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CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Instructional development (ID) services' *raison d'être*, just as any other service department, is to provide assistance to a population within its environment. Directors of service departments must continually assess the assistance provided in terms of quantity, quality, and balance. In educational institutions many service departments are traditionally assessed with the aid of checklists, inventories, standards, and ratings by outside evaluators. Also, users of these services are sometimes surveyed to obtain their perspective of the value of the services. This latter approach is particularly useful in a university environment where independent thought and action by faculty is strongly supported. A systematic and careful method of collecting faculty opinion should be a major component of an assessment program for any university service department. The importance of collecting faculty opinion was stated clearly by Carey (1979)

> The greatest ID programs are worth nothing unless they are utilized . . . they will only be utilized if faculty have a positive perception . . . therefore, faculty opinion (or at least the assessment of faculty opinion) is essential! (p. 1).

This study included the development of such an assessment system, review by selected ID directors to determine content validity and a field test to establish usefulness. This system can now be used by directors
of ID services as a formative or summative evaluation tool to collect faculty opinion and make changes in their services where appropriate.

**Definition of Instructional Development**

Davies (1973) described ID simply as "some type of planned and systematic intervention into an on-going organizational system." As the field of educational technology matured the AECT Task Force on Definition and Terminology produced: The Definition of Educational Technology (1977). This task force defined ID as

A systematic approach to the design, production, evaluation, and utilization of complete systems of instruction, including all appropriate components and a management pattern for using them: instructional development is larger than instructional product development, which is concerned with only isolated products, and is larger than instructional design, which is only one part of instructional development (p. 4).

The AECT definition was adopted for this study.

**Instructional Development: Rapid Growth in Education**

Instructional Development has its roots in systems engineering which played an important role in the industrial revolution. More recently, military use of the systems approach produced substantial volumes of literature on the subject, and the approach was adopted for educational applications. In the field of instructional technology the major impetus for ID came through a professional organization, the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT). This organization acquired a divisional structure to accommodate special interests and the largest division became the Division for Instructional Development. This division now distributes a
a quarterly publication titled *Journal of Instructional Development*, has a membership of over 1250 (1978) and sponsors a major portion of the AECT program at each annual convention.

**Background of the Problem**

There are approximately 2600 two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities in the United States and of the 1783 responding to a survey by Centra (1976) 60 percent have some type of ID/Faculty Development program. However, there are no validated guidelines for deciding what ID services should be provided to faculty.

Through experience many heuristics have evolved and many case studies have described ID programs. However, the programs that are described are always the successful programs. Unsuccessful programs could have many of the same characteristics.

There are different theories concerning the organization of ID services. Heinich (1970) suggested a top-down procedure where instructional technology decisions are made at the curricular level. Diamond (1975) described the success of such an approach at his institution, Syracuse University. Alternatively, Davies (1973) argued that ID is successful when a consulting relationship is established with an individual faculty member. Allen (1971) in a survey of the literature pointed out a need for research on the effectiveness of ID:

Yet apparently little effort is being made to submit the procedures evolved through verbal explication and practice to rigid and objective evaluation or to determine the effectiveness of alternative forms of the technique for particular problems or goals (p. 13).
Allen went on to question the feasibility of a good research design:

Of course, the question of whether or not such techniques as the systems approach and the development of instructional objectives can be studied under such controlled conditions needs to be answered. It may be that they are not susceptible to this kind of assessment. The fact remains, however, that there is little evidence that such research is going on (p. 13).

Recently Rutt (1979) reported a study which determined which of three models of consultation instructional developers chose when presented with a number of variables in the task environment. Results showed developers did not favor one model. Level of involvement and type of innovation influenced their choice and developers tended to shift models as they worked through the consulting process. No attempt was made to determine which model might be more effective or preferred by the faculty clients.

Loertscher (1973) conducted a two-part study of media center services in Indiana high schools. In the first phase media staff rated the importance and reported the frequency of use of 64 services to teachers covering eight program areas. In the second phase a random sample of teachers rated the frequency of the same 64 services and their satisfaction with them. Among the results was a definite discrepancy between the perception of the media staff and the teachers concerning the frequency of use of media center services.

Stroud (1976) surveyed media center staff, students, and teachers in 24 randomly selected middle and junior high schools in Indiana:
Traditionally, we have measured a library program by how effective the librarian said it was. However, we now realize that the success or failure of our program often depends not on how we view the program, but rather on how our users view it which means that we must try to determine the needs of our patrons (p. 3).

Data showed that media specialists had not broken out of the traditional role of keeper of the books and that only about one third of the media specialists were involved in any curriculum planning or instructional development.

Mayo (1978) developed and used an evaluation instrument for an instructional media service that was keyed to that unit's objectives. While generally useful at his institution, one limitation was apparent. The number of faculty users of ID services was small and therefore the number of responses to that portion of his study could not be interpreted statistically. Additionally, the objectives Mayo used were specific for his service and as such could not be adopted for use at other universities.

Knapper (1979) concisely described the status of evaluation of instructional development programs.

It is suggested that although it is a basic tenet in instructional development that teaching improvement is closely linked to effective evaluation, it is ironical that most instructional development programs have themselves been evaluated only superficially, if at all. There is very limited evidence that teaching practices and learning effectiveness have been substantially changed as a result of the instructional development (p. 1).

Evaluation strategies on three levels were discussed. 1) Descriptive surveys and ratings that report on units of service, available resources, and staffing patterns are the first level. Most evaluations of
Instructional development programs are conducted at this level. 2) The measurement of attitudes towards instructional development programs is the second level. This assessment frequently takes the form of feedback following some service or development activity. 3) The third level involves the collection of empirical evidence relating changes in teaching and learning to instructional development programs.

Statement of the Problem

A research design to determine overall effectiveness of ID programs, which vary in services provided and environments served, was beyond the scope of this work. However, it was important to begin to formally assess ID programs and an important step toward this goal was achieved by developing a systematic procedure to collect faculty opinion of ID programs.

The opinions of faculty at the university level are extremely important because of the decentralized nature of universities. David G. Brown (n.d.), Provost of Miami University states this clearly:

> Universities are decentralized institutions that expect faculty to make many crucial judgments. Development programs designed and mandated from the top-down won't work. They won't work because faculty regard professional development like curriculum approval, as an important faculty responsibility (p. 3).

The assessment of faculty opinion of university ID services should provide information concerning how well services are provided, why some services are not used by some faculty, and the relative importance of current and proposed services. An evaluation instrument to obtain this opinion will be most valuable. However, ID programs differ in their goals and services. Since no single instrument would have broad
applicability at different institutions, a flexible system is needed.

This study developed a flexible evaluation system to assess university faculty opinions of ID services. The system provides an extensive set of evaluation items that are the basis of a "cafeteria" evaluation system. ID service directors will be able to match their department's objectives with items to assemble an evaluation instrument much like one would assemble a meal from a display of foods in a cafeteria.

This "cafeteria" system is designed for at least three kinds of use. It is anticipated that other uses will evolve.

1. Directors of ID services will first determine their program objectives. From these objectives appropriate evaluation items can be assembled to assess the opinions of faculty users concerning the quality of the service.

2. Directors can use the same items with an altered response format to assess the perception of faculty non-users as to the quality of the service, and to determine why those faculty are non-users.

3. Directors can select items to assess faculty opinion concerning what ID services should be provided.

Procedure

This study achieved the following steps toward development and validation of a cafeteria system. First, it developed an extensive set of items for ID services by examining the literature concerning standards, evaluation instruments and descriptions of ID services.
Second, these items were reviewed by a group of ID directors.
Third, a representative sample of faculty at one university were surveyed with an instrument designed to elicit additional items. Fourth, the complete cafeteria system, evaluation items and user's manual were provided to one ID director for field testing with faculty at his university. The formative data received from this field test established initial validity for the system. See the PERT Chart in Appendix A.

Finally, since cafeteria systems are a recent development, introduced at Purdue University in 1972 (Seibert, 1977), little has been reported concerning the process of building such systems. This study explored, and documented the procedure for building a cafeteria system.

Definition of Terms

The rapid growth in the field of ID has meant that definitions for some terms have been adopted from related disciplines. In other cases the definitions are quite different from what is accepted in related disciplines. For the purpose of this study the following definitions are included to avoid possible misunderstanding.

**Instructional Design** is a term often confused with instructional development. It is the part of the instructional development process that provides analysis and specification for other functions.

**Faculty Development** describes the broadest possible range of activities that might improve a faculty member's performance whether this be teaching, research or service. These activities can include instructional development, organizational development, and personal development (Bergquist and Phillips, 1975).
Organizational Development describes improvements in the institutional environment that will support teaching and administrative functioning. Most Organizational Development programs focus on communications and working relationships among faculty and administration.

Process Consultation is a term designated by Schein (1969) and used to describe the increase in a faculty member's ability to perform instructional development functions as a result of participation in the development process with a consultant. In process consultation, the skill that is transferred from consultant to faculty member is considered as important as the product that results from the interaction.

Formative and Summative Evaluation are two forms of evaluation defined by Scriven (1967). Formative evaluation describes the activities undertaken to gather feedback during the course of a development project with the purpose of making appropriate revisions. Summative evaluation describes the activities undertaken to measure and report the effectiveness of a development project after completion.

Instructional Improvement Programs is a general descriptor used to collectively describe many programs including instructional development, faculty development, communications, media services, learning resources, audio visual and others.

Assumptions

This study will be productive and its results valid if the following assumptions are true.
1. ID directors in general and specifically those directors contributing to this study operate with a philosophy that ID services are available to assist faculty.

2. ID directors will want to use data based on faculty opinions and perceptions as a basis for modifying their ID services.

3. The sample of ID directors used in this study is representative of other ID directors at four year higher education institutions.

4. The university ID service used to field test the assessment system is representative of ID services at other four year higher education institutions.

**Delimitations**

1. This study is based upon reviews from a small number of universities and field test data from one university. It is valid to the extent that this sample is representative of other universities.

2. This study is conducted with four year, higher education institutions and although the results might hold true at other institutional levels this should not be assumed.

**Organization of the Report of the Study**

This introductory chapter has provided a description of the problem and delimited the scope of the study. Chapter Two consists of a review of the literature of instructional development including appropriate citations concerning surveys and evaluation systems.
Chapter Three describes the procedures for development of the cafeteria system. Chapter Four describes procedures for determining validity as determined by a field test and presents the results of the field test. Chapter Five projects potential applications and suggests further research and development for systems to evaluate instructional development. The items are provided in Appendix B.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter II is a review of literature relevant to the assessment of faculty attitudes towards higher education, instructional development services. This chapter presents an overview of instructional development which traces the growth of instructional development from its roots in the audiovisual field to its present form. Highlighting this review are those reports which have theorized about the effectiveness of instructional development programs and recent surveys which present information concerning such effectiveness. This chapter begins with a brief history of audiovisual services and then reviews the major developments that have contributed to the formation of the field termed instructional development. Briefly these developments are: 1) the application of the systems approach to education; 2) the dissemination of reports concerning instructional development programs funded by the U. S. Office of Education; 3) the formalization of the field of instructional development as recognized by the formation of the Division for Instructional Development within the Association for Educational Communications and Technology and the subsequent dissemination of reports on successful development programs; 4) the formation and application of several models which define the relationship between
faculty and instructional development services; 5) a continuing introspective view of instructional development and, more recently, 6) formal studies such as the evaluation of faculty development services made by Centra (1976), biomedical communications programs by Sturwold (1977), and of instructional development services made by Davis (1978) and Mayo (1978).

Although the antecedents of audiovisual instruction could be logically linked to early education, a major movement termed visual instruction, began around 1920. This term was changed to audiovisual instruction in 1947 with the renaming of the NEA Department of Visual Instruction to Audiovisual Instruction (Saettler, 1968). This organization withdrew from the NEA in 1971 and adopted its present name, the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

The formation of the Department of Visual Instruction came as a result of a report to the NEA for F. Dean McClusky (1923), "The Administration of Visual Education: A National Survey". McClusky's effort was the first major survey in the field and served as a basis for administrative decision making for many years.

World War II required an extensive training effort that channeled large resources into development and use of media in instruction. The motion picture developed as an effective medium for accomplishing both motivational and instructional goals. As described by Hoban (1946) motion pictures were used for orientation, discipline, current information and basic instruction.
The Application of the Systems Approach

The development and use of the systems approach was a major factor in preparing the way for Instructional Development. Systems engineering has been in use since the industrial revolution but was not widely applied outside the field of engineering until the military used the systems concept in the development of the atomic bomb and in subsequent military projects (Saettler, 1968). In education, early work by Charters (1912) laid the groundwork for task analysis, determining objectives, and selection of appropriate teaching methods. About 1960 the term systems approach was adopted to describe the interface of people and machines (Saettler, 1968). More importantly, a practice was supported wherein problems were solved with teams composed of people with complementary skills and following a logical procedure.

