

ASJMC INSIGHTS

Spring 2014

INSIDE:

Journalism Programs Must Embrace Notion That They Are No Longer Training Students for Newsrooms Alone

Issues of Editorial Control, Prior Restraint, and Prior Review Facing Student Newspapers on Public University Campuses in Ohio

Migrant from Professional Journalism to Academic Administration Examines Differences, Real and Otherwise, Between Fields

State of Change: Author Recounts His Experiences, Lessons from Program to Bridge Between Newsroom and Classroom

World Journalism Education Congress Explores Methods for Renewing Journalism Through Education

From the Editor

Zombies v. Newsies: Novel Offers Post-apocalyptic Critique of Journalism

By James L. Stewart

ASJMC **INSIGHTS**

ASJMC Insights

Editor: James L. Stewart, Nicholls State University

Layout/design and production: Lillian Coleman, AEJMC/ASJMC

Submissions

Submit queries and manuscripts to Dr. James L. Stewart, *Insights* Editor, Department of Mass Communication, Nicholls State University, P.O. Box 2031, Thibodaux, LA 70310. E-mail: james.stewart@nicholls.edu. Phone: 985-448-4586. *Academic citations must be in APA or MLA styles.*

The Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication (ASJMC)

234 Outlet Pointe Boulevard, Suite A

Columbia, SC 29210-5667

803-798-0271 (phone) • 803-772-3509 (fax)

ASJMC on the Web: www.asjmc.org

ASJMC Insights is a publication of the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication.

Copyright © 2014 by ASJMC

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including electronic, mechanical, photocopying, and recording, without the prior permission of the publisher. For information on getting permission for reprints and excerpts, or ordering additional copies, contact aejmchq@aol.com.

Opinions expressed in *Insights* are solely those of the authors and are not those of ASJMC or its officers.

Insights is printed and bound in the United States of America.

2013/14 ASJMC Executive Committee

President, Don Heider, Loyola University of Chicago • **President-elect**, Ann Brill, University of Kansas • **Vice-President**, Brad Rawlins, Arkansas State University • **Past President**, Peggy Kuhr, University of Montana • **Publication Committee Chair**, TBA • **Executive Committee Representatives**, Mary Arnold, South Dakota State University; Cheryl Bacon, Abilene Christian University; Lorraine Branham, Syracuse University • **ACEJMC Representatives Chair**, Paul Parsons, Elon University • **AEJMC President**, Paula Poindexter, University of Texas at Austin • **Black College Communication Association Representative**, Rochelle Ford, Howard University • **Executive Director**, Jennifer McGill, AEJMC/ASJMC

Contents

- 5** *From the Editor*
ZOMBIES V. NEWSIES: NOVEL OFFERS POST-APOCALYPTIC CRITIQUE OF JOURNALISM
By James L. Stewart, Nicholls State University
- 7** **JOURNALISM PROGRAMS MUST EMBRACE NOTION THAT THEY ARE NO LONGER TRAINING STUDENTS FOR NEWSROOMS ALONE**
By Brian Steffen, Simpson College
- 10** **ISSUES OF EDITORIAL CONTROL, PRIOR RESTRAINT, AND PRIOR REVIEW FACING STUDENT NEWSPAPERS ON PUBLIC UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN OHIO: ADMINISTRATIVE, FACULTY, AND STUDENT PERSPECTIVES**
By Terry L. Hapney, Jr., Marshall University, and David M. Lucas, Ohio University
- 18** **MIGRANT FROM PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISM TO ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION EXAMINES DIFFERENCES, REAL AND OTHERWISE, BETWEEN FIELDS**
By Jerry Ceppos, Louisiana State University
- 21** **STATE OF CHANGE: AUTHOR RECOUNTS HIS EXPERIENCES, LESSONS FROM PROGRAM TO BRIDGE BETWEEN NEWSROOM AND CLASSROOM**
By Keith Oppenheim, Grand Valley State University
- 26** **WORLD JOURNALISM EDUCATION CONGRESS EXPLORES METHODS FOR RENEWING JOURNALISM THROUGH EDUCATION**
By Robyn S. Goodman, Alfred University

Special thanks to Dr. Al Delabaye, professor emeritus, Nicholls State University, for his invaluable assistance.

From the Editor

ZOMBIES V. NEWSIES: NOVEL OFFERS POST-APOCALYPTIC CRITIQUE OF JOURNALISM

By James L. Stewart, Nicholls State University

In case you've missed it, zombies are taking over the world.

Even the Center for Disease Control and the U.S. military have paid homage to the movement, and if the government has noticed a trend, you know it's pretty far along. Heck, the military was ready to acknowledge the growing presence of zombies in the world sooner than it was to concede the existence of gays.

Now you may be saying that zombies are not real. But real or not (depending on what web sites you are willing to put your faith in) they are everywhere.

And they are no longer content to merely shamle across the landscape, (I prefer the slow zombies to the fast ones, as I've lost a step through the years.) in gobbling up pop culture in huge, ripping chomps. The zombie revolution is branching out into media criticism.

I have a high-school-age nephew who lives in Texas who has a strong interest in zombies. I lent him my copy of Brooks' 2003 *The Zombie Survival Guide*. (Laugh now, but if things get out of hand, you may want to keep my email address handy for tips.)

