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ABSTRACT

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF COMMUNICATIONS
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UC/CSUC
VENTURA LEARNING CENTER

by
Joyce Mildred Kennedy
Master of Arts in Mass Communication

On July 1, 1974, what has been termed by some as an innovative form of postsecondary education metamorphosed from concept to reality in the Pacific coastal city of Ventura. It was the University of California and the California State University and Colleges Ventura Learning Center, the first of its kind to be jointly sponsored by the two senior segments of public higher education in California.

Its purpose was to bring the campus into the community by offering upper division and graduate level courses leading to Bachelor's and Master's degrees from several participating campuses in the UC and CSUC systems.
This study traces the evolvement of the Ventura Learning Center from concept to reality, and the significance of the role of external communication in the development, acceptance and growth not only of the Center itself, but the concept. It attempts to show the critical role played by communication "gatekeepers" in the community, such as the news media, and the equally significant role played by other communication channels, such as direct mail, in reaching target audiences. It also outlines some methods of determining the educational needs of the community, and suggests some procedures for promoting and publicizing new programs to non-traditional students.

The thesis concludes with several communication models that may be used by practitioners in their market research and promotional efforts, and selected samples of marketing and promotional materials used by the Learning Center during the first 36 months of its existence.
CHAPTER I

Not only do accessible and diversified learning alternatives for adults have the potential for reducing social ills such as functional illiteracy, welfare dependence, individual demoralization, and social instability, they offer the prospect of enhancing the state's culture, politics, economy, and general quality of life.

from Postsecondary Alternatives to Meet the Educational Needs of California's Adults

Justification

During the past five years there have been numerous reports, studies, and surveys that have attempted to define or assess the need for alternative forms of higher education in California—alternatives, that is, to the traditional pattern of earning a college degree by attending classes, usually full-time, on campus.

These studies have been conducted or authorized by private institutions of higher learning, as well as by the three public segments of higher education in California—the University of California (UC), the California State University and Colleges (CSUC) and the California Community Colleges. Major studies have also been authored or authorized by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). The CPEC was created by the California Legislature (AB770) in 1973 to act in an advisory capacity to the
Legislature and Governor on all aspects of postsecondary education (including public, private and independent) in California. It replaced the former Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

The reports carry a consistent and recurrent theme.

As early as 1973, for example, the *Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California*, stressed that conventional campuses must be complemented by new approaches. The report said:

> We are particularly concerned with the development of off-campus programs which attempt to bring post-secondary education to the student. If properly developed, these can enhance access and choice for the people of California.

Some of the characteristics of these extended forms of higher education include new student clientele, new instructional techniques, new uses of media, off-campus settings, credit by examination and credit for work and other non-academic experiences. Many of these techniques have been in existence for a long time, but their magnitude and importance is increasing.

In September 1975, the final report of a feasibility study prepared for the California Legislature, *Postsecondary Alternatives to Meet the Educational Needs of California's Adults*, recommended that "California should increasingly conceive of postsecondary education as lifelong learning to meet the educational needs of all its adult citizens." It noted further how "accessible and diversified alternatives" could improve the quality of life.

In April 1976, the *Report of the Extended University* (of the UC) recalled the resolutions of the Twenty-Fifth
All University Faculty Conference of 1970, which "bespoke of a sense of urgency to extend the University's educational services well beyond its traditional student clientele and to assist society in seeking solutions for the complex problems of our time." The framers of the recommendation, according to the 1976 Report, knew that modifications in the operations and priorities of the University would be necessary, and believed the University "must reaffirm its commitments to the training of disadvantages and oppressed persons so as to enable them to attack the problems besetting their communities."

The Report of the Task Force on Off-Campus Instruction of the CSUC in September 1975 noted that "it would be difficult to conceive of the California State University and Colleges being fully responsive to its mission as currently conceived without offering instruction at off-campus locations." It also expressed concern for improved student access.

These and numerous other reports leave no doubt that the bringing of the campus into the community, especially to meet the needs of the non-traditional student (including older persons, women, minorities and disadvantaged and oppressed persons) is an idea whose time has come.

The Ventura Learning Center, an innovative alternative to on-campus instruction, is an embodiment of that idea, and came about as a direct result of those studies.
It is hoped that this study will be of value, not only to those within the academic environment (such as the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the University of California, the California State University and Colleges, and individual institutions, public and private, now engaged in off-campus instruction) but indirectly and, more importantly, to potential students who have despaired of a four year college education simply because they are beyond a reasonable commuting distance to the nearest public institution of higher learning.

**Purpose**

This study has a two-fold purpose. It will first trace the involvement of a particularly innovative and alternative delivery mode of higher education, the UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center, and second, examine the significance of the role of communication in the Center's development, in the hope that the findings will be of value to similar future pursuits. By the nature of the subject, this study will be largely historical.

**Method**

This thesis will be descriptive in nature, with methodology based on participant observation, a search of records, correspondence and publications. It will also utilize personal interviews and correspondence with officials who were or are involved in the founding and functioning
Assumptions

Several basic assumptions must be made as a preface to this study. The writer is operating from the premise that, in a society which espouses a democratic form of government, an informed electorate is essential, and further, that education plays a vital role in creating an informed citizenry. The words of George Washington in his Farewell Address of 1796 are relevant: "Promote then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened." ⁶

The writer also assumes that in an era of unprecedented and accelerating technological and sociological change, lifelong learning is not a luxury or fringe benefit, but an essential ingredient for coping. As Carl Rogers wrote, "The goal of education must be to develop a society in which people can live more comfortably with change than with rigidity." ⁷ Or, to quote futurist Alvin Toffler, "For education the lesson is clear; its prime objective must be to increase individual's 'cope-ability' - the speed and economy with which he can adapt to continual change." ⁸

Or again,

The rigid obsolescence of knowledge and the extension of life span make it clear that the skills learned in youth are unlikely to remain relevant by the time old age
arrives. Super-industrial education must therefore make provision for life-long education on a plug-in/plug-out basis.

While it may be a philosophical decision as to whether publich higher education is to be made available to the masses or to the elite, the writer believes that post-secondary education should not be the exclusive domain of the traditional 18 to 25 year old student who has the where-withal to attend campus full time.

This study is not, however, an attempt to describe or justify part-time decentralized (i.e., off-campus) life-long learning for the non-traditional student, although a search of literature will show great support for it. It is rather a study for educators, administrators and others who are already committed to or are interested in innovative and alternative forms of higher education, and who wish to examine one example of it.

Limitations

This study is limited to a history of the Ventura Learning Center and an analysis of the role of communications in the development of the Center. It is not the purpose of this study to evaluate alternative forms of post-secondary education, or the quality of programs or the performance of faculty or students at off-campus locations in general or at the Ventura Learning Center in particular. A scientific assessment of the quality of off-campus education will perhaps come in time.
Nor is it an attempt to show the cost-effectiveness of off-campus centers. This too is suitable for a study of another nature and time.

Although there will be references to and quotes regarding the effectiveness of multi media and instructional technology, counseling procedures and so on, they will be largely personal observations, not necessarily based on scientific data.

Definitions

The academic world, like any other, has a vocabulary of its own. Some definitions are therefore in order.

Postsecondary education, for the purposes of this study, refers to formal education beyond high school. It includes public and private two-year and four-year colleges and universities.

Alternative postsecondary education services and programs are those which provide an alternative to the full-time, on-campus, classroom-based degree programs. They may include but are not limited to evening or weekend instructions, independent study, new instructional techniques, use of multi media and so on.

It should be noted that this study deals essentially with alternative structuring of education, of which the VLC is an example, as opposed to alternative forms of classroom instruction which may occur at either on-campus or off-campus locations.
The Extended University, a fully integrated part of the University of California, evolved from the Twenty-Fifth All University Faculty Conference of 1970, and was designed as a three-year pilot project, with the goal of extending access to a new group of qualified, part-time, older working Californians. It includes but is not limited to off-campus programs, and is limited to upper division and graduate level courses. As described in the Administrative Report of the Extended University:

Each degree program supported by the State's Extended University appropriation is offered by a regular academic department or unit of one of the nine campuses. A degree earned by an Extended University student, on a part-time basis, is indistinguishable from a degree earned by a full-time regular student. The same department develops and offers the course, provides the faculty and evaluates the performance.

In terms of day to day activities, each Extended University student is a student at a particular campus; it is the campus which admits a student, registers, teaches, keeps records, counsels, graduates and provides all the other services the student needs and receives. The Extended University receives state financial support.

Off-Campus Programs can refer to any program offered at an off-campus location. However, the term has a more specific definition when used in this study with reference to CSU Northridge programs; that is, it includes the University's External Degree programs and the Expanded Campus offerings.

The CSUC External Degree Programs, instituted in 1952, abandoned in 1966 and revived by Chancellor Dumke in 1971,
as yet enjoy no standard statewide (or national) definition, but in general are characterized by instruction at off-campus locations, with weekend or late afternoon and evening scheduling, through modes of instruction not usually associated with the traditional on-campus programs. External degree programs, like UC Extended University programs, are limited to upper division and graduate level courses in order to avoid duplication of services offered by the California Community Colleges. Also, like Extended University programs, there is no distinction between the degrees earned by students in external degree programs and those earned by students in internal or on-campus programs.

The CUSC External Degree programs are fiscally administered within the framework of the CSUC Continuing Education. They do not receive state financial support.

The Expanded Campus Offerings are programs in which students are admitted in the same manner as on-campus students, and in which they pay the same fees as on-campus students. Residence credit, for state-supported courses at off-campus locations, was recently authorized by the CSUC Board of Trustees. As noted in the External Degree Report to the Chancellor in June 1976:

The Authorization was for a two-year pilot period only. Again, the purpose was to make instruction more easily accessible to greater numbers of people. It should be pointed out that authorization was for the offering of courses, not degree programs.... Residence credit courses may be offered at off-campus locations only upon authorization from the office of the Chancellor. Furthermore, a campus may offer such courses only within
The Consortium of the CSUC is also known as the "1,000 Mile Campus". It was established in 1973 largely to enable adult Californians who are unable to attend regular on-campus classes to earn bachelor's and master's degrees. The Consortium programs can be divided into three categories: 1) statewide or regional programs offered by the Consortium; 2) programs of independent study offered statewide by individual campuses in collaboration with the Consortium; and 3) programs of instruction offered by a single campus outside its own geographic area, in collaboration with the Consortium and one or more other campuses. The Consortium operates through the Division of Continuing Education in the office of the Chancellor. The programs are self-supporting.

Extension is frequently confused with Extended University programs and External Degree programs. However, while the latter programs are characterized by a "coherent" curriculum similar to that of regular on-campus degree programs, Extension programs, as aptly described by Marcia Salner, "are comprised of discrete single-course offerings in which there is little continuity from course to course, and hence, little on-going evaluation of students." In other words, it is not possible to systematically accumulate credit for a university degree through Extension.

(Nor are persons enrolling in Extension courses required to
meet regular admissions criteria.) Extension programs and courses are not state supported.

Programming, for the purpose of this study, refers to the bringing of graduate or undergraduate degree programs, partial or total, to the Ventura Learning Center.
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CHAPTER II

It is the mark of a civilized country to provide a significant measure of public support to education at all stages of life.

- Leonard Freedman

Review of Literature

Although no history of the Ventura Learning Center has been written, and no evaluation of the role of communication in the development of the Center has been made, there have been references to the Ventura Learning Center in recent reports and documents of the state government, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and the university systems.

Additionally, there are documents which, although they do not specifically mention the Ventura Learning Center, have implications for it. While a review of literature of alternative forms of higher education within or beyond the United States is beyond the purview of this study, a review of major California documents is in order, for their relevance to the Ventura Learning Center.

A review of literature not only provides background information on off-campus education in California, but shows considerable support for it (including pleas for equity in fee structures for off-campus students) in spite
of concern in some areas for "watered down" standards. It also reveals, on the one hand, numerous recommendations for increased public information and communication efforts to explain the relatively new concept but without any accompanying methodology to accomplish the desired goals, and on the other hand, total disregard for the role of public information and communication in launching a new concept.

This study will attempt to show the need to go a step further, from concept to reality through communication.

Prior to the opening of the Ventura Learning Center in August 1974, several significant reports had been written which were to have an impact on the Center.

One such document was the Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, 2 in 1973, in which are listed the final conclusions of two years of study and 49 recommendations for postsecondary education. The Report outlines the structure of higher education in California, explains the 1960 Master Plan set forth by the Donahoe Act in the Education Code, and the differentiated functions of the three segments (the Community Colleges, the CSUC and the UC), and devotes one chapter to alternative delivery systems and off-campus learning.

Concern for cooperative efforts between segments and institutions is expressed in Interinstitutional Cooperation in California Higher Education. The report notes that while the UC's Extended University and the CSUC's External
Degree programs may still (1973) be small enough to be coordinated effectively at the state-wide level, "as they grow, the potential for duplication and unproductive competition will grow, and there will be an increasingly urgent need for cooperation at the regional level." 3

The same document notes that though there are examples of cooperation between the UC and community colleges, and between the CSUC and community colleges, there are "very few examples of cooperation between the UC and CSUC campuses." 4 The Ventura Learning Center was, of course, not yet on the scene.

The Siroky Report No. 15 (September 1975) was the culmination of several pilot research projects and two full-scale market research efforts that studied the need for external degree programs in California. Report 15 discusses types and methods of instruction requested, times of day/week desired for instruction, off-campus versus on-campus instruction, and the desirability of instruction via non-traditional methods. The study also deals in projections for the CSU Northridge area. Among the Siroky Report findings are several with relevance to the Ventura Learning Center. For example (and using their numbering); 5

1. It is estimated that 5,119 individuals in the area served by CSU Northridge are interested in, educationally qualified, and willing to pay the fees for enrollment in External Degree programs.
2. Those interested in external degree programs are generally in the 30's or 40's (mean age 34), predominantly male (88%), married (81%) and employed full-time in professional or managerial positions with a median income of approximately $14,000.

6. It is evident that external degree programs attract a more mature, better educated, self reliant, and professionally more responsible student body than typical on-campus programs. It is strongly suggested, for this reason, that the demographic, occupational and educational characteristics of the potential external degree student be thoroughly kept in mind along with specific curricular demands, when programs are developed...

   Thus programs should not necessarily follow the traditional on-campus programs either in mode of instruction, time, or content.

8. At the bachelor's level, sufficient interest is expressed in the following programs to warrant a prediction that they could be supported: Business Administration, Diversified Major (Special), Engineering, Professional Engineering, Early Childhood Education, Administration, Community Services, Environmental Health, Liberal Studies and Public Health.

9. At the master's level, there is sufficient interest to support the following programs: Business Administration, Early Childhood Education, Psychology, Public Administration,
Accounting, Liberal Studies, Civil Engineering, Police
Science, Women's Studies, and Community Services.

The above Siroky findings are strikingly similar to Ventura Learning Center findings, but changes have occurred since it was written. For example, while 5,119 individuals may have been willing to pay the fees for enrollment in external degree programs prior to September 1973, the subsequent energy crisis, economic recession and unemployment problems would probably necessitate a revised downward estimate of interested and financially eligible individuals. It is also significant that the Siroky questionnaire (Question 10) based its survey on a contemplated fee of $35.00 per unit (or approximately $100 per three-unit course) in the external degree program. The escalating fees could invalidate some of the Siroky findings (as will be noted further in Chapter IV). The Ventura Learning Center has found that, in general, while individuals in graduate programs are able, through job seniority and benefits, to afford external degree fees, those at the undergraduate level find it virtually impossible to do so.

The Siroky findings on student characteristics correspond somewhat to the Ventura Learning Center's first student profile survey, conducted in September 1975, except for the male/female ratio. The Ventura Learning Center had slightly more women students (52%).

An education needs survey by the Center likewise
pinpointed Business Administration, Health Science and Liberal Studies, but also Sociology/Counseling and Nursing at the bachelor's level. At the master's level, there was support for Public Administration, Environmental Studies/Planning, Educational Psychology, Social Welfare, Early Childhood Education, Business Administration, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Secondary Education, Vocational Education, and later (1976) Home Economics. Requests for Police Sciences, Women's Studies and Community Services did not appear significant.

The Siroky Report found that "external degree programs apparently are not attracting, to a significantly large degree, those teachers and administrators who might be interested in upgrading their credentials or educational backgrounds." This is not consistent with Ventura Learning Center findings. (See Chapter IV.)

Like most reports reviewed, the Siroky Report stressed the importance of an intensive and extensive program of public information and marketing.

Another significant report is Warren Bryan Martin's Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California. Martin writes that many of the problems in today's colleges and universities are a result of "segmental" thinking and planning, and he advocates that, with the limited resources available to higher education today, alternatives to building new campuses be found.
He singles out other problems:

Nowhere are the traditional underpinnings for nontraditional superstructures more visible than in the extended degree programs of the University of California or the external degree program of the California State University and Colleges. The key words are extended and external. They speak volumes.

Some of these concerns are legitimate. The profession should care about the quality of its services. But there are self-serving features in this service function --boundary maintenance, status concerns, and the like. These must be eradicated if educators are to help our society make the crucial transition to an educational structure in which representatives of all the people will participate.7

Martin also stresses the need for non-traditional adult education programs to have full parity in financing. "Educational programs worthy of our citizenry are worthy of the state's financial resources; this is where money saved by holding the line on campus expansion in facilities, instructional budgets, and support budgets, should be spent."8

Evaluating Higher Education in California, by Michael Scriven, one of a series of policy alternative papers commissioned by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, was printed in 1973 and does not really deal with off-campus instruction. However, many of Scriven's concerns apply to off-campus as well as on-campus instruction. He notes, for example, the delivery system of California higher education at this stage (1973) "has tended to optimize efficiency considerations at the expense of service considerations."9
He also notes that a very large number of students (a footnote quotes an estimate of 10,000 in 1971-72) who would otherwise attend are prevented from doing so for reasons of cost. He particularly emphasizes how "minorities suffer, because they tend to be at the lower end of the economic scale and the major discriminatory activity of California higher education is against those who are not well off."

As he succinctly puts it, "inaccessible services are not services at all." Scriven's concerns for accessibility have direct bearing on off-campus programs, and his list of resources for overall assessment of higher education may be useful in evaluating off-campus instruction.

Specific mention of the Ventura Learning Center largely began in 1975, not only in university documents but in state documents. In September (1975) a series of reports from the feasibility study, "Postsecondary Alternatives: Meeting California's Educational Needs" was issued. Several reports refer to the Center.

Postsecondary Alternatives to Meet the Educational Needs of California's Adults (which describes the design of the above study) identifies seven major current educational needs, and makes 17 recommendations to meet these priority needs. Of the 17, the largest number focus on the
critical need for equity in funding for part-time and adult students, and for groups with special needs. (For example, Recommendation Two urges the UC and CSUC to adopt more equitable fee schedules for part-time students. Recommendation Six urges CSUC and UC to further extend their regular degree programs to off-campus locations in ways, times and places convenient to adults.) Recommendation Seventeen proposes that CPEC launch a public information program about all available postsecondary education opportunities and especially the information and counseling service.

The Ventura Learning Center is mentioned twice in the report, chiefly with regard to the UC Extended University.13

California's Need for Postsecondary Alternatives14 is an analytical report giving state and national trends and findings of market studies conducted with UC and CSUC. The report forecast that California's interest in higher education will continue to grow due to job mobility, increased leisure time, opportunities for worker's sabbaticals and early retirement, as well as personal fulfillment.

