

KPFA Program Council: Role, Composition, Confidentiality, and Reporting

Brian Shiratsuki

November 2006

The KPFA Program Council assembled at a retreat in November 2003 to deliberate its composition, role, decision-making, and reporting requirements. In addition to resolutions establishing reporting options and meeting confidentiality, Program Council also adopted a resolution defining its composition and establishing majority vote as the requirement for programming decisions. Near the end of March 2004, the Council provisionally added a voting seat for Engineering, but the motion considered by the LSB to approve authority and composition of the Program Council the following month omitted that addition. Instead the KPFA LSB amended and approved the original November 2003 Program Council resolution in April 2004:

Resolved that:

Whereas, it is the duty of the KPFA LSB: To work with station management to ensure that station programming fulfills the purposes of the Foundation and is responsive to the diverse needs of the listeners (demographic) and communities (geographic) served by the station, and that station policies and procedures for making programming decisions and for program evaluation are working in a fair, collaborative and respectful manner to provide quality programming. @ Bylaws, Article Seven, Section 3.G.

Therefore, the KPFA LSB adopts and approves the programming decision-making policy and procedure agreed upon by the KPFA management and Program Council at their retreat on November 18, 2003, specifically:

We affirm the power of the Program Council to make programming decisions by majority vote, and to [sic] affirm the composition of the program council to include as voting members, management (programming and development), department heads (music, drama and literature, training, news, and future public affairs), unpaid staff (4 plus 2 alternates), and Local Advisory Board, which elects 3, and appoints 3 community representatives, and in timely consultation with KFCF and other Associate Station management, which shall have access to the Program Council, access to all relevant information and input on any programming proposals that impact KFCF or other Associate Stations and their listeners.

Further, the LSB adopts the following policy:

The General Manager may override a programming decision made by the Program Council in the following cases:

- 1. legal issues that pose a threat to the broadcast license,*
- 2. personnel issues where the programming decision conflicts with a disciplinary action taken by the GM,*
- 3. violations of the KPFA union contract, and*
- 4. where the GM believes the decision would cause serious financial harm to the station.*

If the General Manager overrides a programming decision made by the Program Council, the Program Council may appeal to the LSB to override the General Manager.

The LSB refrained from acting on the reporting and confidentiality resolutions, quoted in the next section.

Background

Program Council met for a retreat on 18 November 2003. In attendance were Newport, Bennett, Stone, Osegueda, Medina, Osman, Fay, Conley, Alexander, Nagy, Welch, Spooner, Woods, and Aguirre, with Walker as note-taker. Alfandary, Molina, and Gonzáles were also reported in attendance, though the unofficial notes do not mention them. This motion passed 12-0-1:

We affirm the power of program council to make decisions according to majority rule and to [sic] affirm the composition of the program council to include voting members, management (program and development), department heads (music, drama and literature, training, news, and future public affairs), unpaid staff (4 plus 2 alternates)), and Local Advisory Board, which elects 3, and appoints 3 community representatives.

We affirm the power of the program council to make decisions according to majority rule, and to [sic] affirm the composition of the program council to include these voting members:

1. *Management (program and development director)*
2. *Department heads (music, drama and literature, training, news, public affairs)*
3. *Unpaid staff (four; plus two alternates)*
4. *LAB (3 members, elected by LAB)*
5. *Community representatives (appointed by LAB)*

(This admittedly redundant wording appears in the meeting notes.) The group broke for lunch, then passed 10-0:

Program council needs to come up with a regular forum for a report back to listeners. This could be on the air, at the local station board meetings, a meet-and-greet with listeners twice annually, or on the website.

And this, 11-0:

Everything with program council should be confidential except official minutes. At the end of each meeting, program council minutes [sic] can initiate discussion on items to be brought by [sic] the public.

In regular session four months later, on 30 March 2004, the Program Council met and adopted 8-0-1, this:

Motion to set [sic] Erica Bridgeman and Dev Ross as voting Program Council members provisionally, until such time as know our new management and Council structures and in the full knowledge that we are increasing the paid staff representation.