In 1971, William H. Allen reviewed instructional media research and reported that "little effort is being made to submit the procedures evolved through verbal explication and practice to rigid and objective evaluation or to determine the effectiveness of alternative forms of the technique for particular problems or goals" (p. 13). However, Allen did go on to raise the question of whether instructional development approaches can be studied under controlled conditions. Since 1971 several studies including ones by Rutt (1979) and Eastmond (1975) have examined instructional development approaches under controlled conditions.

As the systems approach was applied to education numerous models were developed which "flow-charted" steps or stages in the instructional development process. Kemp (1971) provides a model for the
design and implementation of instructional materials. Briggs (1977) presents a model in which media is prescribed for each competency to be learned. Each of these competencies is based upon Gagne's (1970) hierarchy of different types of learning. One of the most elaborate systems models for instructional development was produced by Hamerus (1968). He has represented the systems approach to instructional development as a series of twenty-two interlocking steps that guide the developer through the process. The model begins with system definition and management, proceeds to design analysis and concludes with development and assessment with all steps having feedback loops.

**Instructional Development Heuristics**

Numerous writers including Kemp (1971), Merrill (1971), and Hamerus (1968) have presented models which chart or list procedures of a systematic instructional development process. This review will now focus instead on the organization and implementation considerations that make procedural models work. These kinds of guidelines were first presented by Haney (1968) as the heuristics of instructional development. Heuristics are what has been learned through action, research, experience and rules of thumb. His heuristics grew out of a two-year evaluation of instructional development in four major universities. Prominent among these eighteen heuristics are three that attend directly to the concerns of the faculty client:

# 6. Stress the human elements in an instructional system.

#11. See that faculty members are rewarded for work in instructional development.
Faculty members are not generally moved to change their behavior by reading reports of instructional research. but the point to remember is that a professor, student or administrator will accept a change when it produces a perceived net gain from his own point of view and on his own terms.

Lee (1971) added nine heuristics to those of Haney. However, not only did these additional heuristics not attend to concerns from the faculty point-of-view, but stressed the concept of a top-down implementation policy which leaves little discretion to individual teachers.

Another complete set of heuristics was provided by Durzo as recommendations from the literature. He described these 16 guiding principles as: "Tentative conclusions, tentatively held. None are based on experimental research". Again four of these heuristics relate directly to concerns of the individual faculty member:

#10. Attempt innovations that have perceived clear-cut advantages over present practice. . .It must solve real problems which are important to the faculty member(s) involved.

#13. Faculty must be willing to innovate. Initiative and support of the faculty is crucial to attempts at change and innovation.

#14. Time should be provided for faculty to engage in academic change and innovation.

#15. Faculty who engage in academic change and innovation efforts should be rewarded.
Professional Development in the Field

Professional identification in the field has been assisted by the Jobs in Media Study published by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT), (1969). Also occurring at that time were Educational Professions Development Act programs for graduate students in instructional technology.

In 1970, AECT reorganized into a divisional structure. The largest division and one of the most active is the Division for Instructional Development. An initial sign of its activity was the large volume of publications which included an issue of Audiovisual Instruction (December, 1971) devoted to instructional development and a newsletter which has subsequently become the quarterly Journal of Instructional Development. This organization has provided a forum not only for ID models, but for theories of consultation styles.

Consultation Styles

Consultation is generally considered to be a process that is supportive to a client. Consultation has grown and developed in the medical area in the business world and in education. A broad definition of consulting and one that is useful for instructional development is provided by Steele (1975):

any form of providing help on the content, process or structure of a task or series of tasks where the consultant is not actually responsible for doing the task itself but is helping those who are (pp. 2-3).

Within the categories of content, process and structure there is a large variation in the way ID staff work with clients. These are
classified in slightly different ways, by different writers. Schein (1969) categorized consulting styles into three kinds of relationships: the purchase model, the doctor-patient model and the process model. He favors the process model which focuses on the benefits to the client which can be achieved by his developing problem solving skills.

Davies (1973) identified a product model and a prescription model that corresponds roughly to Schein's purchase model and doctor-patient model. He suggests the product-process model as an alternative that is dynamic and built upon mutually agreed goals. More recently, Rutt (1979) has reviewed various models and focused on three which are most useful. These are the product model and prescription model as described and the collaborative process model, which as its name suggests involves a mutual effort including an aim to convey instructional development skills to the client. These three models will now be discussed.

The Product Model

The basic assumption concerning this model is that the client has identified the problem and solution and seeks help in the delivery of the solution. This model is easily followed by traditional media services that provide units of equipment or materials and is encouraged by price lists and charge-back systems. Rutt (1979) has suggested that developers might use this model in early stages of a consulting relationship and also in certain levels of involvement. Although no university could afford a one-to-one relationship for product only results, it is sometimes necessary to first meet the
client's expectations and then move toward process skills. Parker (1975) states this clearly:

The perspective of the person who uses consultants is often different from that of the person who offers consultation. The consumer is primarily interested in results rather than theory and process. His critical question might be, "Does it work?" (p. 249).

However, as Davies (1973) points out, when a product model relationship exists there is little guarantee that the final product will be used. Furthermore, if a collaborative relationship has not been established there is little likelihood that evaluation and revision, so essential to instructional development, will occur.

**Prescription Model**

The prescription model clearly is derived from medical relationships and likewise presupposes significant trust on the part of the client. Davies (1973) describes this model using terms that establish this origin:

The prescription orientated set of assumptions suggest that what is obtained as a result of the relationship between developer or evaluator and his client is less a product in the form of a package of materials, and more an on-going continuous and warm relationship aimed at maintaining a "healthy instructional state" (p. 16).

It is easy to see several advantages in this model. It must seem attractive to the developer who is obviously in a power position especially when compared to the product model (Tilles, 1961). Additionally, it would seem to be an efficient means to apply the developer's skills.
Conversely, the prescription model has some detractions. It assumes the client is ill, and furthermore that the client is open enough to expose his true problem area. Tilles (1961) uses an analogy in the business arena:

An individual approaches a relationship with a physician prepared to admit readily that it is he himself who is in need of assistance, but in many cases an executive calls in a consultant with the hope of improving the performance of somebody else (p. 90).

Furthermore, even when a client does admit he is seeking help for himself, the real area of concern might be hidden by side issues. Developers frequently describe the hesitancy of clients to identify their real concerns.

The Product-Process Model

The product model places the responsibility for identifying the problem on the client and assumes the developer will deliver a packaged solution. Conversely, a pure process model (Schein, 1969) emphasizes the transfer of problem solving skills from developer to client. A more comprehensive model, the product-process model as defined by Davies includes more than these two thrusts.

The relationship is essentially a dynamic one, as compared with the static relationships assumed in the two previous models, continuously changing until a final termination is achieved. The product-process view looks upon the relationship between the two parties as something to be managed and above all a relationship that is managed by the client (p. 7).

Tilles (1961) describes an effective consulting relationship as a "process directed toward the achievement of specific organizational results" (p. 91). This model is termed a Constructive Relationship
and is directed towards four end results: 1) improved performance, 2) increased client ability to solve problems, 3) changed client-consultant relationship, and 4) changed relationships among a client team.

Both Davies and Tilles emphasize that the most advantageous relationship exists where there is collaboration between consultant and client and the process is aimed at identified objectives.

The product-process model has been renamed the Collaborative process model by Rutt (1979) to emphasize the collaboration that is necessary to identify objectives and work to accomplish them. Rutt goes on to suggest that developers prefer not one model but move from one to another. In a study conducted by Rutt, the developers' choice of consultation style was influenced by 1) the level of curriculum involvement, that is, the greater the curriculum involvement the more preference for the product model, 2) the use of media augmentation rather than other strategy changes which encouraged the choice of a collaborative process style and 3) the longer a consulting relationship the greater the movement from a product style to a collaborative process style.

Evaluation of Audiovisual Services

The early history of data collection concerning audiovisual services began with the 1923 study conducted for the National Education Association by F. Dean McClusky. He reported on matters such as personnel, equipment, materials, budgets, distribution and utilization, but did not include information gathered from teachers
(Saettler, 1968). A much more recent publication for the National Education Association by Eleanor P. Godfrey reviewed audiovisual technology from 1961 to 1966. She surveyed teachers concerning the major problems in using audiovisual media (1967).

William H. Allen (1971) reviewed a number of surveys and concluded that while many quantitative studies had documented the growth of audiovisual programs, effective utilization must also be assessed. This qualitative aspect must include teacher satisfaction and contribution to the total educational program. Allen also reported that in general, teachers welcome assistance in the location and use of audiovisual materials and use these materials to the extent that they are taught to do so.

Several authors have reported on evaluation instruments which assess not only quantitative data, but solicit teacher opinion of the quality of audiovisual services. Erickson (1965) gives a number of examples including those of the Westport, Connecticut, schools and the California questionnaire on county audiovisual services.

In Administering Educational Media, Brown (1972) makes a case for subjective appraisals as part of an evaluation program. Recognizing that media services operate in a complex academic milieu, he maintains that such appraisals are necessary and useful.

**Evaluation of Instructional Improvement Services**

Services designed to support and improve instruction have many names and have been evaluated many ways. This section reviews four diverse approaches.
Centra (1976) conducted a nationwide survey of all colleges and universities to determine practices for faculty development and instructional improvement. His working definition of faculty development paralleled that of Bergquist and Phillips and thus a deliberate effort was made to include in the survey all instructional improvement programs as a part of those termed faculty development.

Because of the large scale of his survey it necessarily questioned directors of development programs and could not reach individual faculty members. As Centra states, "their estimates of the use and effectiveness of the various practices can be expected to be somewhat more positive than those provided by faculty members or others" (p. 9).

One category of Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Development Practices was titled: Media, Technology, Course Development, and Miscellaneous Practices (p. 20). In this category, specialists to assist faculty in instructional or course development were used in 36% of the institutions and reported effective in 63%. Somewhat similar figures for effectiveness were reported for assistance in use of audiovisual materials, in constructing tests, and in developing teaching skills.

As previously stated this survey reported only the perception of directors of development programs. Only 14% of these directors reported they had evaluated their program or activities. Centra concluded that in these few cases questionnaires or interviews with samples of faculty members were commonly used (p. 42).

In the field of biomedical communications Sturwold (1977) conducted a survey of programs in the United States and Canada. This
survey "attempted to determine the status of biomedical communications programs in 1977, concerning organization, program scope, type of services rendered, disciplines or teaching areas served, physical facilities and equipment available, personnel and budget" (p. 7). The survey was sent to directors of programs titled Learning Resources, Biomedical Communications, Educational Resources, Audiovisual Services, Instructional Media and other similar titles. No attempt was made to evaluate the quality of services or faculty perceptions of such quality.

Davis (1978) conducted an intensive study of selected instructional improvement programs at sixteen universities. Programs "selected for study were those which emphasized active assistance in the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of instruction in regular college courses" (p. 4). Davis reported that among the criteria used to assess faculty attitudes toward these programs were: "1) increased use of the programs by faculty and 2) return of clients for new projects" (p. 11). This study not only interviewed program directors and observed programs at each institution, but interviewed faculty users of the service. However, since these faculty were proposed for the interview by the service, it is not too surprising that they typically reported exemplary awareness and use of that service.

Mayo (1978) reported on a quantitative and qualitative survey of faculty at Memphis State University. A significant feature of the survey design was the identification of functions of the center and a stated objective for each function. Faculty users of the service (Instructional Service and Research) were surveyed, first to evaluate
the importance of these objectives, and second to assess the level of accomplishment of each objective. A portion of the survey form was open-ended to elicit suggestions for improvement. To provide a balanced perspective a random sample of faculty non-users were also surveyed to evaluate the importance of the center's objectives.

**Evaluation Instruments**

There are a number of current, published evaluation instruments and these instruments reflect the focus of their sponsor. These instruments were developed to guide accreditation, serve professional organizations, and/or improve management. The general utility of these instruments varies with the objectives established for their use and the populations for which they are intended.

The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools developed and published the Instructional Technology Inventory (Griffith, 1976). This instrument has three purposes: 1) To assist faculty and staff in self study, 2) To facilitate study by NCA evaluation teams and 3) To provide teacher-training students a resource about instructional technology. Also, this inventory is designed for use at elementary through post secondary institutions. Because of the above factors the inventory is somewhat global, focusing on policy and guidelines.

The Evaluative Checklist: An Instrument for Self-Evaluating an Educational Media Program in Colleges and Universities (Fulton, 1979) is a publication of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT). Now in its third edition, it is an outgrowth of an earlier instrument developed by W. R. Fulton in 1966. This
instrument was designed to be used for self-evaluation by program administrators using professional judgment. It provides a listing of criteria to guide administrators in making subjective judgments comparing selected aspects of their programs with one of four levels of quality. Several strengths of the instrument are its global perspective and ease of application. Weaknesses included somewhat dated terminology and minimal coverage of instructional design, evaluation, and production.

Evaluating Media Programs: District and School is published by AECT (1970) and reflects the standards of Media Programs: District and School (1975), a joint publication of the American Association of School Librarians and AECT. Its purpose is to facilitate data collection for formative evaluation by internal or external evaluators at elementary and secondary schools. It contains one page opinionnaires for students and teachers, and there is some overlap in items. Another opinionnaire for media center staff would allow for a comparison of their perceptions with those of students and teachers.