In Community Needs for Postsecondary Alternatives,15 a summary of learning and an analysis of seven diverse communities throughout the state, two major conclusions are drawn. The first is that programs tend to be reactive rather than progressive, and organized as a result of public initiative. The second conclusion is that the "immediate problems in adjusting resources to interest does not appear
to lie in the creation of new programs but, instead, in better publicity, information and distribution of existing programs.  "16

The Ventura Learning Center is mentioned briefly in the report and described as an "innovative venture."  "17

Marcia Salner, in Inventory of Existing Postsecondary Alternatives, 18 gives a thorough across-segment overview of postsecondary education programs in California, plus detailed definitions of various terms and programs. The abstract preceding the report suggests four minimal changes in state policy, including 1) the extension of financial aid and eligibility to needy students who wish to study in part-time off-campus degree programs, 2) incentives for the UC to establish a part-time study policy, part-time pro-rated fees..., and 3) expanded funding for the CSUC Consortium....

The Ventura Learning Center, mentioned several times in the report, is referred to as "among the most interesting of these inter-segmental cooperatives" and described in some detail.  "19 The discussion focuses largely on the Center's first six months of operation (August 1974-January 1975) with accuracy, except for the statement that "programs will be coordinated with Ventura Community College District."

Non-Instructional Services as Postsecondary Alternatives 20 emphasizes the need for such non-instructional services as diagnostic counseling, goal setting,
educational and career counseling, certification, referral and so on. The report includes a number of imaginative approaches, first for "sensitizing" people to the possibility for further personal development and, second, for steering them to the proposed counseling and information centers. The report suggests a model for delivery of services.

Instructional Technology and Media for Postsecondary Alternatives\textsuperscript{21} reviews instructional technology and technology-based programs in California and selected states and nations. In addition to describing such innovations as Instructional Television Fixed Services (ITFS) and Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) etc., it presents four case studies of Instructional Technology-based postsecondary alternatives--the British Open University, the State University of Nebraska and the University of Mid-America, the Free University of Iran, and the Chicago TV College.

The report includes two references to the Ventura Learning Center, once somewhat mistakenly as the only inter-segmental "learning resource center", followed by a one page description adapted from Salner's above-mentioned work,\textsuperscript{22} and once in the Conclusions and Recommendations where it points to the Ventura Learning Center as evidence of segmental cooperative interests and ability.\textsuperscript{23}

Another CPEC staff report, Establishing Community Advisement Centers: A Proposal\textsuperscript{24} deals with Assembly Concurrent Resolution 159 (Resolution Chapter 213, 1974
Legislative Session) that directed the CPEC to develop a plan for establishing on a pilot basis, independent post-secondary education counseling centers in several rural and urban areas. This role has been suggested by some for the Ventura Learning Center.

The report reiterates the need for more information about existing opportunities. It also suggests a six-month start up period for community advisement centers, and guidelines for initial operation.

The CPEC also prepared A Five Year Plan for Post-secondary Education in California: 1976-81, which reviews postsecondary education in California, with definitions of scope and future of education, and discussions of priority areas. It also outlines the Commission's role in the review of proposals for new campuses and off-campus centers, with guidelines and procedures. (A similar report, The Commission's Role in the Review of Proposals for New Campuses and Off-Campus Centers--Guidelines and Procedures, had been prepared earlier, in April 1975.) It noted that alternatives to establishing a campus should be considered, that programs to be offered at proposed off-campus centers should be designed to meet the demonstrated needs of the community in which the off-campus center is to be located, and that off-campus centers should not lead to an unnecessary duplication of programs.

In addition to the CPEC reports were recent reports
by the university segments on the Extended University and
the External Degree programs.

The UC's Administrative Report on the Extended University Pilot Program, 1972-73--1974-75, gives a descriptive report on the Extended University, with student characteristics, student performance, changes in program structure and delivery, and cost-effectiveness. It includes a three-page description of the Ventura Learning Center, with minor inaccuracies (regarding programming) and a feature story, "Getting A Degree Without A Campus" (see Appendix A) from the UC Clip Sheet of January 14, 1975.

The Report of the Extended University Advisory Council on the Pilot Phase of the Extended University (April 1976) reviews the pilot phase of the program with the chief recommendation that the University "should continue to reach out for a non-traditional, part-time student clientele and make its facilities available to these students in undergraduate and graduate programs offered at both on- and off-campus locations." It also notes that "the Ventura Learning Center, having proved its viability, should continue to be maintained."

Meanwhile, in the other segment, the Board of Trustees of the CSUC in mid-1975 directed the Chancellor to appoint a special task force to consider the implications of off-campus instruction. The resulting Report of the
Task Force on Off-Campus Instruction\textsuperscript{32} outlines the issues and limits of the CSUC in teaching off-campus. Among its recommendations: the CSUC should offer degree oriented instruction; students should not be required to pay instructional fees solely on the basis of location; and off-campus instruction should be limited to upper division and graduate level work, except in limited instances.

The Report includes a brief reference to the Ventura Learning Center on its last page, under Budget Requirements.

The \textit{External Degree Programs Report to the Chancellor},\textsuperscript{33} printed in June 1976, delineates the activities and recommendations of the CSUC Commission on External Degree Programs. The Commission, which was established in 1971 under the direction of Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke, was charged with the task of determining ways in which state residents could have greater access to the university resources.

In its summary of major recommendations, it urges that "steps be taken to ensure equitable treatment of off-campus and on-campus students with regard to fees paid and program fiscal support"\textsuperscript{34} and stresses the necessity for evaluation of programs, funding and needs.

It also includes examples of other external degree programs, specifically, Great Britain's Open University, the Regents' External Degree in the State of New York, the Minnesota Metropolitan State College, the Regional Learning
The Ventura Learning Center is mentioned with the UC Extended University program\textsuperscript{35} and alluded to under Consortium programs.\textsuperscript{36} The latter mentions a Bachelor of Science degree program in Nursing in Ventura County, but fails to mention the Master of Arts in Vocational Education (from CSU Long Beach) and the Masters degree in Early Childhood Education (from CSU Northridge) at the Ventura Center. Both are Consortium programs.

The report makes no recommendations for public information or communication though it states, in reference to problems during the first two years, that "disseminating information to prospective students concerning Consortium programs which are ready to be implemented has proved to be difficult,"\textsuperscript{37} in spite of the use of various techniques ranging from radio and TV spot announcements to direct mail advertising.

There have been relatively few published magazine articles specifically on the Ventura Learning Center, but three are worth noting.

The Learning Center was featured in the January 14, 1975 issue of the UC Clip Sheet\textsuperscript{38} (reprinted in Appendix A) and the article was subsequently picked up by the Ventura County Star-Free Press on February 2, 1975.

An article "Lab for Lifelong Learning" which appeared in the Nation's Schools and Colleges magazine, May 1975,\textsuperscript{39}
focuses on the Center's multimedia equipment and capabilities, based on information provided by the Center staff. However, in a somewhat typical mistake, the article's subheading refers to "Extension Services".

In "The end of growth---the universities' new challenge", John Woods quotes predictions that the era of ever increasing enrollment is near an end and that after a period of very slow growth until 1980, enrollment in both UC and CSUC will begin to decline. Woods, however, predicts that while the traditional clientele of the colleges and universities—youth—will diminish, a new clientele—"the adult, usually employed, frequently female and with family, and often living at some distance from a college campus"—will be served. His description already fits the Ventura Learning Center clientele.

Woods refers to the Ventura Learning Center as "probably the most novel of the off-campus programs," and his description of it is followed by some questions about its joint sponsorship.

Although at the dedication ceremony UC President Charles Hitch declared that the center 'is very much a joint venture with the State University and Colleges', the only thing shared so far is the physical facility. Each segment develops its own degree programs, counsels its own students, and offers its own courses taught by its own faculty. Although a liaison committee exists, little attempt has been made to insure that duplication of courses does not occur. Moreover, UC students cannot take CSUC courses for credit, no matter how relevant; nor can CSUC students take UC courses. So, it remains to be seen whether the center will evolve into a truly unique partnership or simply house the competitive efforts of the two segments."
Woods also raises the question of state support, the lack of which makes costs prohibitive to students. He cites the attempt to offer a bachelor's degree in business administration at the Center, from CSU Northridge, for $65.00 per unit, or almost $4,000.00 to complete the two-year program.

Although this study focuses on one example of innovative postsecondary education in California, there is an expanding movement by both public and private institutions throughout the United States toward extending education to more adults throughout their lifetimes through more diversified options. (The reader who is interested in this general movement is invited to read such reports as Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School, which suggests that opportunities be available to persons throughout their lifetimes and not just after high school; Toward a Learning Society: Alternative Channels to Life, Work, and Services; and The Campus and the City: Maximizing Assets and Reducing Liabilities, all from the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education; and Diversity by Design, from the Commission on Non-Traditional Study, which offers 57 recommendations concerning support for lifelong learning, including non-traditional learning.

While the movement is new, off-campus instruction is not. Ball State University, for example, has been offering credit classes to the citizens of Eastern Indiana in local communities since the 1940s.
Empire State College has no campus at all, but consists of Learning Centers scattered across the state.48 Chicago TV College has neither campus nor Learning Centers, but bases its degree-granting postsecondary education on media-based instruction.49

One of the newest alternative forms of postsecondary instruction in the United States is the University of Mid-America (UMA), developed by the State University of Nebraska (SUN) in cooperation with Kansas State University, the University of Missouri, the University of Kansas, and Iowa State University. The new institution, like the Ventura Learning Center, serves those who formerly could not avail themselves of higher education opportunities due to family, work or other obligations, or geographic isolation.50

(The UMA is currently developing a directory of all non-traditional and innovative graduate degree programs offered by regionally accredited institutions across the nation. It will be distributed by the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) an agency of the Department of Defense.)

Other learning alternatives learning modes are making news. Adelphi University, which sponsored the innovative Classroom-On-Wheels Program, has taken university-level education to the public for six years by offering a Master's degree in Business Administration to New York area train commuters. The program, which takes two years to complete
if students take 50-minute classes four mornings a week, has been so successful that there are plans to expand the program to New Jersey, Chicago, San Francisco and Atlanta.51

With the emergence of increased alternative learning opportunities in the United States comes a new awareness of the need for better public information programs and the need to reach a new audience, including those who are changing careers, re-entry women, minorities, the retired and others.

In "Colleges Learning the Hard Sell", Peter C. Tolos, a marketing consultant who has worked for the California State University and Colleges and Drexel University, says colleges are amateurs at selling themselves and stresses that programs must be marketed.52 The same article notes that Temple University's Center City Continuing Education campus is using market research and flamboyant promotion (with an advertising budget of $165,000.00) to reach and recruit more students, 90 percent of whom are white collar workers taking classes early in the morning, at lunchtime or in the evening.53

Again, the importance of "interpreting itself to the public and listening to the market" is manifested by the University of Michigan's upcoming study of external degree programs, financed by a $95,000.00 grant from the Carnegie Corporation.54

Advertising, which played such a minor role in the launching of the Ventura Learning Center, as will be seen
In later chapters, was also instrumental in the success of the Los Angeles-based Pepperdine University's Masters program in Business Administration, which grew from an enrollment of 25 in 1968 to more than 1,200 today at 60 different locations. 55
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CHAPTER III

We have a comparatively decent system of common schools, schools for infants only; but...no school for ourselves.... It is time that we had uncommon schools, that we did not leave off our education when we began to be men and women.

- Thoreau...in Walden

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF THE UC/CSUC VENTURA LEARNING CENTER

Demography

Sixty-eight miles northwest of the City of Los Angeles, between the mountains of Los Padres National Forest and the Pacific Ocean, is the bucolic city of San Buena-ventura, more commonly known as Ventura.

Although it is one of the oldest settlements on the Pacific Coast, and the site of the ninth and last of the California Missions, it is dwarfed by the megopolis to the southeast, and somewhat overshadowed by the city of Santa Barbara, to the northwest.

It is the County Seat of Ventura County, a county covering 1,843 square miles (in size, ranking 26th of 58 counties in the state), bordered by Kern, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara counties on the north, east and west, and by 42 miles of coastline on the south. The county, with a population of 439,259 is one of the state's faster
growing counties.

It is also a wealthy county. Agriculture, the county's chief source of income, produces more than $300,000,000.00 annually in crops and agriculture products. Two major military bases provide the county's second largest source of income. Point Mugu, Headquarters of the Pacific Missile Range, has become one of the world's most advanced missile testing centers, with more than 9,000 civilian and military personnel. Port Hueneme, with approximately 10,000 civilian and military personnel, is home of the Seabees, the Naval Construction Battalion Center, and boasts seven deep-water berths. In 1974, Ventura County income from the two facilities was $173,467,973.00.

Manufacturing ranks third as the county's source of income ($171,585,257.00 in 1974) followed by oil production, with 2,623 producing wells in operation in 1974. With a kindly climate, with safe sandy beaches, deep-water fishing, short distances to mountain and desert regions, and with reasonable access to all the amenities of a cosmopolitan city without its concomitant congestion and crime, there is perhaps some justification for the prevailing feeling among local residents--that the area is all things to, and has all things for, all people--with one major exception.

The county is without a public four-year institution of higher learning.
Opportunities for Postsecondary Education in 1973/74

Ventura County, however, was by no means an educational vacuum. In addition to adult education classes, vocational and occupational educational services by various city, county and volunteer agencies and organization, there were two two-year community colleges (Ventura College and Moorpark College) serving the needs of high school graduates and those over the age of 18 capable of profiting from instruction. A third two-year institution, Oxnard College, evolved from the Oxnard Center concept and officially opened in June 1975 to serve the Oxnard Plain.

Private colleges and universities also offered degree programs in the county. California Lutheran College, the only four-year liberal arts college actually located in the county, was chartered in August 1959. Its enrollment for Fall 1974 included 1,058 undergraduates, 861 graduate students and 2,826 in workshop and extension programs. LaVerne College, operating out of LaVerne, California, the University of Southern California, and Pepperdine University were also offering a limited number of baccalaureate and master's degree programs in the county as were, to a lesser degree, Chapman College (which was phased out in 1975) and Antioch West. The Ventura College of Law and the Glendale College of Law, with a Thousand Oaks campus, also offered degree programs. Additionally, a host of extension courses were offered by numerous public and private colleges and
universities and correspondence schools.

Nor had the public institutions overlooked Ventura. The California State University and Colleges (CSUC) system had acquired land in Ventura County for an additional state college campus nearly a decade before, \(^5\) while the UC Santa Barbara (UCSB) campus began offering degree programs in Ventura through the Extended University in the Fall of 1972. \(^6\)

Because the Extended University programs were actually precursors to the Ventura Learning Center itself, they merit more than passing reference. Briefly, with hopes for ultimate media-based instruction, the Extended University of the UC Santa Barbara began offering its first classes leading to a BA in Law and Society in the Ventura-Oxnard area in September 1972, in free space provided at the Oxnard Air Force Base, in a cooperative arrangement with the County Regional Occupational Program (ROP). At the same time, the first person to become a UCSB Extended University employee, Ernest Zomalt, was appointed Counselor to the program.

In spite of their out-of-the-way location, where few could find them and which brought little "drop in" traffic, the off-campus classes were destined to grow and by the following summer (1973), Master's degrees in Computer Science and Urban Economics were scheduled.

The summer of 1973 also brought Dr. Brian Fagan, to whom much of the credit for the idea and ultimate creation
of the Ventura Learning Center is due. As Dean of Instructional Development at UCSB (and Chairman of the Systemwide President's Advisory Committee on Instructional Improvement Programs) he soon recognized that if UCSB's programs were to be media based, they would need a central, identifiable and accessible location. Dr. Fagan and Mr. Zomalt immediately began discussions with Dr. Durward Long, UC's Vice President for Extended Academic and Public Service Programs, and Dr. Patrick Healey, Academic Assistant to Vice President Long. Budgets were prepared; old theaters, shopping centers, military barracks and offices examined; and conversion costs studied. With space becoming inadequate or not regularly available, Dr. Fagan proposed to the University of California that a facility be rented in the new San Buenaventura Financial Center where specifications could still be built to UCSB's needs, in order to deliver a range of degree programs by means of electronic media and traveling instructors. His proposal included budget and design.

It was then (Fall 1973), largely through the initiative and public responsiveness of Vice President Long and Dr. Healey, that the idea for a UCSB off-campus center metamorphosed to a public multisegmental learning center, in order to provide a greater array of educational services to the Ventura area.

One must also bear in mind, however, the Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education
of 1973, which had criticized the California educational system for its absence of statewide coordination, planning and policy development, and which recommended not only new approaches to education, such as life-long learning opportunities and off-campus programs, but the creation of a whole new "fourth segment" of higher education, to plan and deliver off-campus programs, encourage a greater diversity of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, and utilize resources more efficiently through cooperation and coordination. (Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 81, introduced on August 27, 1973 and Chaptered as RC 192 on September 20, 1973, had directed the legislature's Joint Committee on Post-secondary Education to contract for a feasibility study of a fourth segment or system.)

Neither UC or CSUC felt a fourth segment was needed, but that the three existing systems--UC, CSUC and the California Community Colleges--could work closely and effectively together to meet the demands of off-campus programs. (To this end, they later formed the Joint Advisory Committee on Off-campus Degree Programs in the Fall of 1974. (See Page 49)

Discussions were immediately initiated (Fall 1973) between Vice President Long, Dr. Alex Sheriffs, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the CSUC, and with the local Ventura (Community) College, to reach agreement on operating the "multi-segmental" facility, the first of its kind in
the state, and a possible solution to the problem of bringing upper division and graduate coursework from both public segments to a low density area in a cost-efficient way.

The idea was to become a reality in the form of the Ventura Learning Center.

**Its Mandate**

Agreement regarding the Ventura Learning Center facility was secured and was characterized by the following:

1. The facility will serve as a physical site for the delivery and coordination of instruction from:
   a. Extended University programs from any UC campus,
   b. University Extension from any Statewide or Regional program and the UC Santa Barbara campus,
   c. External degree programs from any California State University or College, and
   d. Continuing Education programs of the CSUC.
2. The Center will serve to advise the people in the community of higher educational (and eventually all postsecondary education) opportunities available to them locally and regionally.
3. The Center will be managed by a director, recruited by representatives of the two senior segments, who will administer the facility in line with guidelines developed by representatives of both public senior segments and by consultation with Ventura College.
4. The costs for maintaining and operating the Center will be shared by the two senior segments.
5. The Center will be equipped to receive televised instruction from several campus locations and equipped to provide linkage from the campus transmission to community cable companies.
6. The Center will be leased on a short-term basis, less than five years, so as to permit institutional and State flexibility.
7. The programs to be offered at this Center by the UC and CSUC will be programs regularly approved by the campuses of the respective segment and as such reported to the California Postsecondary Education Commission in the normal program review process.
The above characteristics are viewed as applicable to Phase I of the undertaking and will influence and perhaps determine the nature of Phase II which will seek greater involvement, first with community colleges in the area, in addition to Ventura College, and then with private institutions.

The Physical Plant

Space for the Learning Center, which comprises approximately 6,300 square feet of office space on the ground floor of the San Buenaventura Financial Building, 3585 Maple Street, in Ventura, was leased on April 26, 1974 (ending June 30, 1979) for monthly rental payments of $3,650.00 with an option to cancel the lease on June 30, 1976, 1977 or 1978, provided a written notice was given the Lessor no later than April 1 of each given year. The option to cancel on April 1 was to have later significance.