The next month, on 17 April 2004, the KPFA LSB met in special session and began considering a resolution to affirm Program Council composition and authority, along with additional language specifying when the GM could override the PC, and how the PC could subsequently appeal to the LSB to reverse any such override. The original and amended motions established a composition consistent with that determined at the November 2003 Program Council retreat, including a Training seat but omitting an Engineering one. In session the LSB added language giving KFCF and other Associate Stations access to PC. It further added a requirement that authoritative PC decisions would require two affirmative votes from each “consistency,” as enumerated above but with Management and Department Heads considered a single consistency.

At its 25 April 2004 regular session the LSB rescinded the requirement for two affirmative votes from each constituency, then passed the resolution 13-10.

Pacifica's Mission Statement

- (a) To establish a Foundation organized and operated exclusively for educational purposes no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any member of the Foundation.*
- (b) To establish and operate for educational purposes, in such manner that the facilities involved shall be as nearly self-sustaining as possible, one or more radio broadcasting stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission and subject in their operation to the regulatory actions of the Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, As Amended.
- (c) In radio broadcasting operations to encourage and provide outlets for the creative skills and energies of the community; to conduct classes and workshops in the writing and producing of drama; to establish awards and scholarships for creative writing; to offer performance facilities to amateur instrumentalists, choral groups, orchestral groups and music students; and to promote and aid other creative activities which will serve the cultural welfare of the community.
- (d) In radio broadcasting operations to engage in any activity that shall contribute to a lasting understanding between nations and between the individuals of all nations, races, creeds and colors; to gather and disseminate information on the causes of conflict between any and all of such groups; and through any and all means compatible with the purposes of this corporation to promote the study of political and economic problems and of the causes of religious, philosophical and racial antagonisms.
- (e) In radio broadcasting operations to promote the full distribution of public information; to obtain access to sources of news not commonly brought together in the same medium; and to employ such varied sources in the public presentation of accurate, objective, comprehensive news on all matters vitally affecting the community.

*Article II Subsection (a) was amended March 6, 1971, filed April 9, 1971, and corrected amendment filed May 5, 1971.

The Theory of Listener-Sponsored Radio*

by Lewis Hill, 1951

Listener sponsorship is an answer to the practical problem of getting better radio programs and keeping them. But it involves, as a theory of radio, an analysis of the problem as well as an answer to it. The theory advances not only an economic innovation for broadcasting but an interpretation of the facts of life in American radio. And actually it begins in a concern with some of the facts of life in general.

I imagine we can agree that if a sound is worth passing through the magnificent apparatus of a microphone, a transmitter, and your receiving set, it ought to convey some meaningful intelligence. There are innumerable ways of wasting time and generating nonsense, and there are also uncounted ways of making money, many of which may be pursued in broad daylight. But the elaborate machinery and the peculiar intimacy of the radio medium have better and more basic uses. The theory I want to discuss rests on two particular assumptions: first, that radio can and should be used for significant communication and art; and second, that since broadcasting is an act of communication, it ought to be subject to the same aesthetic and ethical principles as we apply to any communicative act, including the most personal. Of course we know that in American radio many obstacles stand in the way of these principles. When I have examined some of the obstacles, I shall try to indicate briefly how listener sponsorship offers a means of surmounting them.

What does stand in the way?

When we ask this question we usually think at once of the advertiser or of the mass audience. We feel that one or both of these demonological figures must account for the mediocrity and exploitation which on the whole signify radio in the United States. And since, as we know, no one can reform the advertiser or confer with the inscrutable mass, we are more or less accustomed to thinking of improvement as utopian.

We seem generally to ignore, when we criticize radio, the moment and situation in which someone actually broadcasts. I refer to the person who actually opens his mouth or plays his fiddle. I mean to include also the individual who holds the stop watch, the one who writes the script, and perhaps the man who controls the switch. And I am definitely referring to these individuals as individuals—for after all, willing or not, they have that dimension. Now these are the people who actually start the production that comes out at the other end. Even if someone else has decided why there should be a broadcast and what should be in it, these are the people who make it. Yet we never hear these people mentioned in any serious social or moral criticism of American radio. They do not appear in the demonologies of the advertiser and the mass. They constitute most of the radio industry, but are perhaps the last people we would think of in trying to place the fundamental responsibility for what radio does.

This curious fact reveals more about the problem than any number of surveys of public taste and advertising venality. And this is the point at which our theory has to begin. We start with the forgotten man of broadcasting—the man who broadcasts.

