the administrators involved when he said the cooperation among the colleges was "great."¹⁸ "I think" he said, "on this particular project" that the attitude of all the participating schools "was real wholesome and healthy and willing to cooperate."¹⁹

The exception referred to was noted by Dr. Evans of West Hills. He cited the existence, at one point, of "some internal conflict" between Reedley College and Fresno City College, both of which represent the same district. The problem, according to Dr. Evans, was one of "internal politics."²⁰ He implied that the District Office ought to mediate the dispute between the two institutions.

Efforts to involve the Art faculties of the five institutions in the planning process for the televised course were minimal. Of the five instructors of record selected to work with the course, only one, Mr. Jerry Livesay of West Hills College, previewed lessons. The other four said they had not been asked to do so. Mr. Williamson, in defense of the administrators, said there had not been sufficient time to invite each instructor to preview the video tapes prior to selection of the television series. Mr. Weinschenk, however, admitted, at least for his part, that the selection of the course was done "backwards."²¹ His staff, he said, should have been consulted before the course was selected, not afterwards. Instead, it was selected by the deans of

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Interview with Dr. Arthur Evans.

²¹Interview with Dean Franz Weinschenk.

instruction. Subsequently instructors of record were selected on each campus and told that a decision had been made. Dean Weinschenk went on to say:

The process should be that we consult with faculties first and find interest there, and assuage their concerns about ITV, then go ahead, rather than going at these decisions administratively and then tell faculties to go along with them. . . .That was a mistake we made.²²

Faculty resistance to ITV was discovered at Fresno City College. As related by Mr. Walter Witt, Art instructor and instructor of record for the televised course, the opposition came first from the faculty senate.²³ Although the Art Department, according to Mr. Witt, saw no threat to on-campus enrollments prior to the senate statement, they subsequently came to have opposite views to those they originally held.

Among the five instructors of record, four separate occasions to cooperate were provided, all of which took the form of televised programs and which were to be aired as a part of the televised series. Each time they assembled in Fresno at the studios of KMJ-TV. Twice they met prior to the commencement of the course to tape previews of the telelessons for the viewing audience. These programs were also designed to give the at-home students an opportunity to "meet" their instructors. A third opportunity to work together came when the group again met at KMJ-TV to tape a review program which was to be aired just prior to the mid-term examination. Each instructor was to have had five minutes to discuss a specific area of art history, but, evidently because of

²²Ibid.

²³Interview with Mr. Walter Witt, Instructor, Art Department, Fresno City College, Fresno, California, April 24, 1973.

insufficient communication, one instructor was not informed of the limited role each was supposed to play and consequently took fifteen minutes of the thirty allowed for the entire production. The program had to be scrapped. The last opportunity was offered to the instructors of record in a review program for the final examination.

Organization

The Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges is a de facto but not a de jure body. To date, it has no joint powers agreement, by-laws, or other documents of incorporation. Dr. Evans described it as:

just a half dozen individuals who know each other well on a first name basis, who believe and trust in each other and who are willing to share this and be open and not sandbag.²⁴

At this time the colleges have "organized", according to their spokesmen, to do just one thing: air television programs for credit. One administrator referred to it as "our little endeavor."

The organization of the Consortium is equally as informal as its agreement to cooperate. It functions without a formally appointed director, although it does in fact possess one. Virtually all of the functions of an executive have been assumed, perhaps of necessity, by Dr. Hall. It is he who calls together the group and it is he who, more than any single individual, has held the group together. All of his colleagues have looked to him for leadership of the Consortium. He takes responsibility for calling meetings of the institutional representatives to act on Consortium business, which includes deciding upon future ITV courses, evaluating television broadcast times, scheduling examinations,

²⁴Interview with Dr. Arthur Evans.

collaborating on the design of course brochures, and evaluating the consortium. Dr. Hall has, by admission, been willing to take on this burden above and beyond his normal load. As of the fall semester 1973, Dr. Hall has been relieved of a portion of his past duties as Dean of Instruction in order that he can devote time to directing the Consortium.

The attitude of the other deans toward Dr. Hall is perhaps best expressed by Dean Weinschenk who attributed Dr. Hall's leadership role to the fact that "we all like the guy."²⁵

A lesser, but nonetheless important, role, perhaps comparable to that of co-director, is played by Dean Weinschenk himself. Because of Fresno City College's proximity to KMJ-TV, and due to its experience in producing and airing a television course, Dr. Weinschenk is looked to by his colleagues for help in Consortium business.

Below the levels of Consortium director and co-director, unofficial as they are, are the deans of instruction of the five colleges, plus Mr. John S. Hansen, Assistant Superintendent for Education, State Center Junior College District. Dr. Hall and Dean Weinschenk play dual roles, those of director and co-director, respectively, and members of what might be called the Consortium council. In the council each dean of instruction has equal voice and vote in Consortium business. Each is given authority to represent his own institution in the Consortium.

The lowest level of Consortium organization is comprised of the instructors of record from each of the five participating colleges. Their role is mandatory under the CIS organization. It specifies that:

²⁵Interview with Dean Franz Weinschenk.

(1) a CIS program must be under the supervision of a district employee who holds a certificate qualifying him to teach the subject matter being presented through the CIS; (2) "the instructor shall have the primary responsibility for preparing, having prepared or organizing the instructional material, supervising other staff involved, and evaluating and grading the students using the CIS;" (3) students using the CIS program have "access to the CIS instructor equal to or greater than that commonly available in the other instructional methods."²⁶ Each instructor of record is required by his institution to monitor the course, which means rising at 6:30 a.m. Monday, Wednesday and Friday each week during the semester. West Hills College taped the lessons on video cassettes each day they were broadcast and made them available to students for viewing on campus each Friday. In addition, each instructor of record makes himself available to answer questions regarding the televised course. Students may either telephone him, usually on campus, or see him during publicized office hours. The remainder of their duties are taken up with proctoring two scheduled examinations, correcting and grading the examinations, and determining final grades for each student enrolled in the televised course.

Even though the five instructors of record cooperated on four separate occasions to produce special preview and review programs, no formal organization or leadership appears to have emerged in the group.

Institutional membership in the Consortium was originally determined by invitation, and by reception of the signal of Fresno commercial

²⁶California Administrative Code, Chapter IV, Article 3, sections 55332 and 55333.5.

television stations. Each community college within the reception area was invited to participate. The invitations were issued by Dr. Hall. Since the Consortium has no formal organization, there is no specified term of institutional membership. Colleges are at liberty either to join or withdraw at will. Those which do join enjoy voting rights and access to services on an equal basis with all other participating institutions.

Communication

The system developed by the Consortium to communicate with institutional representatives took three forms: (1) written communications, (2) telephone calls, and (3) face-to-face meetings.

The written communications, of which there were a minimum, originated almost entirely from the office of Dr. Hall, in keeping with his role as unofficial executive director. The usual approach was for him to write a letter of Consortium business to each dean of instruction. Other letters were sent to Mr. Ralph Moody of the Extension Division, Fresno State College, and to Mr. William Davidson, Program Director, KMJ-TV, Fresno. Dr. Hall also sent a mimeographed sheet to each dean of instruction listing the advantages of televised courses and giving the steps to be followed in establishing a consortium in the central valley of California. The last type of written communication was to supply each institutional representative with a copy of the proceedings of a meeting of the Consortium. This was done just once, in the fall of 1971 when Dr. Leslie Wilbur, a special consultant from the Los Angeles consortium, was in attendance. Minutes of meetings, unfortunately, were

not kept.

An even more frequent kind of communication used, according to Dr. Hall, was the telephone. He found it more convenient simply to pick up the telephone and call his fellow deans than to direct correspondence to each of them and to wait for answers from them. The cost of calls is reimbursable from the State under the CIS program.

The third method of horizontal communication utilized in the Consortium council was the face-to-face meeting. The meetings were irregular and were called, generally by Dr. Hall, when there was pressing business to be transacted. They were generally held in Fresno, in the offices of the State Center Community College District, the most central geographical location for all the colleges.

Vertical communication, from administrator to instructor of record, was accomplished by the same three methods already described. They took the forms of discussions between each instructor and his dean, telephone calls between the two individuals, and the sending of course syllabi, examinations, and other course materials. In at least one instance an instructor received most of the communication relative to the course, not from his own dean, but from Dean Weinschenk at Fresno City College.

Three of the five instructors of record reported communication problems. These problems arose from insufficient information reaching them, generally from their deans. One instructor characterized administrators as "hard-headed businessmen" and said the lack of communication between faculty and administration is "legendary." This same instructor was a member of the majority of instructors of record from the five colleges who did not preview the telelessons before selection of a course

was made. Two other instructors said there "is definitely a breakdown in communication" from their perspectives. They reported that communication between them and the acting director was encouraged but that important information relative to the course, such as copies of examinations, arrived at the last minute, thus hindering them from adequately preparing their students for the tests.

As for horizontal communication among the instructors of record, it was minimal. It was limited to a few video taping sessions which took place in the studios of KMJ-TV in Fresno and to brief correspondence leading up to the sessions. It was one of these sessions, a review in particular, which lead to a communication breakdown. Each instructor had allotted a ten-minute portion of the sixty-minute review program but, for some reason not explained, one of the instructors took more than twice his portion of the time period. The result was that the review program was scrapped and ill feelings were directed toward the offending instructor.

There was, however, communication between the instructors of record and their students. It was facilitated by the publication of the telephone numbers of each instructor in the brochure each student received prior to registration. Consequently, the instructors received a number of telephone calls from students who were taking the course. Students also visited the offices of the instructors to ask questions regarding course content, grades, etc. One instructor reported that approximately 25% of students taking the course through his institution came to his office during the semester to discuss some aspect of the course. This was typical of student response on each of the campuses and represented,

according to the instructors, a greater response than shown in on-campus courses.

At least three of the instructors made a practice of communicating with the television students by means of letters informing them of the time and place of examinations, the scope and type of examinations, the availability of text books, the availability of video tapes, and other information equally as important to the students.

Finances

One of the original proposals made to prospective Consortium members by Dr. Hall was the rental of television courses. It was no doubt apparent to him, and certainly must have been confirmed by the later meeting with Dr. Wilbur, that production of its own television series would prove to be prohibitive for the Consortium. Consequently, arrangements were made with the Los Angeles consortium to rent its course, "Art History." The agreed rental price of \$3,300 was to be shared equally by the five participating colleges. In addition, each institution was also to bear the remaining costs of advertising, salaries for its secretarial help and instructor of record, mailings, and miscellaneous costs incurred. Fifty per cent of the total costs of CIS programs, as previously mentioned, are recoverable under the Fong Bill.

Fresno City College's proposed budget for the television course, with the exception of its administrative costs, is typical of those listed by each of the five colleges. The administrative costs were those incurred, according to Dean Weinschenk, by administrators such as the Registrar and himself in the activities connected with arranging for

Fresno City College's participation in the televised course. They also included his time and expenses in attending conferences pertinent to instructional television, previewing video taped lessons, preparing proposals for televised courses, supervising the instructor of record on his campus, monitoring examinations, etc. The budget was as follows:

Direct Costs:

Salary of the instructor (Class V, Step 4, Salary Schedule C-3 units)	650
Advertising costs	
Art work	50
Printing	<u>300</u>
Mailing	150
Rental fee of video tape	650

Indirect Costs:

Administrative costs for preparation of the class	2000
Classified salaries	750
Miscellaneous (includes operation of plant, maintenance, fixed charges)	<u>150</u>
Grand Total	\$4700
50% of Grand Total (maximum allowance)	\$2350 ²⁷

Each college originally estimated its total costs at \$2,000, one half of which they can recover from the State, as stipulated in the CIS program.

Normally, some of the colleges in the Consortium assess fees for adult education courses, the normal classification of the television course, but because Fresno City College does not charge tuition for any of its courses, all the participating institutions agreed to waive their

²⁷ Franz Weinschenk, "A Proposal for a Television Class in Art 25--Art History, 3 Units," p. 5. (Mimeographed.)

normal fees. The only costs to students who enrolled in the televised course were those incurred in purchasing the text book and syllabus, and in driving to campus, or other designated sites, to take mid-term and final examinations.

ITV Teachers

Since the Consortium leased its televised course from another consortium it did not require the services of local ITV teachers. Selection and compensation of on-camera teachers were, therefore, made with the originating institution.

Registration and Promotion

As specified in the Consortium brochure, registration for the televised course was open to all adults, high school graduates, and, under certain conditions to be determined by the colleges, to high school seniors. Those persons interested in registering for the course could do so by either sending in a registration form attached to the brochure or going directly to the college in their districts. Four of the five cooperating colleges were able to use forms which, when filled in by the prospective student, constituted complete registration for the course. Fresno City College, however, was not able to secure permission from its Registrar to abbreviate its normal registration form. Its brochure, therefore, included a form on which a person expressed interest in enrolling in the Art History course. When the form had been forwarded to the College the person received by return mail a lengthy registration form to be completed and returned to the Registrar. Dean Weinschenk reported that of the initial 400 persons who expressed interest in the

course by filling out and returning the initial form to Fresno City College, only 300 actually registered for the course. He attributed the drop-off to the lengthy form used at his institution.²⁸

Since each interested person was directed to register with the college in his district, there was not the problem of cross-registration, and, since registration fees were not charged, there was not the problem of distributing fees among the participating institutions.

The televised course carried 3 semester units credit, and was identified by a different course number at each institution. Approximately 850 persons initially enrolled in the course through the five colleges.

To promote the course, a number of different methods were utilized: radio, television, newspapers, and printed brochures. KMJ-TV sent a camera crew to the campus of each participating college to shoot approximately five minutes of 16mm film on each campus. The film was used as a part of three half-hour television programs which were aired prior to the first lecture of the "Art History" series. They were designed to acquaint the communities both with their colleges and with those instructors who would be monitoring the television course.

In addition, twenty public service announcements and three one-minute news stories appeared on KMJ-TV.

Newspaper coverage in The Fresno Bee, which owns KMJ-TV, was provided in the form of ten two-column by ten inch advertisements which appeared beginning January 17, two weeks prior to the beginning of the course.

²⁸Interview with Franz Weinschenk.

All coverage of the course on KMJ-TV, including the three half-hour promotion programs, and in The Fresno Bee were without charge to the Consortium.²⁹

Public service announcements and news items also appeared on radio stations and in newspapers in Merced, Visalia, and Coalinga. Materials were prepared in some instances by the colleges and in other instances by the local stations. By comparison, the intensity of the coverage was less because The Fresno Bee and KMJ-TV are received in the areas served by each college.

In addition, several thousand brochures were printed and distributed to the public. These were distributed to several groups, such as public school teachers, on-campus college students, evening college students, etc. The brochure included: (1) an outline of the course, by topics; (2) qualifications of the lecturer; (3) a brief course description; (4) a brief description of the Consortium; (5) the times of day, days of the week, and channel for receiving the course; (6) registration instructions and form; (7) text book purchase information; (8) examination dates and times; and (9) names and telephone numbers of instructors of record on each campus.

Last, the course was publicized by word of mouth. In some cases news of the availability of the course was spread during the regular registration periods for on-campus courses.

²⁹Interview with Mr. William Davidson, Program Director, KMJ-TV, Channel 24, Fresno, California, May 1, 1973.

Delivery Systems

In order to get the course to the prospective students it was decided from the beginning to approach the commercial television stations serving the Fresno area to determine which ones would be willing to cooperate. This action was dictated by at least four factors: (1) the successful experience of the Los Angeles Consortium in using commercial television stations; (2) the belief that free air time would be available on Fresno stations; (3) the nonexistence of a public television station serving the Central San Joaquin Valley; and (4) the unavailability of a cable television system or systems, reaching the students of all five colleges in the Consortium.

KMJ-TV, Channel 24, was chosen. The time available for airing the course was 6:30 to 7:00 a.m., Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Forty-four half-hour sessions were scheduled commencing Wednesday, February 7 and ending Friday, May 25.

In the beginning of the Consortium it was suggested that video tape copies of the lessons be made for on-campus closed-circuit broadcasting. The closest this came to being accomplished was at West Hills College where the instructor of record arose each morning the course was televised, went to campus and recorded the lessons using the College's video cassette machine. The tapes were made available each Friday in the College library for students who either missed them or wanted to review them.

