ABSTRACT
Mass Media programs in colleges and universities endure competition from other programs and must also take on the challenges of rapid technological changes to keep their programs up to date (or “state of the art”) for their students. The focus of each program is slightly different and technology available to the student varies greatly from institution to institution. Furthermore there is only some similarity as to how each institution grants student access to equipment and lab facilities. This study attempts to determine the issues that are most challenging to operating academic Mass Media programs and examine the various ways programs at Texas Association of Broadcast Educators member schools are addressing those concerns.

GOALS
1. To attempt to determine which approaches work better as a possible method of developing a model for better learning for media programs.
2. The study also looks for any commonality in available equipment, funding practices such as use of lab/course fees and other differences.

THE SURVEY
Topics included in the survey include strategies for technology maintenance and upgrades, facility operation and opportunities for hands on student experience. The survey asked about student access to labs outside of class time, lab fees, software in use for video and audio production. Other topics such as penalties for failure to follow policies were also included. For comparison purposes, institutions were also asked about course enrollment approximations.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS
1. No single dominate audio software is in use
2. Final Cut Pro is dominate video editing software in use but AVID and Premiere also frequently found in use.
3. There is increased use of smaller, less expensive cameras (GoPro as an example).
4. Institutions with no student lab fees wish they could implement fees.
5. Some institutions including state schools do use lab fees for equipment replacement and paying for staffing equipment checkout.
6. Nearly all have penalties on a sliding scale of severity for late equipment returns.

CONCLUSION
Institutions agree there is a need for more support for the technical facilities used for instruction of students. Specific policy wording and practices need to be studied further to better identify what is more effective for the operations at most institutions.