

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT: R. C. HIGBY, WEAD
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

VICE-PRESIDENT: CARL MENZER, WSUI
STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

SECRETARY-TREASURER:
E. B. BRACKETT, KUSD
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA
VERMILION, SOUTH DAKOTA

OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
T. M. BEAIRD, WNAD
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
NORMAN, OKLAHOMA

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

FIRST ZONE: DANIEL E. NOBLE, WCAC
CONNECTICUT AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
STORRS, CONNECTICUT

SECOND ZONE: J. B. HASSELMAN, WKAR
MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

THIRD ZONE: GARLAND POWELL, WRUF
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

FOURTH ZONE: W. I. GRIFFITH, WOI
IOWA STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
AMES, IOWA

FIFTH ZONE: H. V. CARPENTER, KWSC
STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON
PULLMAN, WASHINGTON

AT LARGE: CHARLES A. CULVER, KFMY
CARLETON COLLEGE
NORTHFIELD, MINNESOTA

The Association
of
College and University
Broadcasting Stations

TO MEMBERS
OF

THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING STATIONS
(and a special request mailing list)

At the annual meeting of the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations, Columbus, Ohio, on June 7, 1932, the report of the Nominating Committee was considered by the members present, and from their recommendations the following officers were elected for the coming year:

Jos. F. Wright	President WILL	University of Illinois
W. I. Griffith	Vice-President WOI	Iowa State College
E. B. Brackett	Secretary-Treasurer KUSD	University of South Dakota
	Executive Committee	
First Zone Daniel E. Noble	WCAC	Conn. Agricultural College
Second Zone G. R. Faint	WJBU	Bucknell University
Third Zone Garland Powell	WRUF	University of Florida
Fourth Zone H. G. Ingham	KFKU	University of Kansas
Fifth Zone H. V. Carpenter	KWSC	Washington State College
At Large R. C. Higby	WEAD	University of Ohio
T. M. Beaird	Executive Secretary WNAD	University of Oklahoma

A WORD FROM THE NEW PRESIDENT

I appreciate very much the honor of heading the association and ask that each of you help in every possible way to make our efforts for the coming year bear fruit. There are many things to do, but an official announcement of what we have in mind will not be forthcoming until early in the fall. In the meantime, I want to leave the following remarks for your consideration.

The inference voiced repeatedly during the past two or three years by our commercial friends, not only at radio hearings but more frequently in the radio press, that educational stations are not doing a good job because a good job is impossible even by a smaller station unless a large sum of money is spent, is an erroneous one that needs some denial.

These statements are invariably based on judgments which follow the reading of budget figures as presented by the various educational institutions.

The fact that an educational institution spends only \$1500 or \$3000 (some spend many times this amount) to do a nine months' job is no more a criterion of what it accomplishes than it would be for us to accept the fact that because \$60,000 is spent by a chain in producing one program it is 100% perfect.

This impression concerning educational stations has come about through a lack of knowledge on the part of those not familiar with educational broadcasting and more particularly with the budget systems - of educational institutions. They do not take into consideration, at least for the purpose of argument, that educational stations pay nothing for talent and in most cases not even a charge is made against the radio operating funds for salaries. Last year, to cite our own case as an example, the University's budget showed a total charge against the radio station for \$3950. Only \$600 of this was included in the salary item. A true picture would have shown that by charging one-fourth of the time of the Director and one-fourth the time of the Assistant Director to the salary item, the salary expense alone would have exceeded \$2600. If we add to this another item which takes care of those people working at the radio station but who are not on regular University appointment, another \$1,000 would be added to this figure, or a total of \$3600. It just so happens that educational budgets for the most part are not made up in the way as are those of commercial stations.

The talent item would amount to a considerable sum if we found it necessary to pay for that item in the same manner that the commercial stations do. These short educational talks that a certain portion of the listening public seems to enjoy (whether our commercial friends believe it or not) have some value and I can prove it by just this one instance. One of our staff members has been giving a series of talks which has been so well liked that a commercial advertiser has offered the gentleman \$600 apiece for a series of twelve ten-minute talks. In my opinion the discussions of this man were no better than those of most of our other speakers. Is it entirely wrong then to assume that if these talks are worth \$600 apiece to this commercial advertiser that they should be worth at least a tenth as much to us - or \$60 apiece? Over our own station during the past year we have given 493 talks which, figured at the rate of \$60, would be worth \$29,580. Likewise, I might show you that were it necessary for us to pay for the musical talent which is available to us, we could easily have spent some \$20,000 for that item alone.

Just on the above few items, therefore, my budget might have read \$53,180 instead of \$3950. This is without all consideration of maintenance and depreciation and of such operating costs as operators and announcers. All such personnel are students who receive the student rate of fifty cents an hour for the time actually spent. Neither does the above amount include anything for the expense of office and building rentals, heat, light, correspondence, and the hundred and one other little things that go to make up the average operating cost sheet of a commercial station.

My good friend Ted Beard of the University of Oklahoma makes the point that the money supplied in financing University radio stations comes from the tax payers pockets. "Like all institutions of higher learning," he says, "we are striving to serve the patrons of this state in an educational activity using sound educational policy. We all know that radio is one of the principal factors in presenting educational material to our constituency and I think we all agree," he continues, "that \$1,000 spent in promoting the work of an educational radio station will go as far as \$10,000 in the commercial field, because we have the natural facilities, talent, etc., already contracted and paid for, the same not appearing as an item of cost for radio broadcasting".

Professor Brackett, Director of Station KUSD, points out that "nothing has ever been paid for anything broadcast by this station. Office and correspondence is charged to general administration, no rental is charged for the rooms used and there is no charge to radio for heat, light, and power used. The only thing charged directly to radio operation is \$1800 per year to the Director of Radio as part of his salary in payment of that portion of his work as the general administrative official and technical director of the station."

These three instances - Illinois, Oklahoma, and South Dakota - are the true picture of educational broadcasting as it concerns the charges for cost and operation.

I want to make the point again that just because the budget "set-up" for educational institutions allows radio broadcasting to go forward without any great expenditure of money, it is no criterion that its programs are consequently of correspondingly low grade.

Yours very truly,

Jos. F. Wright, President.