Both deans of instruction and instructors expressed interest in the eventual benefits cable television can bring to television courses. Dr. Evans noted that in sparsely populated districts, such as that served by West Hills College, cable television appears to offer unique possibilities

for instruction. Although a cable company now serves his area, Dr. Evans indicated that the cost of renting television courses would be prohibitive for West Hills College itself.³⁰

Evaluation

No formal evaluation of the Consortium was planned by the member institutions. An informal evaluation of the group's efforts, however, did take place in the summer of 1972, prior to the broadcast of the first television course. At that time a meeting of the deans of instruction was held during which each institutional representative was invited to express his reactions to the cooperative effort to date. Dr. Hall reported that to the best of his knowledge there was a consensus of the deans in favor of continuing the organization.³¹

Evaluation of the television course was left to the discretion of each institution in the Consortium. Four of the five colleges conducted evaluations. In each case, the evaluation was based upon two sources of data: (1) the reactions of students enrolled in the course as tabulated through a written questionnaire, and (2) the reactions of the college administration, and the dean of instruction in particular.

The written evaluations were submitted to the State as part of the CIS program requirements, and included the following information: (1) a brief description of the television course, (2) an identification of the producing institution, (3) the title of the television consortium through which the course was offered, (4) an identification of the

³⁰Interview with Dr. Arthur Evans.

³¹Interview with Dr. Lincoln Hall.

commercial television station which carried the course, (5) a description of promotional efforts on behalf of the course, (6) a notation of enrollment figures, (7) the mid-term and final examination arrangements, and (8) a summary of student responses to the television course.

No explanation was given by the one college concerning its decision not to evaluate the course even though participation in the CIS program requires an evaluation.

Appraisal

The strength of the Central Valley Community College Consortium can be traced primarily to the voluntary leadership of Dr. Lincoln Hall, and to the willingness of his fellow deans to accept him in the capacity and to cooperate with each other. Dr. Hall adopted, according to one of his colleagues, a "second mile" philosophy³² and this was sufficient to virtually sustain the workings of the group. His approach to the directorship was best expressed when he said:

The work that has been done so far by me has been done on my time, and if it has cut into my work here at the college, I just have to make that up on my own time. There is a certain job that must be done here and I do that. And, if I don't do it here as a result of involvement in Consortium activities, I take it home and do it at night.³³

What may be the Consortium's main weakness lies also in the identified strength of Dr. Hall's leadership. His fellow deans relied too heavily upon his leadership role to the end that decisions were dangerously delayed to the detriment of all involved, including both

³²A biblical expression indicating going beyond what is asked or expected of an individual.

³³Interview with Dr. Lincoln Hall.

administrators and students. A case in point was the determination of a television course for the 1973 fall semester. No decision was reached until after the close of the 1973 spring semester which meant that deadlines had passed at each of the five participating institutions preventing the course from being announced in the fall schedules. This in turn meant that complete promotion of the course was not possible and therefore student enrollment would be adversely affected.

The reason for the delay was apparent: Dr. Hall, because of the press of his regular duties, failed to call together the other deans. Since the mantel of leadership rested upon him, and since it is apparent that none of his fellow deans wished to assume the leadership of the Consortium, no leadership was exercised when it was most needed.

Although the leadership problem is temporarily "solved" in the released time arrangement made through Dr. Hall's institution, the "solution" can be viewed, at best, as being only temporary and partial. First, there is no indication that he will be given released time beyond the academic year 1973-1974. There is certainly a question as to how long one institution of the five participating in the Consortium will bear an unequal share of the load. How long can it be expected to finance that portion of Dr. Hall's time which is given in service to the Consortium? It will almost certainly soon call upon the other four colleges to commit their deans in similar fashions. What, then, will be the fate of the consortium, and ultimately the educational needs of those hundreds of students who responded by enrolling in the television course, if leadership of the group is left to a rotational basis? Not one of the remaining deans indicated any willingness to direct the Consortium.

It is apparent that a long-term solution to the leadership problem must be sought if the Consortium is to maintain the most efficient service to the community.

The goals of the Consortium, likewise, need attention. First, those goals were not arrived at by consensus. It is little wonder, therefore, that individual Consortium members were unable, for the most part, to articulate them. Second, since the goals are mainly community service oriented, they do not appear to be high-priority in nature and will likely be dropped when difficulties in meeting them interpose. Since the spring semester ended without a decision having been made to offer another televised class in the fall, partial fault can be found in the weak commitment of the Consortium to its own goals. Even though over 850 persons enrolled initially in the course, this enrollment was not interpreted, in the words of one dean, as a "mandate" from the public for continued courses via television.

Television does not appear, from discussions with the deans of instruction, to be part of the long-range goals of the colleges in the Consortium. It was stressed that the organization was formed to, in the long run, achieve other cooperative goals. In such a climate, instructional television can be very easily lost sight of as a goal of cooperation.

As for communications and cooperation, they have been effective among the deans of instruction in achieving a climate of affirmative action. Praise for mutual efforts and for the efforts of the director were everywhere evident at this level.

Vertical communication and cooperation from deans and the Consortium director to instructors of record, however, did not elicit comparably positive comments from the instructors of record. As was previously indicated, three of the five instructors reported communication problems with their deans and the Consortium director. Those problems centered around the following: (1) failure to include the faculty in the process of previewing and selecting televised courses; (2) failure of the college administrations to allay the fears of faculties regarding the possible impact of televised courses on campus enrollments; (3) failure of some deans to approach sufficiently in advance the persons they had selected to serve as instructors of record; and (4) failure of the Consortium director and some deans to put examination materials in the hands of instructors of record far enough in advance of the examination dates.

Horizontal communication among the instructors of record is likewise open to repair. Infrequent meetings to plan television review sessions and lack of formal leadership led to ineffectual communication among the five instructors of record. Students in the televised course were deprived of one entire review session due to poor communication among the five instructors.

In the area of finances an irony exists. At the present rate of expenditure, with renting television courses and having no paid director, the colleges can admittedly continue to cooperate without great financial burden to any one institution. However, if a full-time director is hired--the need for which may increase--the colleges indicate they would then be compelled to withdraw for lack of financial resources. The most needed item thus becomes the least affordable.

In the areas of course registration and promotion the Consortium demonstrated little need for improvement. Virtually all of the normally used methods of advertising a course were employed. The success of the promotional efforts can be measured in the significant first-time enrollment figures of 850 students.

Those figures might be further enhanced if Fresno City College is able to convince the office of the Registrar at its institution to abbreviate its registration form. A loss of one-fourth of those persons originally expressing interest in the course would appear to be attributable to the cumbersome registration form being used.

Finally, the availability of only a single television outlet, i.e., commercial television, in the geographic area served by the Consortium has placed a restriction on the number of persons who can be served by the cooperating colleges. Not only has course exposure been limited to commercial television stations, but only one of the four most powerful stations in the area has carried the series, and then at an early morning hour when it could not or would not be viewed by all those who might otherwise tune in.

Solutions to the above-mentioned problems lie in: (1) the hiring of a full-time Consortium director and at least a minimal support staff; (2) cooperative examination of the most pressing educational needs of the cooperating colleges which can be best served by application of ITV, and cooperative definition of Consortium and ITV program goals; (3) fundamental involvement of faculty members in the decision-making process of the Consortium especially as concerns its ITV courses; (4) earnest development of more open and consistent communication between college

deans and/or Consortium representatives and the instructors of record on their campuses; (5) the unification of instructors of record into a single organization with both appointed leadership and recognized lines of communication; (6) the securing of an additional financial base beyond CIS to perhaps include the sale of course materials and the assessing of course fees; and (7) the ultimate expansion of television coverage to include public television and cable television outlets when, and if, they become available within the geographic area served by the Consortium.

The efforts of the Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges to air a televised course have amply demonstrated both the need for and acceptance of instructional television in their respective districts. The citizens of the districts have responded affirmatively to the offer of instruction by television. The ultimate decision as to the future of the Consortium now rests with those in positions of responsibility at each of the five participating institutions, and most specifically with the deans of instruction.

CHAPTER IV
TELEVISION CONSORTIUM OF VALLEY COLLEGES: A CASE STUDY

Background

On May 25, 1971 administrators from colleges in the Central Joaquin Valley, ranging from Marysville in the north to Modesto in the south, met in Sacramento, the center of the geographical area. At the meeting the superintendents of the community college districts which were represented authorized the formal development of an organization which had had its informal beginning in 1969. In that year, seven community colleges planned and produced an ETV series, "Campus Discovery", which was aired on KCRA-TV, one of Sacramento's commercial television stations. Following the cooperative venture it was "noted that the same group could produce instructional television courses for TV for credit and all colleges could benefit from this, via exchange of credits, etc."¹ The group ultimately gave rise to the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges.

At the earliest meetings of the Consortium, representatives from the community colleges and one four-year institution were present. The community colleges were: Columbia Junior College, Yosemite Junior College, Sacramento City College, Butte College, Cosumnes River College, Modesto Junior College, Sierra College, and San Joaquin Delta College.²

¹Minutes of the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges, June 17, 1971, p. 2.

²Minutes of the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges, May 25, 1971, p. 1.

Sacramento State College was the only four year institution represented at the meeting. Later meetings were attended by representatives of Yuba College, the University of California at Davis, Napa College, and television stations KVIE and KCRA. By the time the Consortium aired its first course the number of colleges had been pared to seven.

Almost immediately the organization began drawing upon the expertise of the largest and most successful community college consortium in the state, the Los Angeles consortium. One of the first directives given the Consortium was to rewrite the Joint Powers Agreement drawn up by the Los Angeles group. In addition, it was suggested that Dr. Leslie Wilbur, coordinator of the Los Angeles organization, be considered as an informal consultant to the new group.³

Secondly, the Consortium began looking to Mr. Robert Wyman, whom the group almost immediately elected as its president. Cosumnes River College, where he serves as Associate Dean of Instruction, had led in the production of telecourses. In 1971 and 1972 it presented two courses in the Los Rios Community College District which drew total enrollments of 1,089.⁴ Thus, the new group which he headed was able to draw upon his experience with successful telecourses.

Third, the Consortium was backed by the additional television experiences of two of its other member colleges, Modesto Junior College and San Joaquin Delta Community College. Modesto had produced a course

³Minutes, October 14, 1971, p. 1.

⁴John C. Crabbe, Master Plan for Television Consortium of Valley Colleges, Report to the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges, Sacramento, California, June 22, 1972, p. 11.

in Business Management, while Delta had aired California History.

For over a year the Consortium met on the average of every month and a half, including the summer months of 1971 and 1972, resolving matters of organization, finances, etc. After video tapes of courses produced at other colleges were viewed, legal and financial factors connected with renting courses were considered, a call was issued in June 1972 to the participating colleges. It was suggested that they submit any proposals they might have for producing programs for use by the Consortium. When the group reconvened in September, only one proposal had come in. Not surprisingly, given its previous record of producing telecourses, Cosumnes River College declared it was ready to produce a course for the Spring semester, 1973. It would consist of forty-five half-hour presentations in Humanities I. The proposed budget was \$16,900.

By the November meeting of the Consortium the course was in production, and in January it was announced to the group that the video taping would be complete within two weeks following the beginning of the course.

In February of 1973 the first lesson in the series, "Classical Humanities", was aired to six cities in the Central San Joaquin Valley. At that time the Consortium consisted of seven active members: American River College, Consumnes River College and Sacramento City College, all located in Sacramento; and Butte Junior College, Durham; Modesto Junior College, Modesto; Sierra College, Rocklin; and Yuba College, Marysville.

Needs and Goals

The goals of the Consortium, which appear in the Master Plan, seem to have been arrived at in concert by the cooperating colleges.⁵ They are as follows:

1. To serve people of our districts who never come to college. Distance, travel time and expense, feelings of inadequacy, etc., can be eliminated.
2. To add another dimension to traditional teaching by making use of a medium that has demonstrated its capacity to capture the imagination, to challenge the viewer, and to move people to action.
3. To offer an opportunity for inservice improvement of professional skills for participating staff.
4. To reduce redundancy in on-campus teaching so that faculty can be relieved of routine and duplication of effort and thereby be freed to give greater time and attention to more specialized efforts.
5. To improve the quality of teaching by exposing the best of teaching skills to other teachers.
6. To provide a pool of expert instructional staff not available on any one campus.
7. To take advantage of local resource personnel for many classes, while inconveniencing them only once.
8. To provide lessons that may be repeated as frequently as desired through closed circuit or individual playback on the local campus.
9. To offer courses which are presently impossible due to limited enrollment.
10. To relieve the increasing pressure on the educational facility by dispersing the center of the learning experience throughout the community.
11. To provide a greater number and variety of opportunities for students to take courses they might not otherwise be able to take because of limitations imposed by class

⁵The goals are not listed in the minutes of the Consortium meetings.

schedules and maximum unit loads on campus.

12. To present material in courses developed from outside resources not normally available to the colleges in the area.
13. To upgrade the understandings and skills of the community by presenting vocational courses addressed to area needs.
14. To discover new techniques in the use of television in teaching.
15. To provide a laboratory for pre-vocational training on campuses where such course work is being offered.
16. To perform community services that become available to all members of the community in their own homes.⁶

There was no evidence of any additional goals held by the colleges either separately or collectively.

Cooperation

As is the case with all college level consortia in California today, the cooperation displayed among the institutions composing the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges was entirely voluntary. The voluntary nature of the organization made it possible for colleges both to join and to withdraw at will.

From the outset of the Consortium, attempts were made -- and those successfully -- to involve the highest administrative levels of the community college districts. At the initial meeting of the Consortium, superintendents of the five Community College Districts were present. In addition, presidents of several of the colleges were periodically involved in Consortium planning. The president of each consorting

⁶Crabbe, Master Plan, pp. 14-16.

institution was also asked to suggest the names of candidates for the position of Television Consortium Coordinator.

The Chancellor's office in Sacramento became involved in Consortium business when it was asked by President Wyman to work with him in adapting the Joint Powers Agreement from the Los Angeles Consortium to the focus of the Valley Consortium.

The burden of Consortium business, however, lay in general with the deans of instruction of the participating institutions. With but one exception, they were the appointed representatives to the Consortium, having received their appointments from the president of each college. Only one member college sent a non-instructional officer as a representative. Problems were said to have arisen in this instance because the representative, following the Consortium meetings, had to communicate in turn with his dean of instruction, and communication was delayed or inefficient.

As yet the Joint Powers Agreement has not been signed, thus forcing the deans to function as a council with one vote each in Consortium business.

Cooperation among these administrators, according to all evidence available, has been generally good. The Consortium President praised the level of "mutual trust" achieved within the Consortium. In general, his estimate was supported by his fellow deans. Six of the seven interviewed, including the President, had positive comments to offer regarding cooperation at their level. The only adverse reaction, interestingly, came from within the Los Rios District. It is worthy of note that it is: (1) the only multi-college district in the Consortium, (2) the

location of the Consortium President, (3) the location of the only consorting college actively doing television production for the Consortium, (4) the only district which has not signed the Joint Powers Agreement and which, therefore, is hindering the Consortium from becoming a legal entity. Indications are that resistance to signing the document exists at the highest levels within the Los Rios District.

The source of the criticism was one of the deans of instruction within the district. The dean said the problems within the district center around the location of television production facilities. The distance between the campuses causes an "inconvenience", the dean said, making it difficult for the other two colleges in the district to "work out their problems" in producing courses. The dean also felt that the location of production facilities has led to possessive feelings toward the equipment by the college on the campus of which it is housed.

As for input of faculty members into the television course, only one instructor had a part in its planning and production. He was one of the three on-camera instructors, a faculty member at Cosumnes River College, the producing institution. The remaining six instructors of record did not share in either development or execution, although the producing college reportedly had drawn up plans to involve faculty members from other colleges. Its call for assistance was not answered affirmatively by the consorting schools. However, none of the instructors of record interviewed was among those who were asked to participate. Whether the basis of faculty nonparticipation lay in failure to ask or failure to respond, one dean of instruction may have summarized the feelings of his fellow deans and their faculties when he said that he felt

that Cosumnes River College would have gone on with the course by itself if necessary.

It is not surprising, too, that no cooperation existed among the instructors of record as a group. Neither periodic nor regular meetings were scheduled for discussion of problems, exchange of views, reactions to the course, etc., although the teachers expressed a desire to meet. The deans had discussed an annual workshop to promote a feeling of faculty involvement and to update the faculty on the current direction of the Consortium. To date, no workshop has been conducted.