It consists of five classrooms (with student capacities ranging from 35 to 60 persons), a Learning Resource Center or multi-media room, two administrative offices, and a reception area which doubles as a student lounge.10

The Learning Resource Center deserves description. In addition to its standard equipment, such as 16mm projectors, overhead projectors and slide projectors, it is equipped with seven independent learning carrels for students requiring slide-tape modules or videocassette systems (color receivers and players) for use in individual studies or programmed learning.

A computer terminal is also housed in the Learning
Resource Center. By use of its keyboard, students have access to and control of the IBM 360 Computer on campus at UCSB.

Shortly after the Center opened, permission was granted by the FCC for construction of microwave capacity to provide for concurrent instruction of students at UC Santa Barbara and the Center.\footnote{11}

In this Instructional Television Fixed Service (ITFS) system,\footnote{12} the UCSB signal is beamed from Santa Barbara to Point Mugu to Ventura, thus going over the longest stretch of ocean water, by such a system, experienced anywhere in the United States--a fact which sometimes causes momentary fading.

\textbf{SOME CHRONOLOGICAL HIGHLIGHTS OF THE VENTURA LEARNING CENTER}

\textit{July 1, 1974 - December 31, 1974}

The Ventura Learning Center opened on July 1, 1974. The telephones were not in, the carpets were not down, and furniture and supplies had not arrived, but the first Director, Barbara Walker, who was jointly recruited by the two segments, took over operating for the first two weeks out of the office of the building manager.

Several immediate priorities loomed.

With some degree of urgency, the Director began to set up classrooms as furniture and audiovisual equipment arrived; touch base with the community college district,
education officials, community leaders and the news media; establish communications with the UC and CSUC systems and individual campuses; hire staff; and, of course, coordinate and promote degree programs in preparation for September classes.

Staffing was dispensed with relatively quickly. A promotions consultant was retained on a two-month contract on August 19, 1974 and an Administrative Assistant hired on September 9, 1974. After a series of intermittent contracts, the consultant was hired as Assistant Director in November 1975, with responsibility equally divided between counseling and Public/Community Relations. The Ventura Learning Center staffing picture has remained the same since then.

By September, after just two-month's operation, the Center was housing four Master's degrees—Public Administration and Business Administration from UC Riverside (UCR), Urban Economics from UC Santa Barbara (UCSB), and Vocational Education from CSU Long Beach, and three Bachelor's degrees—Urban Studies from UCR, and Law and Society and Liberal Studies from UCSB.

CSU Northridge, in something of a gesture of faith, and with only three weeks' lead time, hurriedly offered five upper division courses through Extension at the fledgling center in the Fall of 1974, with class enrollment ranging from four to twelve.
For the first time, Ventura County had a publicly funded educational and counseling facility that offered upper division and graduate instruction.

**Joint Advisory Committee**

It was at this time, Fall 1974, that President Hitch and Chancellor Dumke announced the formation of a Joint Advisory Committee on Off-Campus Degree Programs to ensure greater cooperation and effectiveness in implementing programs throughout the state. Appointed to the Committee from the University of California were Drs. Long and Healey; from the University of California Los Angeles, Dr. Rosemary Park, Chairwoman of the Extended University Advisory Council; from the California State University and Colleges, Dr. Sherriffs, Dr. Leo Cain, President of California State College-Dominguez Hills and Chairman of the Statewide Commission of External Degree Programs; and Dr. Ralph D. Mills, State University Dean of Continuing Education.

The committee was charged with advising and consulting with the two chief executives on the following:  

1. The assessment of statewide needs for off-campus baccalaureate and master's degree programs to be offered in upper division and graduate instruction by the two segments.

2. Coordination of the offering of off-campus degree programs to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts while maximizing educational opportunities at off-campus locations.

3. The feasibility of establishing cooperative instructional capability and sharing segmental resources at off-campus locations.
4. The need for and establishment of jointly operated off-campus learning/counseling facilities.

5. The coordination and articulation of segmental off-campus degree programs with community colleges.

Dedication Ceremony

A major milestone in the life of the Ventura Learning Center occurred on December 2, 1974, five months after it opened, when the Center's official dedication ceremonies were held.

Although anticipated for several months, the ceremony was thrown into gear in a matter of days when the two chief executives of the UC and CSUC were available on the same day. The event was so rushed that the Ventura Learning Center staff had to telephone every invited guest to advise them that the official invitations would probably arrive after the event.

About 100 persons attended the ceremonies, and the presence of Hitch and Dumke brought much needed credibility and stature to the Learning Center, which was still regarded as "just another Extention center" and, to quote a local education official, "not very important if run by a woman".

The Vicissitudes of 1975

With one quarter/semester (or "quarmester" as the Ventura Learning Center staff put it) completed, official dedication ceremonies over, most equipment in place, staff hired, and the community faintly cognizant of its
existence, the Ventura Learning Center looked ahead to a new year of uninterrupted growth and service.

The growth and service materialized, but not without tramas.

With a feeling of exultation, staff completed and printed the first "Schedule of Degree Programs and Courses" after working days and nights to coordinate and "nail down" 34 classes in 13 degree programs from four campuses in two systems. The brochure, however, brought thundering disapproval from the Chancellor's office, as it reflected the ignorance of Center staff and campus departmental personnel regarding the necessary approvals and policies governing off-campus degrees. The Ventura Learning Center staff had not yet seen or been made aware of the Expanded Campus guidelines, wherein the Chancellor was authorized to approve the offering of portions of regular instructional programs at off-campus locations at tax-subsidized rates, but not total degrees. This differs, of course, from CSUC's self-support External Degree programs and UC's Extended University tax-supported programs which can be brought in their entirety to off-campus locations.

The schedule, however, had its bright spots. New to the Center were much anticipated courses leading to a Master's degree in Mass Communication, a degree requested by the Ventura Learning Center on the basis of its marketing
Devol, Chairman of the Department of Journalism at CSU Northridge, and the Center Director. In an excellent example of flexibility and cooperation, two core courses for the degree were brought on an Extension basis, thus allowing students to begin studies while their applications for admission to the degree program (on campus) were still being processed.\textsuperscript{18}

Other new listings included courses in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Counseling, Health Science, Computer Science, Vocational Education and Business Administration.\textsuperscript{19,20}

Like the Mass Communication courses, the new Sociology classes were a source of pride to the Ventura Learning Center, not only for the "can-do" spirit the program engendered on campus but because it, too, began as a request from the community.

The need for a counseling degree in Ventura was first brought to the attention of the Ventura Learning Center staff in August 1974, just after the Center opened, in meetings between Ventura County's Manpower Director and Training and Development Director, and educational groups. The feeling was for a Master's degree in Counseling.

But subsequent meetings and studies defined the need more accurately as for a baccalaureate degree, particularly for paraprofessional counselors in the county government,
who desperately needed an academic and theoretical back-
ground. There was, however, a major hitch. CSU Northridge
didn't have such a degree or option.

In a unique demonstration of response to community
need, CSU Northridge immediately offered three interdepart-
mental core-type courses for the non-existent degree. And
in the full knowledge that there was as yet no such degree
at Northridge and that there was no guarantee there would
ever be one, students enrolled in the courses while the
Sociology Department set about to establish one.

The students' faith was rewarded. Counseling was
approved as a fourth option of the Sociology degree in 1976,
thanks largely to the efforts of Dr. Harry Finestone, Dean
of Academic Planning at Northridge, and Dr. Bernard Thorsell
of the Sociology Department. The program continues to be
offered at the Ventura Learning Center at Expanded Campus
(i.e., tax-supported) rates.

And, as one newspaper article put it, life was
"looking rosy" at the Ventura Learning Center.

All was not totally serene in the spring of 1975,
however. The Master's program in Administration (Business
and Public) from UC Riverside was in difficulty, and the
Ventura Learning Center itself on the threshold of its first
full-blown crisis.

__Budget Crisis__

In a visit to the Center in mid-April, representatives
of the CPEC legislative budget committee abruptly asked about "contingency plans for the center", since the Center's future did not look particularly bright. Funds for the Extended University program, of which the Learning Center was a part, had been deleted from the preliminary 1975-76 state budget by Governor Brown who felt that the Extended University's programs should not receive state financial support.

Although State Senator Omer Rains, D-Ventura, immediately contacted the governor to clarify the distinction between the Extended University programs and Extension programs, and although Assemblyman J. K. MacDonald, D-Ojai, Chairman of the Assembly's Ways and Means subcommittee, pleaded on behalf of the Center and although numerous letters, including one from the Ventura Learning Center Director, were dispatched to the governor to clarify the nature, purpose and scope of the Ventura Learning Center programs, and although Governor Brown admitted confusing the two programs (according to a statement made by Senator Rains to students at the Ventura Learning Center), he nonetheless, July 1, 1975, eliminated from the state budget $2.5 million from funds requested by the CSUC and UC segments, including the $100,000.00 needed to support the Learning Center.

The Ventura Learning Center reeled--temporarily.

The Center staff, long frustrated by the apathy of the community toward the innovative center, used the budget
Rains and Assemblyman MacDonald championed the Center, newspapers took up the fight, students wrote letters to the editors of local papers (as well as to Governor Brown and to the UC and CSUC segments) and petitions by the hundreds almost spontaneously began to circulate throughout the county. Many of the Center's non-traditional students--homemakers, military personnel, engineers, nurses, mechanics, computer technicians and unemployed alike--became involved and carried petitions to voting friends, coworkers, neighbors and club meetings, to "save our learning center". There were, indeed, some who had never heard of the Center who suddenly were out to save it.

The petitions were then gathered and forwarded to the UC Board of Regents and to the CSUC Board of Trustees. Meanwhile, the two systems diverted funds from other sources and the Center was assured of at least one more year's existence. Survival fights were temporarily put aside, and programming and counseling resumed priorities.

In spite of budget difficulties and the indefinite future they predicted for the Center, the Ventura Learning Center staff were able to assure students, on behalf of the UC and CSUC systems and participating campuses, that those already enrolled in degree programs would be seen through to degree completion, whether or not the Learning Center itself survived. This was not an automatic arrangement. The
Center Director had lengthy discussions with more than one campus to win this concession, and thus honor Ventura Learning Center advertising and promotion efforts and commitments to students.

In spite of this ambivalent environment, several highly successful new degrees were launched in September 1975, including an MA in Early Childhood Education from CSU Northridge, an MS in Environmental Studies from CSC Dominguez Hills, and a BS in Nursing from CSU Los Angeles. All three programs began under the aegis of the CSUC Consortium, with healthy (that is, each in excess of 35) enrollments.

However, troubles with UC Riverside's program in Administration continued and when no special funds from Sacramento or Berkeley were forthcoming for its continuance, UC Riverside decided to withdraw the program. The UC Riverside and Ventura Learning Center staff immediately met with all students to discuss other options for completion of studies in other programs at the Center, in an administrative certificate program from UCSB/UCR, or with private institutions in the area. All students were accommodated.

Normally, Center staff would have argued for completion of the degree but, in this instance, did not because as the Director said at the time, the UCR program and its problems made it a case study in how not to provide a degree
for off-campus, non-traditional students. For example, a memo from the Ventura Learning Center to UC and UCR regarding the program (dated August 1, 1975) recommended discontinuance of the program, citing more than a dozen reasons. Among them were:

1. The five year commitment necessary by students to complete the degree at one course a quarter.

2. The fact that more Ventura applicants were rejected than admitted.

3. The inappropriate counseling, provision of course materials, and procedures for notifying students of grades, whereby students were advised they could find their grades posted on the professor's door on campus--120 miles away.

4. The fact that the program had not encouraged any student to apply since January, and was constantly presented as "tentative".

5. The already established programs in the area by USC and LaVerne College.

6. The fact that applications, which were incomplete, minimally short or late for a given quarter, could not be held for the following one, so that students had to reapply and pay another $20.00.

The UC Riverside Urban Studies Bachelor's degree program at the Ventura Learning Center, also offered through Extended University, with an enrollment of only 12, faced identical funding problems. However, exemplifying sincere concern for the students' welfare, the Urban Studies department under the leadership of its chairman, Dr. Ron McAllister, continued to offer courses and independent study work, and waive certain residency requirements, to enable students to complete their work. Six of the original 12 students are scheduled to graduate from the program by mid-1977.
Highlights of 1976

Programming in Spring 1976 was somewhat similar to the previous Fall quarter/semester, though new courses leading to an MA in Elementary Education were tested, but budget problems loomed in January instead of April.

The Ventura Star-Free Press, on January 14, warned that the "Learning Center Fate Hangs in State Balance" after a reporter talked to Dr. Allan Hershfield, Assistant Academic Vice President for Educational Services at the UC Systemwide Administration, and learned that the Center's future was "touch and go".

By March the battle cry had resumed. Senator Rains and Assemblyman MacDonald resumed their campaign for the Center, this time directing their efforts and communications at the CSUC and UC systems, as did the Ventura County Board of Supervisors, several city Chambers of Commerce, the city councils of Oxnard and Ventura (in official resolutions), newspaper editorials, social, fraternal and educational groups, private citizens and students.

Then, to the Learning Center's surprise, the Oxnard Press Courier announced in a six-column, 24 column-inch article on March 30, that Ventura Learning Center funds were pledged, and that Assemblyman MacDonald "Gets $100,000.00 commitment" from officials in the CSUC and UC. A similar but much smaller (three column, 12 column-inch) story, "Learning Center Supported" appeared on the same day.
In the Ventura Star-Free Press quoting Assemblyman MacDonald as saying that the Center "is in good shape for the current fiscal year".27

In the midst of it all, the April 1 deadline for canceling the lease of the building came and went, and the Ventura Learning Center literally had another lease on life.

Once again, with survival efforts at least temporarily set aside, the Ventura Learning Center staff gave full attention to the daily operation of the Center, counseling, market research and programming.

Shortly thereafter (Summer 1976), courses leading to a Master's degree in Secondary Education (with an emphasis in Reading) were introduced by CSU Northridge in an Expanded Campus offering. Master's degrees in Public Administration and Environmental Planning (both offered by CSU Northridge and the Consortium) and courses from the Business Administration and Recreation and Leisure Studies Departments were offered in the Fall. With the advent of the new programs, the student enrollment went over the 600 mark for the first time as 1976 drew to a close.

The vicissitudes of 1975 and 1976, while highlighting the life of the Center, fail to take into account the regular heartbeat of the Ventura Learning Center--the day-to-day, behind-the-scenes discussions, negotiations and communications that are necessary to launch even a single degree. Yet without them, the Center would not survive. Therefore,
a brief review is in order.

Programming

Generally, but by no means always, programming at the Ventura Learning Center is based on the educational needs of the community. While this will be dealt with in more detail later in this study, the general procedure is that, as a result of Ventura Learning Center staff initiative or community requests, a needed degree is first identified. Once identified, the first considerations are which system/campus has such a program, and whether the potential clientele can afford self-support courses. If a campus in each segment is capable of bringing the requested degree, the Director seeks guidance at the Vice Chancellorial and Vice Presidential level of the two segments, simultaneously, in choosing a specific campus.

If no degree is available from either campus in the service area (i.e., CSUN and UCSB) and if it appears that students can afford self-support programs, the Director contacts the Consortium's Coordinator of Curriculum Development to request such a program. However, if a program is not already an approved Consortium program, it will take 18 months or more to develop it and get its necessary approvals. Even if a degree is available on campus, an extraordinary number of approvals are required to bring it off campus.

There are times when departments wish to test or
"dump" a degree in off-campus locations. The testing is welcome as long as those involved know that further courses toward the degree depend on sufficient enrollment. The dumping, however, is not. Courses that will not "make" on campus generally will not do so off-campus, and bringing unneeded courses to off-campus locations has costly ramifications.

Conversely, some of the most frequently requested degrees, notably Master's degrees in Counseling Psychology and Social Welfare, have not been available at the Ventura Learning Center in spite of repeated requests over a two-year period. The two programs had been scheduled to come from UC Santa Barbara and UC Los Angeles, respectively, but were cancelled with the Governor's budget cuts in 1975.

One condition unique to off-campus programming is when to end a program. Some may continue indefinitely, while others may serve the market in one or two cycles. At least one year's advance notice of phaseout plans is essential so that students are not stranded midway through a degree.

It should be understood that the role of the Ventura Learning Center staff varies from campus to campus in programming. For example, the Director of the Center serves as a negotiator for new programs from most campuses. This frequently involves departmental negotiations as well as communications with the assigned liaison person from the
office of the Dean of Academic Instruction or the Dean of Continuing Education. The Director, however, does not negotiate directly for UCSB programs—UCSB preferring to depend on Center staff for room scheduling and referrals.

Counseling

Counseling is a major mandate and service of the Ventura Learning Center. In most cases, general counseling, guidance and referrals are provided for students whether they are interested in Learning Center programs, in degrees, or in coursework from UC or CSUC campuses elsewhere, from private institutions in the area or from vocational centers.

Counseling procedures vary. UCSB, for example, has a counselor (and secretary) in residence at the Center from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. daily, with counseling available by appointment or on a drop-in basis. All other campuses send counselors, usually from 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. or longer, to allow prospective students with daytime responsibilities time to make evening appointments, on a fairly regular basis, both before and after a program is launched.

This has worked particularly well for several reasons. First, the Ventura Learning Center, which serves six or seven campuses at a time, has access to all program information and can show the student multiple options. Second, the visiting counselor can see enough students at one session to make his/her trip to Ventura cost-efficient. Third, many basic questions have already been answered and applicants
screened by Ventura Learning Center staff, and the counselor's time thereby saved for more academic questions. Fourth, all promotional efforts have been made by the Learning Center staff through local community contacts, so the individual campus has minimal, if any, promotional costs. Fifth, departmental counseling is usually more effective than a single representative of a whole campus.30

One additional and novel counseling service is available as a free service to prospective CSU Northridge students. An electronic telecopier service31 was instituted in 1975 between the Ventura Learning Center and the Northridge Office of Admissions and Records to facilitate admissions procedures by providing almost instant feedback to Ventura students. Transcripts are fed into the Ventura telecopier, printed out and evaluated at Northridge, and telephoned back to Ventura. The whole procedure usually takes less than a half hour and is particularly beneficial to community college students who wish to know which lower division units are transferable and/or which community college courses, if any, are required for eligibility in junior year standing.

**Budgeting**

In spite of the time and effort spent on budget crises and the publicity they engendered, the Ventura Learning Center budgets themselves were, as the Ventura County Star-Free Press put it in a lead editorial32 (May 13, 1975), "pretty small change" in the state budget of
$10 billion.

The first tentative budget for 1974-75 totalled $85,179 with more than half of that budgeted for rent (6,300 square feet @ 58 cents) at $43,848.00 and for supplies and expenses (S&E), $6,000.00.

A supplemental request of $8,000 was made in January 1975, partly to allow for a third staff member, part time, and partly for supplies and expenses.

The 1975-76 budget proposal was for $102,654.00, with rent remaining constant, and S&E increased to $10,000.00, and the 1976-77 proposal for $106,848.00, again with rent constant, but S&E set at $12,000.00.

The S&E category includes three telephone lines (a major item because of long distance calls to most CSUC campuses, particularly Northridge), telex charges, postage, printing, promotions, advertising and public relations, travel and mileage, office supplies, photocopying at commercial rates, and even in 1976, office reconstruction. It is probably no exaggeration to say that the staff operated on a "bare bones" budget.