Let me instance the announcer, not only to seize the simplest case, but because he will serve as the gross symbol for the writer, the musician, and all who try to make a living in the program end of radio. You will recall without difficulty, I hope, this fellow's nightly solicitude toward your internal organs. In his baritone way he makes a claim on your attention and faith which few of your closest friends would venture. I know of no better explanation of this man's relation to you, to his utterances, his job, and his industry, than one of the time-honored audition tests given to applicants for announcing jobs at certain of the networks. The test consists of three or four paragraphs minutely constructed to avoid conveying any

*From *The Exacting Ear: The Story of Listener-Sponsored Radio, and an Anthology of Programs from KPFA, KPFK, and WBAI*, edited by Eleanor McKinney with a preface by Erich Fromm, published by Pantheon Books. © 1966, Pacifica Foundation

meaning. The words are familiar, and every sentence is grammatically sound, but the text is gibberish. The applicant is required to read this text in different voices, as though it meant different things: with solemnity and heavy sincerity, with lighthearted humor, and of course with "punch." If his judges award him the job and turn him loose on you, he has succeeded on account of an extraordinary skill in simulating emotions, intentions and beliefs which he does not possess. In fact the test was especially designed to assure that nothing in the announcer's mind except the sound of his voice—no comprehension, no value, no choice, and above all no sense of responsibility—could possibly enter into what he said or what he sounded like. This is the criterion of his job.

The significance of this situation is strangely neglected, as I have said, although the commonplaces of industrial life that best explain it are much discussed. We all know, for example, that the purpose of commercial radio is to induce mass sales. For mass sales there must be a mass norm, and the activity must be conducted as nearly as possible without risk of departure from the norm. But art and the communication of ideas—as most of us also appreciate—are risky affairs, for it can never be predicted in those activities just when the purely individual and abnormal may assert itself. Indeed to get any real art or any significant communication, one must rely entirely on individuals, and must resign himself to accept not only their uniqueness but the possibility that the individual may at any time fail. By suppressing the individual, the unique, the industry reduces the risk of failure (abnormality) and assures itself a standard product for mass consumption.

We know these commonplaces, but it is truly staggering to contemplate what they imply and cause in American radio. Should you inquire why there is no affinity between the serious arts and radio, you will find that this is the reason.

America is well supplied with remarkably talented writers, musicians, philosophers, and scientists whose work will survive for some centuries. Such people have no relation whatever to our greatest communication medium. I have been describing a fact at the level of the industry's staff; it is actually so notorious in the whole tradition and atmosphere of our radio that it precludes anyone of serious talent and reasonable sanity from offering material for broadcast, much less joining a staff. The country's best minds, like one mind, shun the medium unless the possessor of one happens to be running for office. Yet if we want an improvement in radio worth the trouble, it is these people whose talent the medium must attract. The basic situation of broadcasting must be such that artists and thinkers have a place to work—with freedom. Short of this, the suffering listener has no out.

It may be clearer why I indicated at the outset that listener sponsorship involves some basic concerns. This is the first problem it sets out to solve—to give the genuine artist and thinker a possible, even a desirable, place to work in radio.

Unfortunately it will not do to go halfway in the effort. Many have tried. The story of American radio is sprinkled with episodes in which some ambitious producer, momentarily out of touch with reality, has tried. These episodes remind me of someone's recent comment about purchasing a house under the Federal Housing Administration. This, he explains, is a system which makes it possible to convert an imaginary equity into a vested illusion. There are still in the industry many a frustrated idealist, many an embittered artist, whose last efforts foundered in the sales department, but who hope someday to own a program. Since our first object is to avoid that chronic industrial frustration, we have to give a somewhat elementary interpretation to the idea of freedom in radio.

The answer of the KPFA project on this point is not necessarily the only good answer, but it is explicit. It requires that the people who actually do the broadcasting should also be responsible for what and why they broadcast. In short, they must control the policy which determines their actions. If I may, I will emphasize that neither a "Public Be Damned" nor a "Down with Commerce" attitude enters into this formulation. The problem was, you remember, not whether you as a listener should choose what you like or agree with—as obviously you should and do—but how to get some genuinely significant choices before you. Radio which aims to do that must express what its practitioners believe to be real, good, beautiful, and so forth, and what they believe is truly at stake in the assertion of such values. For better or

worse these are matters like the nature of the deity which cannot be determined by majority vote or a sales curve. Either some particular person makes up his mind about these things and learns to express them for himself, or we have no values or no significant expression of them. Since values and expressions as fundamental as this are what we must have to improve radio noticeably, there is no choice but to begin by extending to someone the privilege of thinking and acting in ways important to him. Whatever else may happen, we thus assign to the participating individual the responsibility, artistic integrity, freedom of expression, and the like, which in conventional radio are normally denied him. KPFA is operated literally on this principle.