Cafeteria Systems

The rationale for developing a cafeteria system was effectively stated by Starry (1973) in an article describing the Purdue Automated Instructor Appraisal System. Starry summarizes the reports that challenge the validity of student rating of teaching by suggesting these rating scales may have contingent validity. That is, a given rating scale might be applicable to a particular course or school, but not to other situations. Since courses vary in instructional
formats, strategies and objectives, different assessment instruments should be used. However, a proliferation of tailor-made scales is a duplication of effort and provides no normative data. A cafeteria system could be used to generate instruments valid in many situations, could reduce duplication of effort and could provide some normative data.

The basic structure of the cafeteria system developed at Purdue was derived from an idea expressed by McKeachie (1969). He suggested using a few broad questions for collecting normative data and a pool of items from which instructors could choose individually relevant items to complete the scale. The Purdue system goes a step further by allowing up to three additional items of the instructors own design (Starry, 1973).

Partial support for the development and dissemination of the Purdue system was provided by the Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (HEW) and reported by Seibert (1977). Seibert called the system CAFETERIA and described it as:

> a flexible, computer-based system that permits each instructor to select from an item "menu" or catalog and thus "design" a unique or tailor-made diagnostic rating form for any course (p. 4).

At that time CAFETERIA consisted of five mandatory core items and a catalog of 200 items from which an instructor could choose up to 35. Also, the system was designed for easy expansion.

Little information is reported in the literature concerning the process for developing CAFETERIA. A telephone discussion and subsequent correspondence with one member of the team that created CAFETERIA
provided a source for that information (Wright, 1980). According to Gary L. Wright the process for developing CAFETERIA followed these steps.

1. All available evaluation instruments were used as a source of evaluation items.
2. The team of five instructional evaluators ("experts") generated additional items to extend the range of the system.
3. The team edited the items and eliminated redundancy.
4. The team solicited guidance from faculty in the form of additions and revisions. It was observed that these changes were relatively minor.
5. The system was implemented and statistical data has guided subsequent modifications.

In 1972 David Loertscher studied Media Center Services to Teachers in Indiana Senior High Schools and in the process developed a partial structure for a cafeteria system for elementary and secondary media services.

Differences in perceptions of media services by three groups (media staff, teachers and students) was the focus of a study by Loertscher and Land (1975). Because of differences in size, staffing patterns, and types of elementary school media centers, several forms of each questionnaire had to be constructed (thirteen questionnaires). To generate the items a process involving six steps was followed.

1. Usable service items were extracted from a variety of lists.
2. Items were organized into nine categories.
3. Revisions were made by an advisory group.
4. Survey forms were custom generated.

5. A pilot study was conducted.

6. The system was applied in 32 schools.

Stroud (1978) describes the Purdue Self-Evaluation System (PSES) as qualitative in nature and involving input from media staff, teachers, administrators, students and non-users as well as users. The Purdue Self-Evaluation System (Loertscher and Stroud, 1976) is available for secondary and elementary levels, and can be applied manually or with the computerized service available through Purdue University.

A telephone conversation with David Loertscher (1981) confirmed that the process of generating PSES was essentially the same as other cafeteria systems:


2. Categorized items nine ways.

3. Revised items based on authors (experts) experience.

4. Used all types of reviewers.

5. Performed pilot studies in several schools.

6. Published the cafeteria in two forms.

**Surveys**

Surveys can be performed by in person interviews, by telephone interviews, and by mail. Mail surveys have the advantage of being least expensive (Berdie, 1974), (Tuckman, 1972). Dillman (1978) recognizes advantages of the different methods including the low
cost of mail surveys. This is especially true when the population to be surveyed would be hard to contact by telephone or in person because of irregular location or hours of work.

Each survey is unique and should be adapted to the people involved. Berdie (1974) suggests that preparation of the survey instrument include input from potential subjects. Dillman (1978) develops a social response theory which emphasizes the building of trust. To develop trust every conceivable step is taken to communicate the importance, the reason for, and the benefits of the survey. Sponsorship from proper authorities, official stationery, quality printing, and clean layout all are used. Every effort is made to reduce the costs in time and effort for the subject.

All the literature concerning surveys attaches importance to response rate, and identifies it as the major limitation (Kerlinger, 1973), (Van Dalen, 1966), (Babbie, 1973). However, Berdie (1974) points out that non-responders do not always differ from responders. It is only when non-responders differ from responders on the content of the survey that results are questioned. Dillman (1978) states that representativeness is the major issue and that return rate is one of four determining factors. The other factors are: 1) equal opportunity for all members of the population to be included in the sample, 2) controlled selection of respondents, and 3) location of selected respondents.

The literature which focuses on response rate discussed many techniques to increase the percentage of returns. It was once thought important to keep surveys short, but Berdie (1974) reports
that recent experiments suggest that content is more important.

Dillman (1978) goes further and presents research that well designed surveys can be up to twelve pages and maintain a high response rate.

There are many other suggestions in the literature for improving response rate, but there seems to be a consensus for the following:

1. Begin the survey with interesting items. If demographics can provide useful information, they should be collected at the end of the survey.
2. The layout of the form should be sensuous, easy to read, and flow from top to bottom.
3. Items should be grouped logically by topic to reduce effort by the subject.
4. Return envelopes should be provided.
5. Only one piece of information should be requested per item.
6. If personalization is used it should be done with sincerity.

Summary

This review of the literature concerning ID services has focused on the growth of ID services, the importance of faculty perceptions of those services, and on past assessments of those perceptions. An examination of the heuristics for guiding ID services revealed a number of recommended procedures for attending to the faculty client's concerns. In a similar way a review of the literature concerning consultation styles dealt with efficiency and effectiveness, but always addressed the importance of the faculty member's perception of that relationship.
The history of the evaluation of ID services frequently included assessment of faculty perceptions. While some surveys collected extensive data concerning organizational structure, several comprehensive studies included questionnaires for faculty or faculty interviews. The current evaluation instruments which were reviewed were both qualitative and quantative and one, Evaluating Media Programs: District and School includes two instruments to gather client opinion.

The scant literature concerning cafeteria systems revealed two significant findings. First, a sound rationale for cafeteria systems, and second, little documentation of how such systems were developed. Only two distinct systems were discovered: Purdue's CAFETERIA which has been widely distributed and PSES (1976) for school media centers which does not have wide distribution, since it has not been referenced frequently.

Survey research literature was reviewed and a consensus of important procedures presented. These procedures were designed to increase communication, response rate, and ultimately, validity. One characteristic of surveys that contributes to all three factors is relevancy, and part of the rationale for cafeteria systems is the probability of creating relevant instruments.
CHAPTER III
DEVELOPMENT OF THE CAFETERIA SYSTEM

Chapter three provides a description of the method used to develop the cafeteria system to assess university faculty perceptions of ID services.

In university environments faculty traditionally make independent decisions concerning implementation of courses. If an ID service department is to make any impact on these courses then faculty must perceive a net gain from that service or the service will go unused. Since faculty perception is critically important, it should be one of the assessments that contribute to the formative evaluation of ID services.

To meet the needs of faculty, ID services offer different supporting activities at different universities. Because activities of ID services differ each is somewhat unique and no standard evaluation instrument is appropriate. The solution to the dilemma of assessing faculty opinion of "unique" ID services is to develop a flexible "cafeteria" system. ID service directors will be able to match their department's objectives with corresponding cafeteria items to assess faculty opinion.

The Process

There is little information available concerning the process of developing cafeteria systems. The reports of Seibert, et. al. (1977)
describe the CAFETERIA system in terms of what it is, and what it can
do to facilitate student evaluation of teaching, but provide little
information about how it was developed. Recent contact with Wright
(1980) produced a verbal description of the major steps in developing
CAFETERIA.

Loertscher and Stroud (1976) built a cafeteria system: Purdue
Self-Evaluation System for School Media Centers (PSES). Again there
was little documentation of the process of developing that system
that might contribute to future cafeteria systems for other disciplines.

This section begins with the little available information about
creating cafeteria systems. It combines that information with a priori
thought to build a cafeteria system. . . . that cafeteria system was field
tested and documentation of the process formed the basis of a model for
creating other cafeteria systems.

PROCEDURE

Step One

The purpose of this cafeteria system is to enable directors of
instructional development services to assess faculty perceptions of
that service. An important first step is to define instructional
development because there are many definitions in use. The definition
accepted by AECT (1977) is very useful for a cafeteria system for
several reasons. First, it is very comprehensive. Second, it is
the current statement of the national professional organization.
A systematic approach to the design, production, evaluation, and utilization of complete systems of instruction, including all appropriate components and a management pattern for using them; instructional development is larger than instructional product development, which is concerned with only isolated products, and is larger than instructional design, which is only one part of instructional development (p. 46).

The AECT Task Force on Definition and Terminology (1977) has gone beyond the definition to delineate functions that compose instructional development. Six of these functions pertain to instructional development services and therefore will help to structure the cafeteria:


Step Two

The second major step in building a cafeteria system is to gather items by examining existing evaluation instruments. This source of items should be supplemented and checked by examining current standards, reports of major surveys, and reviewing literature that describes ID services.

The first evaluation instrument examined was AECT's Evaluative Checklist: An Instrument for Self Evaluating an Educational Media Programs in Colleges and Universities (Fulton, 1979). Although a current instrument, it is an outgrowth of earlier work by Fulton and does not reflect the ID functions. Another checklist is North Central Association's Instructional Technology Inventory (Griffith, 1976). A third instrument, AECT's Evaluating Media Programs: District and School is intended for elementary and secondary application, but does
include some overlap of services with AECT's ID functions.

Standards provide another source of items for building a cafeteria system. The AECT publication College Learning Resources Programs: A Book of Readings (Brown, 1977) projects what services should be available, but does not constitute a standard. (Standards for college ID programs are currently being developed.) AASL/AECT Media Programs: District and School is a current standard that provides some overlap with AECT's ID functions.

Reports of major surveys contribute to cafeteria construction. There are four that were especially valuable. Centra's (1976) nationwide survey included all colleges and universities. It was also valuable because it included all instructional improvement activities, potentially broadening the base of the cafeteria. Davis' (1978) study intensively examined sixteen instructional improvement programs. The specificity of his report contributed to some items. Mayo's (1978) study was a contribution because he keyed items to objectives which fulfilled functions of the center. Sturwold's (1977) survey dealt with instructional improvement programs in medical areas and this included items not found elsewhere.

Step two generated the largest number of items for the system. Approximately 75% of the items in the final cafeteria originated in existing documents with most coming from evaluation instruments.

Step Three

The initial collection of items was then assembled, redundancy eliminated and items aligned with the six AECT functions. The
clustering of items had two benefits. First, the structure benefited
the expert reviewers and would later benefit ID directors using the
cafeteria system. Second, the grouping of similar items in a survey
is a good procedure because it reduces the respondents cost in time
and effort required to complete the survey (Dillman, 1978).

Although step three eliminated some redundancy the overall number
of items remained the same. This effect resulted from the rewording
of some items to be very inclusive (complete photography service)
and others to be very specific (processing color film). Thus, the
cafeteria system gained another dimension of flexibility.

Step Four

Expert review is needed to verify or extend the comprehensiveness
of a cafeteria system and to assist in choice of terminology that will
make the system most universal. To the extent that the experts repre­
sent diverse backgrounds the cafeteria should be more comprehensive.

There were a number of guidelines adopted for selecting a panel
of expert reviewers. First, the experts were to be directors of
instructional development services at four year higher education
institutions. Second, the list of experts from which the panel was
selected should represent large and small, public and private institu­
tions. Third, directors needed to be able to participate Autumn and
perhaps Winter quarter 1980-81. Finally, midwestern locations were
preferred for logistical reasons because a field test would subsequently
be performed at one of the universities.
Following the guidelines, ten colleges and universities were identified and attempts made to contact the ID directors by telephone. Because of position changes and budget cuts the list of ID directors agreeing to participate was reduced to six. When written plans for expert review were forwarded one university dropped out because of disagreement with the AECT definition of ID and its functions. At a later time another university dropped out because of other commitments. The panel of experts then represented four universities:

- Indiana University
- Miami University
- Pennsylvania State University
- Virginia Poly Technical Institute

These experts were mailed the cafeteria of items and asked to suggest modifications and additions. Their comments were incorporated and at a later date a second round of review was completed with items arranged in a survey format. Approximately 15% of the cafeteria items came from the reviewers. Their contribution, however, was even more important because an equal number of items were reworded or reassigned to other functions as a result of their comments.

**Step Five**

Although the previous four steps provide confidence that the system is fairly extensive there are no assurances that it represents faculty interest nor that it is presented in terms faculty understand. Review by a sample of faculty representing a target audience is essential.
A systematic sample of 200 faculty at a large university was presented with a survey. The survey presented twenty-four representative, service objective items from the six AECT functions. These items not only represented different functions, but diverse technologies, and both process and product oriented services. The items were presented to stimulate additions to the cafeteria and space was designated for that purpose (see Appendix C). A total of 83 questionnaires were returned (42%). Of these 83 questionnaires, 15 suggested additional services of which eleven were added -- approximately 10% of the system. However, a much more significant outcome resulted from general faculty confusion over the terminology used in the service objectives. As a result all items were changed from service objectives to services. The former was viewed as management oriented while services are viewed as a faculty right. At this point the cafeteria of services was essentially complete (see Appendix B).