Several points should be made in reference to the budget.

The first is that the UC originally paid 75% of the budget with the understanding that the Center would eventually be a 50-50 proposition with the CSUC. This 50-50 arrangement was to have begun in Fiscal Year 1976-77 but,
at this writing, it is still a 75-25 division. Both systems were hoping to have the Ventura Learning Center budget included as regular line items in their UC and CSUC budgets by Fiscal Year 1977-78 but, as yet, this too has not transpired.

Secondly, for sheer manageability, accounting has had to be done through one system. Thus, while the staff of the Ventura Learning Center are actually employed by both the UC and CSUC (and the only people in the state of California whose business cards carry the seals of both institutions), for administrative and budgeting purposes are considered UC Systemwide employees. The Learning Center budget requests, likewise, go to UC Systemwide at Berkeley, and from there are negotiated with CSUC.

Thirdly, because the Ventura Learning Center is a joint enterprise between the UC and CSUC and the first of its kind, nearly every financial request made by the Center is an exception to the rule. Therefore, it has to be handled in a special, often time-consuming, way. Very often the Center does not have the official forms required and is instructed by UC Systemwide to pick up the required forms at the UCSB Administration Office, not realizing the Learning Center is more than 40 miles away from campus.

This has had both amusing and frustrating consequences. For example, with no photocopying machines and no charge account at any store in Ventura, the staff solved the
problem of duplicating their first news release by taking the original copy to several Savings and Loan offices where ten free photocopies of each original were available. Envelopes and postage costs were paid for by the staff. Likewise, the first bulk mailing could not have gone out had not the Director floated a loan for the postage. On other occasions, the staff/student coffee kitty provided emergency funds of a minor nature, while any hosting of visiting dignitaries or faculty was paid for personally by staff members.

A final point to be remembered in the Ventura Learning Center experience is the pitifully small feedback received by the Center regarding its proposed budget. Whether it is because two segments are involved, or because of the Governor's budget cuts and the subsequent necessity of transferring funds from other university resources, or because of the geographic isolation of the Center, there frequently was and is little or no information shared with the Center regarding budget allocations. Sometimes a telephone call confirms that the budget has been approved at a certain level in either system, but official correspondence to that effect has been non-existent.

Budgeting, therefore, has been a major and continuous source of concern at the Ventura Learning Center, not only from but prior to the Center's opening, when no thought had been given to any promotion or advertising for a new concept.
Enrollment

During the Center's first quarter/semester, there were 194 students enrolled in programs from UC Santa Barbara, UC Riverside, and CSU Long Beach. While the figure grew to 508, Fall 1975 and 604, Fall 1976, with the advent of new programs and campuses, the total figures do not tell the whole story, and further breakdown is necessary.

Even a cursory glance will reveal a declining UC enrollment and a corresponding growth in CSUC enrollment. (Ventura Learning Center figures show a decline from 82% UC enrollment in Fall 1974 to 28.6% in Fall 1976.) There are several reasons for this.

One can be traced to the Governor's budget cuts and subsequent phase-out of UCR's programs and UCSB's Urban Economics and Law and Society programs.

It might also be argued that CSUC fees are lower (and they indeed are in the Expanded Campus offerings) and, therefore, attract more students, but this is hardly valid. The CSU Los Angeles Nursing program, for example, at $42.00 a quarter unit or $336.00 for two courses per quarter, is almost twice the cost of a UCSB equivalent load. Actually, approximately 50% of the CSUC degrees are more expensive than UCSB degrees.

Another factor is the unavailability of the Counseling Psychology and Masters of Social Welfare degree, originally
scheduled to come from UCSB and UCLA--and still unavailable.

Yet another reason may be the fact that the Ventura Learning Center is not permitted to negotiate directly with UCSB departments for degrees.

Whatever the causes, the UC decline in enrollment is offset by an increase in enrollment in CSUN Expanded Campus offerings and CSUC Consortium programs.

The Learning Center staff conducted a survey of students in the Fall quarter/semester of 1975 from which the following observations may be made:

Of the 508 students, slightly more were women (52%). This trend has continued. The greatest number of students were from 30 to 39 years of age, followed closely by those in their twenties. However, more than 100 degree-seeking students were in their forties and fifties. While the majority of students listed Ventura, Oxnard, Camarillo and other parts of the county as their home, students came from as far as Vandenberg, Bakersfield, Valencia, Lancaster and Los Angeles, either because the program they required was not available in their area or because the Ventura Learning Center offered convenient scheduling--that is, two courses, back-to-back, from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. in one evening.

Several statistics that do not appear in the Center's enrollment figures, but which testify to intersegmental cooperation and the cost-efficiency of the Center, are those
pertaining to courses by Ventura College, by UCSB and CSU Northridge Extension departments, and by Ventura County In-Service Training programs. Rooms are provided without charge to these groups, in non prime-time blocks, on a space available basis. More than 1,000 students have thus been served annually.

Two and a half years of innovation, negotiations, counseling, budget crises, hope and despair have provided a practical learning experience for staff and faculty and all who have been involved with the pilot project in education in Ventura.

It was also a learning laboratory in communication, as will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.
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1 Source: Ventura County Planning Department (July 1975) data. The county has nine incorporated cities: Ventura 63,483; Oxnard 87,357; Simi Valley 70,680; Thousand Oaks 55,084; Camarillo 24,942; Santa Paula 18,492; Port Hueneme 18,035; Fillmore 7,869; and Ojai 5,811.

2 According to the Ventura County Legislative Analyst, Ventura County is a "donor county", sending more in property and sales taxes to Sacramento than it receives in services. Prior to the opening of the Ventura Learning Center, it received no return on its taxes for higher education beyond the Community College level.

3 Source: Ventura County (Calif.) Market Data Report - No. 16, published by the Ventura County Star-Free Press, undated but probably late 1975.

4 Source: California Lutheran College, Resources '75-'76, Vol. 15, No. 6, August 1975, page 181.

5 The land, however, was soon to be sold. Senate Bill 928, signed by Governor Brown on March 2, 1976, authorized the sale of the 425-acre site in the Las Posas Valley.

6 There were really two reasons for this. It was partly a result of the recommendation of UC's 1970 All University Faculty Conference that access to education be extended to more students by off-campus programs. (See Chapter One, Footnote 3.) It should also be remembered that unlike most UC campuses, UCSB was not located in an urban area and drew 87% of its enrollment from up to 40 miles from the campus. Thus, the Oxnard-Ventura area was a natural outreach for UCSB.


8 Actually the term "intersegmental" is more accurate.

9 Source: From information released by the Office of
the President/University Relations, Berkeley, September 12, 1974.

10 This was to change somewhat in June 1976, when increased enrollment necessitated converting the large learning resource room into a sixth classroom. One of the two administrative offices was then transformed into the resource room, and two small offices and one counseling cubicle parceled out of the lobby area.

11 Actual use of the microwave, however, which featured one channel, one-way color video and two-way audio, for student response, did not get underway until Fall 1976. A second channel was added in Spring 1977.

12 For thorough descriptions of instructional technology and media, including ITFS, see Clark and Rubin's Instructional Technology and Media for Postsecondary Alternatives, prepared for the California Legislature in September 1975. It quotes the FCC definition of ITFS as a "fixed station operated by an educational organization and used primarily for the transmission of visual and aural instruction, cultural and other types of educational material to one or more fixed receiving locations". It further adds that it is the point-to-point nature of fixed transmission and reception stations which differentiates ITFS from broadcast television (page 26).

13 Ms. Walker had accepted the position with three major stipulations: First, that it would be necessary to correct the complete lack of budgeting for any promotion, advertising or community relations; second, that she have accountability to one individual instead of "schizophrenic accountability" to the two segments, that is, to the Vice President's and Chancellor's offices; and, third, that she have the authority to remove the UCSB staff from residence at the Center if intersegmental cooperation were jeopardized by the "physical presence" of one campus. The first of these was immediately conceded. The second became obviously impossible, given the joint nature of the project, and the third warrants further explanation. Given the pre-existing nature of UCSB involvement with degree programming in the area, and their justifiable pride in having initiated the idea of a center in Ventura, proprietary possessiveness and role confusion were inevitable. Time, patience, staff changes, direct communication
and room rearrangements contributed to the resolution of this initial confusion and conflict.

14 Source: University Bulletin, October 7, 1974, page 48; and news release from the University of California, Office of the President/University Relations, September 12, 1974.

15 The community's dispassionate welcome to the Ventura Learning Center will be discussed in Chapter IV.

16 See Appendix D for a complete listing.

17 The CSUC Board of Trustees at its July 1, 1975 meeting requested the Chancellor to appoint a special task force to consider the implications of expansion of existing off-campus instruction policy to include offering of degree programs.

18 The writer admits having a vested interest in this program. However, the program was of great value to many in the news media and teaching professions, both of intrinsic importance to the Center.

19 The Health Science degree was an excellent example of the futility of attempting to offer a program when a department is motivated by pressure rather than commitment. Prospective students were discouraged by department counselors from enrolling, and the program never materialized.

20 The BS "degree" in Business Administration has a history unto itself. Nine courses were first offered in Spring 1975 through Extension at $28.00 per unit, in locations throughout the county, although Ventura Learning Center staff strongly recommended a total of only two or three courses each semester to avoid dispersing the market. The over-scheduling hurt the program and enrollments per class were low in spite of market research that showed major interest in the degree.

In the Fall of 1975, three courses which were to be the beginning of an External Degree (CSU Northridge and the Consortium) at self-support rates of $65.00 a unit or $195.00 per class, were proposed at the Learning Center. However, the great majority of the students could not possibly pay the tuition rates and only three persons showed
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up for classes.

No classes were given in Spring 1976 but in the Fall Semester, three classes were offered for the first time at Expanded Campus rates. Unfortunately, while all three classes "made", many interested students were lost somewhere in the interim and confusion of two false starts. However, three classes are scheduled to continue in 1977, with no guarantee of any classes beyond that.


22 See Appendix F.

23 The programs had been agreed upon and funded before the Ventura Learning Center opened, when UC Riverside and UC Santa Barbara had hopes for a joint program.


25 Dr. Hershfield had succeeded Dr. Pat Healey in September 1975.


28 It has become very evident that self-support programs are appropriate only at the Master's level or for certain clientele, but seldom, if ever, for those at the Baccalaureate level. Even at the Master's level, fee waivers must be easily available for certain students.

29 Even the internal campus procedure can be a complex one. UCSB's proposal for the Master's degree in Counseling Psychology, for example, went to the sponsoring department first, thence to the Council on Part-time Degree Programs, Executive Committee of the College, Graduate Council, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, and the Faculty Legislature. Only then did it go from campus level to the UC Council on Graduate Affairs, and the University-wide Committee on Educational Policy and Planning, and Senate.
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30 The role of communication in counseling will be discussed further in Chapter IV.

31 In a gesture of good faith, CSU Northridge purchased two telecopiers specifically for the assistance of off-campus students in Ventura.

32 Ventura County (Calif.) Star-Free Press, 13 May 1975, p. B10.

33 A tie-line is also available, except for summer months, to UC campuses and Los Angeles area campuses, and is used between the Ventura Learning Center computer terminal and the UCSB campus. Its cost is borne by UCSB in return for their staff use of Ventura Learning Center lines.
CHAPTER IV

It's not what your write that counts, it is what you get others to read.

- George Horace Lorimer

THE ROLE OF EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE VENTURA LEARNING CENTER

Once upon a time a hunter bought a remarkable retriever — so remarkable that it could sprint across water to retrieve what his master had shot. The hunter lost no time in bringing a friend with him on his next hunting trip, and without explaining his dog's prowess, promptly shot a duck. The retriever immediately trotted across the water, retrieved the duck and dropped it at his proud master's feet on shore. His friend said nothing. The hunter repeated the feat — as did the dog. Again, the friend said nothing.

In frustration the hunter asked, "Didn't you notice something unusual about my dog?"

"Yes," said the friend, "he can't swim."

While the retriever in the above tale doesn't exactly correspond to the Ventura Learning Center, there were times in its early days when its staff felt the Center was perceived by some of its publics as "not being able to swim". Whether it was because the Center began with a low profile, or because, in spite of its many attributes, it did not have some of the traditional "essentials" of institutions of higher learning (such as a campus), or because it represented to some a threat to the establishment of a four-year college within the county borders or the threat of the
establishment of a four-year college, or because of its name, or because of other reasons, the Center did, in fact, have difficulty in some of its early communication efforts.

While communication with other educational institutions, elected officials, potential students, various publics and others played a significant role in the development of the Center, the role of communication with the media was of more immediate and critical importance in launching not only a new institution but a new concept.

**Communication with the News Media**

Shortly after the Center opened in July 1974, the Center Director telephoned the major newspaper in the county, the *Ventura County Star-Free Press*, to explain its concept and scope, and the promise it held. The call apparently was made at a bad time. The education editor was leaving the newspaper that week, her replacement had not yet taken over, and the telephone call was referred to several different reporters. While everyone expressed interest in the new Center, that was as far as it went.

Thus, in spite of having several natural ingredients of a news story (e.g., being the first and only Learning Center of its kind in the state, a possible prototype for future learning centers, and representing for the first time the opportunity in Ventura for a four-year public college education), the story of the advent of the Ventura Learning Center was not picked up by the *Ventura County*
In the midst of other priorities (e.g., negotiating with segments and campuses for degrees, meeting county officials and searching for staff), additional contacts with the news media were delayed for several weeks.

On August 19, 1974, this writer was hired on a two-month contract, with media relations being the first priority. (More than six weeks had passed since the Center opened and no word of it had appeared in county papers, though local radio stations had carried news and interviews with the Director.) In cooperation with the Public Information Officer of the Ventura Community College District, this writer compiled a county-wide news media list and on August 21, issued the Center's first news release, "Unique Learning Center Opens in Ventura". The release was mailed to all county news media, and handcarried to the two largest county newspapers--partly to save time and partly to pay a courtesy call on the education writers.

The story was printed in several county papers before or during the following weekend, but did not appear in either major newspaper. With some reluctance (i.e., not wanting to appear to "check up" on reporters) this writer telephoned both papers on August 26 to ask if there were a problem. The Oxnard Press-Courier education writer explained that he was about to write a larger feature and promptly scheduled an interview with Ventura Learning Center
staff. (His five-column, 25-column-inch story, "4 Year Colleges Plan Unveiled" and cautiously subheaded "Experiment Believed First of its Kind in County", ran on August 30, 1974.) The Ventura County Star-Free Press education writer explained that he was new to the position and "a bit behind" but, nonetheless, agreed to drop by the Center the same day for an interview. His three-column, 15-column-inch story, "New Center Offers Unique Learning", with an inaccurate subheading, "College Through Extension", and somewhat unrealistic story appeared on August 28. (The story was unrealistic in that it implied that a student could graduate with a degree in Education from UC Berkeley by taking courses from Cal State Northridge and Long Beach, with several of his classes being taught by a professor from UCLA, all through a "new concept in university extension programs" being tried out at the Learning Center. As noted earlier, one cannot earn a degree through Extension, nor are credits readily transferable between segments.)

Thus began a somewhat off-again, on-again relationship between the Ventura Learning Center and the largest newspaper in the county. A detailed chronicle of that relationship follows.

Communication with the Ventura County Star-Free Press

That first, relatively brief and somewhat inaccurate, story plus two smaller items in the weekly "In The Schools" column (a three-column-inch story on CSU Northridge
Registration on November 20 and three-column-inch story on the Vocational Education program from CSU Long Beach on September 29) was all the Ventura Learning Center could garner during its first five months in operation.

With little funds available for advertising, (none whatsoever had been budgeted) the problem of publicizing the Center was real. While other channels of communication were used to introduce the Center and its programs to various publics, as will be described later in this chapter, the consultant (this writer) felt it necessary to approach other people at the newspaper, with other story angles for publicity.

The third contact with the newspaper, a letter to the managing editor (September 9) with a brief description of the Center and an invitation for a "get-together" either at the newspaper or at the Center, brought no response whatsoever.

A telephone call on October 3 to a woman feature writer in the newspaper's People Department, regarding the possibility of a story on the Center Director, resulted in a suggestion to visit the People Editor. He agreed (October 8) that the idea had merit, but then asked when the Center had last received coverage. The August 28 story was deemed much too recent, and the story idea temporarily shelved. (Ironically, a two-page feature on the Director was later printed after much, sometimes front page,
publicity about the fate of the Learning Center. The story was written by a regular staff reporter who was also a Mass Communication student at the Learning Center, and appeared in the weekend Vista (tabloid) section of the Sunday paper, July 13, 1975.)

It was obviously proving difficult to arouse the newspaper's interest in the Learning Center, in spite of five attempts and several news releases over a five-month period. In fairness to the newspaper, however, the Learning Center was not generating much additional publicity, saving the greatest punch for the dedication ceremonies which were tentatively scheduled several times in October and November.

By the last week of November, however, the dedication date was firm and, because of the short lead-time before the event, the staff began telephoning those on the guest list.

One such guest was the editor of the paper who, when called, was intrigued by the nature and scope of the Center and asked if his paper had carried much about it. When told that the Ventura Learning Center had had discouragingly little (and had purchased about three times as much in advertising space) the editor promised to speak to the education writer.

The education writer called the next day, and on December 1 (the day before the dedication ceremony), a seven-column, 35-column-inch story, "Ventura Learning Center Is Unique In State", with one-column pictures of UC's
President Hitch and CSUC's Chancellor Dumke, appeared on the front page of the paper. Two days later, after the editor and education writer attended the ceremony, a 30-column-inch story, ("Hitch, Dumke Laude Ventura Center") with a large photo of the two men and the Center Director, ran on page two.

More publicity followed and the Learning Center found itself the subject of a 24-column-inch editorial, "Higher Future For County Education", on Sunday, December 8. The editorial referred to the visit of the "impresarios" of both the UC and CSUC to the Center, which was termed "a worthy consolation prize: California's first joint university/state college learning center". The editorial lauded the Center's early success, saying its experience would serve as a model for other learning centers in other parts of the state. It concluded:

We welcome the learning center as a useful and imaginative addition to Ventura County's facilities for higher education, and we urge county students of all ages to make good use of the program. It's not intended as a substitute for a college campus, but as a supplement to the county's present education program, and it's no reflection on the learning center that we'll keep on yearning for a state college campus of our very own.

News releases were carried faithfully, and somewhat colorful feature "updates" were often initiated by the paper itself. A January 13, 1975 article, for example, with a headlining "Learning Center Chiefs Persevere" noted that if someone were to slam the door in the faces of the Ventura
Learning Center administrators, they wouldn't give up easily—and went on to describe the difficulty of bringing a one degree program to Ventura.

On February 2, a 64-column-inch (six-column) story, "Life Turning Rosy at Learning Center", written by the consultant for the UC Clip Sheet, was carried with five pictures.

When the Center's first budget crisis occurred, the paper was in the midst of the battle, giving generous, sometimes front-page coverage to the issues, often touching base with the UC, CSUC, Senator Rains and Assemblyman MacDonald, as well as the Learning Center staff. At the request of this writer, the paper ran a lead editorial (15-column-inch) on May 13, "Losing Our Only State University", asking that the Center not only be kept open but that more equitable fee structures be arranged for off-campus students. More news, feature and editorial support followed in the succeeding months.