Well, then, who in present-day America might be expected to permit such a broadcasting group to earn a living at it, and on what terms?

You already know the answer that KPFA proposes, and you may have wondered why I choose to present it as a theory, as though there were alternatives to listener sponsorship. Certainly when we develop the idea of broadcasting to this point, the listener is the only one discernible who has a real stake in the outcome. But while that may be an adequate reason for a subscription plan, I think there is a better and more rewarding one.

I have already examined the problem of getting the creative product on radio before we worry about how it is to be evaluated. It must have occurred to you that such a principle could easily revert to the fabled ivory tower. Some self-determining group of broadcasters might find that no one, not the least minority of the minority audiences, gave a hang for their product, morally responsible or not. What then? Then, you will say, there would be no radio station—or not for long—and the various individualists involved could go scratch for a living. But it is the reverse possibility that explains what is most important about listener sponsorship. When we imagine the opposite situation, we are compelled to account for some conscious flow of influences, some creative tension between broadcaster and audience that constantly reaffirms their mutual relevance. Listener sponsorship will require this mutual stimulus if it is to exist at all.

KPFA's present air schedule is a modest example. It embraces four main categories—music, drama and literature, public affairs, and children's programs. The schedule has two sources in almost equal balance as to their importance and influence. On the one hand, these happen to be subjects of primary interest to people working at KPFA. On the other hand, they happen also to represent the articulate interests of well-defined minorities in the audience of the San Francisco Bay Area. The correspondence is not accidental. A constant exchange between the staff and the audience enriches the schedule with fresh judgment and new ideas, materials, and issues. Thus members of the staff work out their own ideas and, if you like, categorical imperatives, with some of the undistracted certitude one feels in deciding what he will have for dinner, subject to the menu. Listener sponsorship makes possible this extremely productive balance of interests and initiatives.

The fact that the subscription is voluntary merely enlarges the same point. We make a considerable step forward, it seems to me, when we use a system of broadcasting which promises that the mediocre will not survive. But the significance of what does survive increases in ways of the profoundest import to our times when it proceeds from voluntary action. Anyone can listen to a listener-sponsored station. Anyone can understand the rationale of listener sponsorship—that unless the station is supported by those who value it, no one can listen to it including those who value it. This is common sense. But beyond this, actually sending in the subscription, which one does not have to send in unless one particularly wants to, implies the kind of cultural engagement, as some French philosophers call it, that is surely indispensable for the sake of the whole culture. When we have a radio station fully supported by subscribers who have not responded to a special gift offer, who are not participating in a lottery, who have not ventured an investment at 3 per cent, but who use this means of supporting values that seem to them of basic and lasting importance—then we will have more than a subscription roster. It will amount, I think, to a new focus of action or a new shaping influence that can hardly fail to strengthen all of us.

We are concerned, of course, with a supplemental form of radio. Listener sponsorship is not a substitute for the commercial industry. But in every major metropolitan area of the country there is room for such an undertaking. I believe we may expect that if these theories and high hopes can be confirmed soundly in a pilot experiment, the idea will not be long in spreading.

KPFA happens to be the pilot experiment. No one there imagines he is the artist or thinker whose talent ultimately must be attracted to radio. KPFA is the beginning of a tradition to make that possible. The survival of this station is based upon the necessity of voluntary subscriptions from 2 per cent of the total FM audience in the area in which it operates. We are hoping to succeed for several reasons, not the least among which is the realization that our success may inspire others to experiment for the eventual betterment of the broadcast product.

Operational Duties

Meet Weekly

(Agenda might include group check-in, “good radio” feedback)

- Discuss and coordinate upcoming pre-emptions, holidays, election coverage, community events, etc.
- Discuss and plan program changes
- Review program proposals
- Plan fund drives

Operation Policies

- Establish sub-committees within Program Council, if need be, to help unlog process; to make recommendations to rest of group
- Clarify Department Head authority where needed in making programming decisions
- Provide and maintain programmer feedback
- Provide support to inform/teach programmers about station policies and relevant operations (board op tardiness, fund drive obligations, board op skills update)

KPFA’s standard programming goals

- Does this program further the mission?
- Does this serve the core audience?
- Does it bring in new listeners?
- Does it make money?