Interviews with the instructors of record brought to light reticence to participate as the student on-campus contacts for the television course. One dean spoke of having to "coerce" a faculty member into taking the position. It may not be coincidental that his institution had next to the lowest enrollment for the course among the seven participating institutions. In fact, the three lowest enrollment figures for the course were recorded in the three colleges which manifested cooperation problems. Another of the three colleges has a distinct communication breakdown between its dean and its intended instructor of record, resulting in the latter's adamant refusal to function in the capacity of campus student contact. He rechanneled all student contacts to the dean's office. In the third institution in question, both the dean and the instructor of record displayed general apathy toward the course as seen in lack of course promotion and of initiation of student contacts. In a fourth college, where the dean of instruction was enthusiastic about the course, the instructor of record reported that his initial feeling toward the course, upon being asked to participate, was that of

reluctance, followed by enthusiasm, followed later by apathy and even disappointment. He reported avoiding his dean when the latter feeling, prompted by disappointment with aspects of the course, developed. Only two of the seven instructors of record could be classified as cooperative or very cooperative.

It is interesting to note, too, that the deans of instruction often felt their communication with their campus representatives was better than the representatives themselves reported it to be. Three deans freely admitted or implied communication difficulties with the appointed faculty members on their respective campuses, ranging from complete breakdowns to difficulties in communication. Only one instructor of record was enthusiastic about communication with his campus superior in the telecourse.

Organization

Like its neighbor to the south, the Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges, the Television Consortium of Valley Colleges is not yet a legal entity. Presumably, however, it is closer to the goal than its southern neighbor since it has gone to the length of drawing up a formal Joint Powers Agreement which lacks the signatures of three colleges.

In the absence of a legal agreement, and preparatory to it, the Consortium has functioned, as one dean put it, as an "alliance" of colleges. At its second meeting the eight community colleges then in attendance nominated and elected a President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer. Later, the position of Treasurer was set apart from that of

the Secretary, and the Business Manager of one of the colleges, in accordance with the Joint Powers Agreement, was named to the position. The three elected officers of the Consortium serve as the Executive Committee, which meets periodically apart from regular Consortium meetings. Special committees were also appointed by the President when particular needs arose.

At the first meeting of the Consortium, even before the organization had selected its officers, consideration was given to the employment of a part-time Coordinator who would be hired on a consultative basis. A job description was drawn up and sent out to the Consortium members. Applicants were screened by the Executive Committee and presented to the Board of Directors. Ultimately Mr. John C. Crabbe was hired and served for a period of five months. His function was to handle interdistrict agreements, refine the Joint Powers Agreement, establish plans for sharing materials and future television programs, write proposals for more money, and find sources of other funds.⁷ His findings were recorded in the Consortium's Master Plan.

Also in the Master Plan, provision was made for an Auditor, one of only two positions specified in the document. He is to be "the auditor or controller of the same member of the Consortium as the Treasurer".⁸ His duties are to: (1) provide strict accountability of all funds received and disbursed, (2) pay demands against the Consortium, and (3) employ a certified public accountant or public accountant to make an

⁷Minutes, June 17, 1971.

⁸Joint Powers Agreement, Article 12.

1

annual audit of the accounts and records of the Consortium.⁹

The general body of the Consortium, called the Board of Directors, is composed of one official representative from "each of the signatory districts or colleges".¹⁰ It functions to

establish policy and procedures concerning all activities and endeavors of the consortium including but not limited to the following: curriculum development, selection of staff, collection and disbursement of funds, programming and production.¹¹

Its authority extends to: (1) appointing officers or employees of the Consortium, (2) employing other individuals or organizations, (3) receiving and disbursing funds, (4) making capital expenditures, (5) adopting by-laws and regulations for the government of the Consortium and transaction of its business, and (6) amending the Joint Powers Agreement, subject to the approval of the Governing Boards of the participating districts or colleges.¹²

The Board must meet at least six times a year as specified in the Joint Powers Agreement.¹³ At its meetings each member college is allotted one vote, and a quorum is constituted by a majority of the member colleges.

Membership in the Consortium is open to community and junior colleges who are willing to execute

⁹Ibid., Subsections a-c.

¹⁰Ibid., Article 4.

¹¹Loc. cit.

¹²Ibid., Article 5, Subsections a-e.

¹³Ibid., Article 8.

an agreement with the Board of Directors whereby said district agrees to comply with the terms hereof and to pay the fee prescribed or subsequently set by the Board of Directors....¹⁴

It is also open, on an Associate Member basis, to colleges and universities. Although they are "eligible to participate in Consortium activities subject to any rules or regulations which may be established by the Board of Directors",¹⁵ they are granted no voting privileges. In addition, they are

charged a fee equal to usage cost plus an amount which in the best estimate of the Board of Directors will cover an appropriate portion of the development costs as amortized over the useful life of the Consortium production.¹⁶

Although two four-year institutions did attend Consortium meetings, only one, Sacramento State College, joined on the Associate Member basis. The University of California, Davis, was represented at three meetings but did not join the Consortium.

Members may withdraw from the Consortium by sending written notice of intention to the Board of Directors on or before August of any year. Any funds contributed to the Consortium by the college or district will not be returned except in the event of the dissolution of the Consortium. However, a withdrawing member may still continue using Consortium programming by the payment of a nominal fee "to cover costs of maintaining, storing and distributing and using the programs."¹⁷ The right to use

¹⁴Ibid., Article 19.

¹⁵Ibid., Article 20.

¹⁶Loc. Cit.

¹⁷Ibid., Article 14.

the programs terminates when they are no longer made available to the Consortium itself.

In the event the Consortium dissolves, surplus funds, if any, are returned to members and former members in proportion to their contributions. Other property or assets of the Consortium shall be disposed of in a manner to be determined by the Board.

The lowest level of Consortium organization is occupied by the instructor of record. His role, as mentioned in Chapter III, is called for and regulated by CIS legislation and is, therefore, consistent on a state-wide basis. In the case of this Consortium, each was selected from the Humanities Department, or the closest existing department, of his institution by the dean of instruction, or some other administrator.

If and when the Joint Powers Agreement is signed, the organization of the Consortium will have been formalized. Up to that time it will continue to function as a cooperative effort of institutions which wish to have a part in getting instructional television programs to the citizens of their districts.

For the 1973-1974 academic year five additional community colleges joined the Consortium, bringing membership to a total of twelve.

Communication

A three-fold method of communication was utilized in the Consortium. This consists of: (1) written correspondence and printed materials, (2) telephone calls, and (3) scheduled meetings.

The written correspondence was most prolific at the Board of Directors level, consisting mainly of the minutes of Board meetings. Copies

1

of the minutes were distributed to Board members but there is no evidence they were made available to the instructors of record or to other faculty members.

Numerous letters were sent from the Secretary of the Consortium to Board members and to the Presidents of the member colleges. At the outset of the Consortium, in particular, the Presidents were called upon to aid in the selection of personnel for the organization and were kept informed of Consortium business, such as the amount of participation fees being charged each school. Letters were also sent to those persons who registered for the course providing such information as time of the television lectures, identity of the instructors of record, and dates of examinations.

A flow of printed materials also came from the Consortium office including copies of course syllabi, brochures to be distributed by each school, copies of the course examinations, and copies of the Joint Powers Agreement sent out for comments and revision.

Equally as numerous were the face-to-face meetings held by the Board of Directors. They were normally held at Cosumnes River College, the home institution of the Consortium head, and came from one to eleven weeks apart. During the two years of its existence, the Board met a total of twenty-one times, or an average of ten and one-half times per year. Although the meetings lasted from one to two hours each, one dean commented that they did not last long enough. Another complained that they were not scheduled far enough in advance.

The direction of the bulk of the communication was from the President to his fellow deans. A portion of it, as already indicated, also

went vertically from the Consortium to superintendents and college presidents. Relatively little that originated with the Board or the President flowed directly to instructors of record on the seven campuses. Apparently it was intended that they receive the mainstay of their information through their respective deans.

The third method of communication at the Board level was the use of the telephone. Mr. Wyman, the Consortium President, indicated that due to the reasonably small number of schools presently in the Consortium it was relatively simple for him to pick up the telephone and communicate with the individual deans. However, as the number of member schools increases, as it is hoped will occur, telephone communication may decrease.

A fourth avenue utilized was the telelesson. Each began and ended with the telephone numbers of the participating colleges. Students were urged via the announcements to call the local campus to be put in contact with the persons appointed to assist them in the course, viz., the instructors of record. The telephone numbers of instructors of record were not provided on the air.

At the local level, instructors of record kept in touch with the Consortium office, their deans, and students enrolled in the television course using the same methods employed at the Board level. Of particular interest are the on-campus meetings conducted by the instructors of record with students enrolled in the course. These meetings served several functions: (1) to enable faculty to meet students and vice versa, (2) to answer students' questions regarding course content, examinations, requirements, etc., and (3) to administer examinations. The meetings were held from two to four times during the semester and were conducted

on but two of the seven campuses.

Another communication device was the instructor-to-student letter. Only one instructor of record composed and sent such a letter. It was extensive and contained, in order, the following information: (1) the days of the week, time of day, and television channel on which the programs could be seen, (2) telephone numbers, both office and home, and times of day during which he could be contacted, (3) the text book titles, authors, and purchase information, (4) availability of alternative reading materials, (5) course requirements, (6) types of tests from which the student could choose, (7) dates, times, and places of examinations, (8) due dates and mailing address for course projects, (9) grading rationale, and (10) explanation of extra credit procedures.

At least two other colleges did send letters to enrollees but none contained as extensive information as that contained in the above-mentioned one.

Most of the instructors did have contact with their students by telephone, however, even though their office telephone numbers were not furnished to students initially. Students, in most cases, were able to secure those numbers after first contacting the college. One instructor, the same one who sent out the letter mentioned above, furnished his students with his home telephone in the belief that a portion of those viewing the course at 6 o'clock in the morning had daytime jobs and needed, therefore, to reach the instructor after the work day and after his normal office hours. He was the only instructor who provided students both his home telephone number and alternative hours during which to reach him.

Contact between the instructors of record and the Board of Directors was severely limited. Only one meeting between the two groups took place in the two years during which the Consortium has existed.

Finances

Financing of the Consortium during the 1972-1973 academic year can be looked at from two perspectives: (1) sources of funding employed by the Consortium, and (2) sources of funding to which it gave consideration and for which it hoped.

Since it was proposed at the first meeting of the Consortium that the colleges produce their own television courses and not lease one, the group was forced to adopt a financial base that would yield substantial yearly revenue, given the comparatively high costs associated with producing original television programming. With reimbursement from the State promised through the C.I.S. legislation, the Consortium decided to assess each member institution on the basis of its Average Daily Attendance (ADA), which is equivalent to the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) formula used by the State Colleges in California. Initially a figure of 38¢ per ADA was decided upon by the Consortium but later raised to 43¢ per ADA in order to raise the minimum amount of money projected for production of the course. With a minimum enrollment of 800 students, approximately \$20,000 was necessary for the 1972-1973 academic year. The estimated cost of producing the course was \$16,900. In order to reach the goal, the Master Plan had projected the "break even" enrollments, based on 1970-1971 State aid per ADA and one three-unite course, to be as follows: Butte College, 50, Sierra College, 40, Yosemite College 103, Yuba College,

54, San Joaquin-Delta College, 115, Los Rios Community College District (American River College, Sacramento City College, and Cosumnes River College), 241. Although the number of colleges participating dropped to seven, the total course enrollment surpassed by 129 the minimum number needed.

Discussion took place as to the possibility of producing the telecourses using the facilities of commercial television stations, but two factors led the Consortium away from that course of action. First, production costs would be significantly higher: an estimated \$24,500-\$30,500 per course as compared to \$18,500 to produce the same forty-five half-hour programs using the facilities of one of the colleges. Second, the policies of the stations prevent programs produced in their studios from being distributed to other television stations.

Consideration is presently being given to renting courses from other community college consortia, both in and out of the State. Here, too, the costs are substantial, as illustrated here.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Course</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Miami-Dade District	Man and Environment	\$20,000
Los Angeles Consortium	Law of the 70's	13,200
Los Angeles Consortium	Fundamentals of Art	1,600

A second funding source used by the Consortium was the assessment of a stipulated fee. This was done just once when the organization voted to hire a part-time Coordinator. Each college contributed \$500 for a total of \$4,500.¹⁸

¹⁸As of January, 1972, there were nine colleges in the Consortium.

Still another source of revenue developed by the group was the sale of course syllabi. Students were charged one dollar per copy, and sale was promoted via the telelessons. It was hoped that sufficient funds could be raised to defray the purchase price of 2" broadcast video tapes used in the airing of the lessons over commercial television channels. Because not all enrollees purchased syllabi, the Consortium failed to raise the funds necessary to purchase the video tapes.

Additional means of securing funds were explored during the period in which the Consortium course was in production. Hopes had been pinned on the passage of Assembly Bill 2118 which was to have provided some \$200,000 for the promotion of instructional television. Passage of the bill would have brought approximately \$25,000 to the Consortium treasury. The bill was vetoed by Governor Ronald Reagan in 1972.

At one point it seemed to the colleges that they could qualify for Community Service funds in their local districts since many residents were watching the lessons without registering for the course but benefiting nonetheless. Later, it was concluded that the funds were not applicable toward C.I.S. cost reimbursement.

On three occasions the possibility of securing federal monies was considered despite the fact that the Master Plan had warned that "investigations of the possibility of obtaining" those funds "for organizations of this sort have not been too fruitful".¹⁹

A possible future source of revenue for the Consortium is the leasing of telecourses which it produces. To that end the following

¹⁹Master Plan, p. 38.

statement was unanimously agreed upon by the Consortium:

The Consortium reserves the rights of all telecourses unto itself in perpetuity and grants member institutions of the Consortium the right to redistribute the courses on public television, on-campus closed circuit, or community CATV during the same period of time it is being originally broadcast.²⁰

While the statement permits the consorting colleges to rebroadcast programs, it also establishes ownership of them. The cost of renting its first television program to outside agencies has been set, as of 1973, at \$75.00 per lesson, or \$3,375. for the series of forty-five half-hour lessons.

ITV Teachers

The Classical Humanities course produced by the Consortium was the result of the efforts of three instructors at Cosumnes River College, two in the Humanities division, one of whom is the division chairman, and an instructor from the Music department. The bulk of the course was produced by the Humanities instructor. It was almost natural that he be given the primary responsibility for the course since its television version was an adaptation of a successful classroom course he had taught. Of the forty-five thirty-minute lessons in the series, he produced thirty-two. Three were produced by the Music instructor, leaving ten which were done by the division chairman.

Selection of the main course instructor was made on two criteria already alluded to: (1) successful classroom teaching based on class enrollments of an on-campus course, and (2) previous on-camera experience

²⁰Minutes, September 14, 1972, p. 2.

in a televised course produced by Cosumnes River College. Virtually every administrator and instructor of record interviewed had praise for this instructor's on-camera work. Their compliments arose from lessons they had viewed and from frequent positive student feedback. The other two instructors were selected because of their expertise in selected areas and to help lighten the load of the main course instructor.

Selection of the instructors was made by the dean of instruction at Cosumnes River College based on the factors already enumerated plus those of availability and willingness. It should be noted, however, that the Humanities division is composed of only two persons, and the Music instructor was the only member of his department who was willing to cooperate in the production of the course.

Although the main instructor had received remuneration for a previous telecourse produced by his institution, none was provided for the Consortium course even though it was produced through his college. He was not able to explain the difference in policies. The decision of the Consortium not to pay the instructors runs contrary to earlier discussions by the Board. In two separate meetings in which released time, salary, residual rights, etc., were discussed "in depth" it was agreed that the ITV teacher would be an employee for the duration of the project. It is presumed, despite the notation that "this situation will remain flexible in order to satisfy the needs of each individual project",²¹ that the on-camera instructors were to have been paid for their work.

²¹Minutes, June 29, 1972, p. 1.

Released time was granted to the instructor who produced the bulk of the telelessons, but he felt that the amount of released time was inadequate. He was relieved of one on-campus course but felt that in view of the fact that he acted in the dual capacity of on-camera teacher and instructor of record, even more released time should have been granted. He indicated that his District is reluctant to cooperate in this area. No released time, moreover, was granted to the other two instructors for the course. These practices were at variance with the recommendations given by the Consortium Coordinator. The Master Plan states that an ITV teacher should be given either a summer assignment or its equivalent, or one-half released time during the semester for course preparation.²²

Residual and revision rights of television teachers were also the subjects of discussion at least once at the Board level. A "strong point" was made relative to these areas. However, when the Master Plan was drawn up, it made this recommendation:

Telecourse instructors will convey all rights to courses to the Consortium and no residual rights as such for re-use of the courses will be granted.²³

However, it does take cognizance of the need to update televised courses periodically and suggests that the instructor be given the first opportunity to do so. The instructors for the Classical Humanities were not granted these rights.