The happy relationship continued, however, only until November 7, when the education writer, in a sincere but perhaps overzealous effort to help the Center in its ongoing budget crisis, wrote a story "Director Will Fight For Learning Center's Life", in which he erroneously quoted the Director as saying she "wouldn't let the Governor shut down the Center" and "dared" them (presumably the UC and CSUC) to try to shut it down. The substance of the article, which
carried a one-column picture of the Director, was that she was almost singlehandedly fighting officials at UC and CSUC, and in Sacramento in keeping the Center open.

The consultant telephoned the writer to arrange for a clarification, but none was forthcoming. Instead, the Director wrote a letter to the Editor (printed November 14) explaining the universities' commitment to the Ventura Center and their attempt to divert funds from other programs to keep it open. The issue appeared to be resolved.

However, the Ventura Learning Center seemed to fall from grace. Its news releases were sometimes reduced to one- or two-inch items, often buried without any headings, in the twice-weekly "In the Schools" column. While the news was printed, it was easy to overlook.

This less than felicitous relationship continued until early September (1976) when several students complained to the Learning Center staff that they didn't see any Ventura County Star-Free Press coverage of the CSU Northridge Registration Day at the Center, or of the new Environmental Planning Degree. Actually, both items had been in the "In the Schools" column on August 29 and September 5 under the small headings "Registration Scheduled" and "New Master's Offering".

Because of the student complaints, the consultant (now Assistant Director) called the reporter to ask if he could give new degrees and counseling dates more prominence
in the "Schools" column, or list them elsewhere in the paper because, as the students indicated, they associated the "Schools" column with elementary and secondary schools, and missed the Ventura Learning Center items. (Many students, in their thirties and forties, didn't think the column applied to them.) The request was probably ill advised, and diplomatic efforts apparently failed. The reporter replied that "just announcing a new degree doesn't warrant a special area of the newspaper--and if I did move it, it would probably end up next to the classified ads". The conversation ended with the Assistant Director offering to try to get more Learning Center students reading the "Schools" column.

The impasse continued--but so did the Center's efforts at reconciliation.

A thaw finally came in October 1976. A news release, announcing the introduction of a CSU Northridge Expanded campus program leading to a Master's degree in Home Economics was made by the Ventura Learning Center on September 21, with counseling dates scheduled for October 7 and November 11. While Thousand Oaks, Oxnard and Camarillo newspapers carried the story, the first counseling date came with no mention of the program in the Ventura County Star-Free Press. However, the same day brought a call from the education writer with an apology for the oversight, saying he had seen only the second date, and asking how he could
make amends in the publicity for the October counseling. A long friendly conversation followed, including explanations of the difference between extension courses and degree programs, and the months of negotiations and market studies that precede the introduction of each new degree to the Center. To the delight of the Center staff, the Home Economics story was the lead item in the October 24 "Schools" column, with a large (four-column-inch) headline, "Center To Offer Home Economics Degree".

The long drought was over.

The chronic problems with one reporter in one medium point to the importance of effective communication, not only with other media in the area (if they are available), but with "back-up" or supplementary communication channels. The fact that more than 30 persons appeared for the first counseling session, though no word of it had appeared in the county's largest newspaper, testifies to this. These channels will be discussed later in this and the following chapter.

Other Media Relations

Communication with all other news media was positive and productive, with news articles and features appearing on a regular basis. The broadcast media deserve special mention in that they scooped the story of the opening of the Center by about a week, and were always receptive to Learning Center happenings. Although news releases were written
for the print media, the radio stations usually adapted the releases to their own format or called the Center for taped interviews. Shortly after the Ventura Learning Center opened, KVEN in Ventura dedicated most of one evening's call-in talk show to the Center, including a 20-minute interview with the Center's consultant. The county radio stations, particularly KVEN, KAAP, AND KFBB, were all supportive during the budget crises. Even the major Spanish-speaking station, KOXR in Oxnard, carried interviews with some of the Learning Center Chicano students who spoke in Spanish on behalf of the Center staff.

The two military newspapers in the county, as well as the community college campus newspapers and the College District's twice-annual Report to the Community (a supplement printed in all county newspapers) carried Ventura Learning Center articles and/or news releases and feature stories, as did county government publications, the occupational education newsletter of the Superintendent of Schools office, and various house organs and professional newsletters in the county.

One of the most faithful supporters of the Learning Center has been KAAP radio, which adapted an all-news format in mid-1975. The station had carried Ventura Learning Center news releases and interviews since the Center opened, but in August 1975, suggested a new feature—a weekly two-minute news/feature spot with subject chosen,
written and recorded over the telephone by Center staff. The new feature was inaugurated August 15, 1975 and continues to this writing. There was one minor change on August 8, 1976 when the recording was reduced by ten seconds to allow for a regular music and voice introduction by the KAAP newsroom staff.

The free publicity engendered by the feature spots, which are played once on Fridays and three or four times on Saturdays and Sundays, has amounted to the equivalent of approximately $800,000.00 weekly in advertising for the Center.

Advertising and Promotion Budget

The initial lack of a budget for promotion and public information as discussed earlier (page 79), and of guidelines for promotion and public information were definite handicaps. At the Director's insistence, funds for public information, promotion and advertising were diverted from the Supplies and Expenses budget (see Footnote 13, page 71) and the Center spent $7,875.03 in Fiscal Year 1974-75 for consultant fees, advertising, printing, photography, and mailing expenses.

Promotion costs were $5,391.54 in Fiscal Year 1975-76. Part of the reason for the reduced figure was the hiring of the consultant as Assistant Director, and the salary item being transferred to Payroll and General Benefits, where it
is equally divided between promotion and counseling expenses.

Although advertising per se was a low priority, the Center staff concluded that a healthy budget for promotion and advertising was and continues to be a necessity, and that advertising and propriety are not mutually exclusive.

(For an example of a Ventura Learning Center ad, see Appendix B. The ad, which was designed by Center staff and run in all county newspapers and the Ventura College Schedule of Classes in late 1976, was highly successful, pulling 147 coupon responses from county newspapers and 129 from the College Schedule of Classes, and more than 90 telephone calls and letters from all papers combined. An accurate accounting of all telephone inquiries is not available because callers didn't always mention the ad, nor did Center staff always ask.)

Summary

Between July 1, 1974 and December 30, 1976 a total of 51 news releases were made to Ventura and Santa Barbara county newspapers and radio stations, plus an additional 14 special news releases to specific audiences through professional, county government, firemen's, nurses', teachers', health and other publications. There is no official count of the number of feature stories generated either by the Ventura Learning Center staff or the newspapers or magazines themselves, but an estimate of 20 would be conservative--the
major ones being written for the UC Clip Sheet (January 1975), and reprinted in the Ventura County Star-Free Press, February 2, 1975; News from CSUN, January 1975; the Nation's Schools and Colleges, May 1975; the CSUN Insight, March 1976; the CSUN Daily Sundial, March 26, 1976; the CSUC Continuing Education Currents, February 1977; and the Ventura and Oxnard College student newspapers.

Seventy-three weekly broadcasts were recorded and broadcast by KAAP radio, in addition to an unknown number of interviews on KAAP and other local stations regarding Learning Center events.

Cable TV played a minor role in the publicizing of the Center. Learning Center staff appeared four times on Avenue TV Cable Service (Ventura) and Oxnard Cablevision, but there was little feedback, either verbally or on the student's survey later conducted by the Center staff regarding the programs.

Analysis

The sluggish response of the county's largest daily newspaper to the advent of the Ventura Learning Center is a graphic reminder that though communication is made, it may not be understood. The point might be made that the newspaper was in the midst of a staff change and, thus, missed the importance of the Center's arrival. However, the Center staff initially failed to communicate with the Education editor at his level.
The initial (i.e., July through November) response of that newspaper was also partly attributable to the low profile of the Ventura Learning Center, which, as far as publicity was concerned, was in something of a "holding pattern" while waiting for the official dedication ceremony.

The above factors, however, are both symptoms of a much larger issue. One must ask why the first learning center of its kind in the state, and one that brought a long awaited opportunity for a four-year public college education to the area, was so apathetically received.

One major reason was that a solution (the Ventura Learning Center) was provided before the people realized they had a problem, and that the university segments assumed people knew of the need and would be lined up at the doors for classes. This was not the case. It is true that a four-year state college was seen as needed by many, but some were more captivated by the image (which the Center lacked) than by the function (which the Center had). To others, the Learning Center was seen as a threat to the establishment of a four-year college, or a consolation prize. To still others, it was "just an Extension Center" having no resemblance to a four-year college. Without the traditional trappings of a campus, the Center's many attributes (degrees brought on the basis of community need, cost efficiency, choice of campuses with which to identify and regular campus faculty) counted for naught. Like the hunter who saw the
dog walking on water, many saw only that it wasn't able to swim.

Advertising which could have helped was infrequent and of low profile. Blatant recruitment of students was neither necessary nor advised, but appropriate advertisements would have been beneficial.

Two final points should be made. The first is that the problems with one newspaper should not overshadow the communications and relationships with other media in the county, which were highly positive and productive.

The second point is that there was a major change in attitude toward the Learning Center after the dedication ceremonies and the visits by dignitaries from UC and CSUC. Their presence gave considerable credibility and prestige to the Center which it had not previously enjoyed, and for this reason should be a major consideration in the launching of any future Learning Centers.

Communication With Educational Institutions

While internal communication (that is, within and between the UC and the CSUC systems and campuses) was, self-evidently, crucial in the launching and development of the Ventura Learning Center, so also was communication externally between the Learning Center and the California Post-secondary Education Commission, the Ventura Community College District and its campuses, the county Superintendent of Schools office, and the private colleges and universities
in the area.

**Communication with CPEC**

Although communications between the CPEC and the Learning Center and vice versa have not been frequent, they were established early in the life of the Center by the CPEC and have resulted in a warm and supportive relationship by the CPEC toward the Learning Center.

Senator Stephen Teale, Chairman of the CPEC, and Dr. Donald R. MacNeil, Director of the CPEC, toured the Ventura Learning Center shortly after the latter's appointment to that position in 1975. During that Ventura County visit, Dr. MacNeil was instrumental in introducing to the Center, Senator Omer Rains, who has since become one of its strongest advocates.

While there is no direct communication from the Learning Center to the CPEC, Dr. MacNeil's staff have made periodic visits to it for input to various CPEC reports and for firsthand insight into intersegmental cooperation.

**Communication with the Community College District and Community Colleges**

One of the first acts of the Center Director in the early days of July 1974 was a visit to the Superintendent of the Ventura Community College District, and to the Ventura College President. The visit was the first of many to the College District and its campuses (at that time, Ventura and Moorpark; later, Oxnard).
Communication with the College District administration, according to the Ventura Learning Center Director, while cordial and pleasant, tended to be superficial, which she attributed to their lack of experience in dealing with women administrators. (There are no women in mid or top management in the College District offices.) The relationship, therefore, tended to be one of a "helping" or "rescuing" nature, whereby college administrators would offer help and advice on running the Center, but would bypass the Learning Center and go directly to the CSUC Chancellor's Office (or to a CSUC campus) on matters affecting the Ventura Learning Center or its degree programming. One College District Trustee repeatedly encouraged direct communication between the Community College Trustees and the Chancellor's Office, by-passing the Center, which was the official representative of the CSUC in Ventura County.

It was only after consistent and repeated communication by the Ventura Learning Center (in the form of letters, telephone conversations, visits and meetings) that communication became more horizontal rather than vertical--that is, from the College District "over" rather than "down" to the Learning Center.

In addition to the Director's frequent "drop-in" visits to the District Office, for visibility, the Assistant Director sent courtesy copies of all news releases and schedules to the District's Public Information Officer who, in
turn, forwarded them to appropriate administrators and officials.

(Another channel of communication that gave the Learning Center more credibility was opened indirectly through community memberships, such as the League of Women Voters and the county's Adult Educational Advisory Council.)

Communication with Ventura College was frequent and effective, resulting in cooperative relationships at several levels. The Center Director and the College President exchanged visits early in the life of the Center, and ultimately formed a close working relationship. Evidence of this relationship came initially at the Ventura Learning Center dedication ceremony (when the college assisted the small Learning Center staff in the hurried arrangements) but also significantly on later occasions. For example, the Ventura College bookstore has ordered, stocked and sold textbooks for faculty from various university campuses having classes at the Ventura Learning Center. (During the year 1976, for example, the Ventura College bookstore sold approximately 3,150 textbooks, with an approximate retail value of $15,652.00, for UC Santa Barbara and CSU Northridge classes being held at the Learning Center.) The College Library has been most cooperative in reserving materials or books brought from campus by faculty for use by Ventura Learning Center students. The College Counseling Office and Career Planning Center carry a generous quantity
of all Learning Center materials and schedules, and make numerous student referrals to the Center.

Communication with Moorpark College, however, has been less than effective, possibly because of staff turnover at that campus and because the campus was without a President for some time. Although the Learning Center staff personally visited the Moorpark campus several times in 1974 and 1975, there was little follow-up in either communication or action, though various actions, principally with regard to meetings between Moorpark counselors and Learning Center staff, had been agreed upon. What there was from Moorpark, at the administrative level, was condescending in nature, resulting in diminishing communication and relationships.

Communication with Oxnard College has been consistently two-way and mutually supportive, from the President's level down. Although the college is still in its infancy, it is now making almost as many referrals to the Ventura Learning Center as the larger and longer-established Ventura College.

Communication with the Superintendent of Schools Office

Communication with the Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools, essential for many reasons but particularly because of the educational degrees offered at the Learning Center, has ranged from poor to excellent.

While the Superintendent himself was receptive to and
supportive of the Ventura Learning Center, not all his senior staff were. When, for example, the Learning Center staff went to one senior official regarding a recent survey made by that office on the educational needs of teachers in the county, he said the survey merely revealed a "laundry list" of needs, and was not available. When asked if Center fliers on the new CSUN/Consortium Early Childhood Education (ECE) degree could be sent through the School's regular weekly distribution system to all ECE teachers in the county, the same individual flatly denied the request because "If we do it for you we'll have to do it for everyone--public and private colleges alike." (The Center staff later learned, from teachers enrolled in degree programs at the Center, that fliers from various educational institutions were frequently distributed through the School's service.)

While the Ventura Learning Center staff came away empty handed on that occasion, it should be noted that normal communication and relationships with the Superintendent of Schools Office were far more productive and supportive. For example, the Center staff later met with the Coordinator of Elementary Education at the Superintendent's office, who not only agreed to send out the fliers but provided the individual mailing labels. Of the more than 100 teachers who ultimately enrolled in the ECE program, more than half indicated that they first heard of the new degree
in the fliers sent to them at the schools.10

Excellent communication also existed between the two credential technicians at the School's Office and the Learning Center staff. Referrals between the two offices are made daily, and input from the technicians has been sought in the Center's programming.

Communication with Private Institutions

Relationships with and referrals to and from private colleges and universities in the county reflect fairly accurately the communication (or lack of it) between the colleges and the Center.

A prime example is the frequent communication and referrals between the Director of LaVerne College Residence Center at Point Mugu and the Ventura Learning Center. While no records are kept in this type of activity, the Center staff estimate approximately seven to ten referrals a week to LaVerne. LaVerne and the Center keep each other's schedules on hand as a service to students.

Antioch West personnel made overtures to the Learning Center staff shortly after the Center opened, and as a result of fairly regular communication and cooperation, the Center makes referrals to them--especially for students who need credit for work or life experience.

The University of Southern California (USC) and the Ventura Learning Center communicate less frequently with each other, but are aware of each other's programs and make
some effort not to offer conflicting programs. The Center, for example, carefully weighed the merits of introducing an M.P.A. program, knowing that USC already had one in the area, and proceeded only when assured by numerous county officials and administrators in the public sector that the cost of the USC program was prohibitive to many qualified and deserving students, and that the area could support two programs.

There was evidence of further cooperation when, in the Fall of 1976, USC asked the Ventura Learning Center for room space for their new Master's degree in Petroleum Engineering, to be given largely by videotape. The Center agreed and gained approval from both UC and CSUC, but USC later found space elsewhere.

Communication, however, between the Learning Center and Pepperdine and California Lutheran College (CLC) has been almost non-existent, although approximately 15 teachers and others seeking credentials are referred monthly by the Center to CLC.

**Analysis**

Two major influences colored the communication between the Ventura Learning Center and other local education institutions. The first was the early concern on the part of the community colleges and district that the Center might offer lower division courses (and therefore be a competitor), but this concern was soon alleviated by both the
UC and CSUC and the Center Director. The second, more prevalent and prolonged influence, was the chauvinism among some local educators, which resulted in considerable cognitive dissonance toward the Learning Center and its staff of three—all women—with considerable administrative responsibility. Communication suffered accordingly.

This dissonance probably was needed in the county as a prelude to much needed change. Until the Ventura Learning Center arrived, the community college district was the only voice of higher education in the county, and not used to consulting with other agencies, particularly a new non-traditional entity.

A third, but less significant influence, was the question of pre-existing loyalty of at least three administrators to private schools in the area. This was not a major problem but could have been had there not been other options (people) through whom to communicate and work.

**Communication with Elected Officials**

The Ventura Learning Center was (and is) a highly political entity, and communication with elected officials at state, county and local levels was inevitable.

Generally, communication was more frequent between the Learning Center and state officials, largely because the Center is a state-sponsored institution. And in most cases, communication was initiated by those at the state level (or those aspiring to it)—the only regular
communication from the Ventura Learning Center being in the form of courtesy copies of news releases.

There were also numerous visitors, usually unannounced, from Sacramento—if not elected officials themselves, then their representatives or staff. They included program analysts from the Legislative Budget Committee in the Office of the Legislative Analyst, and officials from the Program Review and Audit Division (representing both UC and CSUC budgets) in the Department of Finance, who came for first-hand reports on the Ventura Learning Center. Without exception, they reassured the Center staff of their support for the Center in both its concept and practice.

Communication with the county Board of Supervisors was less frequent and, in some cases, almost fruitless. Although Supervisors received courtesy copies of all Ventura Learning Center news releases, several were not aware either of the releases or the Center when invited to the Dedication ceremonies, six months after the Center opened. The Center Director visited each Supervisor personally during her first year on the job, by which time their reactions to the Center ranged from strongly supportive to distrust of higher education.

There was no major effort made on the part of the Learning Center staff to establish strong communication with elected officials in all nine cities of the county. There was some communication (through meetings, for example, with
the City Managers in late 1975, and during the budget struggles, when Ventura and Oxnard City Councils supported the Center by proclamation); but most communication by the Learning Center was made indirectly through informal channels, such as the Lions and Rotary Clubs, or through administrative channels, Personnel Officers and so on. It was felt that the major support needed at the city level was in educational awareness and involvement in backing State action.

Analysis

With a staff of three, priorities in establishing communication and relationships (to determine needed programs, negotiate with the two segments for the degrees and, in some cases such as the Nursing program, arrange for political back-up support for their implementation off-campus) were important. There can be a low rate of return if one attempts to establish communication with all elected officials at state, county and city levels. Furthermore, the staff felt it was not necessary to be "loved" or understood by all elected or aspiring officials. In the case of the Ventura Learning Center, approximately fifty percent of the elected officials changed in the two and a half years since its opening through the normal election process. Nevertheless, it would have been advisable to have made an early official contact with the Board of Supervisors as a group since the Center's news releases and newspaper
publicity did not make a major impression on all five members.