Step Six

The cafeteria of services can be used in a number of ways to meet the needs of ID service directors. To facilitate this a number of possible uses were listed and it is anticipated that a number of additional uses will develop. Furthermore an assortment of rating scales are suggested.

Four recommended purposes for using the system are:

1. To survey faculty who have used instructional development services to obtain a rating of how well those services were performed.
2. To survey faculty who have not used instructional development services to obtain their perceptions of how well services are performed.

3. To survey faculty to determine the importance of current and/or proposed services.

4. To survey faculty non-users of instructional development services to determine why services were not used.

Many different rating scales could be used for the above purposes. Rating scales fall into the following categories (see Appendix D for a listing of possible rating scales).

1. To assess degree
2. To assess acceptance
3. To assess value
4. To assess approval or quality

**Step Seven**

The last step in the process of developing a cafeteria system is the field test. This step demonstrates the kinds of information that can be obtained by application. The field test is the last formative step. As such there should be modifications based upon feedback but these should be of a minor nature. The field test is described and the results presented in Chapter Four.

**Summary.** The process of developing a cafeteria system has consisted of seven steps:

1. Definition and structure
2. Survey of existing instruments
3. Consolidation

4. Expert review

5. User sample review

6. Applications

7. Field test
CHAPTER IV
THE FIELD TEST
APPLICATION AND RESULTS

The final step in developing a cafeteria system is a field test. The field test had several objectives. First, it should establish that the cafeteria system can be used to generate instruments that will collect useful information for ID directors. Second, it should demonstrate and document some ways of using the system. Third, it may reveal some problem areas that require modification.

Site

The selection of a site for the field test depended on three sets of criteria. First, the site had to meet one of the guidelines for selecting expert reviewers, that is, it had to have a comprehensive program that involved all six AECT functions. Second, because of logistical considerations the site had to be within reasonable traveling distance (two visits to the site were planned and executed during the field test). Third, the director at that site had to be willing to conduct a field test, a procedure that would consume resources and raise questions of propriety during a period of economic hardship and retrenchment.

The participation of one of the four expert reviewers was requested and received. This site also met the two other criteria.
Because of fiscal retrenchment at that site it was agreed that the field test instruments would have two endorsement cover letters. One cover letter from the investigator at The Ohio State University established the reason and importance of the study. The second cover letter from the ID director at the site endorsed the study and indicated that the results would be used to improve services. This procedure was adopted to protect the ID department from criticism on economic or political grounds while maintaining the endorsement that would encourage faculty participation.

**Design**

To design the field test the investigator traveled to the test site, met with the ID director, and discussed different ways the cafeteria system could be used to gather information from faculty. It was agreed that three surveys would serve the information needs of the director and demonstrate the range of the system. The three surveys were:

1. A sample of frequent users of services to determine the quality of service.
2. A sample of infrequent users of services to determine their perceptions of the quality of service.
3. A sample of faculty (frequent and infrequent users) to determine the relative importance of current and proposed services.

The first survey was composed of all the items from the cafeteria that were related to services offered at the site. The director
selected these 59 items from the total cafeteria of 96 items.

The second survey intended for infrequent users, consisted of 22 of the 59 items in the users' survey. These items addressed representative services in the six ID functions in an effort to gather perceptions of faculty. All 59 items were not used because the effort required by faculty might have reduced response rate.

The third survey was designed to collect information concerning the potential benefit to faculty of proposed services. Items concerned with seven current services were intermixed with items concerned with seven proposed services (selected from the cafeteria by the director) and faculty were asked to rate the importance of these services.

In order to collect as much useable information as possible the questionnaires were designed and presented in a way that would encourage faculty response. Many procedures were used as recommended by Dillman (1978) in Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method.

First, cover letters were designed to convey endorsements, importance of the study, application of results at the site, the importance of each response as part of a random sample, and a realistic estimate of time required for response.

Second, the response format was an easily understood low to high rating scale requiring checks, including a not applicable choice, and allowing space for comments. (A number of rating scales could be used. See Appendix D for other options.)
Third, the surveys were attractively designed and packaged on uncluttered pages (eight pages maximum), using departmental envelopes with typed addresses, cover letter salutations with first names as appropriate, and return address labels were paper clipped to the survey form for return by campus mail.

Fourth, surveys were distributed to faculty offices early in the second week of the quarter with the request for return by the end of that week.

Population and Sample

The ID director determined that the population he wished to sample consisted of department directors and teaching faculty, assistant professor and above, who taught on the main campus. The campus faculty/staff directory which had been in use for three months was selected as the basis for drawing the samples. Faculty known to be away from campus were dropped from the list. Since there was no consistent pattern in the faculty/staff directory, systematic samples were judged to be random (Van Dalen, 1966). By this process the first name was selected randomly and then every fourth name was drawn. The resulting sample will therefore be termed random. This sample was systematically divided into two random lists. From one random list the ID service staff classified faculty as either frequent or infrequent service users. This classification formed the basis for the samples for the first two questionnaires. The second random list assumed to be a mix of frequent and infrequent users was the sample for the third questionnaire.
The procedures of determining sample size involved several trade-offs. Because three surveys were necessary to establish the range of the system, sample size was controlled by costs and the number necessary to collect information representing the faculty. Sample size for each survey was set at fifty with the idea that a minimum return of 50% would provide adequate distribution on the rating scale.

Field Test Return

The field test consisted of three separate surveys. For the first survey fifty frequent users, selected randomly were asked to rate the quality of services. Thirty-three questionnaires were completed and returned for a response rate of 66% (one form was return
ed uncompleted with a note explaining that the faculty member was ill and not expected to return during the semester).

For the second survey fifty infrequent users, selected randomly, were asked to record their perceptions of the quality of services. Twenty-six questionnaires were completed and returned for a response rate of 52% (one form was returned uncompleted with a note explaining that the faculty member was out of the country).

For the third survey, fifty faculty members were randomly selected and asked to rate the importance of 14 current and proposed services. The status of the services (current or proposed) was not indicated to encourage faculty to base their response on need rather than status quo. Thirty-three questionnaires were completed and returned for a response rate of 66%.
Survey Results

Quality of services as judged by frequent users. To provide frequency distributions all individual responses were totaled and percentages computed for each response category. Next, points (from one to five) were assigned to the rating scale. These points were multiplied by the number of responses in each category and divided by the number of responders to that item to produce a mean score. Mean scores were compared and ranked one through fifty-nine. This information is reported on a survey form in Appendix E.

The rank order information as presented on the survey form is difficult to use so a separate table "Quality of Services as Judged by Frequent Users" presents the services by rank order (see Table 1). This table also includes identifiers for the six AECT functions so the ID director can more easily identify and categorize the relative strengths of the department.

Presenting information in rank order has several potential problems. First, ordinal ranking due to small differences in mean score is probably not significant and should not be interpreted as such. Second, major differences in mean score should not be overlooked because of the quantity of data. As indicated by Van Dalen (1966) it is the extremes of rank order information that provide the most useful information. To assist in data interpretation the top ranked and lowest ranked services can be extracted and presented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Function*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pickup/del. materials &amp; equipment</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dupe audio material</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Produce slide/tape programs</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dupe visual materials</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Copy print materials</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Photograph for passports, pubs.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule AV materials &amp; equipment</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Facilities for previewing AV</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Area to field test materials</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Self instructional learning center</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Graphics for slides, trans.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Graphics for signs, charts, posters</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Processing film</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Photocopying graphics</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Collection of AV equipment</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Graphics to illustrated print</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Programmed instruction</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Facilities for viewing video</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Operators for AV equipment</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Offset print., collating, binding</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Maintain AV material</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Typesetting service</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Studio photography</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Prevent &amp; repair maintenance</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Produce motion pictures</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Catalog campus AV material</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>Produce video material</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Produce Multi-image</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Off-campus rental or loan material</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Assist. select media format</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Assist faculty analyze media instr.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sponsor instr. seminars for faculty</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Design learning labs</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Assist design instruction</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>Consult on equipment selection</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>Transfer video format</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Demonstrate new AV equipment</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Locate materials for preview</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Observer feedback instr.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Assist students select resources</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Equipment operation training</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fund innovative instruction</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>RT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>Catalogs of off-campus materials</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>Photograph for field work</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Grants to produce material</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Design. new/remodel. instr. space</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Video feedback instr.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Select materials for fac. preview</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Design individual instruction</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Sponsor seminar for TA's</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Catalog for independent learning</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Information by newsletter</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Sequence &amp; structure learning</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Script writing</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Self-service production by faculty</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Crit. &amp; forms for evaluating mat.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Equip/facilities for handicapped</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Narrator for Production</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The function codes are:

- L = Logistics
- P = Production
- RT = Research – Theory
- D = Design
- ES = Evaluation – Selection
- U = Utilization
Table 2 presents the mean scores for the nine top-ranked services. Similarly, the six lowest ranked services are separated.

Table 2
Quality of Services as Judged by Frequent Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pickup/del. materials &amp; equip.</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dupe audio material</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Produce slide/tape programs</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dupe visual materials</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Copy print materials</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Photograph for passports, pubs.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule AV materials &amp; equip.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Facilities for previewing AV</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Area to field test materials</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Sequence &amp; structure learning</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Script writing</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Self-service prod. by faculty</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Crit. &amp; forms for eval. materials</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Equip/facil. for handicapped</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Narrators for production</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impressions of Service Quality as Judged by Infrequent Users.

Data from infrequent users were handled just as the quality rating data from frequent users: frequency distributions and mean scores were computed, number of responders to each item was recorded, and numerical rank assigned. This information is presented in Appendix F.

A separate table, Impressions of Service Quality as Judged by Infrequent Users, presents the ranking and mean scores of the 22 services from this survey. This table also includes identifiers
for the six AECT functions (see Table 3).

Table 3

Impressions of Service Quality as Judged by Infrequent Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Offset print. collat., bind.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Graphics for slides, trans.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilities viewing video</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Complete photo service</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Collection of AV equip.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Prod. slide/tape programs</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Locate materials for preview</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Self instr. learning center</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Operators for AV equipment</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assist fac. analyze/mod. instr.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Assist selection of media format</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Observer feedback instr.</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Prevent &amp; repair maintenance</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Assist design instr.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Design. instr. spaces</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Select material for fac. preview</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sponsor instr. seminars for fac.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Assist stud. select resources</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Equip/facil. for handicapped</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Info. by newsletter</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Self-service prod. by faculty</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assist in interpretation the top-ranked services are compared with the lowest ranked services (see Table 4).

Importance of Current and Proposed Services. Data were handled as in the two previously reported surveys: frequency distributions and mean scores were computed, number of responders to each item was recorded and numerical rank assigned. This information is presented in Appendix G.

A separate table, Importance of Current and Proposed Services, presents the ranking and mean scores of the fourteen services from this survey. Two columns were added to this table so the ranking
Table 4

Impressions of Service Quality as Judged by Infrequent Users

High and Low Rated Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Offset print., collat., bind.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Graphics for slides, trans.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilities viewing video</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Complete photo service</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Collection of AV equip.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Prod. slide/tape programs</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

|      | Equip/facil. for handicapped          | 3.33       | U        |
|      | Info. by newsletter                   | 3.24       | RT       |
| 22   | Self-service prod. by faculty         | 3.20       | P        |

of the seven representative, current services could be compared to seven proposed services (see Table 5). The table indicates five of seven current services were rated more important than the highest rated proposed service. The faculty comments concerning the Importance of Current and Proposed Services (Appendix G) provides information necessary to interpret this chart. (Note: While faculty comments on the other two questionnaires were helpful because they supported the quantitative data they are essential in interpreting the importance of proposed services.) Most faculty could identify the current and proposed services. Their comments could be summarized in four categories with implications for interpreting the questionnaire.
Table 5

Importance of Current and Proposed Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Rank among Current Serv.</th>
<th>Rank among Proposed Serv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collection of AV equip.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete photo serv.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Catalog indep. learning</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assist sel. media format</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sponsor instr. seminars</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In-house color process</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Locate mat. for preview</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lab for improve study skills</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Color xerox copying</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Word processing</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lab improve read. skill</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Assist writing instr. obj.</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Assist const/valid. test</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Assist. analy. test results</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Faculty questioned proposed services as an additional cost, something difficult to justify in times of budget retrenchment. It appears that the rating of importance of a service might be contaminated by an administrative concern (cost) because it would be a new service.

2. Faculty perceived that some proposed services were not within the domain of responsibility of the ID service and in some cases were a duplication of services provided by other departments.

3. Faculty perceived in this questionnaire, more than in the other two, the opportunity to suggest additional proposed services helpful to them. Although this additional information is useful in a qualitative sense it lessens the quantitative value of information presented in Table 5.