²²Master Plan, p. 32.

²³Ibid., p. 31.

Registration and Promotion

The Valley Consortium, like the Central Valley cooperative discussed in Chapter III, broadcast its course open-circuit over commercial television stations and cable systems. Although, as noted in Chapter II, courses reaching the public in this manner may pose registration problems, especially with cross-registration, no such problems were encountered. Students, if they desired, could register for credit through a college not located in their district. This was accomplished by an agreement by the colleges to regard the entire area served by the Consortium as a "free territory". Students were permitted to enroll in the television course without having to obtain the interdistrict permits normally necessary to take courses outside of one's district.

Registration, which was open to all college age and adult persons, was accomplished by mail or in person at the local college. If a student chose to register by mail, he removed a printed portion of the Consortium brochure and mailed it to the Registrar of the college through which he desired credit. The Registrar, in turn, forwarded to him the necessary registration forms for enrollment in the course.

Fees were charged only to adults, those 21 years and older, in accordance with the normal handling of extension classes. They were determined by the individual colleges and ranged from a low of \$1.00 to a maximum of \$15.00 for the credit course. Each college retained the money it collected.

Initial enrollment as of May 15, 1973, totalled 929. A break-down for the seven colleges was as follows: American River College, 89; Butte College, 214; Cosumnes River College, 161; Modesto Junior College,

191; Sacramento City College, 168; Sierra College, 41; and Yuba College, 65.

Generally, the enrollment figures reflected the amount and lead time of promotion. The two colleges which admittedly gave the course the earliest and most wide-ranging publicity received the highest returns for their investments. Those institutions which received brochures too late for early distribution, failed to distribute them widely, made little use of local media, or had mix-ups in communication with the media had correspondingly smaller enrollments.

Promotion followed the same pattern mentioned in Chapter III, viz., the use of the print media, radio, and television. However, the Valley Consortium emphasized local college more than did its neighbor to the south. Although advertisements appeared in the Sacramento and Modesto Bee newspapers and on KOVR, Channel 13, Sacramento; which overlaps much of the geographical area served by the colleges, many promotional activities were designed to be carried on locally.

As part of the course expense, 48,000 brochures advertising the course were printed; 7,000 for each college. They were placed on automobiles in parking lots, in banks, hospitals, fire stations, police stations, public libraries, school libraries, and supermarkets. In addition, they were sent to PTA's, church councils, to persons on cultural mailing lists, and to persons who had previously enrolled in continuing Education courses.

The brochure contained the following information: (1) the course title and number of credits, (2) a description of the Consortium, (3) the television channels on which the lessons could be received, (4) a

brief statement of the course focus, (5) statements indicating that credit and fee requirements were to be set by each campus, (6) the names and college mailing addresses of two of the three instructors, (7) the titles, in order, of the 45 lessons, (8) the mailing addresses of the seven consorting colleges, (9) a statement saying that textbook information could be obtained from the local college bookstore, and (10) an application for enrollment form. Notably absent were the names, addresses and/or telephone numbers of the seven instructors of record, the dates, times of day, and days of the week when the lessons could be seen, and dates, times, and places of examinations. A few colleges did repair the shortcomings of the brochure by printing inserts which contained additional information.

Two colleges reported having received the brochures too late for effective distribution, another reported an insufficient staff to distribute them, and a fourth said it "did not do much" by way of promotion in general, including dissemination of the brochures. That meant that almost 60% of the schools carried out ineffective distribution of the brochures.

Nearly blanket coverage of the Consortium service area was accomplished through one-half page advertisements placed free of charge in the Sacramento and the Modesto Bee, both of which are owned by McClatchy Newspapers and Broadcasting, owners of the television station which broadcasts the telecourse. These papers are read in nearly all of the cities in which the colleges are located. Additional advertisements were placed in the local newspapers of Durham, Marysville, and Rocklin and in the campus paper of California State University, Chico.

Spot announcements telling of the course were broadcast over radio stations in Durham, Roseville, Auburn, and Modesto; and public service announcements were aired on KQVR, Channel 13, Sacramento, and Cable Com 5 in Modesto.

Additionally, the course was promoted by word-of-mouth in registration lines at the beginning of the spring semester 1973, and through the printed schedule of on-campus courses. One college, however, deliberately omitted mention of the course in the regular schedule in order to allay the fears of faculty members who view television courses as competitive with scheduled courses on campus.

Despite advice given in the Master Plan which says that "a carefully designed publicity program" is essential in reaching potential students, four of the seven colleges indicated definite dissatisfaction with their promotional efforts. The most general complaint was identified with lack of planning due either to lack of enthusiasm or of sufficient lead time. Again, there was a direct correlation between the number of students enrolled at a given college and the depth of its promotional efforts.

Delivery System

The geographical area served by the Consortium colleges is also covered by the ideal combination of television signals: commercial open-circuit, public broadcast, and cable.

Of the three commercial television stations serving Sacramento, the Consortium chose the McClatchy station KQVR, the CBS affiliate in Sacramento. The decision was based on the following factors: (1) the

station offered free air time to broadcast the course; (2) the station promised to publicize the course on the air free of charge; (3) the station, which is owned by the leading daily newspapers of Sacramento and Modesto, offered the Consortium free newspaper advertisement of the course. The course appeared on KQVR Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday mornings from 6:00 to 6:30. The station's signal is received in each of the areas served by the seven colleges making up the Consortium.

Two of the colleges, Butte and Yuba, are served by KIXE, Channel 9, Redding, a public broadcast station. The northern-most college in the Consortium, receives a strong signal from Channel 9, which is still further north, while the Marysville area, the location of Yuba College, is on the fringe of the reception area and receives a weak signal. Channel 9 also broadcasts the course Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, as did Channel 13, but from 6:00 to 7:00 in the evening. The first half-hour was a repeat of a previous lesson and the second half-hour was a new lesson for the day. The same colleges also received the signal from Channel 13, Sacramento.

One of them, Yuba College, also received the course via Bi-Cities Cable Company, which meant that residents of its area could choose from among one or all of the three separate video sources available to the Consortium. Bi-Cities aired the course from 10:30 to 11:00 a.m. That meant that the course was seen in the Marysville area three times a day: 6:00 - 7:00 a.m.; 10:30 - 11:00 a.m.; and 6:00 - 7:00 p.m. No other college district received the telelessons from a wider variety of sources.

One other city, Modesto, is presently served by Cable Com 5, a cable television service which boasts 10,000 subscribing homes.

Residents of the area were able to view the course from 6:00 to 6:30 a.m. on Channel 13, Sacramento, and again on Cable Com 5 at 7:00 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 2:30 p.m., and 4:30 p.m. Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. The programs were repeated on Friday and Saturday plus evening showings.

Four of the colleges, then, received the course from one source only, viz., an open-circuit commercial television station, while each of the remaining institutions received it via two or more video sources. One of those was fortunate to have access to three separate television outlets.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the Classical Humanities course, like other aspects of the Consortium, was left to the individual colleges. Each was left to design its own instrument to determine success of the course. Those colleges which exercised their option--and not all of them did--administered the instrument at the time of the final examination or following the completion of the course. This meant that the questionnaires were filled out by students either while they were on campus or after they had returned home.

Appraisal

First, attention should be given to the goals arrived at by the Consortium. Of the sixteen stated in the Master Plan three focus upon the classroom teacher and the benefits that will supposedly accrue to him by the employment of ITV. One of the goals relates to the benefit the local colleges will receive via relief of pressure on campus facilities. The remaining twelve goals constitute a list of benefits to be

received by the student-community group.

While the latter goals are always legitimate ones, more careful attention must be given by administrators on the various campuses and by the Consortium to faculty needs, not the least of which is security. Several of those interviewed expressed for themselves and for their colleagues concern over what is seen as the competitive nature of ITV. They feel that it has already kept, or is capable of keeping, students out of their classrooms. Yet each of the goals drawn up by the Consortium, which do not appear to have had faculty input in their formulation, is concerned with in-service training, reduction of routine duties, and improvement of teaching skills. While no teacher would deny the importance of each of these goals, they do not rank first in priority when teachers view, as they apparently do, their jobs as threatened. With college enrollments no longer rising, and in some cases falling off significantly, classroom teachers look suspiciously upon anything which would supplant them.

If indeed ITV actually brings more students to the campus, as some administrators are arguing, and results in surges in classroom enrollments, then careful documentation must first take place. It will be an essential part of the information needed to convince faculties that ITV is an ally not an enemy.

Five of the goals relate directly to a need which has become the focus of other college-level consortia: the adult member of the community who is unable or unwilling to take courses on the local college campus. This appears, at this time, to be the least objectionable, most pressing, and most enduring of all the goals at which the Consortium

arrived. It deserves even greater attention than has been given it and holds out the greatest promise of acceptance by elements hostile to ITV. It may also hold out greater promise for acquisition of funding than other goals stated.

A second area of attention pertains to the degree of autonomy granted by the Consortium to its component institutions in the transaction of course-related business, especially as pertains to publicity and evaluation. While maintenance of local autonomy is both vigorously guarded and highly desirable, it poses problems for the Consortium which might otherwise be avoided. Because all cooperating colleges were left on their own to publicize and evaluate the telecourse some poor as well as excellent work was done. Avoidance of poor performance, or non-performance, could be accomplished in at least two ways: (1) the employment of a full-time Consortium Director whose duties would include design, in consultation with faculty and administration, and execution of publicity and course evaluation, and/or (2) agreement upon minimum academic standards for each televised course and implementation of those standards.

A general broadening of the level of participation in the Consortium is also needed. A special effort should be made to involve faculties from each cooperating institution in the planning, if not the production, of all telecourses originating with the Consortium. Faculty members who functioned as instructors of record for the Consortium's first course complained, almost to a man, at not having had opportunity to participate in its planning.

An annual workshop, which was originally proposed for instructors of record, should by all means be instituted and continued. This would

promote a needed feeling of involvement in the Consortium and of comradeship among the instructors of record.

More effective communication is likewise needed among the instructors of record and the campus representatives of the Consortium, the deans of instruction. Breakdowns occurred when instructors were approached at the last minute and asked to assume responsibility for the televised course, were not offered either released time or compensation in exchange for television course duties, or were not consulted regarding academic standards. Following the Master Plan recommendations should lead to the solution of these problems.

Stricter attention to the Master Plan will also avoid dissatisfaction on the part of ITV teachers and instructors of record. Those who function as on-camera teachers must receive an ample amount of released time for course production or financial compensation, preferably both. Less than positive feelings by the telecourse's main instructor resulted when he received no remuneration and inadequate released time to produce his portion of the course.

Equally frustrated were the instructors of record who, too, received neither compensation nor released time for additional duties. These Consortium actions were contrary to both the recommendations of the group itself and the accumulated experiences of other ITV consortia.

Communication is also lacking among some of the consorting colleges, arising over misconceptions of location of production facilities and the worth of the Consortium in general. These problems may be traceable to misunderstandings, personalities, etc., and could likely be resolved by bringing them to light and discussing them frankly.

12

Organizationally the Consortium is on the threshold of expansion with the possible addition of five more colleges and the ultimate reactivation of two schools, bringing total participation--assuming no further dropouts--to fourteen. The result would be a further taxation of the energies of the present Consortium leadership, with special attention to its President, whoever he may be. Any part-time director, under the present arrangement, will in all likelihood, be a dean of instruction or another administrator. The assumption of duties pertaining to a consortium of ten or more colleges would necessitate released time, a concession which many community college do not appear to be willing to make. The most feasible alternative is the hiring of a full-time director with full-time secretarial help. While the colleges try to avoid the expense of a full-time consortium staff, the maintenance of viable consortia by means of part-time, unpaid staff is most difficult. The tendency for consortia to grow beyond manageable proportions of part-time staffs is virtually inevitable.

As a consortium grows, and especially as it continues producing its own courses, as in the case of this consortium, so do its financial needs. The ADA costs per institutions have doubled in one year. Two colleges, representing almost one third of the members, which cooperated in the 1972-1973 academic year, expressed reservations regarding the depth of the financial commitment necessary to remain active in the Consortium. Even though reimbursement per college for actual expenses incurred in telecourses is provided by the State, each school must initially have the money to expend. That, according to one dean, is a problem. Attempts should be made to hold down course-related expenses.

5

An immediate solution would be the leasing of college-level courses from other consortia, or from other available sources. Ultimately exchanges of ITV courses with other colleges across the country may be possible.

The other alternative, that of securing additional funds from non-state sources, is less predictable and, therefore, less desirable.

In general, greater attention needs to be given to executing plans well in advance of deadlines. While a schedule was agreed upon at the highest level, it was not always carried out in time to meet deadlines. Communication, promotion, and administration-faculty relations will benefit as a result.

The foregoing comments are not meant to suggest, however, that the Consortium is not characterized by significant strengths, not the least of which is the general degree of cooperation achieved among its official representatives on the Board of Directors. Despite two weak links in the chain, these men achieved enviable cooperation among themselves in accomplishing Consortium business. It now remains for the upper echelon of the organization to open the door to their respective faculties and initiate a like feeling of cooperation with them. The resulting unity can only continue to improve the picture for ITV in the community colleges of the Central San Joaquin Valley.

Equally praiseworthy was the quality of the course produced by the Consortium as determined by the frequency of positive comments from instructors of record and through them from students who took the courses. Although production techniques were not unique, the on-camera performance of the main instructor was mentioned again and again as

having been outstanding. He was evidently able to establish a rapport with viewing students usually expected only in the classroom. This first course it is hoped will be looked upon as a benchmark for future Consortium productions.

The quality of the course is indicative of the thorough planning evident over the brief history of this cooperative. The degree of planning is no doubt traceable to the extensive involvement of all levels of college administrators and the frequency with which the Board met. It is also seen in the move of the Board to hire a Coordinator to research guidelines for the cooperative. Those guidelines, in the form of the Master Plan, are capable of giving positive and firm direction for the future.

Last, the delivery systems available to the Central Valley Consortium for reaching the public can be regarded as among the best in the State of California. The versatile broadcast day which they provide in combining the virtues of cable, commercial open-circuit television, and public broadcasting helps to insure the largest possible audience for future telelessons. If the Consortium continues producing first-quality courses or renting ones of similar caliber, delivering them diversely, and is able to resolve its personnel problems, the future of the Consortium should be secure.

CHAPTER V
THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION
CONSORTIUM: A CASE STUDY

Background

Potentially the largest higher education consortium in the State of California, the Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium, can ultimately embrace as many as forty-two institutions: thirty-four two-year colleges, two State colleges, and six State universities. Within the proposed service area of the Consortium is a total population in excess of 7 million.

The origin of the Northern California Consortium is unique. Unlike the two consortia previously examined, it began at the highest administrative levels in the State of California. The joint efforts of the Chancellors' offices of the California State University and Colleges, deans and staff members of the California Community Colleges, and deans and staff members from several state universities and colleges culminated in the submission of a proposal in the fall of 1971 to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The project was funded the following spring, with additional money coming from the Continuing Education reserve fund of the California State University and Colleges.

A Search Committee was formed, and the services of a Consortium Director were sought. In the summer of 1972 Dr. Stuart Cooney, formerly of the American Samoa television project, was hired for the position.

He immediately began the involved task of making contact with the many state colleges, universities, and community colleges in northern California. In addition he expanded his staff to include an Assistant Director, in charge of promotion, and a secretary.

Toward the end of the first fiscal year, and in an apparent effort to end it with some concrete project, arrangements were made for the Consortium to air its first course. The plans were to begin on a small scale. Two institutions, California State University, Humboldt, and California State University, Chico, agreed to cooperate in airing a course, "Health, Poverty, and Public Policy." Produced by Chico, it featured an instructor from its Political Science Department. The format combined 15 televised hours of instruction with 8 hours of discussion. Eleven viewing sites were selected in schools, television stations, college classrooms, and one private home where students gathered on five Saturdays from April 14 to May 12, 1973. The sessions began at 8:30 a.m. and ended at 1:00 p.m. and included two 1 1/2 hour television presentations and two 30 minute discussions led by appointed persons, usually faculty members. The daily schedule ran as follows:

- 8:30 - 9:00 Group discussion at multiple sites.
- 9:00 - 10:30 TV presentation by lecturer and guest speaker.
- 10:30 - 11:00 Break for relaxation and discussion.
- 11:00 - 12:30 TV presentation continued.
- 12:30 - 1:00 Discussion.