What is more important is to find a power base, or opinion leader in political circles. With the Learning Center, the pivotal position was that of the legislative analyst—the link between the service area (Ventura County) and budget area (State). Communication at this level was the key to an effective two-way communication system between state, county and local elected officials, as well as the UC and CSUC systems.

**Communication with Other Publics**

A typical university or college, like other institutions, has many publics to which it can turn for support or recognition. They may include its students, parents of students, faculty, staff, the community, alumni, donors, government, foundations, trustees and the news media to name a few.

The Ventura Learning Center (at least for the first six weeks) had none of the above, except for a staff of one and approximately 150 students, who were already enrolled in and identified with UCSB's Extended University program in the area. Nor was there a campus, gleeclub or football team to bring identity to the Center.

While "other publics" or audiences could be examined individually, it is not the purpose of this study to delineate a university's (or Learning Center's) many traditional
publics, some of which the Ventura Learning Center could not anticipate having for some time, if ever. Moreover, there are textbooks available for this purpose. A more pragmatic and historical approach would be to examine the way the Center itself and its new degrees were "communicated" to its publics.

(Each degree's publics, of course, differ but a review of one will illustrate the steps taken in reaching specific target audiences or publics.)

**Introducing the Center**

In introducing the Center to other publics in the community (that is, other than those already mentioned in political offices, educational institutions and the media), the Ventura Learning Center staff made as many personal contacts as possible, but more often than not, due to time and staff limitations, contacts were made by letter or telephone.

In the Fall of 1974, the personnel officers of all major employers in the county were contacted by letter or were visited, as were such county government departments as planning, public works, parks and recreation, personnel, environmental resources, health services, mental health, public health, the library system, veterans service bureau, the Superintendent of Schools and the county schools library. The Center staff also visited all city personnel offices in the county, some state offices (in the county)
and introduced themselves, again either in person or by letter, to administrators, personnel officers or training directors of various other institutions, industries or businesses where large numbers of potential students might be employed. The staff also contacted service clubs, youth groups, high schools and high school districts (to reach teachers, not students) and the California Teachers Association.

An inexpensive fact sheet (one page, printed two sides) was prepared and distributed by the thousands, largely through the library system, the county chambers of commerce, the community colleges' libraries and counseling departments, and by local Welcome Wagon (Newcomer's Club) hostesses. The fact sheet was also included in the Center's introductory letters.

The Ventura County Library Services Agency was one of the earliest and strongest supporters of the Learning Center and continues to be. The Director of Library Services and the Coordinator of Adult Services personally saw that Learning Center brochures and schedules were distributed in quantity to all libraries in the county system, as a regular service to the Ventura Learning Center. Other significant services have also been provided. Copies of the Center's news releases were distributed by the main library to all branches throughout the county, where many were publicly posted. In the Learning Center's first days,
the library administrators helped identify opinion leaders in the community. When a graduate class in Mass Communication desperately needed historical microfilm that was available only at the Cal State Northridge library, arrangements were made between the two libraries to keep the microfilm on reserve at the Ventura library for the students. (Not one microfilm was lost.) And when the Master's program in Public Administration was introduced, county library personnel compiled a major specialized bibliography especially for the Ventura Learning Center students.

In short, the resources of the county's library went far beyond books and materials, important though they were.

Contacts with both military bases at several levels were initiated early in the life of the Center. Base education officers and counselors were (and are) in frequent communication with the Learning Center staff, and the latter participate regularly with other educational institutions in base education meetings and events, including the Navy Campus for Achievement (NCFA) programs. News of the Ventura Learning Center programs is carried frequently in the Plan of the Day (POD) publication and Special Services Bulletin.

The Learning Center has also communicated regularly with health organizations (such as the Channel Counties Health Manpower Education Consortium) and hospitals and convalescent homes in Ventura and Santa Barbara counties, particularly because of the Nursing degree program offered
at the Center by CSU Los Angeles, and the possibility of a Health Science program. For example, courtesy copies of all news releases regarding the nursing program are sent to all hospitals and convalescent homes in the two counties. Although news of the nursing program has been in county news media, many nurses have indicated that they first heard of the Ventura Learning Center program at their hospital, on a staff bulletin board or at a staff meeting.

The Learning Center Director was also a member of several community organizations, particularly the League of Women Voters, and several educational committees and was able to reach many women and minorities through these channels. One such channel was the annual, Navy-sponsored Women's Awareness Week.

Center staff spoke to numerous social, fraternal, religious, civic and educational groups throughout the county. The availability of a Ventura Learning Center speaker was publicized periodically in the news media, especially on KAAP radio, and in the Center's publications, notably the fact sheet.

There was one other significant channel of communication employed in introducing the Center to the community. The Learning Center's mandate, for actual use of the Center, did not include community groups, but the Director felt that day use (8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.) of the Center, when few or no classes were scheduled, should be made
available to community groups for educational purposes. Thus, numerous on-going Ventura County government classes, which were offered in cooperation with Ventura College, have been held at the Center and, in many cases, instructors have invited Center staff into the sessions for a brief introduction to the Center. It is estimated, by the county's Training Director, that more than 2,000 different individuals in county training programs have taken classes at the Center. Many of them picked up its brochures and schedules of classes, and many have since become students in programs at the Center or have passed information along to friends and co-workers.

This service to the community has been doubly beneficial to the Center. In addition to reaching a new audience and new potential students, it has earned considerable goodwill in the community, and plaudits from city and county officials and newspapers for the cost efficiency and extra tax dollar mileage it affords the taxpayer.

**Introducing a Degree Program**

In late 1975, after discussions with the CSUC Consortium's Coordinator of Curriculum Development, the Learning Center began the process of surveying the community's need for a Master of Public Administration degree. "Market Research" may be too sophisticated a term to use for the Center's methods of evaluating the need or market for the degree. The method utilized was simply direct communication
with numerous groups, organizations, agencies and individuals in addition to newspaper and radio publicity.

One of the first steps was a letter to all former students in UC Riverside's erstwhile MA program in Public Administration and Business Administration and to all individuals on the Center's Master of Public Administration mailing list. The mailing list is a prime target group, delineated by degree program interest, and developed over a period of time (actually, since the Center opened) from walk-in traffic, telephone inquiries, referrals, response from county and community college newspaper coupons, interest surveys, feedback from participating campuses, and so on.

During the months of November and December, 1975, more than 100 letters also went to major employers in the county, particularly those in the public sector, such as various departments of the county of Ventura, all cities in the county, and to the neighboring city and county of Santa Barbara. The initial letter did not announce the degree but rather the possibility of bringing it to Ventura, and asked for the recipient's insight and input, particularly in view of the USC Master of Public Administration program already being offered in the area. The main feedback from administrators in the county was that if the CSUC degree were available at $50.00 per unit (and this had been mentioned in the Ventura Learning Center letter), the degree
was needed in order to serve a whole category of people, especially women and minorities in dead-end positions who could not afford the $100.00+ per unit fees of the private university and who were not eligible for reimbursement from their employers.

With 86 individuals responding to the letters, and approximately 30 indicating immediate and definite personal interest, the decision to begin the degree was made.

Follow-up letters announcing the degree were then sent (March 17, 1976) to all those who had responded affirmatively, and to administrators who had responded on behalf of their staffs. Newspaper and radio publicity followed (beginning April 9--see Appendix B) and monthly counseling by CSU Northridge faculty was scheduled and publicized. (The publicity and counseling sessions usually resulted in a dozen or more new names each month.)

Brochures developed by the CSUC Consortium were also distributed throughout the two counties (Ventura and Santa Barbara), not only as inclusions in letters to target audiences but through the county library system, the College District, the community colleges, chambers of commerce, Superintendent of Schools offices, military bases, and the personnel and training departments of various county and county government agencies.

The Master of Public Administration degree program began in September 1976, with more than 40 students. A
second section was added in January 1977.

The introduction of the Master of Public Administration program, like other programs at the Center, involved a five-point promotion plan:

1. A special letter to all those on that specific degree's waiting list;

2. News release(s) to all county news media, including public media and controlled media (college and military newspapers, county government publications and house organs), with courtesy copies to county libraries, county personnel, college administrators, college counseling and veteran's departments, county Board of Supervisors, legislators, military career development officers, Superintendent of Schools, etc., and to a similar though smaller distribution list in Santa Barbara;

2a. Special radio broadcasts on KAAP radio (and other stations if requested);

3. The development and distribution of special promotional fliers to those on the waiting list, and others as outlined in (2) above. Fliers were also available for Learning Center walk-in traffic and telephone inquiries;

4. Regular course promotion in the Ventura Learning Center Schedule of Classes, distributed to approximately 4,000 on the master mailing list, twice annually;

4a. Regular course promotion in the sponsoring university's Schedule of Classes or Extension bulletin;
5. Follow-up telephone calls and/or letters and fliers to appropriate professional organizations or specific interest groups. For example, when the Business Administration courses were opened to new students, the finance directors, budget officers, fiscal officers and/or personnel managers of major county corporations and businesses were contacted by telephone and letter.

A sixth point—advertising—is sometimes used. However, in most cases, budget restrictions have necessitated advertising several degrees or courses per ad. The advertisement in Appendix B is a case in point.

**Analysis**

There is sometimes a temptation (on the part of the uninitiated at least) to think of the "public" as one large homogeneous mass, with similar interests and aspirations, and all susceptible to the same influences. And there are still those who would argue that publicity is the grand elixir or panacea for the problem of "getting the word out".

Print and broadcast publicity is, of course, critically important, as noted earlier in this chapter, but it must be supplemented by other communication efforts. Even if a news release is printed or broadcast verbatim (indeed, even if ads are purchased), the "buckshot" method of communication to a mass audience may not reach or penetrate certain audiences, and a "rifle" approach is needed. In many cases, more than one communication is needed to create a
distinct awareness, to say nothing of a response.

Just how important the rifle approach is in reaching various publics is indicated in a survey of Learning Center students taken in the Fall of 1975. It showed that 26.49% of the students heard of the Center through the news media; 22.98% through friends or word of mouth; 18.33% through fliers sent to their place of work (schools, hospitals, offices, etc.); 12.46% through UC or CSUC campuses (i.e., their bulletins, extension or regular class schedules, or faculty); and 8.06% through the local community colleges, either by counselor referrals, college newspaper articles, or Ventura Learning Center ads in class schedules. Another 11.73% heard of the Center through other channels of communication, such as the county library system, city personnel offices, speakers, Ventura College and/or county classes held at the Center, military education counselors, and so on.13

A similar survey of students was taken during the Fall of 1976 but, of the population of 604 students, only 62% responded, partly because many of the on-going students remembered having filled out the same questionnaire previously and thought it unnecessary to answer. Of the 378 responses, 28.93% heard of the Center through the news media (up 2.44% over the previous year); 29.87% through friends or word of mouth (up 6.89%); 11.94% through fliers sent to their place of work (down 6.39%); 9.74% through the local
community colleges (up 1.68%); 8.17% from the UC or CUSC campuses (down 4.29%); and 11.32% through other sources (down .41%).

**Communication with Potential Students**

It might seem redundant to single out "potential students" as one category of external publics, since they were obviously the major focus of all Learning Center efforts and, indeed, the Center's *raison d'être*. As already documented, because of the non-traditional nature of off-campus students, they were reached in some non-traditional ways, that is, through their employers, personnel officers at county and city offices, hospitals and military bases, as well as through the more traditional methods—newspaper and radio publicity, community colleges, brochures and so on.

But one major category of potential students, a public of prime importance to the Center both for its size and its vested interest, has not been dealt with, i.e., the students who responded to Learning Center or other communication who called and/or came in for counseling, whether for general counseling, preadmission counseling, academic advisement, financial counseling or for information on specific programs offered at the Center.

This large diversified group (which during the first six months averaged 136 per week) constitutes a major public of the Ventura Learning Center, and the importance of
appropriate communication in counseling at this point, cannot be over emphasized. Any effectiveness in previous communication in introducing the Learning Center or its programs to these potential students could be rendered ineffective at the counseling state, a real "change point" in their relationship to the Center.

As noted earlier, generally the Center staff give daily (10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.) general counseling on all programs offered at the Learning Center (but to a lesser degree UCSB programs, since UCSB has a counselor and secretary in residence at the Center), plus some guidance on financial counseling (such as the availability of Law Enforcement Education Programs funds and fee waivers) and pre admission counseling. They then channel potential (qualified) students to one or more possible programs at the Center or elsewhere. This system has worked extremely well.

If, for example, a student is qualified for both a Master of Public Administration program or an MA in Environmental Planning, and has a fairly accurate view of each degree's requirements and potential but still can't decide which program to enter, (s)he is referred by the Center staff to a counselor in each program for further counseling. The potential student may then telephone the counselor, or come in for the next scheduled counseling session by that counselor at the Ventura Learning Center.

The telexcopyer service between the Learning Center and
CSU Northridge is another example of excellent communication in counseling (see page 63). A student considering UCSB's Social Science degree and CSUN's Sociology degree can get almost immediate feedback from both the UCSB counselor at the Center and the CSUN Admissions office, via the telecopier.

Academic counseling at the Center by campus faculty has been a boon to the Learning Center. Apart from the significant service it can provide to potential students, it gives the Ventura Learning Center a "peg" to hang a news story on (i.e., publicity about the counseling dates and the degree); it gives a degree of status to the Center which has no faculty of its own; it provides an advance glimpse or profile of the student body to the campus counselor or coordinator; and it gives the Center staff (one of whom tries to sit in on each counseling session) better insight into each program being offered at the Center.

Academic counseling at the Center has, however, had its flaws. On occasion, counselors from campus have arrived late, left early, taken an unscheduled hour or two for dinner break and, on three occasions, failed to show altogether. But these are rare exceptions.

The quality of counseling is not something that can be dismissed lightly however. The non-traditional student, though no better or more deserving than his/her counterpart on campus, often is at a disadvantage in that (s)he does not
have access to regular counseling or services on campus. Frequently, in order to be counseled, (s)he must, depending on his/her full time job or family duties, leave work or home (and sometimes a responsible position), arrange to take time off and/or possibly work through lunch hour in order to do so, and/or hire a babysitter, and sometimes even arrange for transportation in an area where buses quit running at 6:00 p.m.

Generally, the Ventura Learning Center has enjoyed superlative counseling from participating campuses. Campus faculty have come to the Center when requested by Center staff, have allowed plenty of lead time for publicity and promotion, have adapted without complaint to the confusion of working in a small lobby or cubicle with students from four or five different campuses milling about them, and have waited beyond the publicized counseling hours for students driving in from distances. On one occasion, Center staff observed three academic counselors from three different campuses informally counseling one student, without the slightest trace of proselytism but only the student's interest in mind. (The student had an appointment with one counselor, who called in the others for additional information and options.)

Ventura Learning Center students have also been fortunate in that their campus counselors often survey their current student body (and sometimes incoming students)
regarding convenient scheduling of classes.

Analysis

It is significant that many of the non-traditional (potential) students have been away from school for a period of time, during which they may have lost confidence in their academic ability or have feelings of inadequacy or insecurity, although they are, in fact, mature, capable and knowledgeable human beings in their own right. Many of them are men who have already put sons and daughters through college and feel "it's my turn now", or are women and minorities in dead-end positions, and very much part of the non-traditional body for whom off-campus programs were designed.

Given these circumstances, the importance of communication in counseling by caring, compassionate, sensitive, accessible and friendly counselors comes into sharper focus.

The Ventura Learning Center has been fortunate in having, for the most part, such counselors who, if not initially at least ultimately, appreciate the nature and circumstances of the non-traditional student.
Footnotes to Chapter IV

1 The low profile was almost overdone. There was no road sign to the Center, no building sign anywhere near or on it, and even the first door sign (UC Learning Center) was incorrect. For two months after it opened, the staff had no letterhead, no calling cards, to say nothing of postage, photocopier or even a dictionary. Nor was there a title for the consultant, who was referred to by the media alternately as consultant, spokesperson, spokesman, or the Center's other administrator. She finally used the title "Student and Public Relations" in an attempt to show some degree of stability and consistency. The Ventura Learning Center staff did score one early victory, however, in its search for identity. First attempts to obtain UC and CSUC seals met with frustration until each segment was told the other's would be used. The Center received the use of both seals!

2 Actually, the Center could be a forerunner of a four-year campus. The precedent had already been set. The Modesto Center, operated by San Francisco State College, later served as a nucleus for CSC Stanislaus; Santa Rosa Center became the nucleus for CSC Sonoma; Bakersfield became CSC Bakersfield.

3 Many have questioned the appropriateness of the name of the Ventura Learning Center. It was confused with learning centers for the developmentally handicapped and mentally retarded, the speech and hearing impaired, as well as learning resource centers and other learning centers on various campuses. (Ventura College alone has several learning centers.) The Ventura Learning Center was also thought to be an Extension Learning Center, and staff spent considerable time, as a courtesy, referring people to appropriate University Extension offices or searching for information required. Perhaps a more imaginative name (such a Multiversity, Omniperson or Communiversity) would have been an asset.

4 The question of the lack of budget for promotion and advertising was a moot one, but at least three factors contributed to its omission. On the one hand, the Learning Center had no precedent to follow, and it was simply overlooked by some administrators. On the other hand, some felt
that because there was no four-year public university in the county, the classrooms would automatically fill up. Another reason was the fact that the Learning Center materialized only during the last nine months of a three-year pilot project, and higher priorities (of site location, inter-segmental cooperation, degree planning and staffing) preempted any planning for promotion budgets.

5 Ventura County (Calif.) Star-Free Press, 8 December 1974, page B10.

6 Actually, the reporter had taken no notes during the interview at the Center, but had "reconstructed" the interview in his car after leaving.

7 There was one two-month exception. One reporter who had regularly printed Ventura Learning Center material asked for special treatment six hours prior to the special news conference regarding the future of the Learning Center on July 31, 1975. The request was turned down, in consideration of the other news media who were waiting for the conference. As a result, subsequent Learning Center stories to that paper were often delayed by a week or two, with notices of counseling dates, for example, sometimes appearing on the actual date of the event.

8 The lack of guidelines was particularly evident in the first printed schedule of classes, as noted earlier (page 51).

9 This difficulty in building credibility with administrators and officials in local education institutions cannot be overlooked, especially since they constituted an important "public" of the Ventura Learning Center. The Center started at ground zero. Initially, for example, the question was raised repeatedly as to the qualifications of the Director, who ultimately growing tired of the question simply replied, "Beats the hell out of me," and the questions stopped. As noted earlier, one education official was quoted as saying the Ventura Learning Center couldn't be very important if run by a woman. On another occasion at a public meeting, the semi-confidential remark of a College Trustee who spoke of a woman educator in the county as "having her tits in a wringer" was overheard by more than one person and did nothing to improve communication with the Center staff.
The Ventura County government as a whole, like the College District, has been criticized by affirmative action groups for its low ratio of women in management positions. The county government has approximately 4,500 employees in about 25 departments. There are three women in management positions. Efforts to organize a Commission on the Status of Women have failed.

10 This estimate was initially made when the Ventura Learning Center staff noted that most teachers coming in to the Center for pre-enrollment and academic counseling carried and referred to the pink ECE flier sent to them at their school. The estimate was later substantiated by the Ventura Learning Center Student Profile Survey taken in 1975 when, of 73 teachers responding to the questionnaire, 38 teachers said they heard of the program through fliers sent to their school, 10 through newspaper articles or ads, and 25 through friends or co-workers.