4. Faculty comments indicated a lack of knowledge concerning some terminology, i.e., word processing, instructional objectives, media formats. Consideration of proposed and perhaps unfamiliar services requires more complete explanation.

In summary, the data collected by this questionnaire must be carefully considered and interpreted by the ID director. All data from the questionnaire must be examined by considering other campus services and ID department resources to provide useful information.
Comparison of Ranking by Frequent and Infrequent Users. To determine the degree of similarity of ranking by these groups another table is presented. The services ranked by infrequent users were extracted from the table of frequent users and ordered according to mean score. These services as ranked by frequent users were renumbered for ease of comparison with ranking by infrequent users. (Note: this renumbering does not effect the use of ordinal statistics.) (See Table 6.) This ranking by frequent users was compared to the ranking by infrequent users by determining a Spearman rank order correlation coefficient. The results showed a high correlation, $p = 0.79$ with a confidence level of 0.01.

To further determine the degree of similarity t-tests were run on the mean scores of the ranking of services by the two groups. An appropriate procedure that reduces the possibility of implied significance through multiple statistical tests is suggested by Field and Armenakis (1974). This procedure is important because as the number of independent test increases the possibility of implied significance by chance also increases. In this comparison none of the t-tests showed a significant difference between the means, further supporting the similarity of ranking by the two groups.

Field Test Results from the ID Director

As previously stated, the field test should establish that the cafeteria system can be used to generate instruments that will collect useful information for ID directors. Second, it should demonstrate and document some useful ways of using the system. Third, it should reveal some problem areas that require modification.
### Table 6

Comparison of Service Quality

Rank Order by Frequent and Infrequent Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Quality Rank by Users</th>
<th>Impression Rank by Infrequent Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod. slide/tape progr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-instr. lrn center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics for slides, trans.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of AV equip</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities viewing video</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset print., collat., bind</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators for AV equip.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent &amp; repair maint.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist select media format</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist fac. analy/mod instr.</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor instr. seminars</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design instr. spaces</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist design instr.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate mat. for preview</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer feedback instr.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist stud. select res.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund innovative instr.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select mat. for fac. preview</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. by newsletter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-serv. prod by fac.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equip/facil. for handicap.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on the above criteria were obtained from the ID director in written correspondence and by telephone. His overall response was that the cafeteria system generated instruments that provided useful information. These instruments were valuable because the information received was specific to services and would therefore be easy to use for improvement efforts.

I found the information gained from your research to be very helpful and will use it for long and short term planning and for directing improvement efforts. With regard to application of the format to other departments I feel that items would have
to be customized somewhat to the local situation in order to gain relevant data. Your system does, however, offer an excellent base.

The ID director had the following response concerning the usefulness of the first survey: Quality of Services as Judged by Frequent Users.

The question addressed by this survey is "how well do we do what we do?" The answers to this question provide insight as to which areas are weak and need to be analyzed for improvement. I would share responses with area managers within the department and work with them in planning improvement strategies. The comments section of the survey is particularly helpful in analysis of individual responses. The raw score for each item offers the most immediate valuable statistical data in that it provides a quick reference of average response rather than emphasizing any isolated low or high responses. The ranking of raw scores aids in prioritizing areas to be addressed in planning. The number of individuals indicating "not applicable" suggests areas in which greater promotion of services should occur. It would be helpful to know if a not applicable response suggests that the service simply does not apply to an individual's needs or that the individual was not aware that the service was available.

The ID director had the following response to the second survey: Impressions of Service Quality as Judged by Infrequent Users.

Of the three surveys I found this one the least useful. Since this survey was directed to infrequent users I would like it to respond to the question "why are you an infrequent user of our services?" Such information occasionally surfaced within the comments but was not addressed directly. I would guess that very few individuals know enough about individual areas of service to formulate an impression.

The ID director had the following response to the third survey: Importance of Current and Proposed Services.
This survey is helpful in long and short range planning of service development. Conversely, it provides useful information regarding present services which might be discontinued. It was interesting to note that some of the services listed were not perceived to fall within the jurisdiction of Audio Visual Services (i.e. writing of objectives and test construction). Also, in the instance of word processing particularly, it appeared that many faculty did not relate to the terminology used.

The ID director was questioned about the perceived degree of correlation of these surveys with other sources of information (concurrent validity). His response indicated that while the structure of these surveys provided specific information about specific services that prior surveys did not address, they did in a general sense confirm previous information. A review of a Faculty Perception Survey (1978) confirmed his response. Exact comparisons were not possible because of differences in survey formats. However, results were similar in that faculty were pleased with current services, responded in higher numbers to survey items concerning production functions, and expressed need for an ID newsletter.

The field test established the diversity of the cafeteria system by demonstrating and documenting some useful ways of using the system. As stated by the ID director: "Obviously each of the surveys was designed to meet unique objectives and the results would be interpreted and applied accordingly." Previous comments have indicated the usefulness of the three surveys. Another application for the system, as suggested by the ID director, would be to determine why some faculty were "non-users". This might be accomplished in a separate instrument or by a modification of the not applicable column when surveying.
"non-users".

Some problem areas were identified in the comment section of the surveys. First, there did not appear to be universal understanding of all terminology. "Word processing" was frequently question marked or otherwise indicated as an unfamiliar term. Instructional objectives and media formats were occasionally question marked.

Second, and perhaps a more major problem, information concerning both existing and proposed services was sometimes contaminated by the issue of territorial rights and responsibilities. Specifically, some faculty marked existing services low in quality because, as they commented, they should be provided elsewhere. Some faculty indicated similar responses on "proposed services". These responses reduced the value of the information.

Finally, there was one typographical error on the three survey forms which although insignificant, was corrected by one faculty member.

Summary

The purpose of the field test was to determine first, if the cafeteria system can be used to generate instruments that will collect useful information for ID directors; second, to demonstrate and document some ways of using the system; third, to determine if there are problem areas that require modification.

The field test did provide useful information for the ID director. Two of the three questionnaires generated from the cafeteria provided specific guidance for the ID director. The other questionnaire, Impressions of Service Quality as Judged by Infrequent Users, provided
less direct guidance although it did show a high correlation with ratings of quality by users. Apparently these faculty are non-users for reasons other than the quality of services. This questionnaire would have been more useful if it had revealed why these faculty were non-users.

Finally, the field test revealed some communication problems because of terminology such as word processing, indicating a need to pilot test any survey prior to distribution. Also, questions of territorial rights, responsibility, and duplication of services were voiced by some faculty. Any survey should always attempt to separate these concerns from statements of need.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter summarizes the information learned about cafeteria systems, their contribution, the process of development and their application, and discusses the need for a particular system for ID directors. The chapter concludes by presenting several procedures for refining the system for ID directors and by suggesting that selection of some form of national distribution is appropriate.

Summary

The need for a cafeteria system to assess higher education ID services. This study analyzed the literature concerning evaluation systems for ID services. The results of that analysis identified 1) a current instrument for evaluating activity within higher education ID service departments (Fulton, 1979), 2) a cafeteria system for gathering information from students, faculty, and media center staff at elementary and secondary school media centers (Loertscher, 1976), and 3) several other generic instruments for rating ID services (Post, 1980 and Griffith, 1976). No universal system is available to collect faculty perceptions of ID services at four year higher education institutions. The development and initial validation of such a system has been the major thrust of this study. The investigator believes that
this cafeteria system, when used with the Evaluative Checklist (Fulton, 1979) will constitute two of three major components of a total evaluation of ID services. Perhaps the availability of these two components will focus attention on and stimulate development of the third component: models or systems to evaluate the effect of ID services on instruction.

**Contribution of Cafeteria Systems.** The first system to achieve national attention, CAFETERIA, was developed at Purdue University for student evaluation of teaching and was designed to meet three major criteria: 1) Avoidance of costly reinvention of evaluation instruments, 2) provision of a validated system which was acceptable to faculty, and 3) development of norms by including some basic items in all instruments. CAFETERIA was successful in achieving these three criteria. Furthermore, the system has found national acceptance and has stimulated the use of similar or derivative systems.

This study has focused on developing a cafeteria system for survey purposes so that instruments can be tailored for specific audiences while meeting the first and second criteria for CAFETERIA. The third criterion for CAFETERIA, establishing norms, was not a component of this study. However, this cafeteria system could certainly be used to identify key items for all instruments, that would be used to generate norms over a period of time with enough users of the system. A more manageable system for generating norms would be based upon some national standards that specify minimum levels of service. There currently are no standards for ID services in four year higher education institutions.
Proposed standards were presented to the AECT Board at the Association Convention (April, 1981) and received initial acceptance for field testing. These standards could guide the identification of a core item or items for each function within the cafeteria. If use of the system was made contingent upon inclusion of and reporting results from those core items, then norms could be established.

**Process of developing cafeteria systems.** The literature that discusses other cafeteria systems does not focus on the process of development. This study included a review of descriptions of cafeteria systems which in some cases included brief descriptions of development. Interviews with the people responsible for those systems served as the only other source of existing information.

A process evolved for developing cafeteria systems. That process must include some attention focused on seven activities:

1. There must be a definition of the area to be covered by the system. Some structure for handling items within the system is a benefit to both the person assembling an instrument and to users of that instrument.

2. Items must be assembled that address all topics identified by the definition. Review of existing instruments and standards is an effective way to collect a list of items that is both extensive and uses terminology acceptable to potential users of the system.

3. It is necessary to consolidate items to both eliminate redundancy and to present items in a usable format.
4. It is necessary to have a review by "experts" that would be representative of the group of potential users of the system. This review should address both the comprehensiveness (content validity) of the system and its usability.

5. The system must have review by a sample of people who would respond to instruments generated from it. This review should address both the extensiveness of the system, from the responders point of view and the effectiveness of the system to communicate through precise directions and acceptable terminology.

6. The users manual for the system must be developed to present the range of applications, and directions for use.

7. The system must have a field test to establish 1) that it is usable, 2) some examples of use, and 3) to revise any problems that would surface in a real application.

In reviewing these seven activities the following heuristics emerged which are worth reporting:

First, the review process should ideally include "experts" from diverse environments. It is difficult to identify such persons and enlist their support. The result was that all four "experts" were located at similar institutions, i.e., large universities. Furthermore, there was significant duplication in reviewer response indicating that two or at most three reviewers from any one type of institution would be adequate.

Second, there was initially little acceptance of the definition that was to specify the range of content for the system. This lack
of acceptance resulted from reviewer disagreement with the AECT definition of instructional development and perhaps poor communication by the investigator of the importance of that definition. A clear understanding of the definition and acceptance by reviewers is an important activity.

Third, communication with the population that is to respond to cafeteria generated instruments is critical. Communication must address intent, benefit, procedure and content. If responders are familiar with the content of an instrument, such as services used, brief descriptors are appropriate. If responders are unfamiliar with the content of an instrument, such as proposed services, more complete description and perhaps scenarios presenting those services would be appropriate. This is an area for further study. If, for example, an ID director is to request information from faculty concerning the potential benefit from a new service then those faculty must understand the nature of that proposed service. Perhaps it would be helpful to present scenarios describing the service activity, the roles played by faculty and ID staff, and the outcomes. These scenarios could not be presented for all services because of the amount of material that would be involved. It would be the responsibility of the ID director to either run a pilot survey to determine which services needed descriptive scenarios or to provide scenarios with each item thus limiting the number of items that could be addressed.
Implications for Application of Cafeteria Systems

Cafeteria systems provide flexibility, not only in availability of items, but in use of those items. The field test established three ways the cafeteria of items could be used. One outcome of the surveys was an interest by the ID director to learn why some faculty were "infrequent users". Since there was a high correlation by frequent and infrequent users as to quality of services infrequent use might be attributed to factors other than quality. A different survey generated from the cafeteria system could determine these factors.

Another way in which this cafeteria system could be used is to collect information from staff providing services and users of these services. A comparison of responses would provide good management information for the service department by identifying differences between perceptions of service staff and faculty.

Minor adaptations of the cafeteria items will always be necessary for each application. For example terminology varies between locations and should be adapted to provide clear communication with responders. Furthermore, the verbs used to describe services in this system might be inappropriate in some applications. Terms such as providing, selecting, assisting, producing and sponsoring imply different levels of control which might or might not be appropriate in a given situation.

In other applications of this cafeteria system the collection of demographics could provide specific information concerning subsets of the population served. These demographics might reasonably include academic units, geographical areas, faculty rank, years at the university and years of teaching experience. Demographics were not
collected in the field test because the small numbers surveyed would not have provided a significant number of responders in subcategories. It was more important to establish the diversity of the system by performing three surveys.

**Implications for Another Application of a Cafeteria System**

A collection of articles and letters in the AECT publication *Instructional Innovator*, culminating with the December, 1980 issue has addressed the topic of certification of instructional developers. Specifically, it has been proposed that AECT certificate instructional developers on the basis of passage of an exam administered annually at the AECT convention. The basis for the exam would be an inventory of specific competencies.

Certification based upon the proposed inventory of competencies implies several assumptions: First, that the competencies are comprehensive and relatively stable, that is, show little change from year to year. Second, that the required competencies should be the same for all types and levels of institutions where instructional developers might function. Third, that training for specific competencies should be the basis of educational programs for instructional developers.