The course was broadcast over KIXE, Channel 9 in Redding, one of the public broadcast stations in Northern California. Approximately 140 persons enrolled in the course.

Needs and Goals

Generally stated, the goal of the Consortium is "to make widely available the resources of colleges and universities in the solution of community and regional problems."¹ The vehicle by which these resources are to become available to a greater number of persons and agencies is television. Ultimately the cooperative envisions addressing itself to problems of increasingly greater magnitude by involving faculties, students, agencies, and community populations "comprehensively in a variety of problem-solving transactions."²

Specifically, the thrust of the Consortium is toward that segment of the adult population which "finds it difficult or impossible to approach campus-centered educational activities."³ They are isolated by geographic, economic, and/or cultural barriers, thus bringing their formal education to a standstill.

What is needed, then, is a problem-oriented, region-wide educational program designed to reach these individuals. Otherwise, they will find it increasingly difficult to function in a world which demands that each adult be an informed and responsible citizen, and a growing, developing individual. The common educational methods now being employed in higher education are inadequate to this need.⁵

To meet the need the Consortium proposes television as "one kind of solution" because it is "a convenient, effective, and available educational delivery system."

¹The Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium: Three-Year Plan and Follow-On Proposal," Sanoma, California, December 15, 1972, p. 1.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 2.

The need for a consortium of colleges to reach the untapped population was seen as arising out of: (1) the inability of most institutions of higher education to bear the cost of developing high quality ITV programming, and (2) the unavailability to students of television courses produced by institutions with which they are not affiliated. With that need in view, the Consortium set out to effect the "close cooperation and joint utilization of facilities and resources among community agencies and institutions of higher education" to "make possible the production of community-oriented instructional television programs...."⁵

For the three-year periods 1972-73, 1973-74, and 1974-75, three comprehensive goals were formulated:

1. To create a communications network to involve community agencies, institutions of higher education, and individuals that will enable coordinate delivery of courses off campus by television and associated media, with credit from participating colleges and universities;
2. To undertake collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, thus to define regional and community problems whose solution may be assisted by mediated release of institutional resources;
3. To design and produce or otherwise provide instructional and learning units appropriate to agency and problem-related individual needs and that exploit media available economically to widespread schools and communities.⁶

Cooperation

As was noted at the outset of this chapter, involvement of high-level administrators in Consortium planning has been characteristic of the organization from its inception. Representatives of the highest

⁵Ibid., p. 3.

⁶Ibid., p. 4.

offices in the State Colleges and University system and the Community Colleges were active from the earliest days of the Consortium, in fact, even before there was officially a consortium. Later, when the Consortium was "officially"⁷ organized, its Steering Committee continued to reflect the high-level interest expressed during the inception period. It is composed of six deans, three representing the State University and Colleges and three representing the California Community segments of higher education in California.

The third level of cooperation, considering the Chancellors' office to have been the summit and the Steering Committee secondary to it, has been and is at the local college, university, and community college level. The pattern which evolved has been for the Consortium Director to contact the Dean of Continuing Education and Extended Day on each campus and from his office ultimately to make contact with staffs and faculties. Primary contact has been made with his office because "in all course-offering activities" he represents "the interests of the Consortium on each campus, providing in-kind assistance on a continuing basis."⁸ All work with faculties or services is done through the Continuing Education Office.

The Director's strategy in contacting prospective member institutions has been characterized by a phrase from one of his memoranda

⁷The colleges function at present without a Joint Powers Agreement and plans have not been laid to draw up one.

⁸Memorandum from Stuart Cooney, Consortium Director, to Mr. Philip Morris, California Title I Coordinator, March 29, 1973, pp. 4-5.

describing his efforts. He said he was "building relationships."⁹ Often he "traveled and listened," meeting with administrators who had received copies of the Consortium's plan or who had informally heard about the organization. These meetings often resulted in supportive reactions from the individual colleges. Equally as often, it seems, they also evoked strong opposition, usually from community colleges. Their general concerns were centered in the following two areas: (1) concern over the absence of prior coordination of the project with them, and (2) concern over preemption by the new consortium of existing community college consortia.

The Director's travels also unearthed two additional problems relating to cooperation. Both of them concern the issue of effecting cooperation between and among the colleges and universities in the State system and the community colleges in the northern portion of California. First, he discovered, or perhaps had reinforced, the lack of trust extant between the two aforementioned segments of the educational system. Second, he discovered the autonomy enjoyed by each of the two-year institutions hinders negotiations in such matters as student fees. Each college board must be bargained with separately.

Faculty involvement in the Consortium, with special emphasis on course planning, has to date ranged from light to moderate. In its first television course, "Poverty, Health, and Public Policy," a limited number of faculty members participated. The course was produced by the Political Science Department of California State University, Chico, and

⁹Memorandum from Stuart Cooney, Consortium Director, to the Consortium Steering Committee, January 29, 1973, p. 1.

was designed to be a joint effort between it and California State University, Humboldt. However, the course was produced solely at Chico with no faculty input from its sister college. The result was rejection of the course by the Political Science Department at Humboldt. When the course was ultimately, and at the eleventh hour, accepted by the Sociology Department, it still faced resistance. Both students and faculty in the Humboldt service area who viewed it, according to the college's Dean of Continuing Education,¹⁰ felt the course lacked relevancy for them. The course was perceived as a "packaged" product of Chico lacking a consideration of the problems unique to the area served by Humboldt.

The Consortium's second television effort, planned for Spring, 1974, "Environmental Impact Report Procedures," has already surpassed the degree of faculty involvement reached by the first course. Eight colleges are projected to cooperate in planning the course. As of the Spring, 1973 eleven faculty members, including two department chairman, from five of the eight colleges were present in planning sessions.

One difficulty which has arisen to hinder the inclusion of faculty members in planning meetings is the physical distance which those at the extremities of the Consortium service area are forced to travel to reach the San Francisco area, the usual site of the meetings. Specifically, the problems are those of providing released time and reimbursement for travel.

The long-range plans of the Consortium, which were revised in December of 1972, appear to make room for heavier and more diversified faculty

¹⁰Interview with Dr. John Hennesy, Dean of Continuing Education, California State University, Humboldt, July 3, 1973.

involvement in Consortium business. Although descriptions of future committees called for in the revised Three Year Plan do not specify faculty membership per se, representatives from participating institutions of higher education will constitute up to one half of committee membership in some cases.

As was noted previously, substantial faculty resistance was observed at one of the two colleges which cooperated in offering the first telecourse. Reportedly, there was no detectable resistance at the second institution.

Moving out horizontally from the local educational institution, the Consortium has already heavily involved persons outside of institutions of higher education in the planning of its second telecourse. At an early planning session attended by 32 persons, 22 of them were from Federal, State, and local government agencies, and private industry. In fact, in the total head-count of two meetings representatives from government and industry outnumbered faculty representatives by a 2 to 1 ratio.

One student and four administrators were present at the two meetings.

Organization

Originally a complex organization was planned for the Consortium, but budget cuts and "other considerations" led to a revised approach. It was decided to "evolve an organization through the offering of courses, rather than model a paper organization and then to implement that."¹¹

¹¹Memorandum from Stuart Cooney, Consortium Director, to Phillip Paris, California Title I Coordinator, March 29, 1973.

The idea of consortium

is treated conditionally--as a formulation we are shaping through our activities, as an emergent set of relationships among institutions, agencies, and persons, and only potentially as a set of formal agreements.¹²

In particular, those "relationships" are being formed among five sets of organizations and relevant units within them: (1) schools, (2) agencies, (3) broadcasting services, (4) private companies and professional groups, and (5) funding resources. Those organizations which are seen as being affected by what the Consortium is doing have been approached.

The ultimate organization is "quite consciously evolving...through function, through working at tasks, permitting the process to teach participants what is possible, what works, what can be trusted."¹³ Flexibility, sensitivity, and functional growth are being stressed.

To date, as was observed by the Consortium's Director, a "four-legged" structure has emerged: (1) administration (deans), (2) course development (faculty), (3) technology (media people in schools and stations), and (4) users (adult students).¹⁴

The foundation of the Consortium is the receiving institution. Originally, when Federal funds were sought to begin the Consortium, that institution was California State University, San Francisco; but the project was transferred north to Sonoma because advantages were seen in locating the Consortium offices in a "geographical environment similar

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid., p. 4.

¹⁴Memorandum from Stuart Cooney, Consortium Director, to the Consortium Steering Committee, January 29, 1973, p. 5.

to most of the area and much of the population to be served ... yet near a major metropolitan area--and to accommodate a condition of hiring."¹⁵

The burden of Consortium business has fallen to the Director, Dr. Stuart Cooney. Dr. Cooney came to his position with impressive credentials, including experience as advisor/administrator in the Department of Education, American Samoa University broadcasting instructor, writer-producer of instructional programs, Executive Vice-President of a group of radio stations on the west coast, radio and television engineer, and media researcher for government, education, and private industry. His diverse background, his willingness to innovate, and his manifest desire to reach out and include wide and diverse elements of the community in the planning and execution of the Consortium and its products make him potentially acceptable to all elements in the Consortium.

There is one danger inherent in his position, however, and it relates to the overlay nature of the Consortium, spanning as it does, colleges, universities, and community colleges in the northern area of the state. The organization has already encountered resistance from the two-year institutions in northern California who see the Consortium as an apparent threat to their autonomy. It takes on the appearance of a super-organization and tends to magnify the position of its Director.

Dr. Cooney has organized a Steering Committee which acts in an advisory capacity to the Consortium. It is presently composed of six representatives, three deans from the state colleges and universities in northern California, and three deans from community colleges. The

¹⁵Memorandum from Stuart Cooney, Consortium Director, to the Consortium Steering Committee, January 9, 1973.

original committee, utilized on an interim basis until a more permanent one could be formed, was the Search Committee which hired the Director. The Steering Committee acts to guide the Consortium staff. Its initial duties, as agreed upon, were to: (1) review plans and activities regularly; (2) approve, qualify, or reject program changes; (3) advise on institutional and agency relationships; (4) shape initial policies; and (5) assist in the ongoing activities of the Consortium.

That staff presently consists of the Director, Assistant Director, (whose duties are concerned with promotion), and a secretary. A clerk typist and a Production Coordinator are to be added in the 1974 fiscal year. The latter will serve

a kind of 'interinstitutional' function linking the schools, agencies, production centers, and stations or cable systems in a manner consistent with the qualitative requirements of media, the substantive credentialing requirements of higher education and the pragmatic needs of course consumers.¹⁶

Future additions to the staff will be dictated by needs arising from expansion.

Generally, the staff functions in a coordinative, or "design," capacity. It sees its role as that of

initiating, then facilitating, then focusing, then promoting, then producing, then evaluating the whole process.¹⁷

It hopes to draw upon continuing education staffs and specialized personnel in agencies and private concerns to fulfill its capacity.

An advisory Council, composed of non-faculty from agencies in the northern California area, is presently evolving. Persons from the

¹⁶Memorandum, January 29, 1973, p. 11.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 10.

community who are now serving in an ad hoc capacity on a design team for an up-coming telecourse and who demonstrate an understanding of the consortium goals will form the nucleus of the Council.

Membership in the Consortium, as defined by the Steering Committee, is the "willingness to participate" in projects. Thus far, no formal expression of that willingness has been asked of potential members because relationships, especially with two-year institutions, are felt to be too "tender" at this time because of institutional prerogatives. Attempts will be made to build confidence in the Consortium through a continuous flow of information to College Presidents, Deans of Extended Day and Evening Colleges, and Media Directors regarding Consortium projects, and through seeking opportunities to develop mutual interests. After working relationships are developed, then written and formal agreements may be drawn up.

Although lack of formal agreement is often viewed as a potential pitfall to Consortium stability, the Northern California Consortium may possibly be an exception. With over 40 potential members it would seem possible for it to remain viable even if its membership fluctuates, as is almost inevitable.

Several of the community colleges in the Consortium service area are already members of consortia. Since a sense of alienation from colleges and universities has grown up, they place high priority on their membership in their own consortia. Agreements will be drawn up with them on a project-by-project basis.

As time passes and the Consortium increases in the number of participating institutions and agencies, plans call for a correspondingly

more complex organization with wider representation.

At least two problem areas are apparent in the Consortium organization: (1) size and (2) institutional representation. The potential size of the consorting group is staggering. So, too, are the foreseeable problems in cooperation and harmony among so many diverse elements as will eventually compose the Consortium. The opportunities for disunity increase in proportion to increases in membership.

Institutional representation on various facets of the organization is predicated upon institutional position and clarify not upon enthusiasm for the Consortium, willingness to cooperate in its ventures, energy level, etc. All Deans of Continuing Education, for instance, will not, by virtue of their positions, make the best possible representatives of their institutions to the Consortium.

Communication

One of the three underlying goals of the Consortium has been the building of a "communications network" to tie together community agencies, educational institutions, and individuals. To accomplish this, the Director early saw the pressing need of frequent reporting to consorting institutions by reason of the geographical separation of member colleges and as a substitute for a complex organization. Specifically, he proposed the frequent dissemination of written reports "along with other documents worth their attention and as requested."¹⁸ Midway in the first year of operation he admitted that the need then existed for better reporting. He had fallen behind in his reporting as a result of over

¹⁸"Follow-on Proposal," p. 28.

formalizing the materials and in so doing had lost "the informed relationship" he believed essential to the new organization. At that time, monthly reports were as much as five months late in being written, and member institutions were receiving up to two belated monthly reports per month. For example, the activities reports for September and October 1972 were both dated January 1973. Despite the Director's efforts to reduce the backlog of activities reports, they continued to arrive late throughout the remainder of the Spring.

Beyond the written reports, the Director has made frequent use of the telephone and face-to-face contacts in pursuance of his communications goal. He has been in almost constant telephone contact with administrators in the State University and Colleges, community colleges, and key figures in government and private agencies. Telephone surveys were conducted in reaching the previously-mentioned community and education segments to fulfill two purposes: (1) to determine and/or clarify community needs preparatory to designing telecourses, and (2) to establish contacts pursuant to requests for cooperation from interested and qualified persons.

Equally as prolific were the Director's meetings. In addition to regular Steering Committee meetings, he criss-crossed the northern portions of the state, meeting with deans, groups of deans, experts on courses and research, instructional television associations, continuing education and external degree committees, and community college associations. In one month alone he traveled to six locations in northern California.

In addition, he conferred with Professor Wilbur Schramm, Director of Stanford's Institute for Communication Research, Professor Lyle Nelson, the Chairman of the Department of Communication at Stanford, and Professor David Hawkridge, Director of the Institute of Educational Technology, Open University, England.

In preparation for the airing of the Consortium's second course scheduled for Spring 1974, meetings have been taking place since February 1973. On one occasion 32 representatives of education, government, and industry met to discuss community needs and course design. Subsequent planning sessions have resulted in the formation of committees and teams to lay out the course. A large number of representatives are currently working on the next telecourse.

Finally, the Director has communicated with the Title I Coordinator for California, representing the principal funding source, and with the Los Angeles ITV consortium. In turn, he has periodically relayed the results of those and other meetings back to Consortium members.

Finances

Virtually every funding source utilized by other college consortia has been used, or is planned for use by the Consortium.

At the outset of the Consortium a proposal was submitted for funds through the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (Title I). Those funds have comprised the bulk of the revenues necessary to sustain the Consortium at its present level of operation. In fact, 66 2/3% of the budget for fiscal year 1974 is slated to come from the Federal government. Of a budget totalling in excess of \$184,000, \$122,000 was hoped for

from Washington, and \$102,000 was received. Proposals are also being submitted to other Federal agencies for additional funds but without success to date.

Although the issue of Title I funds may be purely academic, since they will not be continued beyond 1974, at least two problems are inherent in securing funds in general from the Federal government. Both are evident to the Consortium. The first is the restrictive nature of Title I funds. When the Consortium was ready to move ahead and air a ready-made course which it would lease from another consortium or agency, it was informed by the Title I Coordinator for California that it could not do so. Offering an "off-the-shelf" course constitutes an extension of the university as opposed to a releasing of university resources to aid in the solution of community problems, according to Title I guidelines. It was forced to produce its own course at much increased costs, which it estimates at \$3,500 per program hour.