11 It was also under a political microscope at the state level. There was still the question of the need for a fourth segment, or whether the first and second segments could meet the changing needs of students through such alternatives as the Ventura Learning Center. There was also the question of the necessity for a public, four-year college in Ventura County, or whether higher education needs could be met by the Center. And the Learning Center provided a very real, practical look at innovative forms of post-secondary education, and an outstanding (and only) visible sign of cooperation between the UC and CSUC segments.

12 Countless Learning Center students, impressed by the scope and nature of the Ventura Learning Center, have asked the Center staff why there has been no publicity on the Center, and have expressed great surprise when shown dozens and dozens of articles and ads on the Center. When pressed further about their past awareness of the Center, many admit a vague remembrance of having heard something about the Center (usually, "when you were having all those budget problems"); but then add, "but it didn't mean anything to me then".

13 For this survey, an attempt was made to reach the total population (508 students) of the Ventura Learning Center, but this was not possible, due to absentees, incomplete answers, no response, etc. However, 409 questionnaires
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(80%) were returned and were included in the tabulation.
CHAPTER V

...if the mass media are not as all-powerful as was originally imagined, the problem of understanding the furious rate at which new ideas and behavior travel through society still remains.

- Elihu Katz, Martin L. Levin and Herbert Hamilton

Communication Models

The models in this chapter are presented not so much to clarify any of the previously mentioned communication patters at the Ventura Learning Center but to provide theorists and practitioners with methodologies for organizing their communication structures in a similar situation. In discussing these models, reference, however, will be made to communication problems and solutions experienced at the Center. A time-frame schema for introduction of a degree program also will be included.

One model that lends itself to a Learning Center's (or other organization's) external communication patterns is the interpersonal communications model developed by Theodore M. Newcomb¹ and adapted to mass communication by David M. White.²
Figure 1. The Newcomb-White interpersonal-mass communication model, in which A selects messages from multiple Xs to send on to B through C which, for the purposes of this study, will be considered of major importance for its gatekeeping role.

In this model, A could represent the Ventura Learning Center, C the Channels or key communicators or gatekeepers through which messages (X' and X'') are transmitted to B, a specific public or Bs, many publics. The x1, x2, x∞ represent input from the university segments and campuses. For purposes of illustration, let us apply this model to an effort on the part of the Learning Center to communicate with all Early Childhood Education teachers in the county, in order to interest them in a new degree program (a Master's degree in Early Childhood Education) to be introduced at the Center. Let us further assume that A (the Center), having negotiated with both university systems and campuses (x3 and x6) attempts to send messages (M) in the form of letters, news releases, telephone calls, brochures and other materials to the largest possible number of teachers in the county (Bs).

Although a model is normally a conceptual framework,
Figure 2.

Key:
A - VLC
B - ECE Teachers
C - Channels (some possible ones)
N - Noise
xs - The University Segments and Campuses
M - Messages
----- dotted lines - feedback
_____ solid lines - purposive communication
----- wavy lines - non-purposive communication
let us, for heuristic purposes, insert within this framework some of the actual realities of the situation.

In this paradigm (Figure 2), it is evident that all messages from A to B do not pass through all possible Cs. Nor is it always necessary or even practical that they do. To communicate with B (teachers) for example, A would select the most appropriate channels—in this case, the county Superintendent of Schools office because of its frequent and direct communication with identifiable individuals constituting almost the entire universe of ECE teachers in the county. Another significant channel would be the news media, which would reach a larger but more dispersed audience. Still other Cs would include all libraries in the county (on the assumption that teachers are frequent users of libraries and might pick up and read Learning Center brochures), professional teachers' organizations, the Ventura Learning Center's own mailing lists of teachers seeking credentials or degrees, and the Center's schedule of classes which is distributed widely throughout (and to a degree, beyond) the county. Some other Cs regularly utilized by the Center would not be involved in this instance, for example, city personnel offices and major businesses because they are not usually in communication with teachers.

However, in this paradigm, another element has been added because of the possibility of noise or filters (N) between AC and CB (and XA), which may result in biased,
If, for example, C as the key channel(s) or gatekeeper(s), whether a person, group, institution or newspaper, is detrimental to effective communication to B, it becomes apparent that A must

1. by-pass certain Cs, or

2. select and/or develop other Cs.

The model therefore, unlike the Newcomb-White model, needs to indicate the possibility of direct communication from A to B, such as through a direct mail approach, a telephone conversation, or a speech to a selected audience, without an intermediary or channel or gatekeeper.

A major determinant in choosing the by-pass (A→B) option as opposed to the A→C→B is that the Bs or receivers must be individually identifiable or collectively available or accessible. This might necessitate the initial cooperation of a C or gatekeeper. This by-pass method can be ideal in terms of minimal distortion and greater (and frequently clearer) feedback, but it is not always attainable because of the difficulty in identifying significant segments of Bs, and the time involved in doing so.

The selection and/or development of alternate Cs in another viable option. Again, to use the ECE situation, the primary or key channel (C) was the county Superintendent of Schools office, because of its direct and frequent
communication with nearly all teachers in the county. When blockage occurred in the key channel (C), an alternate gatekeeper (person) in the same channel (office) was selected, and the A→C→B communication was facilitated. (See page 96.) If, however, no other significant gatekeeper in the same channel is available, an alternate channel or channels must be selected or developed. It should be noted that if the blocked channel is a highly significant one, several alternate channels may be necessary. It is also possible that alternate Cs may not be effective.

The selection of alternate channels will be contingent upon several factors—among them, cost, availability, time element, relationships to Bs, significance of and relevance to subject message and sphere of influence.

It would be a mistake to select alternate channels only after a blockage has occurred. The pinpointing and use of multiple channels is inherent in the initial planning of any communication system. For example, in the case of the Home Economics program which was introduced at the Learning Center in January 1977, (see page 85) the initial lack of publicity in the Ventura County Star-Free Press (C blockage) regarding counseling was not evident until about 24 hours before the counseling day. However, the previous selection of other channels, such as professional Home Economics organizations, and the use of a by-pass method (direct mail to all Home Economic teachers in the community college
district) compensated for the disrupted communication in one major media. The direct mail approach was possible because the Ventura Learning Center had a list of all community college teachers, by discipline (as published in the annual Public Schools Directory).

The development of new Cs, because it usually involves interpersonal communications and relationships, can be extremely time-consuming and, for this reason, must be an early and on-going communication priority.

**Marketing**

The Newcomb-White interpersonal communications model might also be adapted, with several modifications, to the market research efforts of a learning center which attempts to base its programming on community needs.

However, to indicate the importance of audience analysis, B will be subdivided into a series of Bs which represent various publics in the mass audience, and some BTAs which signify target audiences or markets. The model appears as Figure 3 on the following page.

This model will suggest the value of choosing selected channels to communicate with target audiences (markets) as opposed to dispersed or indirect communication to mass audiences as, for example, through the mass media (C4). While both general and selected channels are useful, the selective method is subject to less disruption and entropy from noise or filters because it is more purposive in
Figure 3. An Adaptation of the Newcomb-White model in Market Research

Key:
- A - the VLC
- B - the mass audience
- BTAs - target market(s)
- C - channel(s)
- N - noise

--- Solid line - direct communication
----- Dotted line - feedback
----- Wavy line - indirect or mediated communication
nature. If may also be less prone to total blockage by certain Cs or gatekeepers. (For this reason, the above figure shows fewer communication lines from C to B than from A to C.)

In many cases, the greater the number of BTAs the greater the number of Cs from which to choose.

For purposes of illustration, let us assume that the Ventura Learning Center or other learning center wishes to test the need for a Master's degree in Environmental Planning. By pinpointing the target audiences (BTAs), the selection of channels will usually be facilitated, as evidenced by the graphic application of the model, Figure 4, on the following page.

This graphic application of the model shows the multiplicity of channels available to reach various target audiences. However, it is not always immediately evident which audiences and/or channels are appropriate for certain degrees. At such times, the specific campus department or faculty can be of major assistance in pinpointing both target markets and channels of communication to them. Other resources are professional organizations which can identify local chapter affiliations and officers, and members of the involved or related disciplines. Initiative in seeking out these resources is the responsibility of the person(s) doing the market research.

One other salient point should be made with regard to
Figure 4. A graphic application of the Newcomb-White model.
a learning center's market research efforts. Frequently, feedback from an agency or group will indicate that "several" or "numerous" or even a specific number of individuals are interested in the proposed degree. Some caution should be exercised at this point by Center staff in determining actual headcount. Such feedback, while helpful, usually must be revised downwards from 30 to 50 percent. Sometimes, for example, staff members of an agency will indicate an interest in a program partly to please their supervisors, or partly from peer pressure or enthusiasm, or for other reasons. Preferable and more reliable feedback usually results when the individuals themselves take the trouble to contact the Learning Center (that is, B→A, bypassing C) at which point the Center staff member can have the opportunity to judge, personally, the potential student's keenness, qualifications, goals and purpose in a face-to-face situation.

Another model that lends itself to a learning center's communication pattern is the B-P-E Model (Behavior is the result of the Person and the Environment) as described by Hunt and Sullivan in their book, Between Psychology and Education, and brought to this writer's attention by Dr. Maria Maginnis, Professor of Educational Psychology at CSU Northridge. Although the B-P-E model is used by Hunt and Sullivan in the educational psychology milieu, it can be adapted to a communication model by changing the Person...
to Public(s).

The usefulness of the model in communication is in its requirement that the communicator analyze his/her audiences individually to determine the behavior required of them, and then establish an environment or action that will encourage or elicit that required behavior. In the example, Figure 5, on the following page, the Behavior and Environment categories are not limited to the examples suggested.

This B-P-E model is fairly general, but can be translated into more specific paradigms. Communication with the community college district, for example, could be charted as it appears in Figure 6.

In the model, the communicator (or Learning Center staff member), by examining his/her publics (audience analysis) and determining the kind of support or behavior required of the public(s), can then establish an appropriate environment. The environment may include a climate of trust, friendliness, hospitable surroundings, involvement in decision making, open, two-way communication and cooperation.

A Time-Frame Schema for Introduction of a Degree Program

Whether or not a Learning Center bases its programming on community educational needs, it is of critical importance to schedule sufficient time for various phases of degree planning and introduction. The major steps (market research, negotiation with systems and campuses, promotion,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public(s)</th>
<th>Behavior Required</th>
<th>Environment/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting faculty</td>
<td>Willingness to teach off campus</td>
<td>Hospitable welcome; tour of facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>Awareness of Center; student referrals</td>
<td>Cooperation; frequent communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>Cooperation; support systems</td>
<td>Information-sharing; involvement in Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Colleges</td>
<td>Cooperation; referrals</td>
<td>Invitations to Center; referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials</td>
<td>Awareness; public support</td>
<td>Personal visits; shared communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's groups</td>
<td>Awareness; public support</td>
<td>Personal visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>Awareness of new opportunities</td>
<td>Evidence of commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Media</td>
<td>Receptiveness; support; coverage</td>
<td>Openness; availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Students</td>
<td>Involvement and support</td>
<td>Warm learning environment; evidence of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Students</td>
<td>Awareness of programs</td>
<td>Friendly caring; counseling sessions; student-directed concern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. An adaptation of the B-P-E model in which the communicator can determine the most appropriate environment for the behavior required.
**Figure 6.** An adaptation of the B-P-E model. The lists are illustrative, not definitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Environment/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy support</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Information-sharing; Frequent, open communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals to the Center</td>
<td>Counseling Department</td>
<td>Regular updating of information; Invitations to Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of Information</td>
<td>Veterans' Department</td>
<td>Cooperation; Two-way communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input regarding needed programs</td>
<td>Various Department Heads</td>
<td>Involvement in decisions regarding student needs on programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
orientation of counselors, counseling and evaluation) should all follow a definite pattern as illustrated in Figure 7.

In this time-frame schema, steps 2 and 3, which are conducted almost simultaneously, are major change points in programming. Negative responses in either (for example, the unavailability, for whatever reason, of the program from campus or the lack of need for the degree in the community) would terminate at least temporarily, programming for that degree.

Note that if a decision to begin a new degree program is made in April or May of Year Two, as is sometimes the case, the components are drastically telescoped in time, with possible detrimental results.
**PROPOSED TIME-FRAME SCHEMA FOR INTRODUCTION OF DEGREE PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Market Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Market Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Educ. Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of Dept. Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. A suggested time-frame schema for a degree scheduled for Fall semester introduction.

Key: Solid lines indicate concentrated efforts. Broken lines indicate intermittent efforts.
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CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Inaccessible services are not services at all.
- Michael Scriven

This study, an institutional case study with methodology based on participant observation, a search of literature and records and approximately 40 interviews, has attempted to describe and analyze the role of external communication in the development of the UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center. The study has been qualitative, not quantitative, in nature.

Significance of Findings

Research has found that though there is considerable support for public off-campus education in California and numerous recommendations for increased public information and communication efforts to explain this relatively new concept, there is, in fact, not only little methodology available to accomplish these communication goals but a singular lack of provision for carrying them out.

While it is true that a public affairs practitioner might recommend such basic practices and essentials as, for example, a budget for public information and promotion, and the forming of a public relations or communications
committee for any new Center, history and research demonstrate that such basic practices were either not done, done late, or done inadequately, with subsequent detrimental though not fatal implications.

Research also verifies empirical findings that showed a major change in attitude toward the Learning Center after visits to the Center by high-ranking dignitaries of the UC and CSUC. The initial lack of response by some news media and some community officials was almost totally offset by this major event. For this reason, high priority should be given to a similar public event, attended by high-ranking officials of the parent institution, early in the life of any future center.

The history and analysis of the Center's communication with the Ventura County Star-Free Press point to a significant recommendation of this study regarding press relationships; namely, that an institution (or its spokesperson) not admonish a reporter even for a blatantly incorrect story unless the inaccuracies are of such consequences as to seriously jeopardize the institution concerned. In the judgment of the writer, such inaccuracies, however serious, can be corrected ultimately by explication and example without the risk of offending or otherwise alienating a reporter.

The prominent role of the gatekeeper in the communication process is, of course, not new to this study, and
merely identifying some (methods of identifying) gatekeepers does not, in itself, hold major significance. However, an analysis of feedback from two surveys of students conducted by the Ventura Learning Center offers some salient insights regarding the effectiveness of alternate gatekeepers or of by-passing gatekeepers when regular major channels (such as the news media) are blocked. The above-mentioned surveys revealed that more people (in this case, attending students) responded to direct mail (fliers sent to their place of work, homes or schools) and friends than to announcements in the news media. This is not to deprecate the value of communication through the news media and its influence on a mass audience or its role in the information process, but rather to emphasize the value of the "rifle" approach of direct communication (by-passing gatekeepers) to and with a target audience.

This rifle approach was instrumental in the successful launching of most of the degrees at the Center, notably Home Economics, Environmental Studies, Public Administration, Sociology/Counseling, Vocational Education, Early Childhood Education, Mass Communication, Nursing and Business Administration.

Another finding of this study is germane to an analysis of the role of communication in the launching of any future learning center, because of the increased attempts by some universities and colleges, both public and private,
to reach non-traditional students. Research shows that though several market surveys have been undertaken by or on behalf of California institutions of higher education (notably the Siroky Report and a series by the CPEC), a major deficiency of such reports is that the economically and educationally disenfranchised are not well represented in the findings. While such market surveys are usually larger and more elaborate than one single learning center can afford, a concomitant principle manifests itself in the marketing and promotion of degrees by a learning center, for minorities and others. It should not be assumed that communication through the traditional media (notably newspapers and radio and/or television) will reach the non-traditional student who, at the age of thirty, forty or fifty, may have a full-time job or family responsibilities that preclude thoughts of returning to school; or who is a member of a minority group and is not "tuned in" to newspaper advertisements regarding educational opportunities hitherto unavailable or inaccessible; or who presumes degrees are synonymous with "on-campus" education and therefore impossible to attain. Alternate channels of communication to the non-traditional student, such as through their employers, at their place of work, through their own organizations and through their own media must be identified and/or developed.

Similarly, emphasis should be placed on the
orientation of counselors who deal with the non-traditional student. The verbal and non-verbal communication of a counselor unfamiliar with the older, more mature, fully-employed potential student who has been out of touch with academic life for 20 years or more, can be a decisive factor in that student's determination to return to school and, indeed, in his or her whole self-image.

Few will argue that communication plays a vital role in any organization's or institution's endeavors. The problem of who communicates what to whom, when, and in what manner or through which channels is difficult and complicated even under propitious circumstances. In an innovative institution with a multiplicity of messages, senders, receivers, and noise (see models on pages 124 and 129) the role of communication assumes even greater importance in the ultimate success or failure of that institution.

The Ventura Learning Center has served as an example of just such a multi-faceted, unprecedented endeavor, and has offered a laboratory for the study of communication. While many vital areas of communication were not dealt with in this study (e.g., internal negotiations with the parent segments, and the whole realm of classroom instruction, to name but two) an overview of some major patterns of external communication has been described. Through these descriptions, this study has documented a major change in the perceived role and function of communication at the Center--a
function that originally, to a large degree, was overlooked and therefore unfunded, but which assumed ever-increasing importance with each passing month.

The most significant factor in the growth and development of the Ventura Learning Center has been the concept and practice of community involvement—involved not merely made possible, but actually given the highest priority through concerted efforts to develop multiple channels for communication (feedback) from the community, as well as to it.

This emphasis on the role of communication has been the major key to the success of the Ventura Learning Center.
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APPENDIX A

SELECTED EXAMPLES OF VENTURA LEARNING CENTER NEWS AND FEATURE RELEASES
VENTURA, Ca.--What is innovative, flexible, tailor-made for individuals, 1000 miles in length, and available in Ventura?

An increasing number of people in Ventura county not only know the answer but are beginning to take advantage of it.

It is the new Consortium of the California State University and Colleges, a state-wide system of higher education that offers a new dimension of off-campus degree earning opportunities to Californians. It is now available locally for those interested in pursuing a Bachelor of Arts degree in Business Administration.

The new dimension of the program that distinguishes it from regular on-campus instruction, is its uniquely flexible approach to learning. Students may learn the course material on their own time, in their own way, at their own rate. Scheduled meetings with an instructor or mentor will provide feedback, direction and evaluation of academic efforts.

A second major feature of the Consortium distinguishing it from other campus-sponsored external degree programs is that students are not limited to classes on one
particular campus. Since the program is a coordinated effort supported by the entire California State University and Colleges system, any appropriate class on any participating campus can be a possible source of direction and instruction, whether the student lives near the campus or not.

This makes it particularly ideal in Ventura, in view of the number of campuses offering courses at the UC/CSUC Learning Center. For example, a full schedule of CSU Northridge Extension Classes may be used to satisfy requirements for the Consortium degree. In addition, students may take courses outside the CSUC system (i.e. courses from UC Santa Barbara and/or UC Riverside) but such courses must be approved in advance by their academic advisor.

Students who have not completed their lower division requirements may take them at Ventura Community College.

The flexibility of the "1,000 mile campus" (so called because CSUC's 19 campuses are interspersed throughout California from Humboldt and Chico to San Diego and the Imperial Valley) makes available a number of learning alternatives from which students may choose those most suitable to their needs.