Contract Policy

Program Council considers contracted hosts who, for reasons other than vacation or health, fail to appear for their programs more than half the time in any twenty-six week period to be in breach of contract. The program loses eligibility for evaluation, and station management with the Program Council may reprogram the slot without issuing a new contract. The slot will be reprogrammed under contract at the next time the council entertains proposals, and substitute hosts for the slot may submit proposals which will be considered without prejudice. Program Council will not recommend for renewal contracts which include terms requiring the host to perform in substantial excess of their demonstrated capacity to appear for their show during its evaluation period. [Adopted 21 February 2006]

KPFA Radio Program Objectives

1. To broadcast stimulating and thought-provoking news, drama, literature, public affairs, spoken word, and music programming which informs, educates, or entertains, and provides listeners with a progressive, alternative view of our world.
2. To serve our core listeners-donors; to broadcast progressive and alternative programming that will build and appeal to the largest possible audience; to develop a program schedule which best fits the listening habits of the KPFA audience.
3. To broadcast programming that includes the creation and development of content that appeals to a younger demographic (18-35 years of age).
4. To promote and broadcast programming which serves under-represented community cultures residing in our listening area, featuring producers and programmers from those communities.
5. To contribute to, and help facilitate a harmonious work environment which fosters respect for volunteers, staff and management.
6. To broadcast live community events.
7. KPFA's on-air fund raising efforts will occur through programming activities that solicit listener support that helps keep us on the air.

Ground Rules

- Respectful discourse: allow each person to speak
- Don't personalize or attack
- Focus on the issues, not on personalities
- Offer positive solutions
- No retribution or attribution during or after the meeting
- Share the floor with others
- Speak for yourself
- Start on time/end on time

Confidentiality Policy

The KPFA Program Council's decisions and the nature of its discussions are disseminated, but comments are not attributed to the individuals who made them. This policy exists to promote candid discussion of programming among Program Council members.

Agenda

Items for Program Council meetings are due by 5:00 PM on the Friday before the meeting. A list of agenda items will be emailed to members by Monday at 5:00 PM. Program Council members will set the agenda for the meeting during the first 15 minutes of the meeting.

Quorum

For a legitimate Program Council vote to occur, 50% of the total council must be present, and each constituency must have 1 representative present for the vote.

Membership

Paid Staff:

Programming	Arts/Humanities
Development	News
Technical	Public Affairs
Training	Music

Unpaid Staff:

Four members plus two alternates

Local Station Broad:

Three representatives from the LSB
 Three representatives from the community (chosen by the LSB)

Attendance

If a Program Council member misses more than 1/3 of the meetings over a six month period, their constituency will be notified and can decide if a change is in order, or there are extenuating circumstances. If there is a second six month period of missing more than 1/3 of the meetings, then the effectiveness of the Program Council is being impacted over the long-term, the problem is not a short-term one, and the constituency will need to find someone else who is available to come to meetings.
[Revised 4 April 2006]

The “Transformation” Proposal

August 1999

This Nine-Point program was distributed at the Coalition for a democratic Pacifica by a working group composed of Media Alliance, KPFA Apprentice Program, Blacks for Justice in Radio, and other activists who wrote it in August of 1999.

- (1) Expand and transform KPFA program council to include diverse non-paid staff and community representatives as voting members.
- (2) Adopt a “crisis programming” format and not a “business as usual” format during the station's first week back on the air (this format should include "impeachment hearings" for the Pacifica board.)
- (3) Commit to turning the 4-5 PM program slot into a dynamic, top-quality community/public affairs show, appealing especially to young people and people of color, using as many apprentices as possible and feasible.
- (4) Establish an accountability mechanism for paid staff, including a 2-3 year review of department heads by staff and community members.
- (5) Re-establish the Third World and Gender departments, on a volunteer basis in the short term if necessary. Also, create a mechanism to support youth at the station.
- (6) Establish a regular mechanism for broader community input.
- (7) Hire all dismissed staffers in some capacity.
- (8) Have the ISDN line removed from the KPFA transmitter.
- (9) Integrate apprentices thoroughly into programming.