A second problem connected with Federal funding is its instability. In the Spring of 1973 the Director reported that the outlook for monies through Title I was "grim". A "crisis" was looming at the Federal funding level which might mean no funds at all through Title I, he said. Fortunately, the funds did arrive and the Consortium was able to continue. However, Federal funding may never present the kind of security educators seem to need and want, especially to carry on endeavors which are usually looked upon as secondary in institutional priorities.

In addition to Title I funds, the Consortium benefited indirectly from Title VIII funds received by California State University, Chico, to produce the Consortium's first telecourse.

A second general funding source currently being drawn upon is the Continuing Education Reserve Fund of the California State University and Colleges. No estimate has been given of the future promise of this source.

In addition to the State and Federal funds applied for and received, the Consortium has applied for other monies through private foundations. The Director reports that competition for the latter funds is "extremely keen" and that the Consortium is not yet oriented to the success formula for obtaining those funds. Word is forthcoming on the outcome of those proposals.

In the fiscal year 1973, the Consortium turned to its member institutions for the necessary funds to make up deficits. Eight institutions, through their deans, kept the Consortium out of the red. However, the master plan contains no provision for this occurring on a regular basis; and it is not likely that the individual member colleges and universities could, or would, support the effort out of their own treasuries for any length of time.

With the cessation of Title I funds, the Consortium, of necessity, is turning its attention to three other sources. They are student registration fees, the sale of course materials, and reimbursement through ADA funds received by community colleges. Projected income from the combination of the first two sources during the first year was low, only 5% of the budget. Original productions were not planned and the burden was to be carried by the Federal and State funds. The second year, however, with costs rising because of planned original television productions, 15% of the budget is expected to come from fees and course materials.

The following year 30% of the budget is to come from the two sources, with 60% expected in the fourth year. Plans call for the Consortium to be self-supporting during the fifth year. Thus the transition is planned from State and Federal funds to self-sustaining status.

The first telecourse offered, as previously mentioned, through California State University, Chico, and California State University, Humboldt, had a total enrollment of approximately 140 students, a number less than had been hoped for by both the Consortium staff and the two universities. With each student having paid a fee of \$28.00 the total funds generated by the course from enrollment fees were \$4,900. Of that amount the Consortium was to have received \$1,750, or \$10.00 per student. However, one of the two consorting institutions reported that the central office had not yet claimed its share of the revenue. The official understood this to indicate the central office's disappointment with the enrollment turnout.

Hopes for the financial solvency of the Consortium are also being pinned upon the sale of course materials. Plans call for the addition of this support "as soon as feasible." Unfortunately, no description of the nature of the materials, or advertising and marketing approaches was available.

The third, and latest, funding source being considered, is reimbursement through the ADA monies paid by the State to community colleges which air telecourses. The Consortium proposes to produce courses especially for community colleges in northern California and assess charges pro-rated on each college's enrollment. Since this particular scheme has yet to be attempted successfully in the State, the Director admits

that it is "sheer speculation" on his part. Naturally, no estimates of the amount of revenue which can be generated via this method are available since arrangements have yet to be worked out with the community colleges. Nonetheless, with the loss of Title I funds, hopes for a substantial portion of Consortium revenues appear to lie with the latest approval of the funding search.

ITV Teachers

Consortium plans for the production of telecourses call for the use of "broadcasting stations and production centers"¹⁹ to be specified and costed for each production. That means also that ITV teachers will be contracted for on a course-by-course basis when original productions are considered expedient. When they are employed, guidelines for compensation, residual rights, etc., will have to be formulated because the Consortium does not presently have any.

In the case of its first telecourse produced through the California State University, Chico, the ITV teacher, a faculty member from the University's Political Science Department was reimbursed for his services. However, since the course was aired live, revision and residual rights were not granted.

It is presumed that if rights are granted in the future to on-camera teachers, they will have to be bargained for in an individual teacher and course basis.

¹⁹"Follow-on Proposal", p. 21.

Registration and Promotion

The Consortium, organizationally and financially, is in a state of flux. Promotional and registration methods have changed and will change as the organization attempts to reach its most viable form.

Registration procedures for the Chico-Humboldt course were handled in the same way that enrollment for off-campus classes is handled, i.e., students paid their fees and registered on the first day of class. Eighteen dollars of the \$28.00 fee went into the Continuing Education Reserve Fund, and the remainder belonged to the Consortium.

Registration for subsequent courses, however, will be determined separately for each course, depending upon the nature of the offering, i.e., whether it is offered through the college's Continuing Education Office or through some other campus office. If plans mature which result in courses being offered through community colleges, the registration procedures should follow the order described in Chapters III and IV.

Course promotion is looked upon by the Director as so important a part of offering television courses that he is willing to devote up to one half of the Consortium's budget to it. The Consortium hired a full-time Assistant Director in charge of promotion and the original plans were to clear and place all promotional materials with the Public Affairs Director on each campus.

In his report to the Deans of Continuing Education at the cooperating institutions, the Assistant Director noted the delicate problems associated with local prerogatives. In effect, he assured them that the Consortium office would initiate news stories, brochures, tapes, slides, etc., which are beyond the area or scope of the local staff, and would

9

coordinate the use of materials among the cooperating institutions, yet all the while using the on-campus promotional arm of each college.

The promotional responsibilities, which it wished to share with the individual colleges, were as follows:

- A. Contacting the schools, agencies, and individuals involved in each program.
- B. Determining what promotion facilities each has and what is logical and reasonable to expect from them in originating promotional material.
- C. Developing a consortium program which will:
 1. Supply material to the schools or agencies for their use through their contacts and mailing lists.
 2. Develop other mailing lists.
 3. Prepare news stories, news releases, and articles which may or may not go through the schools or agency public information officer.
 4. Contact newspapers and radio and TV stations in areas where publicity will be effective.
 5. Prepare slides, copy, tapes, etc. for radio and TV announcements.
 6. Discover which agencies have newsletters, bulletins, etc. which can carry announcements or stories and getting them included by deadline.
 7. Develop new avenues for publicizing programs.
 8. Arrange for pictures and other visual material and background material of participants for promotion use.
 9. Prepare various approaches for use on bulletin boards or as handouts.
 10. Design brochures, contracting for the art work and printing, and arranging for addressing and distribution.

9

11. Coordinate all of the above to avoid overlap, confusion, duplication, yet seeing to it that deadlines are met.
12. Clear all material for accuracy and acceptability by participating institutions or agencies.²⁰

In the preparation of the initial telecourse two principal promotional devices were used: brochures and newspaper advertisements. The brochures were mailed to persons on Continuing Education lists, to those in the health care field, and to persons who in general deal with public health.

However, difficulties were encountered in promoting the first televised course. The Assistant Director of the Consortium, the person in charge of promotion, was charged with failure to convey promotion materials to the appropriate persons on each campus sufficiently in advance of the beginning of the course to ensure adequate promotion. At the same time he accused the campus promotional director of failing to use the materials forwarded to them. As a consequence it was decided, by his office, to by-pass the campus promotional director when promoting future television courses.

Delivery Systems

The design of the "Health, Poverty, and Public Policy" course was such that only one delivery system was needed. With students meeting in groups at a limited number of sites viewing two separate 1 1/2 hour television presentations 30 minutes apart on five successive Saturdays, from 9:00-10:30 and 11:00-12:30, only two delivery systems were feasible:

²⁰Memorandum to Steering Committee and Means from Alfred Partridge, Assistant Director, Promoting, of March 19, 1973, pp. 2-3.

cable or public broadcasting. The Consortium chose the latter because the television production facilities at Chico are also the production facilities of KIXE, Channel 9, Redding.

For future courses which will be offered among a wider number of colleges and, therefore, over a wider geographic area, the facilities of all three types of television delivery systems will be sought. With prospects of several courses for the fall, the Director reports that the available time on KQED, the public broadcasting station in San Francisco, has been exhausted. Conferences are under way with cable casters in northern California to determine the availability of air time for courses. In addition, commercial stations will be approached to donate air time.

Evaluation

Elaborate evaluations systems for assessing Consortium "activities and their consequences"²¹ have been desired, presumably to meet regulations associated with the receipt of federal funds. Evaluation of the project as a whole is to be done by a social psychologist employed by the Consortium especially for this purpose. It is to be done in three phases to correspond to the three year-long phases of the project.

Evaluation of the first-year objectives will include examination of: (1) the learning needs and interests of adults and agencies and the availability of institutional resources, (2) a survey of available televised courses or problem-related courses that could be televised, (3) at least one television course, (4) the process by which the course was promoted, (5) the student evaluation instruments used to determine course

²¹"Follow-on Proposal," p. 28.

effectiveness, and (6) the plan for instituting a program of instructional activities. Data to be used include Consortium documents, studies used by the Consortium staff to determine community needs, opinions of experts, published reviews, promotional documents, course schedules, registration and accounting records, student rating scale results, the continued funding proposal, course materials, plus interviews with Consortium staff members and sample members of participating agencies and consorting institutions.

The second-year evaluation will concentrate on determining "the numbers and characteristics of students reached and to discover the extent to which the courses meet their needs and aid community problem solving."²² Data for it will consist of "reports of student-users, opinions of members of participating agencies, and, where possible, objective tests will be used to obtain evidence about the benefits derived from the courses."²³

The third-year evaluation will determine the cost-effectiveness of the telecourses by relating data from the second-year phase to managerial, instructional, and distributional expenditures in phase three. The costs will be related to learning and community consequences to determine cost effectiveness. When possible these results will also be compared with results obtained from more traditional forms of teaching.

Evaluation of the first television course was two-fold in nature: (1) an attitudinal pre- and post-test administered by one of the colleges

²²"Follow-on Proposal," p. 34.

²³Ibid.

to students who took the course, and (2) a discussion session between the Consortium Director and those at Chico who were connected in one way or another with the production of the course. Student input into course evaluations, other than the attitudinal tests, was not sought by the two colleges. Results of the evaluations have not been tabulated.

Appraisal

The goals of the Consortium, as originally formulated by the member institutions, while addressing themselves to pressing societal needs, appeared to be contradictory by being simultaneously generic and restrictive. They were generic in that they concentrated upon the isolated adult population who find it difficult or impossible to reach the college campus. At the same time, however, the Consortium has focused upon community problems and their solution. The first course aired dealt with public health, the second course to be produced by the cooperative will focus upon the environment. If these are indicative of the future range of courses, then it is too narrow. Those adults who would otherwise come to campus do not enroll solely in problem oriented courses. Their range of interest is broader, as seen in a typical schedule of adult-oriented courses.

The slant of the Consortium's telecourse offerings has been dictated up to this point by its receipt of Title I funds. Since those funds will not extend beyond 1974, the Consortium will no longer find itself restrained by the accompanying dictates and should be in a position to appeal to an even broader segment of the adult population.

The goals described earlier in this chapter were, very wisely, the product of a large number of member, and prospective member, colleges in concert. The Director sent copies of the proposed goals to all, or virtually all, of the colleges which would conceivably join the project as well as to those colleges which formed the original Consortium. This avoids the obvious complaining which can result from the subsequent expansion of an organization to include members who had no previous connection with it.

The same kind of wisdom and foresight was demonstrated by the Director and the project originators by initiating the organization with the cooperation of the highest college and university administrators in California. The problem of receiving their blessing and support was immediately solved.

However, two problems in cooperation will continue needing attention during the existence of the Consortium. One is the gulf existing between the community colleges and the colleges and universities. The cleavage is real and has been duly noted by the Director. Although he indicates that the cooperation of the two-year institutions is good, that cooperation can be withdrawn at any time they feel their functions are being preempted. Their trust will need to be nurtured and will likely be extended on a course-to-course basis.

An equal amount of attention should be directed toward faculty involvement. First, while long-range plans appear to make room for faculty participation, their membership on committees and teams is limited, at best, to lower levels. Second, their membership, by wording, is not guaranteed. It is possible that some member institutions could send

nonfaculty representatives to the Consortium, leaving one or more colleges completely without faculty members sitting in on the planning and execution of television courses. Third, there is only moderate faculty representation on the teams which are presently planning the second television offering. Of the 32 persons participating, 11 represent the faculties of 5 colleges, while 22 of those present are from government and the private sector. One wonders how the faculties feel at being out-represented by a 2 to 1 ratio.

Last, a notable lack of faculty input in the production of the first telecourse prompts the observation: if it happened once, can it happen again? That incident led to outward faculty rebellion and an undermining of Consortium and local institution efforts. The end result was a suspected lack of confidence in the Consortium, and perhaps in ITV in general, as well as a reduced amount of learning for students enrolled in the course.

The organization of the Consortium, with a potential membership of over forty colleges, holds out the possibility of becoming cumbersome, perhaps too unwieldy to succeed. At one point the Director himself said: "We must, therefore, not assume this project will work, for the odds are very much against it."²⁴ While the literature has stressed simplicity of organization this Consortium is, perhaps of necessity, moving toward complexity. The question of the optimum size of the group, raised early by its Director, may ultimately be answered when the Consortium reaches a point of unworkability. While no expert has yet set a maximum size,

²⁴Memorandum from Stuart Cooney to the Consortium Steering Committee, January 29, 1973, p. 8.

by number of consorting institutions, this writer suspects that a cooperative of forty-two colleges will prove to be less than a desirable number for optimum efficiency and cooperation.

The group is fortunate, however, to have as its Director a man of Dr. Cooney's wide experience and apparent ability. The Consortium records indicate that he has initiated contact with a large number of colleges, universities, and agencies and that he has succeeded in bringing them together in cooperative endeavors. Also, he has apparently succeeded, to a degree, in allaying the fears especially of the community colleges toward the Consortium.

However, as was noted with the two previous consortia, no particular attention has been given to campus representatives from each institution. They are almost exclusively Deans of Continuing Education without respect to their energy levels, understanding of the Consortium, respect among colleagues, and other essential qualifications.

One of the most persistent problems which will continue to face the Consortium is that of communication. This, too, was noted by the Director. He said:

The task is too new, and the quantities of information that must be exchanged to make it all work are too great for communication lines of this length.²⁵

The problem lies not so much with the techniques, although the Consortium might consider the installation of electronic communication equipment such as Tel Pac, as with the ability of a small staff to carry all of its varied functions, including the huge task that is presented by

²⁵Ibid.

communication on this scale. If the lag in communication which occurred is traceable to an overburdening of the Director, then the solution would seem to lie in an easing of his burdens through either shifting of the work load to existing personnel or adding to the staff either a communications person or a clerical position, which ever is called for.

Finances are already looming as a potentially large problem. With the loss of Title I funds and the uncertainty of other government or private funds, the organization is looking to the sale of course materials and to student fees for support. However, the disappointing experience of the Valley Consortium discussed in Chapter IV should be taken as a warning not to lean heavily upon the sale of course materials. Even when they are required, 100% of students do not purchase course materials.

Second, the flow of ADA monies through the community colleges will depend upon: (1) their willingness to cooperate with the Consortium, (2) their perception of a non-threatening image in the Consortium, (3) their willingness to affiliate with another consortium in addition to those already extant, (4) the ability of the Consortium to produce courses which meet their needs, and (5) the general level of faculty and institutional acceptance given to ITV in the future.

To avoid future problems with on-camera teachers the Consortium should set down at least general guidelines to which it will adhere in future productions. Their formulation will avoid the unpleasanties associated with failure to compensate ITV teachers, failure of an institution to grant release time, or unsatisfactory arrangements for residual and revision rights.

No problems have been noted in registration for courses, probably because only one course has thus far been offered. When students view television courses in groups and at designated sites, registration problems are minimized. When and if courses are offered for in-home viewings the Consortium will have to deal with whatever registration problems arise.

The Consortium is already preparing to deal with diversified delivery systems as course formats dictate. When courses are to reach individual homes in the communities the Consortium is prepared to use all three systems of delivery: cable, commercial, and public television.

While effective methods of course promotion have been planned by the Assistant Director of the Consortium, the breakdown in the distribution of promotional materials which arose in connection with the first course may suggest earlier delivery of materials to member colleges, and/or cultivation of a better climate of cooperation.

The issue of academic standards is a most difficult one, and the problems are compounded by the large number of member colleges participating in the Consortium. Since the standards vary from course to course as well as from institution to institution, the best that can be hoped for is a set of general guidelines and the determination of more specific ones as smaller groups of schools cooperate to produce given courses.