Those interested in enrolling in the Business Administration External Degree program in the Ventura-Oxnard area, are invited to visit the Ventura Learning Center on March 20th between 3pm and 8pm for free counselling from
Miss Phyllis London, Coordinator of the Business Administration program. Additional information is available from the Learning Center at 644-7261 or 647-3606.
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FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
July 31, 1975

The UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center is alive and well!

The fact that additional funding of the Center for the 1975-76 academic year would be forthcoming was reported today by Dr. Patrick Healey, Assistant to the Academic Vice President of the University of California in Berkeley.

The future of the Ventura Learning Center was in jeopardy for several months after Governor Brown "blue pencilled" the entire Center budget from the State budget. However, the University of California and the California State University and Colleges will divert funds from other sources in the systems to meet the needs of off-campus students in Ventura County.

All programs now underway at the Learning Center are being continued, and one new one, a Master of Science degree in Environmental Studies, is being introduced.

There is still time for students to be admitted into Fall programs. The staff at the Learning Center will assist students who have completed their first two years of college work with application procedures and counseling for all programs.

The fall quarter and semester schedule of classes and
degree programs will be mailed out in approximately two weeks. Those wishing to be added to the mailing list should call the Center.
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A Master of Science degree in Environmental Studies will be offered at the UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center, beginning in September.

The degree will be brought to Ventura by the California State College, Dominguez Hills, in cooperation with the statewide Consortium of the California State University and College system.

The program is designed to prepare students with a broad overview of environmental problems and processes and is ideal for city and county planners, developers, loan officers, industrial planners, engineers, architects, conservationists, environmentalists and anyone concerned with environmental impact reports.

Anyone interested in the new degree should plan to attend free pre-enrollment counseling at the Ventura Learning Center, 3585 Maple Street, Suite 112, on August 25 or September 22, between 4 pm and 8 pm, or call 644-7261 or 647-3606 for further information.
Getting a Degree Without a Campus

VENTURA—Just a few months ago, Ventura College students learned the fact that their famous campus near their homes is history. The college was forced to close its doors due to economic problems.

"With a six-month grant from Ventura environmental agency, a group of Ventura College students and faculty members have started a new initiative," the students said. "We are exploring different ways to continue education in our community, even without our main campus," they added.

Despite the loss of their physical campus, the students have found creative solutions to continue their education. They have started online courses, and some have even set up temporary classrooms in local community centers.

"We are dedicated to providing an excellent education for our students," said one of the students. "Even without a physical campus, we can still provide quality education and support to our students," he added.

The Ventura College students are not alone in their efforts. Other institutions have also been forced to adapt to the changing landscape of education. Some have moved entirely online, while others have set up temporary facilities in local community centers.

"We are proud of our students and the adaptability they have shown," said the Ventura College president. "We will continue to innovate and find ways to provide education to our students," he added.

The Ventura College students are just one example of how institutions are adapting to the changing landscape of education. As the world continues to evolve, it is clear that innovation and creativity will be key to providing quality education for all.

APPENDIX B

SELECTED LETTERS, FLIERS, NEWS RELEASES AND ADVERTISEMENTS USED TO MARKET AND PROMOTE NEW DEGREE PROGRAMS AT THE VENTURA LEARNING CENTER
Dear Friend:

As you know, the Ventura Learning Center, which is jointly sponsored by the University of California and the California State University and Colleges is dedicated to the concept of bringing to Ventura County, the degree programs most frequently sought by its residents.

This letter is being written to all who have expressed interest in a Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.) degree, and to those in the public and private sector who would be interested in such a program themselves, or have staff members who would be. The California State University system has an M.P.A. program which we would be happy to attempt to bring to Ventura, if there is sufficient student interest to warrant doing so.

The M.P.A. program would be designed for practicing public administrators. It would offer an educational experience suited to the public administrator's experience, knowledge, and time commitments. The complete degree would be brought to Ventura; students taking two courses per semester would be able to complete all classwork in 2 1/2 years. (Credit could be granted toward the M.P.A. degree for up to three relevant graduate courses taken prior to admission to this program.)

Before we make any attempt to bring this degree to Ventura, however, we would like your candid opinion. Do you feel an M.P.A. degree is needed in Ventura? Would you be seriously interested in such a program? Does your company have funds available for reimbursement of job-related education? (I expect the cost of the degree would be approximately $50.00 per unit.)

Please write, call, or visit the Ventura Learning Center, if an M.P.A. degree interests you or other people on your staff or if you'd like additional information. We need to hear from you before we make a decision to bring the degree.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Joyce M. Kennedy
Assistant Director
March 17, 1976

Dear Friend,

In recent weeks I have corresponded with many of you in the public and private sector regarding your interest and/or recommendation in bringing a Masters degree in Public Administration (M.P.A.) to Ventura. I am happy to report back to you now, with the news that a great many have expressed a very strong interest in such a degree!

Since 1974, the California State University system has been offering an M.P.A. degree throughout the state of California. Now, thanks to your favorable response to our inquiries, California State University, Northridge, in cooperation with the Consortium of the California State University and Colleges, will bring an M.P.A. degree to Ventura, beginning this Fall (i.e. September 1976).

The 30-unit degree is designed for a broad spectrum of people interested in various aspects of public service and public administration. Fees for courses will be approximately $50.00 per semester unit. Credit may be granted toward the M.P.A. degree for three relevant graduate courses taken prior to admission to this program.

Because of your interest in this program, a free pre-enrollment counselling session has been scheduled at the Ventura Learning Center, 3585 Maple Street, Suite 112, Ventura, on Tuesday, March 30th, from 4 to 8pm. Additional information is available by calling the Learning Center at 644-7251 or 647-3606.

As you know, the Learning Center tries to respond to the educational needs of the community. Your input helped make this degree possible.

Yours sincerely,

Joyce M. Kennedy
Assistant Director
M.P.A. PROGRAM TO ADMIT NEW STUDENTS

Free counseling and advisement for men and women interested in obtaining a Master's degree in Public Administration (M.P.A.) will be available at the Ventura Learning Center, 3585 Maple Street, Suite 112, Ventura, on Monday, November 22, from 4 to 8 pm.

Because of the popularity of the degree, new students will be accepted into a second section of the program, which is being offered by California State University, Northridge, and the statewide Consortium.

The 30-unit degree is designed for a broad range of people who are interested in various aspects of public service and public administration. The entire degree will be brought to Ventura.

Admission requirements include a Bachelor of Arts or Science degree from an accredited institution, a grade point average of 2.5 or higher on the last 60 transferable units attempted, and some experience in public service or administration.

A second counseling session has been scheduled for
December 20th, from 4 to 8 pm, for those unable to make the first session.

Further information is available from the Ventura Learning Center at 644-7261 or 747-3606.
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Dear Friend,

Are you working with young children and their parents in a nursery school, elementary school, children's center, day care, or clinic setting?

Are you interested in graduate study which leads to an MA degree in Early Childhood Education or a Specialist Credential in Early Childhood Education?

Would a practically-oriented "hands-on" degree appeal to you?

Would you be interested in a program that accepts prior learning as a partial fulfillment of requirements toward a specialist credential or a Master of Arts degree?

Would you be interested in innovative, non-traditional, and creative modes of learning and techniques of teaching?

If you answer Yes to any of the above questions, you may be interested in a new program that will be brought to Ventura if there is sufficient interest in the community to warrant doing so.

It is a Master of Arts and/or Specialist Credential in Early Childhood Education -- an External Degree program brought by the Consortium of the California State University and Colleges, and California State University, Northridge.

All classes would be given at the Ventura Learning Center.

Units Required for the Degree -- 30 semester units
(Students seeking only the specialist credential in Early Childhood Education must complete the core courses and the internship for a total of 24 units.)

Eligibility Requirements (for admission to the degree program)
1. A BA or BS degree from an accredited institution
2. A valid California teaching credential
3. A grade point average of 2.5 or higher on the last 60 transferable semester units attempted.

Note: Students who do not qualify for admission to the program may enroll in individual courses through Extension, on a "space available" basis.

Free Pre-Enrollment Counseling   Monday, September 15, 4 to 7 pm
                                    Monday, September 22, 4 to 7 pm

Fees: $38.00 per unit. Fee waivers are possible in some cases.

Classes begin Monday, October 6th, at 4 pm.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, WRITE, CALL, OR VISIT THE UC/CSUC VENTURA LEARNING CENTER
3585 MAPLE STREET, SUITE 112, VENTURA, CA 93003   TELEPHONE 647-3606 or 644-7261
WANT TO PUT A LITTLE "CLASS" IN YOUR NIGHT LIFE?

If you have 56 transferable college units
WHY NOT ATTEND CLASSES AT THE

UC/CSUC VENTURA LEARNING CENTER
3585 Maple Street, Suite 112, Ventura (805)644-7261 or 647-3606

There are more than 500 degree-oriented students (from Ventura, Oxnard, Ojai, Camarillo, Thousand Oaks, Santa Paula, Port Hueneme, Simi, Goleta, Santa Barbara and beyond) now taking 3rd, 4th and 5th year classes from one of six different campuses of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges at the Ventura Learning Center.

The Learning Center is NOT an Extension Center. It is, rather, the closest thing we have to a four-year UC or "Cal State Ventura".

So, if a Bachelor's or Master's degree on a part-time basis is what you want, send in the coupon below for a free brochure on the 15 degree programs now being offered at the Center.

And remember, the Center is unique in more ways than one. If we don't have the degree you want, we'll attempt to bring it here, when we have sufficient community interest in it.

We bring the campus, the classes, the counseling and the professors to you.

Take advantage of our efforts. Start by sending in the coupon below. Or just call us (644-7261 or 647-3606).

We listen.

Degrees or Courses Offered
- Environmental Planning
- Elementary Education
- Sociology
- Counseling & Guidance
- Accounting
- Early Childhood Education
- Computer Science
- Reading Specialist
- Nursing
- California Local Politics
- Social Science
- Vocational Education
- Business Administration
- Electrical Engineering
- Public Administration
- Law & Society
- History

Coming in 1977
- Home Economics
- Engineering Technology
- Health Science
- Recreation and Leisure Studies

To the: UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center
3585 Maple Street; Suite 112
Ventura, Calif. 93003

Please send me more information.
I'm especially interested in
at the bachelor's/master's (circle one) level

Name ________________________________
Address ________________________________
City ___________ Zip ___________
Phone ________________________________
INTERESTED IN DEGREE COURSES BUT NOT A TOTAL DEGREE?

Although the Ventura Learning Center is dedicated to bringing total degree programs to the community, the following upper division and graduate courses from California State University, Northridge, can accommodate a limited number of individual enrollments.

496J HITLER'S GERMANY. An inquiry into the man and the nation as elements in the story of German Fascism. Dr. Helmut Haeussler, Professor of History. Mondays, 4-7 pm beginning February 2nd.

E.Ed 441 TEACHING CHILDREN TO MEASURE. A course to prepare teachers and others for the changeover to metric measurement. Dr. Linda Jones, Professor of Elementary Education. Wednesdays, 4-7 pm beginning February 4.

Ed P 505 ADVANCED PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS. Thinking-learning process. Learning theories. Individual differences. Dr. Maria Maginnis, Professor of Educational Psychology. Wednesdays, 7-10 pm beginning February 4.

Tuition: $30.00 per unit through CSU Northridge Extension.
Registration: First night of class

UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center
3385 Maple Street, Suite 112
Ventura, Ca 93003
Phone 644-7261 or 647-3606
ANNOUNCING CAL STATE COURSES AT
UC/CSUC VENTURA LEARNING CENTER

... for those who think they can't afford a college degree
... for those who simply can't face the prospect of long
distance commutes to campus
... for those who cannot relocate near a college
... for those who want to work toward a degree, part-time
... for those who have 56 transferable semester units

COURSES LEADING TOWARD A CALIFORNIA STATE
UNIVERSITY NORTHRIDGE DEGREE
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration
Bachelor of Science in Recreation & Leisure Studies
Bachelor of Arts in Sociology (Counseling)

Each program features
✓ on campus rates — i.e. two courses (6 semester units)
  for $80.00
✓ regular Cal State Northridge faculty
✓ late afternoon and evening classes for the part-time student
✓ free pre-enrollment counseling

Enrollment deadline for Fall: Immediate

For further information, counseling, or application forms, write, call or visit the
UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center, 3585 Maple Street, Suite 112, Ventura, Ca.
93003, Or Telephone 644-7261 or 647-3606
APPENDIX C

VENTURA LEARNING CENTER ENROLLMENT FIGURES
FALL 1974 - FALL 1975
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Fall 74</th>
<th>Sp 75</th>
<th>Fall 75</th>
<th>Sp 76</th>
<th>Fall 76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society (BA)</td>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies (BA)</td>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE/CS (MA)</td>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science (BA)</td>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Economics (MA)</td>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (Pub. and Bus.) (MA)</td>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies (BA)</td>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science (BA)</td>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education (MA)</td>
<td>CSULB</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc-Counseling (BA)</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Foundations (MA)</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communication (MA)</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>25(Ext)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (BS)</td>
<td>CSULA</td>
<td>45(Ext)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C.E. (MA)</td>
<td>CSUN/C</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies (MS)</td>
<td>CSCDH</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (Soc. Science) (BA)</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education (MA)</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Education Reading (MA)</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Planning (MA)</td>
<td>CSUN/C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (MA)</td>
<td>CSUN/C</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration (BS)</td>
<td>CSUN</td>
<td>20(Ext)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Courses toward partial degree
APPENDIX D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Fall 1974</th>
<th>Spring 1975</th>
<th>Fall 1975</th>
<th>Spring 1976</th>
<th>Fall 1976</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>MA Administration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>MA Urban Economics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge</td>
<td>MA Mass Communication</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>MS Electrical Engineering/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Long Beach</td>
<td>MA Vocational Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge/C</td>
<td>MA Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge</td>
<td>MA Education-Social and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophical Foundations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC Dominguez Hills/C</td>
<td>MS Environmental Studies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge</td>
<td>MA Elementary Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge</td>
<td>MA Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge/C</td>
<td>MA Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge/C</td>
<td>MA Environmental Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td>BA Urban Studies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>BA Law and Society</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>BA Liberal Studies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>BA Computer Science</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge</td>
<td>BS Business Administration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Northridge</td>
<td>BA Sociology/Counseling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Los Angeles/C</td>
<td>BS Nursing</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>BA Social Science</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: /C denotes Consortium-sponsored programs
x indicates coursework offered
APPENDIX E

VENTURA LEARNING CENTER STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
INFORMATION FOR THE VENTURA LEARNING CENTER
(Please Print Clearly)

Full Name: ____________________________ (Last) (First) (Middle)

Address: ____________________________ (Number) (Street) (Apt#) (City) (Zipcode)

Phone: (home) ____________________________ (office) ____________________________

Which classes are you taking through the Ventura Learning Center this quarter/semester?
_________________________________________________

Are you at present an enrolled, admitted, matriculated student? yes ___ no ___
If so, which campus? ____________________________ which degree? ____________________________
If not a matriculated student, are you interested in:
Credential ___ Masters ___ Bachelors ___ Miscellaneous courses ______
If so, which program area. ____________________________

Do you attend classes on campus too? ____________________________

How did you discover the Ventura Learning Center? ____________________________

If you need additional information or help toward your education objective please make note here ____________________________

What additional courses would you attend if offered or repeated through this Center? ____________________________

Are you interested in daytime courses? ______ summer courses? ______

Optional information: We would appreciate your completing this section for statewide statistics about off-campus students.

Sex: M ___ F ___ Age: 30 - 39 Marital Status _______ Approx Annual Income: 8,000 - 10,000
20 - 23 10,000 - 12,000
40 - 49 12,000 - 15,000
50 - over 15,000 - over

Head of Household? Yes ___ No ___ How many Dependents? ______

Do you receive financial help for education? Vets benefits ___ Employer ___
Other ____________________________
APPENDIX F

SAMPLE PETITIONS TO THE CSUC BOARD OF TRUSTEES
AND THE UC BOARD OF REGENTS
**SAMPLE PETITION TO CSUC BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

We, the undersigned friends of and students at the UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center respectfully request that the Board of Regents of the University of California act on behalf of its off-campus tax-paying students in the University of California Extended University degree programs, to ensure continued financial subsidy of such programs by allocating a portion of campus-operating budgets to said off-campus programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SAMPLE PETITION TO UC BOARD OF REGENTS**

We, the undersigned students at and friends of the UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center, respectfully request that the CSUC Board of Trustees take action to designate the Ventura Learning Center as part of the CSUC residence system thus enabling Ventura County students to obtain courses at matriculated student rates. If this can not be accomplished, then we request that the board immediately institute proceedings to seek a public policy statement from the State legislature insuring equitable fee structure for on and off-campus students of the CSUC system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
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VENTURA LEARNING CENTER STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following Ventura Learning Center staff policy recommendations are suggested as guidelines for the establishment of any future learning center. Relevant references in the text, when applicable, are included parenthetically by page number.

1. Off-campus students should not be required to pay instruction fees solely on the basis of location (27) and equitable treatment of off-campus and on-campus students, in terms of fees paid and program fiscal support should be ensured (27), particularly for those at the baccalaureate level (18 and 73: Footnote 28);

2. The UC and CSUC should extend their degree programs to off-campus locations in times and places convenient to the non-traditional student;

3. Degree programming should be based on community need, with off-campus center staff capable of assessing those needs (25 and 60);

4. Off-campus instruction should be limited to upper division and graduate level coursework (98);

5. Steps should be taken to provide extension of financial aid and eligibility to part-time students (22);

6. Any future center should be funded for at least a
three to five year period to reflect some degree of sta-

bility (46, 54, 58, 59) and allow for a reasonable chance of

success and evaluation;

7. A six-month start up period should be built into

any time-frame plan for introducing a Learning Center (25);

8. Guidelines for initial operation should be drawn

up prior to the Center's operation;

9. Learning Center staff should not be drawn from or

representative of either segment, but be representative of

both (47);

10. As much as possible, regular campus faculty (as

opposed to "adjunct" or local, part-time personnel) should

teach at off-campus locations;

11. An attempt should be made to facilitate the trans-

fer of relevant credit between UC and CSUC and vice versa

(16 and 29);

12. Off-campus instruction should not develop exclu-

sively into media-based instruction;

13. Provision should be made for on-going evaluation

of mediated instruction;

14. A permanent or semi-permanent, regular facility

should be purchased or rented for the Center, as opposed to

the use of floating, or dispersed high school or community

college facilities (42 and 46);

15. Efforts should be made to establish a pleasant

adult learning environment;
16. The Center's administrative hours should be appropriate to the needs of the part-time student, and its hours not be assumed to coincide with those on traditional campuses (114);

17. Classes should be scheduled at times convenient to the part-time student, most of whom have full-time jobs or family responsibilities (116);

18. Consideration should be given to the phasing out of degree programs when the market is exhausted (61);

19. Announcement of degree phaseout should come at least one year prior to the beginning of the phase-out period (61);

20. Some effort should be made to provide, particularly at the graduate level, reference materials on a temporary basis at a cooperating public library in the vicinity of the Center (105);

21. Key support staff from appropriate departments (such as the Registrar, Admissions, Financial Aid, and Veterans' offices) and department heads and library personnel should receive some form of orientation regarding the role, practices and procedures of the off-campus center, and the privileges of its students, preferably before it opens, or in the case of specific department heads, before a new degree program begins;

22. Consideration should be given to the evolvement of the Learning Center into a total community educational...
counseling and referral center for both public and private universities and colleges.