The results of this investigation imply that the assumptions are not valid for the following reasons. First, the field of instructional development has changed rapidly since the early 1960's. The inventory of competencies will continue to expand and change. Furthermore, an attempt to teach all the identified competencies is likely to provide
little depth of understanding. Second, institutions differ by level and within level by the programs of study they offer and by the populations they serve. The set of competencies required at one institution will not be the same as those required at another. Also, competencies required at any institution may go far beyond competencies in the inventory. Third, if the inventory of competencies should become the basis for graduate programs in instructional development then these programs would teach skills rather than intellectual abilities.

An alternative approach which is confirmed by the present study would be to build a cafeteria of competencies that would represent all possible instructional development activities and that could be modified as instructional development activities change. These competencies could be organized around basic underlying abilities. University curricula should be based on basic abilities and the specific competencies taught should be determined by the strengths of a given university and/or the chosen career path of the student. The cafeteria system developed in this study represents AECT's six service functions. With the addition of a management function it could serve as the basis for a cafeteria of competencies.

**Future Prospects for Development and Dissemination of the Cafeteria System**

The investigator believes the development of the cafeteria system is over 90% complete. To assure maximum usefulness of the system three further activities are planned.
1. The ID directors at four private colleges (two church supported) have been contacted and requested to review and contribute to the list of items.

2. A group of Ohio ID directors at state universities (Inter-University Council of Media Directors) will discuss the system and will be requested to contribute to it.

3. A presentation at the AECT convention in April, 1981, will disseminate the prototype cafeteria and request contributions and comments from convention participants.

Finally, after the above feedback, distribution of the cafeteria system is planned. This distribution could occur through a professional association (AECT), an educational publisher or through the Educational Resources Information Center.

Implications for Future Research

The cafeteria system was developed with content review by four ID directors and field tested at one of those universities. Since that ID director provided input to the cafeteria, further testing is necessary to determine the validity of individual items and the range of the system. Furthermore, the field test raised several questions that should be addressed in future research.

1. What is the best method of presenting and describing ID services to collect information from faculty?

2. What core items can be identified using AECT standards (proposed) and how can use of these items generate norms?
3. Is the cafeteria system appropriate for use at two year higher education institutions, and if so what modifications are necessary?

At the present time AECT is developing standards for ID services at four year higher education institutions. As it has been suggested these standards might guide the identification of core items which would provide norms for evaluating performance of services at a given university. Conversely, faculty response to surveys generated from the cafeteria system could contribute to modification and revision of the standards.

Total evaluation of ID services includes not only information concerning perceptions of faculty. Information concerning units of service, available resources and staffing patterns are most commonly included in evaluation systems for ID programs. A third area, the assessment of changes in teaching and learning as a result of ID services has not been addressed systematically. Although case studies and controlled experiments have demonstrated the effect of specific ID services, there remains a need to systematically assess the effect on a regular basis. The development of models or formulas to guide this evaluation activity should be a focus for future research.

Conclusion

ID services' *raison d'être* is to provide assistance to faculty. Since university faculty work in an environment that encourages creative and independent thought and action, their perception of ID services will control the use of those services. Therefore the ID
director must include the assessment of faculty perceptions in evaluating the ID service.

ID services differ in the populations they serve and the specific technologies they provide. Therefore, any evaluation instrument must address the question of contingent validity. Cafeteria systems can be developed and used to generate instruments valid at any given university.

This study has focused on the process of developing a cafeteria system. One product of that study is the documentation of the process. A second product is a cafeteria system for assessing faculty perceptions of ID services at four year higher education institutions.
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APPENDIX A

PERT CHART
KEY TO PERT CHART

1. Starting point
2. Criteria for ID programs/directors
3. Prototype ID objectives instrument
4. ID programs identified
5. ID programs selected
6. Chapter outlines
7. Prototype ID objectives instrument reviewed by committee
8. Literature analyzed for ID objectives
9. ID objectives instrument completed
10. Chapter 3 drafted
11. ID objectives survey completed
12. Cafeteria of objectives completed
13. Chapter 3 reviewed by committee
14. Chapter 3 revised
15. Chapter 4 drafted
16. Cafeteria of objectives reviewed by committee
17. Cafeteria of objectives reviewed by ID directors
18. Cafeteria of objectives revised
19. Chapter 4 reviewed by committee
20. Cafeteria items developed
21. Chapter 4 revised
22. Chapter 2 re-drafted
23. Chapter 2 reviewed by committee
24. Cafeteria items reviewed by committee
25. Cafeteria items reviewed by ID directors
26. Chapter 2 revised
27. Bibliography re-drafted
28. Cafeteria items revised
29. One university selected for field test
30. Bibliography reviewed by committee
31. Bibliography revised
32. Field test instrument reviewed by committee
33. Field test completed
34. Cafeteria system revised
35. Chapter 5 written
36. Chapter 5 reviewed by committee
37. All revisions made
APPENDIX B

CAFETERIA OF SERVICES
CAFETERIA OF SERVICES

Research - Theory

Sponsoring seminars for faculty on topics related to instructional improvement

Sponsoring seminars for graduate "teaching assistants" on topics related to instructional improvements

Sponsoring seminars for faculty on topics related to research on teaching and learning

Disseminating information concerning teaching and learning via newsletters or other means

Conducting research programs concerning the impact of academic programs and procedures on student learning, attitudes and behaviors

Participating with faculty in presenting results of research on instruction at conferences and seminars

Participating with faculty in publishing the results of research on instruction

Providing funding that supports innovative instruction

Providing grants for faculty travel to study innovative teaching/learning programs

Distributing grants that provide released time for faculty to create innovative instructional programs

Identifying excellence in teaching and providing recognition and awards

Conducting research to determine or validate effective teaching/learning strategies

Creating models for evaluating instructional programs

Evaluation - Selection

Selecting instructional materials for preview by faculty

Providing criteria and forms for evaluating instructional materials

Providing assistance constructing and validating tests

Providing assistance analyzing test results
Providing assistance evaluating instructional programs under development

Providing assistance evaluating the effectiveness of new instructional programs

Assisting faculty prepare the evaluation section of research proposals

Assisting faculty to analyze and modify instruction

Assisting in the analysis of teaching in a teaching/learning laboratory

Assisting in the analysis and modification of classroom instruction by providing feedback through videotape analysis

Assisting faculty in the analysis and modification of classroom instruction by providing feedback through skilled observers

Assisting faculty in interpreting results from student evaluation of teaching

Contributing to tenure and promotion decisions by participating in the evaluation of teaching performance

Utilization

Assisting faculty by providing supervision of individual study areas

Assisting students select resources for independent learning

Providing a catalogue of resources for independent learning

Providing personnel for administering tests to individuals and groups

Providing personnel for monitoring student progress toward meeting learning objectives

Analyzing individuals learning styles and provide results to students and faculty

Providing specialized equipment and facilities to assist handicapped learners

Providing a laboratory for improvement of reading skills

Providing a laboratory for improvement of study skills

Providing darkroom facilities for improvement of development and printing skills
Logistics

Providing an automated test scoring service
Providing a collection of audiovisual equipment for instructional use
Providing a collection of audiovisual equipment for off-campus use
Providing instructional equipment in classrooms and auditoria
Providing pickup/delivery service for audiovisual materials and equipment
Providing operators of audiovisual equipment at faculty request
Providing training in the operation of audiovisual equipment
Providing demonstrations of new audiovisual equipment
Providing preventive and repair maintenance of audiovisual equipment
Providing a catalog of campus audiovisual materials
Scheduling the distribution of courses using mass media
Providing catalogs on audiovisual materials from off campus sources
Providing assistance in locating materials for preview
Providing facilities for preview of audiovisual material
Providing transfer from one video format to another
Providing facilities for viewing video tapes
Providing facilities for student viewing of video tape
Providing facilities for faculty viewing of video tape
Providing maintenance (inspect, clean, repair and store) for a collection of audiovisual materials
Scheduling the use of audiovisual materials and equipment
Providing rental or loan audiovisual materials obtained from off-campus sources
Providing a self instruction learning center
Providing an instructional area to field test new materials
Providing terminals for computer-based learning
Providing computers to support teaching
Providing access to services during evening hours
Providing access to services at satellite service centers

Design

Providing assistance in the application of the instructional design process
Providing assistance in writing instructional objectives
Providing assistance in performing task analyses
Providing assistance in analyzing objectives for types and levels of learning
Providing assistance in determining sequence and structure of learning activities
Providing assistance in analyzing learner characteristics
Providing assistance in selecting instructional strategies
Providing assistance in selecting media formats.
Providing consultation in the design of learning laboratories and other instructional spaces
Providing consultation to faculty or departments in the selection and specification of instructional equipment for purchase
Providing assistance in preparing proposals dealing with instruction
Providing assistance in designing instruction
Providing assistance in designing individualized instruction
Providing assistance in designing courses
Providing assistance in designing the curriculum
Assisting faculty acquire instructional design skills
Providing assistance in designing of new or remodeled instructional spaces
Providing assistance in marketing new courses
Production

Duplicating instructional materials
Copying print instructional materials
Duplicating visual instructional materials
Duplicating audio instructional materials
Providing a complete photography service
Photographically copying graphic materials
Processing film.
Providing photographers for field work
Providing photographers for studio work
Providing photos for passports, publications or award presentations
Providing a self-service area where faculty can create their own instructional material
Providing a self-service darkroom where faculty can develop and print their film
Providing assistance in script writing
Providing narrators for media productions
Providing offset printing, collating and binding
Providing typesetting services
Providing word processing services
Providing grants to support the production of innovative and exemplary instructional materials
Producing silk screens for posters, signs and covers
Producing graphics to illustrate print materials
Producing graphics for conversion to other presentation formats such as slides and transparencies
Producing graphics for display in the form of signs, charts or posters
Producing overhead transparencies
Mounting instructional materials
Laminating instructional materials
Producing slide/tape programs
Producing multi-image programs
Producing programmed instruction materials
Producing computer-based education programs
Producing video materials
Producing motion picture materials.
Producing audio materials
Producing filmstrip materials
July 7, 1980

Dear Colleague:

Alan Evans, a doctoral student of mine, is developing a system to evaluate instructional development services in universities. As a first step, he needs faculty perspective on the range of services which should be included in such a system.

Instructional development services are provided from departments with many names, i.e. Learning Resources, Faculty Development, Educational Development, Educational Resources, Audiovisual Services, Instructional Television, Teaching Aids, etc. An accepted definition of instructional development is:

A systematic approach to the design, production, evaluation, and utilization of complete systems of instruction, including all appropriate components and a management pattern for using them...

This is a very broad definition which should stimulate an extensive list of services -- exactly the purpose of this request.

Please complete the attached form and send it anonymously in the pre-addressed envelope by Friday, July 18, 1980.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John C. Belland
Associate Professor

JCD/ce
Enc.
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT SURVEY FORM

The purpose of this survey is to create an extensive catalog or list of services that are or should be provided to faculty by instructional development services.

On the survey form is a list of some services provided by instructional development departments. Space has been left for you to add services you believe should be provided for faculty. Opposite each service is a check space for you to indicate the degree of importance of those services.

Please complete and return to Alan Evans, Room 121 Ramseyer Hall, 29 West Woodruff Avenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRODUCTION SERVICES**

1. Should support instruction by preparing graphic art for media such as overhead transparencies or slides.
2. Should produce videotapes for instructional use.
3. Should produce audio materials for instruction.
4. Should produce computer-based instructional programs.
5. ________________________________
6. ________________________________

**DESIGN SERVICES**

1. Should provide faculty with video taping and assistance in identifying strengths/weaknesses to modify teaching.
2. Should assist faculty in the design or redesign of courses.
3. Should assist faculty in the design of individualized instruction.
4. Should provide assistance in constructing tests and evaluating student performance.
5. Should provide assistance in writing instructional objectives.
6. ________________________________
7. ________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LOGISTICS SERVICES**

1. Should perform preventive and repair maintenance for all equipment on campus.

2. Should make a wide range of non-print media available for instructional use.

3. Should make a wide selection of audiovisual equipment available and provide instruction for use of that equipment.

4. Should equip classrooms and auditoria with a wide range of instructional equipment.

5. Should provide projection service in the classroom.

6. 

7. 

**UTILIZATION SERVICES**

1. Should provide a viewing/listening area for students to use instructional materials.

2. Should assist in the assessment of student learning styles and encourage student learning.

3. Should provide a system of administering and scoring tests.

4. 

5. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Should provide assistance in evaluation and acquisition of non-print media for instructional purposes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Should provide evaluation of prototype instructional materials to improve the final product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Should evaluate instructional equipment and recommend purchase for special applications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION - SELECTION SERVICES**

**RESEARCH - THEORY SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Should assist faculty in designing and conducting evaluations of experimental instructional programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Should sponsor faculty seminars on topics related to instructional improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Should provide faculty information concerning instruction and learning with professional libraries, reports and newsletters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Should provide small grants to support innovative instructional programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
RATING SCALES
## APPENDIX D

### RATING SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Above average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below average</th>
<th>Poor-missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>Of little importance</td>
<td>Accent with reservations</td>
<td>Accent in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>Averane implementation</td>
<td>Strongly implemented</td>
<td>Endorse completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>Weakly implemented</td>
<td>Averane</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Averane</td>
<td>Disanree</td>
<td>Strongly disanree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Disanprove</td>
<td>Strongly disanprove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

QUALITY OF SERVICES SURVEY AS JUDGED BY FREQUENT USERS
January 15, 1981

Dear Homer:

Mr. Alan Evans, Senior Instructional Developer at the Ohio State University is currently completing the requirements of a Ph.D. degree in Educational Communications. His dissertation encompasses the development and validation of a system to assess faculty perceptions of audio visual services. I have agreed to assist Alan as one of six project reviewers. He has further requested the participation of the Miami University Audio Visual Service as a test unit for implementation of his system.

The nature of Alan's research offers broad application of a useful evaluation instrument. Specifically, we can immediately benefit from the results of his research. Your assistance will provide helpful guidance in our attempt to meet your instructional needs as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bill King, Director

BK/ce
January 15, 1981

Dear faculty member:

A comprehensive listing of Audio Visual services is attached. As a frequent user, please indicate your impressions of the general quality of services listed. Your judgment should reflect how well your needs are met. If you have not previously used a service listed, please so indicate. Explanatory comments, both general and specific, will be appreciated.

I anticipate that your response will require only a few minutes of your time. Since you have been selected as one of a random sample of service users your individual reply is particularly significant.

Please return your form to Bill King, 340 Gaskill Hall by January 23. I appreciate your participation in this project.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Alan D. Evans
Senior Instructional Developer

John C. Belland
Associate Professor, Educational Foundations and Research

College of Education
Instructions:

1. Rate the quality of services you have used.
2. Add additional comments.
3. Return to Bill King, 340 Gaskill Hall using the attached address label.
4. Return by January 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>(Low)</th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>(High)</th>
<th>(not) applicable</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing a collection of audiovisual equipment for instructional use.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing pickup/delivery service for audiovisual materials and equipment.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing operators of audiovisual equipment at faculty request.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training in the operation of audiovisual equipment.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing demonstrations of new audiovisual equipment.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing preventive and repair maintenance of audiovisual equipment.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a catalog of campus audiovisual materials.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Responses 30 33 24 15 15 26 31
Raw Score 4.47 4.79 4.38 3.87 3.93 4.23 4.13
Rank 16 1 20 43 39 25 27

99
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>(Low)</th>
<th>(High)</th>
<th>(not) applicable</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing catalogs on audiovisual materials from off campus sources.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in locating materials for preview.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing facilities for preview of audiovisual materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing transfer from one video format to another.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing facilities for viewing video tapes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing maintenance (inspect, clean, repair and store) for a collection of audiovisual materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling the use of audiovisual materials and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing rental or loan audiovisual materials obtained from off-campus sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
<td>(not) applicable</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a self instructional learning center.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing an instructional area to field test new materials.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting students select resources for independent learning.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a catalogue of resources for independent learning.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing specialized equipment and facilities to assist handicapped learners.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring seminars for faculty on topics related to instructional improvement.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring seminars for graduate &quot;teaching assistants&quot; on topics related to instructional improvements.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating information concerning teaching and learning via newsletters or other means.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
<td>(not applicable)</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing funding that supports innovative instruction.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in determining sequence and structure of learning activities.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in selecting media formats.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing consultation in the design of learning laboratories and other instructional spaces.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing consultation to faculty or departments in the selection and specification of instructional equipment for purchase.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in designing instruction.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in designing individualized instruction.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in designing new or remodeled instructional spaces.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
<td>(not applicable)</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting instructional materials for preview by faculty.</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>126.1</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing criteria and forms for evaluating instructional materials.</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing faculty to analyze and modify instruction.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the analysis and modification of classroom instruction by providing feedback through skilled observers.</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing faculty in the analysis and modification of classroom instruction by providing feedback through skilled observers.</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with instructional materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating visual instructional materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicating audio instructional materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Rating (Low)</td>
<td>Rating (High)</td>
<td>Rating (not applicable)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographically copying graphic materials.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing film.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing photographers for field work.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing photographers for studio work.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing photos for passports, publications or award presentations.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a self-service area where faculty can create their own</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in script writing.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing narrators for media productions.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
<td>(not) applicable</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing offset printing, collating and binding.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing typesetting services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing grants to support the production of innovative and exemplary instructional materials.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing graphics to illustrate print materials.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing graphics for conversion to other presentation formats such as slides and transparencies.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing graphics for display in the form of signs, charts or posters.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing slide/tape programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing multi-image programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>(not)</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing programmed instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing video materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing motion picture materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing audio materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I'm not sure that AV should be providing all of the services mentioned here. So it may not be a criticism that they don't.

This questionnaire, I feel, has not let me say some of the things that I think most need to be said about AV, which has helped me very much many times, but which also has some important deficiencies.

Last four questions vague!

I would be gald to explain/discuss any of these responses with you. I am quite pleased with AV services. I was not aware of all services or utilized all services.

Overall service is excellent. The individuals who are asked for info or advice are always most helpful and courteous.

The typed name tag for returning this was great--the main reason I am sending it.

I am quite satisfied with these services. Problem is purchasing new films which are used often.
COMMENTS ON QUALITY OF SERVICES SURVEY AS JUDGED BY FREQUENT USERS

Providing a collection of audiovisual equipment for instructional use.

For projection equipment, they are fine, but they have too little video tape equipment and (both production and viewing) and are overly reluctant to let it be used.

Very well handled.

Some in need of repair, sometimes not enough to go around.

Providing pickup/delivery service for audiovisual materials and equipment.

Almost faultlessly accomplished.

Experienced only one foul-up over years.

24 hour scheduling sometimes a problem.

Providing operators of audiovisual equipment at faculty request.

Very well done even to the use of full time staff if necessary.

The service is available but usually not requested.

Providing demonstrations of new audiovisual equipment.

I'm not aware that they've had any in the past five years.

Never have had the opportunity.

Providing preventive and repair maintenance of audiovisual equipment.

They've been slow sometimes repairing broken overhead projectors.

Excellently handled.

Some in need of repair, sometimes not enough to go around.

Probably could use more people in this area.
Providing a catalog of campus audiovisual materials.

Films, services. (rated high)

In office - so you have to go there.

Revisions done with frequency.

I believe that a new edition is needed.

Perhaps this could be done more thoroughly to departments/new faculty, etc.

Providing catalogs on audiovisual materials from off campus sources.

Films (rated high)

Providing assistance in locating materials for preview.

They've even sent us notices of materials sometimes.

Excellent if we ask.

Providing facilities for preview of audiovisual materials.

Excellent facilities.

Providing transfer from one video format to another.

More equipment could be used in this area.

AV seems very reluctant to record television programs on videotape.

Providing maintenance (inspect, clean, repair and store) for a collection of audiovisual materials.

Overall, their equipment is in darn good shape.

Scheduling the use of audiovisual materials and equipment.

Great except for videotape equipment.

Except we must give an extended prior notice - 24 hrs. - too long.

Should have some sort of confirmation system (like room scheduling does).
Providing rental or loan audiovisual materials obtained from off campus sources.

    They've done splendidly for me.
    Always handled expeditiously.

Providing a self instructional learning center.

    Areas/equipment is available. I have not utilized it.

Assisting students select resources for independent learning.

    Excellent in helping students prepare AV materials.
    I have no idea; I don't imagine they get much drop-in business.

Providing a catalogue of resources for independent learning.

    I'm not aware that they have one.

Providing specialized equipment and facilities to assist handicapped learners.

    I believe that it would be nearly impossible for someone in a wheelchair to get to the 3rd floor of Gaskill.

Sponsoring seminars for faculty on topics related to instructional improvement.

    They try like hell. Somehow they haven't found the topics that draw faculty. Has anyone?
    Need more of these -- the ones I attended were good.

Disseminating information concerning teaching and learning via newsletters or other means.

    Is this your function?
    Always available to any desiring this information and done with considerable frequency.
Providing funding that supports innovative instruction.

Exceedingly generous support when requested.

Providing assistance in selecting media formats.

Helpful assistance.

Providing assistance in designing instruction.

They provide the service, and I have benefited from it.

Assisting in the analysis and modification of classroom instruction by providing feedback through videotape analysis.

They won't take their equipment to the classroom in which the course is usually taught.

Excellent although only available on limited basis.

Done but never utilized by me.

Assisting faculty in the analysis and modification of classroom instruction by providing feedback through skilled observers.

Excellent although only available on limited basis.

Copying print instructional materials.

Provided with minimal delay.

Excellent work and service.

Sometimes slow, but always willing.

Excellent work and service.

Good, although slow.

The decision to discontinue making of ditto masters as a service has hurt my ability to provide my students with important materials. For the past year I have been having my masters typed not on dittos, but rather on plain paper, precisely because I wanted to work with ditto masters, which can be reproduced without retyping of the original masters.
Duplicating audio instructional materials.

Excellent work and service.

Good although slow.

Photographically copying graphic materials.

Excellent quality - very professional.

Processing film.

Except for the rule whereby must have color film back within 30 days.

Slow, due to their work load.

Providing photographers for field work.

These areas have been outstanding.

Providing photographers for studio work.

These areas have been outstanding.

Providing photographers for portrait work.

Lousy portraits. The man needs to take a course. But it's easy to get a portrait scheduled.

Providing a self-service area where faculty can create their own instructional material.

Very poor facilities.

Limited.

Providing assistance in script writing.

I don't think they do it.

Providing narrators for media productions.

There's an excellent narrator on campus (Bill Utter), but I don't believe he's available through AV.
Providing offset printing, collating and binding.

They are absolutely unreasonable about scheduling. The work they do is good, though.

Providing typesetting services.

Much too slow. A typist does typesetting a few hours a week.

Providing grants to support the production of innovative and exemplary instructional materials.

Via Provost.

Producing graphics to illustrate print materials.

Some of their stuff is very nice.

Providing graphics for conversion to other presentation formats such as slides and transparencies.

Some of their stuff is very nice.

Producing graphics for display in the form of signs, charts or posters.

Some very good; some very bad. Scheduling is almost always a problem.

Producing multi-image programs.

Have they ever done one for faculty?

Providing programmed instruction materials.

All excellent quality although very slow.

Producing video materials.

All excellent quality although very slow.

They are willing, but haven't trained cameramen or very sophisticated equipment.

This is one of AV's major functions.
More equipment could be used in this area.

Producing motion picture materials.

Do they?

All excellent quality although very slow.

Producing audio materials.

More equipment could be used in this area.

All excellent quality although very slow.
APPENDIX F

IMPRESSIONS OF QUALITY SURVEY AS JUDGED BY INFREQUENT USERS
January 15, 1981

Dear Homer:

Mr. Alan Evans, Senior Instructional Developer at the Ohio State University is currently completing the requirements of a Ph.D. degree in Educational Communications. His dissertation encompasses the development and validation of a system to assess faculty perceptions of audio visual services. I have agreed to assist Alan as one of six project reviewers. He has further requested the participation of the Miami University Audio Visual Service as a test unit for implementation of his system.

The nature of Alan's research offers broad application of a useful evaluation instrument. Specifically, we can immediately benefit from the results of his research. Your assistance will provide helpful guidance in our attempt to meet your instructional needs as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Bill King, Director

BK/ce
January 15, 1981

Dear faculty member:

According to Audio Visual Service records you have been an infrequent user of services. As such, your response will be extremely valuable because it will help describe the image and reputation of the Audio Visual Service -- an important factor in program planning.

On the attached form I have listed representative services of the Audio Visual department. I ask that you indicate your impressions of the general quality of these services. Your response should be based on prior information from your colleagues.

I anticipate that your response will require only a few minutes of your time. Since you have been selected as one of a random sample of infrequent service users your individual reply is particularly significant.

Please return your form to Bill King, 340 Gaskill Hall by January 23.