In the matter of evaluation, the Consortium is doing a superb job. It has been careful to hire an unbiased and qualified evaluator who will examine a wide array of data in reaching his conclusions. However, more attention should be given to course evaluations. The Consortium should oversee evaluation of each course to insure that the instruments

used yield the kind of information needed for the overall evaluation of the Consortium.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has sought the answers to a number of questions formulated by the researcher pertaining to instructional television in higher education in the State of California. They were to be gained through (1) the formulation of guidelines drawn from the literature, (2) case studies of three ITV consortia in California higher education, and (3) comparison of the three ITV consortia with the guidelines.

The originally stated questions, which numbered 18 in all, were as follows: (1) With whom, and under what circumstances did each consortium originate? (2) what methods of implementation were selected for each consortium? (3) What were the originally determined needs and goals? (4) Along what lines was each consortium organized? (5) How was authority distributed within each consortium? (6) How were decisions reached? (7) What terms of membership were selected? (8) What means of financing each consortium were chosen? (9) How were course offerings determined? (10) From what sources were televised courses selected? (11) How were television teachers selected and compensated? (12) How did students enroll in televised courses? (13) How did students receive credit for televised courses? (14) How did students fulfill course requirements? (15) How were academic standards maintained in televised courses? (16) What delivery system, or systems, were selected to make televised courses available to students? (17) What method of course

evaluation was used? (18) What methods of evaluation were selected to determine the success of each consortium?

However, a search of the literature, from which the guidelines were drawn, resulted in the formulation of three additional questions: (1) What level of cooperation was achieved within the consortium? (2) What system, or systems, of communication were devised for the consortium? (3) How were ITV courses promoted? A decision was made to include these in the guidelines based upon the frequency with which the issues of cooperation, communication, and promotion appeared in the literature and the emphasis they received. Thus a total of 21 questions remained to be answered by the study.

Conclusions

This study has, in general, confirmed the experiences and conclusions of the ITV consortia as reported in the literature. It also served to indicate that four of the 18 questions originally posed were not: (1) considered to be significant problems in those ITV consortia described in the literature, by reason of the fact that the problem areas were omitted altogether in reporting and (2) found to have posed problems in the three ITV consortia which were the subjects of the case studies.

First, the question of the distribution of authority within the consortium received no special emphasis in the literature and in practice among the three consortia studied. Each operated with either a formally-appointed Director, or with one who assumed his post with the informal consent of the institutional representatives. Each representative, including the Director, was granted one vote in consortium business. Satisfaction with each director might be concluded from

observation that in the two year history of each consortium each Director had not been replaced in his position.

A second question, the importance of which also diminished as the study progressed, dealt with the importance of types and levels of membership. Although the literature made a point of emphasizing both aspects of membership, none of the three California consortia studied emphasized it, perhaps because none of them have yet become legal entities. Despite the fact that members were at liberty to join or to depart, as their circumstances warranted, there were few withdrawals.

Third, the questions relating to course registration and the receiving of credit for television courses dwindled in importance as a result of the case studies. Students registered by mail, in person on campus, or in person at a viewing site. Students normally registered in their own college districts, for community colleges, or free districts were declared to eliminate registration problems.

Last, the question of implementing the consortia proved to be of less importance than first believed. Neither the literature nor the case studies revealed any significant problems or areas of concern surrounding implementation.

The remaining 14 questions did prove to be of more significance. The conclusions which resulted from the research conducted relative to these questions are stated guardedly. The writer is cognizant of the dangers present in attempting to generalize from the experiences of but three ITV consortia. However, in many respects their experiences were confirmatory of those reported by other ITV consortia. The conclusions, then, are as follows:

1. Consistent with the literature, consortia which originate at the administrative level, and preferably the highest possible level, of educational institutions appear to enjoy a high degree of administrative involvement and support. Two of the consortia studied began at levels no lower than that of the Dean of Instruction, while the third originated at the summit of higher education in California. No significant roadblocks were encountered in carrying each from conception to realization.

2. Although the literature suggests that educational crises provide the most fertile ground for cooperation among institutions of higher education, the study demonstrated that ITV consortia can be organized and become viable, at least for a limited period of time,¹ apart from crises conditions. The combined goals of the three consortia studied, none of which were regarded by them as crises situations, grouped themselves around eight broad areas. They were: (1) improvement of teaching skills, (2) enlargement of course offerings, (3) upgrading of courses, (4) expansion of community skills and understanding, (5) offering and improvement of television courses, (6) defining of community problems, (7) creation of institutional-community networks, and (8) assistance to the community disadvantaged.

This writer is cognizant of the comparatively short life span of each of three consortia studied--two years each²--and concedes that adverse conditions could develop in the future to impair and dissolve the

¹At the time of this study, no consortium in the state was older than three years.

²At the time of this study, no consortium in the state was older than three years.

organizations.

3. Contrary to the literature, which urged the drawing up of formal agreements for consortia, the study demonstrated that ITV consortia which lack legal organization can apparently function as efficiently as those which have drawn up Joint Powers Agreements or similarly legally binding documents. Two of the consortia had no legal agreements. One had gone to the lengths of drawing one up, but since it had not been signed by all participating colleges, it was of no effect. Two of the three cooperatives are growing in number of participants despite the presence of a legal document.

4. ITV consortia which are led by full-time Directors, or by Directors who have significant amounts of release time from normal institutional duties, appear to function more smoothly than those with Directors who have little or no release time. The study confirmed the literature. The case studies showed that problems arising from lack of communication between member colleges and consortium Directors and lack of time to fulfill consortium duties have resulted in threatened withdrawal of member colleges, general dissatisfaction, and lethargic decision making.

5. As reported in the literature and confirmed by the case studies, qualifications should be specified, or an indoctrination process provided, for consortium representatives. When a representative is selected from a member college, he should be chosen on the basis of those qualifications given in Chapter II, or similar ones, viz.: (1) a high energy level, (2) a willingness and ability to work, (3) the respect of his or her colleagues, (4) the support of his or her administration, and (5) an understanding of the consortium. In those instances where

representatives are selected because of the administrative position they occupy in a college or university, they should be exposed to persuasive communication which can shape a positive attitude toward the consortium.

6. The case studies upheld the literature by verifying the need for a stable financial basis, preferably combining state and local monies. Of the three consortia studied, the two which enjoyed the most financial stability were those which received reimbursement through State funding. The single consortium which leaned heavily upon Federal funding evidenced the greatest amount of insecurity.

7. In order to hold down expenses and keep financial demands from becoming exorbitant, consortia should consider producing a minimum number of ITV courses locally and should establish communication with other consortia in order to exchange or lease television series. Ultimately, the establishment of a national organization or means of communication to facilitate course exchange or leasing seems inevitable.

8. Guidelines which guarantee compensation and adequate release time for ITV teachers should be carefully constructed and adhered to at the consortium level. Residual and revision rights, if agreed to by both administrators and ITV teachers, can remain negotiable on a course-by-course basis.

9. As indicated in the literature, agreement should be reached at the consortium level--with the results to be included in consortium by-laws--to guarantee financial remuneration, release time, or other mutually agreeable compensation to on-campus course representatives in exchange for their duties in connection with ITV courses.

10. Multiple television delivery systems, including commercial open-circuit, public broadcasting and cable, offer a greater amount of flexibility and audience-delivering capability for ITV than any single delivery system. If only single systems are available, special priority should be given to either cable or public broadcasting systems.

11. Formal evaluation methods and instruments should be determined for the consortium and the television courses offered by it. The evaluation instruments should be devised through the cooperation of at least three segments of the consortium: (1) the ITV consortium Director and/or staff, (2) the administration or representative of each consorting college, and (3) the faculty of each institution, and especially those faculty members participating in the television effort, a fourth segment, the ITV staff, would need to be included. Evaluation of the organization should take place annually, while ITV courses should be evaluated on a course-by-course basis.

12. Steps should be taken to insure that opportunities are provided for faculty members to play significant roles in the planning and production of television courses. The case studies unearthed significant problems arising when faculties were granted minimal involvement, or no involvement at all.

13. The poorest communication links in consortia appear to exist between the consortium staff and the individual faculties and/or between the consortium representatives and their faculties. Although the literature did not reveal the location of the sources of the more frequent communication breakdown, it did stress the imperative need for effective methods of intra-consortium communication.

14. Alternative contact times beyond the normal office hours of faculty members should be provided for the convenience of those student enrollees in television courses who are employed or otherwise unable to contact on-campus representatives during the normal work day. The alternative times may be evenings and/or weekends.

15. In agreement with the consensus of other ITV consortia, the three case studies clearly pointed to the need for public relations efforts to apprise faculties of the advantages of ITV courses for all concerned. The desired end result is the lessening of faculty resistance to ITV.

16. Promotional methods for ITV courses which are diverse in nature, utilizing as many of the mass media as finances permit and which are administered sufficiently in advance of the first telelesson, seem to produce greater course enrollments than meager and late promotional efforts. Once again, the case studies upheld the findings from the literature.

17. Printed promotional materials should include, at a minimum, the following information: (1) the title and a brief description of the television course with the number of credits it carries, (2) a brief description of the consortium, including the consorting institutions, (3) an introduction of the ITV teacher(s), (4) a complete list of the telelessons, including the exact dates they are to be aired, (5) a list of the times of day and television stations on which the telelessons can be viewed, (6) the names, telephone numbers and times of day during which the campus course representatives can be reached, and (7) a simplified self-addressed registration form.

Implications for Further Research

This study may have raised as many questions as, or more questions than, it answered. Chief among them are the following:

1. What is the connection, if any, between the level at which an ITV consortium is conceived and the ease with which the concept is implemented and the success or failure it ultimately enjoys?
2. Is there a rank-order of specific consortium needs and goals; and if so, which ones, if any, correlate with the successful operation and longevity of ITV consortia?
3. Are there some organizational patterns for ITV consortia which result in more efficient and successful operation than other patterns of ITV consortium organization?
4. What is the optimum and the minimum size for workable ITV consortia?
5. Which persuasive measures most effectively reduce faculty resistance to ITV?
6. What are the factors which hinder effective communication between and among the three component elements of ITV consortia: (1) staff, (2) institutional representatives, and (3) faculties.
7. If they can be identified, which promotional devices make the most positive impact upon the public and consequently lead to enrollment in televised courses?

With the number of ITV consortia in higher education having multiplied, the answers to these questions, and others yet to be raised through additional studies, will need to be sought if this most recent application of television to education is to enjoy longevity.

APPENDICES

1

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

I. Background.

- A. With what person, or persons, did the consortium originate?
 - 1. Were they involved in some aspect of education?
 - a. If so, in what aspect were they involved?
 - 2. What relationship did they have to institutions of higher education?
- B. Under what circumstances did the consortium originate?
 - 1. What events or circumstances occurred to generate the consortium?
 - 2. What was the significance of these events or circumstances?

II. Implementation.

- A. How was the consortium implemented?
 - 1. What method was used?
 - a. Why was this method chosen?
 - 2. Were any particular problems encountered?
 - a. If so, how were they solved?
- B. What, if anything, could have been done to have further expedited implementation?

III. Needs and goals.

- A. What are, or have been, the needs and goals?
 - 1. Have new ones been added and/or deleted?
 - a. If so, what are they?
 - b. What rationale was given for additions and deletions?

3

- B. What person, or persons, were responsible for them?
- C. What criteria were used in determining them?
 - 1. By what means were the criteria determined?
 - 2. What person, or persons, were responsible for the criteria?
- D. In your estimation, were the most important needs and goals given consideration?

IV. Cooperation.

- A. What methods are, or have been, used among participating institutions?
- B. What administrative officers are, or have been, involved in consortium planning and/or business?
 - 1. What roles are they now playing, or have they played?
- C. What efforts are being, or have been, made to involve faculty members in consortium planning and/or business?
 - 1. What roles are they now playing, or have they played?
 - 2. What relationship do they now sustain, or have they sustained in the past, to administrators in the consortium?
- D. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving cooperation?

V. Organization.

- A. External.
 - 1. What is, and/or what has been, the over-all pattern?
 - a. How is the organization directed?
 - (1) How was leadership determined?
 - (2) If there is a director, what are his duties and qualifications?
 - (3) For what portion of his time is the leader engaged in consortium business?
 - b. What relationship do member institutions sustain to each other?

9

2. How is membership determined?
 - a. Are there different levels of membership?
 - (1) If so, describe them.
 - b. What constitutes membership?
3. Is there an agreement between the individual institutions?
 - a. If so, describe it.
4. How is authority distributed within the consortium?
 - a. By what process are decisions reached?

B. Internal.

1. What relationship do consortium representatives at the same institution sustain to each other?
2. How many representatives are allotted to each institution?
 - a. What are their titles, duties, and qualifications?

VI. Communication.

- A. What methods are, or have been, used for:
 1. Intra-consortium contact?
 2. Inter-institutional contact?
 3. Faculty-student contact?
- B. Have methods been added and/or deleted?
 1. If so, what rationale was used?
 2. What methods are now being used which were not used previously?
 3. What methods are not now being used which were used previously?
- C. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving methods of communication?

VII. Finances.

- A. What methods are being, or have been, used?

9

1. Have changes been made since the inception of the consortium?
 1. a. If so, what were they?
 - b. What rationale was used for making them?
- B. What portion of consortium expenses are being met by present finances?
- C. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the financing of the consortium?

VIII. ITV Teachers.

- A. Are ITV teachers now, or have they been in the past, employed by the consortium?
 1. What criteria are used in their selection?
 - a. How were the criteria determined?
 2. What portion of their time is devoted to ITV?
 3. What are their duties?
 4. If none are any longer employed, why was the position omitted?
- B. Is compensation provided?
 1. If so, describe the methods being used.
 - a. Are revision and residual rights provided?
 - (1) If so, describe them.
 - (2) If not, what rationale was used in not providing them?
 - b. If released time provided?
 - (1) Is it in lieu of additional salary or in addition to it?
 - (2) If not, what rationale was used in not providing it?
 2. If not, what rationale was used in not providing compensation?
 3. Have other methods of compensation been used in the past which are not now being used?
 - a. If so, what changes were made and why?

- C. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the methods of compensation?

IX. Registration.

- A. How are course offerings determined?
 - 1. What person, or persons, make the determinations?
 - 2. Upon what criteria are these decisions reached?
- B. By what process do students enroll in ITV courses?
 - 1. How and where do they obtain enrollment materials?
 - 2. Of what do the enrollment materials consist?
 - 3. By what means are the enrollment materials returned to the enrolling institution?
- C. What fees, if any, are charged for courses?
 - 1. How are these fees determined?
 - 2. What portion, if any, goes to the consortium?
- D. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving registration procedures?

X. Promotion.

- A. What methods of promoting ITV courses are being, or have been, used?
- B. Have promotional methods been discontinued?
 - 1. If so, what were they and why were they dropped?
- C. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving promotion of ITV courses?

XI. Delivery systems.

- A. What television delivery systems are being, or have been, used?
 - 1. What systems are available within the geographic area served by the consortium?
 - 2. Are all available systems being used?
 - a. If not, which systems are not being used?

- b. What rationale was used to justify the limitation of delivery systems?
- 3. Have systems been used in the past which are no longer being used?
 - a. If so, what are they and what led to their disuse?
- B. At what times of day and on what days of the week are ITV lessons available for viewing?
- C. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the delivery systems?

XII. Evaluation.

- A. What methods are being, or have been, used to evaluate the consortium?
 - 1. Were consortium objectives clearly stated at its inception and/or prior to evaluation?
 - 2. What instruments are being, or have been, used to evaluate the consortium?
 - 3. What person, or persons, are evaluating the consortium?
 - a. By what criteria were they selected?
 - b. What relationship, if any, do they sustain to the consortium?
 - c. What are their qualifications to conduct the evaluation?
 - d. Are they receiving compensation for their work?
- C. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the evaluation procedures?

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into pursuant to the provisions of California Education Code Section 892.6, and of Title 1, Division 7, Chapter 5, Article 1 (Sections 6500 et seq.) of the California Government Code relating to the joint exercise of powers among the following parties:

and

COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS OF _____ COUNTY, as the party designated to carry out this agreement.

WHEREAS, the aforementioned parties recognize the need for providing Community College courses for credit by means of television broadcast; and

WHEREAS, the aforesaid school Districts desire to combine their respective efforts to develop and conduct programs of telecast courses for Community College credit; and

WHEREAS, the _____ County Superintendent of Schools desires to assist in developing and conducting said programs; and

WHEREAS, the parties to this agreement have determined and hereby declare that it is in the best public interest that these parties join together to form a consortium to accomplish the aforesaid purposes; and

WHEREAS, it is the intention of the parties to this agreement to provide herein for the establishment of the Consortium for Community College Broadcast Television;

NOW, THEREFORE, the aforesaid parties do hereby agree as follows:

1. This agreement shall be effective on execution hereof, and shall continue in effect until lawfully terminated by the mutual consent of all the parties. In the event of a reorganization of one or more of the districts participating in this agreement, the successor in interest or successors in interest to the obligations of any such reorganized district may be substituted as a party or as parties to this agreement.

2. The parties to this agreement are herein designated as Consortium for Community College Broadcast Television (hereinafter referred to as the Consortium) and hereby join together for the purpose of providing junior college courses for credit by means of television broadcast. Said Consortium shall consist of each of the parties hereto and such community colleges that hereafter may join in this agreement pursuant to Article 16 hereof.

3. A Consortium Committee, an advisory body, shall be established and shall make recommendations to the County Superintendent of Schools and the member districts concerning all activities and endeavors of the Consortium, including but not limited to the following: curriculum development, selection of staff, collection and disbursement of funds, programming and production.

4. Each Community College District that is a member of the Consortium may appoint to the Consortium Committee one representative for each Community College maintained by said District. Each representative

shall have one vote in any action taken by the Consortium Committee. Votes of colleges within a multi-college district may be cast by proxy through fewer representatives. Action of the Consortium Committee shall be limited to making recommendations pursuant to Article 3 hereof and all action shall require a majority vote. The County Superintendent's representative to the Consortium shall serve as chairman of the Consortium Committee.

5. The Consortium Committee shall meet at least eight times during the school year and shall have the power to appoint subcommittees and/or an executive council for the purpose of carrying out its responsibilities under this agreement. Time and location of the meeting to be mutually determined by the members of the committee.

6. The County Superintendent of Schools shall provide consultant and secretarial services to assist in the coordination of the Consortium.

7. For the first year of this agreement, each community college district that is a member of the Consortium shall pay to the Consortium Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000.00) for each community college maintained by said district. The same shall be paid to the County Superintendent of Schools and shall be held in a fund established by the County Superintendent of Schools.

8. The County Superintendent of Schools is the party hereby designated to carry this agreement into effect and, as such:

a. shall have the authority, on behalf of the members of the Consortium and after securing recommendation of the Consortium Committee, to contract for the Consortium, to

appoint any officer or employee of the Consortium,
and to employ or retain the services of other organizations and individuals as may be necessary or appropriate and to fix and pay their compensation,

b. shall have the authority to receive, accept, expend or disburse funds of the Consortium by contract or otherwise, for purposes consistent with the provisions hereof.

c. shall have the duty to maintain at all times strict accountability of all funds received and disbursed and shall give a report of said accounting to each member of the Consortium at the close of each school years.

9. At the end of each school year, the County Superintendent of Schools upon the recommendation of the Consortium Committee shall re-evaluate the amount of the contribution to be made by each member of the Consortium. On or before the 1st day of August of the second and each succeeding year of this agreement, the County Superintendent of Schools shall report to each of the members of the Consortium, the amount that has been determined shall be paid by each member for the ensuing year, which amount shall not be increased during that year without the consent of the County Superintendent of Schools and all districts or other agencies then a party hereto. Said amount shall be paid by the member District on or before September 15th of that year unless said District has given notice of its intention to withdraw from the Consortium pursuant to Article 10 hereof.

10. Any member may withdraw from this agreement and from the Consortium hereby formed by giving written notice of its intention to do so to the County Superintendent of Schools on or before September 1st of any year. Unless otherwise specified therein, the same shall be effective upon the County Superintendent of Schools' receipt of said notice. Funds contributed by any member District prior to its removal from the Consortium, shall not be returned to said District except as provided in Article 16 hereof.

11. Members of the Consortium agree that persons within each of the member Districts may enroll without interdistrict permits in telecast credit courses sponsored by the Consortium.

12. Any funds received from the State Superintendent of Schools or from State Apportionments as a result of telecast programs selected or produced by the Consortium shall accrue to the member Districts on the basis of student attendance.

13. All programs and materials developed and produced and copyrights thereof pursuant to this agreement shall become the property of the Consortium.

14. The term "Junior College" as used herein include community colleges; and all references herein to "Community College" includes Junior Colleges.

15. Any Junior College District that is not a member of the Consortium but that desires to join the Consortium may become a member thereof by executing an agreement with the County Superintendent of Schools whereby said District agrees to comply with the terms hereof and to pay the fee prescribed herein or subsequently set by the County Superintendent

of Schools pursuant to Article 9 hereof.

16. In the event of the dissolution of the Consortium, the complete rescission or other final termination of this agreement by the _____ County Superintendent of Schools and by all the districts or other agencies then a party hereto, any property interest remaining in the Consortium following a discharge of all obligations thereof, shall be disposed of as the Consortium shall then determine, with the objective of returning to the _____ County Superintendent of Schools and each district or other agency which is then a party to this agreement, a proportionate return on the contributions made to such properties by such parties. The inclusion of additional parties to this agreement or the withdrawal of some but not all of the parties to this agreement shall not be deemed a dissolution of the Consortium nor a termination of this agreement.

18. Should any portion, term, condition or provision of this agreement be decided by a court of competent jurisdiction to be illegal or in conflict with any law of the State of California, or be otherwise rendered unenforceable or ineffectual, the validity of the remaining portions, terms, conditions and provisions shall not be affected thereby.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be duly executed by their authorized officers thereunto duly authorized as set forth hereinbelow:

On the _____ day of _____, 1970, by

(Institution)

By _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Published Materials

- Bailey, K. V. "Evaluating School Radio and Television: Some Problems and Methods." Educational Broadcasting International 6 (March 1973): 22-27.
- Beckes, Isaac K. "Vincennes University: Pioneer in Cable TV." Community and Junior College Journal 43 (November 1972): 10-11.
- Brown, Roscoe C. "Evaluation of Instructional Television." In A Guide to Instructional Television, pp. 160-175. Edited by Robert A. Diamond. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Burke, Richard C. "Some Questions About Instructional Television." In Instructional Television, pp. 114-133. Edited by Richard C. Burke, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- California. Education Code (1961).
- Chester, Giraud; Garrison, Garnet R.; and Willis, Edgar E. Television and Radio. 4th ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.
- Cohen, Jerry M. "Maryland's Community College of the Air." Junior College Journal 42 (October 1971): 33, 36, 40.
- Crippens, David L. "Ripples." Educational Broadcasting Review, 5 (June 1971): 59-60.
- Diamond, Robert A. "The Television Teacher." In A Guide To Instructional Television, pp. 246-254. Edited by Robert A. Diamond. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Dubin, Robert, and Hedley, R. Alan. The Medium May Be Related to the Message. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1969.
- DuMolin, James R. Instructional Television Utilization in the United States. St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University, 1971.
- Felesenthal, Norman. "MPATI: A History (1959-1971)." Educational Broadcasting Review. 5 (December 1971): 36-44.

The Fourth Revolution: Instructional Technology in Higher Education.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

Garnet, Betty, and Thompson, Maurice. "Man and Environment and TV College." Community and Junior College Journal 43 (November 1972): 14-16.

Gilkey, Richard. "Television: A Medium in Transition." The Clearing House 44 (April 1970): 510-512.

Gilliom, Bonnie. "The Television Teacher." In Instructional Television, pp. 57-85. Edited by Richard C. Burke. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1971.

Gordon, George N. Classroom Television: New Frontiers in ITV. New York: Hastings House, 1970.

Gross, Lynn. "The Southern California Consortium for Community College Television." Educational/Industrial Television 5 (January 1973): 16-17, 20.

Gumpert, Gary. "Closed Circuit Television in Training and Education." In The Farther Vision, pp. 155-182. Edited by Allen E. Koenig and Ruane B. Hill. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

_____. "Interinstitutional Exchange and Media." In Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education. pp. 264-293. Edited by Lawrence C. Howard. Wisconsin University, Milwaukee: Institute for Human Relations. Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C., 1967.

Hall, George. "ITFS and the Economic Implications of the New Educational Accountability." Educational Product Report 3 (January 1970): 6-11.

Helmke, Guy M. Emerging Patterns of Instructional Television for California Public Schools. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1966.

"A History of the Development of ITV," Educational Product Report 4 (January 1971): 16-26.

Hoopes, David S., and others. A Study of the Dynamics of Inter-Institutional Cooperation for International Education Development. Final Report. Pittsburg University, Pennsylvania: Regional Council for International Education, 1971.

Hughes, Larry W. Interpretative Study of Research and Development Relative to Educational Cooperatives. Final Report. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee, 1971.

- Inter-Institutional Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education in New York State. Corning, New York: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1970.
- Johnson, Leland L. Cable Television and Higher Education: Two Contrasting Experiences. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1971.
- Maxwell, Lee. "Cooperation Via Televised Instruction." Junior College Journal 41 (November 1970): 27-28.
- Mikes, Donald F. "Contract Practices for ITV Teachers." Audiovisual Instruction. 13 (December 1968): 1091-1094.
- Moore, Raymond S. "Cooperation in Higher Education." In Inter-Institutional Cooperation in Higher Education, pp. 304-324. Edited by Laurence C. Howard. Wisconsin University, Milwaukee: Institute for Human Relations, Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C., 1967.
- Nader, Shafeek. "Cable TV and the Community College." Community and Junior College Journal 43 (November 1972): 8-9.
- NAEB Newsletter, January 14, 1972, pp. 1-2.
- Nylin, Donald W. "TV or Not TV: What is the Question?" Educational Leadership. 28 (November 1970): 137-139.
- Paltridge, James Gilbert. Urban Higher Education Consortia. Berkley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.
- Patterns for Voluntary Cooperation. Self-Study Report of the Finger Lakes. Corning, New York: College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1971.
- Patterson, Lewis D. Consortia in American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, 1970.
- Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Educational Television. Sacramento, California, 1953.
- Schools and Cable Television. Washington, D.C.: Division of Technology, National Education Association, 1971.
- Schramm, Wilbur. "The Future of Educational Radio and Television." Educational Television International. 4 (December 1970): 282-286.
- Schwenkmeyer, Barry and Goodman, Mary Ellen. Putting Cooperation to Work: A Survey of How Cooperation is Helping Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, Incorporated, 1972.

Si

Si

Sm

St

"S

St

Ta

TV

Wa

Wi

Zi

Ce

Cr

Hi

- Siebert, Fred S. Copyrights, Clearances, and Rights of Teachers in the New Educational Media. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964.
- Silverman, Robert J. A Study of the Inter-Organizational Behavior in Consortia. Final Report. Cornell University, Ithaca, New York: Cooperative Extension Service, (1969).
- Smith, Mary Howard, ed. Using Television in the Classroom. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.
- Starlin, Glen. Inter-Institutional Communication Networks. Prepared for the Feasibility Study of Inter-Institutional Television, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1966.
- "Statement on Instructional Television." AAUP Bulletin. 55 (June 1969): 270-272.
- Stier, William F. A Look in Retrospect--A Consortium. Colleges in Mid-America. Sioux City: Briar Cliff College, 1971.
- Taylor, Beverly J. "The Development of Instructional Television." In The Farther Vision, pp. 133-153. Edited by Allen E. Koenig and Ruane B. Hill. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- TV Classroom. Report of the 1968-1969 School Year. San Diego Community College, (1969).
- Watson, Norman E. and Luskin, Bernard J. "Cables, Cassettes, and Computers at Coast." Community and Junior College Journal 43 (November 1972): 12-13.
- Wilbur, Leslie. "A Look at Televised Courses...Before Consorting." Community and Junior College Journal 43 (November 1972): 21-22.
- Zigerrell, James J. "Televised Instruction: Where Do We Go From Here?" Educational Technology. 9 (September 1969): 72-76.

Unpublished Materials

- Central Valley Consortium of Community Colleges (Fresno, California). Minutes of a meeting of representatives of Seven Central Valley Institutions of Higher Education, 1971. (Mimeographed.)
- Crabbe, John C. "Master Plan for Television Consortium of Valley Colleges." Sacramento, California, 1972. (Mimeographed.)
- Highlander, John P. "A Proposal for the Activation of Educational Television Channel 18 at Fresno State College. Fresno, California: Fresno State College, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

Maxwell, L. M.; Lord, W.; and Churchill, R. J. "University Two Year Cooperation Through Direct Communication Linkages." Paper presented at the National Science Foundation Division of Undergraduate Education in Science. Combined UES Project Directors Meeting, Washington, D.C., 12 February 1970.

"The Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium: Three-Year Plan and Follow-On Proposal." Sanoma, California, December 1972. (Mimeographed.)

The Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium (Sanoma). Memoranda from the Consortium Director, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

"Progress Report of Cooperative Graduate Education in Nursing." Number Two. Reno, Nevada, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

"September 1971 Semester College Courses for Credit on Television." Baltimore, Maryland: Maryland Center for Public Broadcasting, 1971.

Television Consortium of the Valley Colleges (Sacramento, California). Minutes of Meetings of Consortium Representatives, 1971-1973. (Mimeographed.)

Weinschenk, Franz. "Proposal For a Television Class in Art 25--Art History, 3 Units." Fresno, California, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Interviews

Akers, Marion. Dean of Instruction, Sierra College, Rocklin, California. Interview, 14 June 1973.

Blodgett, Fritz. Instructor, Sierra College, Rocklin, California. Interview, 21 June 1973.

Brackmann, Holly. Instructor, College of the Sequoias, Visalia. Interview, 9 May 1973.

Cooney, Stuart. Director, The Northern California Regional Instructional Television Consortium. Interview, 22 June 1973.

Davidson, William. Program Director, KMJ-TV, Channel 24, Fresno, California. Interview, 1 May, 1973.

Dillard, Wilson. Public Information Officer, Yuba College, Marysville, California. Interview, 22 June 1973.

Evans, Arthur. Associate Dean of Instruction, West Hills Community College, Coalinga, California. Interview, 1 May 1973.

- Hall, Lincoln. Dean of Instruction, College of the Sequoias, Visalia, California. Interview, 1 May 1973.
- Hansen, Jack. Assistant Superintendent of Education, State Center College District, Fresno, California. Interview, 9 May 1973.
- Hennessy, John. Dean of Continuing Education, California State University, Humboldt, Arcata, California. Interview, 3 July 1973.
- Lane, Ronald. Instructor, Modesto Junior College, Modesto, California. Interview, 23 June 1973.
- Livesey, Jerald. Instructor, West Hills Community College, Coalinga, California. Interview, 9 May 1973.
- McClarty, Edward. Dean of Instructional Services, Modesto Junior College, Modesto, California. Interview, 13 June 1973.
- Meuter, Ralph. Dean for Continuing Education, California State University, Chico, Chico, California. Interview, 5 July 1973.
- Mitchell, James. Butte Junior College District. Durham, California. Interview, 11 June 1973.
- O'Brien, John. Instructor, Reedley College, Reedley, California. Interview, 3 May 1973.
- Orom, Earl. Dean of Instruction, Yuba College, Marysville, California. Interview, 11 June 1973.
- Randall, Queen. Associate Dean of Instruction, American River College, Sacramento, California. Interview, 13 June 1973.
- Roberts, Connell. Associate Dean of Liberal Arts and General Education, Sacramento City College, Sacramento, California. Interview, 13 June 1973.
- Sischo-Nownejad, Edyma. Instructor, Merced College, Merced, California. Interview, 30 April 1973.
- Walsh, Alfred. Instructor, Butte College, Durham, California. Interview, 11 June 1973.
- Warren, David. Instructor, Sacramento City College, Sacramento, California. Interview, 14 June 1973.
- Weinschenk, Franz. Associate Dean of Humanities, Fresno City College, Fresno, California. Interview, 24 April 1973.
- Williamson, Jack. Vice President, Instruction, Merced College, Merced, California. Interview, 30 April 1973.

- Winterman, Jerome Instructor, Cosumnes River College, Sacramento, California. Interview, 25 June 1973.
- Witt, Walter. Instructor, Fresno City College, Fresno, California. Interview, 24 April 1973.
- Wyman, Robert. Associate Dean of Instruction, Cosumnes River College, Sacramento, California. Interview, 1 June 1973.
- Zech, Norman. Dean of Instruction, Reedley College, Reedley, California. Interview, 27 April 1973.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03178 0574