I appreciate your participation in this project.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Alan D. Evans
Senior Instructional Developer

John C. Belland
Associate Professor,
Educational Foundations and Research

College of Education
**APPENDIX F**

**AUDIO VISUAL SERVICE**
*(Impressions of Service Quality)*

**Instructions**
1. Rate the quality of these services as previously reported by your colleagues.
2. Add additional comments.
3. Return to Bill King, 340 Gaskill Hall using the attached address label.
4. Return by January 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>(Low)</th>
<th>(High)</th>
<th>(Not applicable)</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing a collection of audiovisual equipment for instructional use.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing operators of audiovisual equipment at faculty request.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing preventive and repair maintenance of audiovisual equipment.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in locating materials for preview.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing facilities for viewing video tapes.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a self instructional learning center.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
<td>(not applicable)</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting students select resources for independent learning.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing specialized equipment and facilities to assist handicapped</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring seminars for faculty on topics related to instructional</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating information concerning teaching and learning via</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newsletters or other means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing funding that supports innovative instruction.</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in selecting media formats.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing consultation in the design of learning laboratories and other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructional spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in designing instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
<td>(not applicable)</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting instructional materials for preview by faculty.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting faculty to analyze and modify instruction.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting faculty in the analysis and modification of classroom instruction by providing feedback through skilled observers.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a complete photography service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a self-service area where faculty can create their own instructional material.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing offset printing, collating and binding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing graphics for conversion to other presentation formats such as slides and transparencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing slide/tape programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL COMMENTS ON IMPRESSIONS OF SERVICE QUALITY AS JUDGED BY INFREQUENT USERS

It is inadequate regarding the Italian language. There are two movies that more than the teaching of language, fit students who are studying neo-realism cinema. Fortunately my students do not miss too much because I am a native speaker, and I can recreate an Italian atmosphere. I believe in audio-visual service. But it should be more organized. In teaching Italian it doesn't exist. Students should be presented sketches reproducing real life or pictures illustrating active situations of culture.

I am sorry to be called "an infrequent user of services". There is a good reason for my not using all your resources often. My field of teaching is conducting and orchestration. There are few materials available in these subjects and we get along with demonstrations in the classroom. I would appreciate having a video tape operator available.

I have and use frequently movie and slide projectors, transparencies which I make myself, and other visual aids. Thus, except for reproduction of large amounts of materials, I seldom need additional AV equipment. I have often sent students and other instructors to AV to use their resources. Many have taken one or more AV instructional courses at my suggestion.

I've been pleased with service I get from AV, except on occasion the wait is long (or I don't have something done because it would take too long).

There is a false impression (or image) on "the part of many members of the faculty that AV is (a) primarily movies and (b) primarily used by School of Education."

Most of the "not applicable" checks indicate no knowledge of service mentioned. AV has been helpful when I have made requests.
COMMENTS ON IMPRESSIONS OF SERVICE QUALITY AS JUDGED BY INFREQUENT USERS

Providing a collection of audiovisual equipment for instructional use.

Willingness very high. Some of equipment almost too poor to use.

Providing preventive and repair maintenance of audiovisual equipment.

Some equipment is not in good repair.

Sponsoring seminars for faculty on topics related to instructional improvement.

I went to one, it was not helpful.

Disseminating information concerning teaching and learning via newsletters or other means.

Does AV do this at all?

Would be helpful.

Providing assistance in designing instruction.

I'm not sure of their expertise.

Selecting instructional materials for preview by faculty.

As far as I know, initiative for selection comes from faculty.

Assisting faculty to analyze and modify instruction.

Again they provide a service but I doubt their expertise.

Assisting faculty in the analysis and modification of classroom instruction by providing feedback through skilled observers.

I was very pleased at feedback I obtained.
Providing a complete photography service.

Excellent.

We use this service often, on a department basis.

Services are excellent but much too slow to be at all adequate.

These areas, photography, printing, etc. are well covered. The faculty criticism is—and it is a big one—that AV is not responsive to faculty needs. The turnaround time for faculty is so long as to make the service unusable. For the amount of university funds used, there should be greater response to faculty needs. A month or six weeks is entirely too long to wait. Upon occasion I have sent to the University of Illinois to have work done, because they could do it faster.

Providing a self-service area where faculty can create their own instructional material.

Good idea.

Providing offset printing, collating and binding.

Services are excellent but much too slow to be at all adequate.

Producing graphics for conversion to other presentation formats such as slides and transparencies.

Services are excellent but much too slow to be at all adequate.

So long a wait, often.

Producing slide/tape programs.

We have a set up in our department and do a lot of this with our own facilities.
APPENDIX G

IMPORTANCE OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED SERVICES SURVEY
January 15, 1981

Dear Homer:

Mr. Alan Evans, Senior Instructional Developer at the Ohio State University is currently completing the requirements of a Ph.D. degree in Educational Communications. His dissertation encompasses the development and validation of a system to assess faculty perceptions of audio visual services. I have agreed to assist Alan as one of six project reviewers. He has further requested the participation of the Miami University Audio Visual Service as a test unit for implementation of his system.

The nature of Alan's research offers broad application of a useful evaluation instrument. Specifically, we can immediately benefit from the results of his research. Your assistance will provide helpful guidance in our attempt to meet your instructional needs as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Bill King, Director
January 15, 1981

Dear faculty member:

On the attached form I have listed representative, current services and several proposed services of the Audio Visual Service. Your evaluation of the relative importance of these services will aid in program planning. Explanatory comments, both general and specific, will be appreciated.

I anticipate that your response will require only a few minutes of your time. Since you have been selected as one of a random sample of the total faculty your individual reply is particularly significant.

Please return your form to Bill King, 340 Gaskill Hall by January 23. I appreciate your participation in this project.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Alan D. Evans
Senior Instructional Developer

John C. Belland
Associate Professor, Educational Foundations and Research

AE/ce
### Instructions

**AUDIO VISUAL SERVICE**

Importance of current and proposed services

1. Rate the importance of the following services.
2. Add additional comments.
3. Return to Bill King, 340 Gaskill Hall using the attached address label.
4. Return by January 23.

### Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>(Low)</th>
<th>(High)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing a collection of audiovisual equipment for instructional use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 4.82 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a catalogue of resources for independent learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 3.99 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a laboratory for improvement of reading skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 3.21 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a laboratory for improvement of study skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 3.42 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring seminars for faculty on topics related to instructional improvements.</td>
<td>33 3.76 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in writing instructional objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 2.39 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance in selecting media formats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 3.87 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Rating (Low)</td>
<td>Rating (High)</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting instructional materials for preview by faculty.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance constructing and validating tests.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing assistance analyzing test results.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a complete photography service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing word processing services.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing in-house processing for color slides.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing color xerox copying.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED SERVICES SURVEY

Being open in the evenings.

I am only becoming aware of the many opportunities AV has to offer to the teaching faculty. Whatever cooperation we have had was most productive. There are many ways in which AV could improve the teaching-learning process in many disciplines and it is only for lack of time that I have not used them more. Aside from the values of any AV service for the faculty—the department is superb in their technical and pedagogical know-how, their resourcefulness, and helpfulness.

I have less need for AV services for instructional purposes than for complete xerox services and the processing of prints from microfilm for research purposes.

I think AV should be more receptive to students, especially student groups that are educationally oriented. It has been my experience that little help is given to the students directly—it always must go through the advisor who then transmits the info etc. I think DIRECT contact would be more effective for all concerned.

What I see as most important is not listed. Fast, cheap copying is the service I use and need most. Micro-computers and video display for the classroom use (and library of programs such as the one which displays relations between food, population, resources under different assumptions chosen by students) would be also useful and something single departments cannot often afford.

My contact with the AV service in the non-instructional areas has acquainted me with such a mass of regulations (e.g. extensive lead time) that I have been hesitant to rely on the service for instructional needs, and to explore areas of use.

I have the highest regard for the work of our AV Service. They have done excellent work for me in the past ten years. I would like, in particular, to single out John Bowser for his courtesy, cooperation, and excellent service.

It seems to me that art/graphics is an important service not addressed above. Similarly, printing of specialty needs (brochures, transparencies, graphs, etc) are important but not noted.
COMMENTS ON IMPORTANCE OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED SERVICES

Providing a collection of audiovisual equipment for instructional use.

The department, itself, has more than satisfactory equipment.

In working order with spare bulbs and easy to use or with operators.

If you can use it or need it, the AV equipment must be available.

The most important! Assists in teaching effectiveness and facilitates learning.

This is well done now, I think.

Providing a catalogue of resources for independent learning.

I'd really like to see the students made more aware of/encouraged to use this service.

Faculty should encourage students to use AV for independent learning--facility should be open at night for maximum utilization.

Must be communicated and readily accessible--problem of motivating use.

Is this done now? Important!

That, I think, would be most effective if directed at students rather than faculty--advertised to them, etc.

Be willing to disseminate information that is available--but not necessarily be responsible for developing the list of relevant material.

Providing a laboratory for improvement of reading skills.

This seems to be a duplication of efforts with one in McGuffey. Are the two programs coordinated/complementary?

Students should have good reading skills before they come to college, but some don't.

Must be communicated and readily accessible--problem of motivating use.

If duplication of facilities can be avoided!
Relationship to developmental education?
Perhaps this is best "located" in English or School of Education. Important! But not high in priority comparatively. House in academic unit.

Providing a laboratory for improvement of study skills.
This seems to be a duplication of efforts with one in McGuffey. Are the two programs coordinated/complementary?
Many students do not know how to study particularly for multiple choice tests.
Must be communicated and readily accessible—problem of motivating use.
Important; but might best be housed and/or directed by Instructional specialists.
Relationship to developmental education?
Perhaps best located in student life division.
Important! But not high in priority comparatively. House in an academic unit.

Sponsoring seminars for faculty on topics related to instructional improvements.
V. important. Faculty can take advantage of funds spent and immediately reap benefits for students.
Seminars should be meaningful and relevant otherwise they should not be sponsored.
Can seldom attend seminars. I do read material and newsletters sent out.
Is audiovisual qualified to do this?
This could initiate new demands for AV services. A good growth activity.
Faculty are always in need of updating and improving skills. This is extremely important.
Providing assistance in writing instructional objectives.

This seems to be a duplication of efforts with one in McGuffey. Are the two programs coordinated/complementary?

Unfortunately some faculty members have not had educational training and may not feel this is important.

Only with respect to layout, etc. Not with respect to content.

I have never used these services as yet but this is my loss; I realize their expertise and plan on using them in the future.

I don't really understand what this service provides.

Providing assistance in selecting media formats.

Efficient use of expert knowledge!

Faculty are content specialists but I frankly doubt if they know how to select media—they will probably need training to do this.

Not sure meaning.

Should be restricted to formats after instructional models are in place.

Assistance must be objective.

I have never used these services as yet but this is my loss; I realize their expertise and plan on using them in the future.

Selecting instructional materials for preview by faculty.

Sounds difficult to implement.

Faculty have an obligation to be consumer advocates for students to make sure "best" materials are selected.

Usually do own, would appreciate catalogue, etc.

Selected by faculty initiations.

I was not aware of this service.

Useful, but this should also be done by faculty.

Cuts down faculty management time. A great benefit to curious and ambitious teachers.
It would be better for faculty to select their own instructional materials.

Perhaps in conjunction with a faculty advisory committee.

Some institutions' AV services (the ones I know about are, however, at smaller schools) screen upcoming TV schedules—especially PBS—, send a list of potentially relevant ones to faculty, and provide requested video-tapes. That would help a lot.

Would like to be involved in selection process for audio-visual materials.

Providing assistance constructing and validating tests.

Could be an interesting new wrinkle. This could be a good idea.

This is the responsibility of another service—educational psychologists can provide this service.

Don't know, haven't used this service, didn't know you had it.

Can be achieved elsewhere.

House in another academic area.

Only with respect to format, layout, etc.

Good service. Skills in which most teachers are very poor. We assume our instruction is effective but do not effectively evaluate.

Done in part by computer center.

Perhaps, could be done elsewhere.

Measurement background?

Exams given only provide a relative benchmark for evaluation.

Really would be useful.

Didn't realize this was or should be a duty of audiovisual services.
Providing assistance analyzing test results.

Seems to me that this would be a function of computer center.

Responsibility of computer services.

I use computer service, is this under audiovisual?

Can be achieved elsewhere.

House in another academic area.

This is more appropriately done within the discipline.

Good service. Skills in which most teachers are very poor. We assume our instruction is effective but do not effectively evaluate.

Done by computer center.

Perhaps could be done elsewhere.

Measurement background?

In absence of service elsewhere on campus, this could become very important.

Didn't realize this was or should be a duty of audio visual services. Don't know what this is.

Providing a complete photography service.

Service now is excellent.

Provide P. R. for self needed but can be acquired outside.

Providing word processing services.

Another function of computer center?

Responsibility of computer services.

Don't know what this is, if reproducing, printing.

If the service can be thorough and available with minimum adm. procedure.

Improper function for AVS.

I am not familiar with this.
What do you mean by "word processing"?

If no other office can do this.

Someone should do this well?

Stresses publication more support for W.P. is needed.

Feel this would be better done by ACS or by a separate area under Provost.

Art works, tables, figures, etc.

Departments have this. Would be too much duplication.

Don't know what this is.

Providing in-house processing for color slides.

This would really come in handy if not too expensive.

Quick processing at cheap prices.

Improper function for AVS.

Not of extreme importance to teaching faculty. Low priority.

Absolutely--and better qualified personnel to take the slides too.

Easy access elsewhere.

I would use these services more than any others if they existed here.

Providing color xerox copying.

Nice, Sounds expensive though. Is it necessary/cost effective?

This service may be a worthwhile service but it is probably too expensive.

Improper function for AVS.

Rarely necessary.

Not of extreme importance to teaching faculty. Low priority.

Should have had a color xerox a long time ago.
Easy access elsewhere.

I would use these services more than any others if they existed here.

I don't care about color.