In return, he lent me his copy of *Feed* by Mira Grant (2010).

I just started reading it.

So far it has followed a fairly typical dystopian storyline. (That adjective has begun appearing with a distressingly increasing regularity of late.)

What I find interesting is the author's vision of the news media in this brave new world. (You'd better be brave if

zombies are after you 24/7. And it's not just people zombies hungering for your tender flesh; there are also coyote and raccoon zombies. There are even deer zombies.)

The main characters are bloggers, the rock stars of the new reality. Like most of their contemporaries, their activities are pretty much dictated by efforts to avoid becoming Zombie Chow.

However, what plays an equal role in shaping their daily lives is the constant and overwhelming concern over web feeds, ratings, click throughs, site links and the like.

The traditional media? They're still there, but marginalized.

Why? People no longer trust them.

In the view of the novel's protagonist, the news media not only failed in their duty to protect the public from the zombie apocalypse, they contributed to its cause.

The traditional news outlets were slow to get out the real story on the growing menace. In the meantime the bloggers were getting it right.

"The 'real' media was bound by rules and regulations, while the bloggers were bound by nothing more than the speed of their typing" (Grant, p. 48).

I'm not really surprised that an author would take the opportunity to point out weaknesses in the existing system of news media. I'm not even aghast that one would blame the news media for the presence of the undead skulking around in vast herds.

Blaming the news media for things is an old game.

I once heard a basketball coach at a major university blame his team's poor performance on the court to adverse media coverage, though I was never quite clear as to how bad press lent itself to an anemic shooting percentage or a porous defense.

That zombie writers have gotten into the act therefore seems a logical progression.

What does concern me is the author's overall view of the news media as lacking on a fundamental level; that the public should turn to the "alternative" media in its search for "truth." What bothers me even more is that this view, much like the spread of zombie infections, is growing.

I am not naive enough to believe for a nanosecond that traditional news media have a sole proprietary hold on "truth." But I am worried that we are allowing the host to become weakened, opening itself to illness.

In my view journalism, or what journalism should aspire to be, is all about getting the story right, not getting it first or to the most notice.

In November I watched a public-television documentary on the CBS coverage of the John F. Kennedy assassination. What struck me was the efforts that Walter Cronkite demanded of his staff for confirmation before information could be aired.

REFERENCES

- Brooks, M. (2003). *The zombie survival guide: Complete protection from the living dead*. Three Rivers Press: New York.
- Grant, M. (2010). *Feed*. Orbit: New York.

The press doesn't do this any more. I'm not sure we stress it enough in our classes.

Both the academy and the profession seem to be so caught up in the issue of speed and the glamour of technology that we risk losing sight of our real mission. It seems that we are allowing the chaotic vortex caused by emerging technology to shape our future, rather than guiding technological change in the direction of improving news content.

A potential risk of this trend? There are those waiting to fill the void — sources who make only the slightest pretense of seeking truth first.

As Georgia Mason posts in *Feed*, in her world the public "turned to the bloggers, who might be unfiltered and full of shit, but were fast, prolific, and allowed you to triangulate on the truth. Get your news from six or nine sources, and you can usually tell the bullshit from the reality. If that's too much work, you can find a blogger who does your triangulation for you." (p. 50)

Shouldn't our overriding responsibility be triangulating truth?

Come to think about it, maybe zombie-centered literature is the ideal place for considering the future of news media. I am reminded of the message inscribed on old-world maps for the as-yet unexplored sections of the planet, "Here there be monsters."

JOURNALISM PROGRAMS MUST EMBRACE NOTION THAT THEY ARE NO LONGER TRAINING STUDENTS FOR NEWSROOMS ALONE

By Brian Steffen, Simpson College

1981: The beginning of the Reagan years in America, the end of the Carter “malaise,” and a great time to be coming out of university aspiring to be a journalist. I graduated that summer with a journalism degree in the Woodward-and-Bernstein boom of high interest in righting wrongs and doing the public’s business through journalism.

This is not to idealize that world: It was full of problems in the culture and polity and profession. It was the time when income inequality, a term whose importance to the future we just now are beginning to grasp, began to explode. For those of us wanting to enter journalism, we still suffered from embarrassingly low pay for entry-level jobs (my first job as a journalist paid me \$185 per week, working with an office manager who stared at the clock every time I came in and out of the newsroom). There was an abundance of journalists in the marketplace, and the career march for someone coming out of journalism school seemed long and steep.

But we still believed there was a future in the business, and there was: For me, that first job at a very small community weekly newspaper led to a second, bigger weekly after only four months. And to a daily newsroom within three years. And to an Associated Press bureau after only seven. There was plenty of room to move as a journalist in the 1980s.

In 2014, most everything about journalism has changed: Legacy media brands are ill — if not terminally so then at least in ways that impact their ability to serve as the community and national institutions they once were. Virtually anyone with a smartphone and an Internet connection can be a journalist, with all of the promises and perils that brings. Corporate-owned media demand profitability at levels unimagined in the 1980s, casting off the long-accepted philosophy that good journalism is subsidized journalism. That means fewer jobs, lower pay and

less incentive to keep accomplished journalists in the fold.

The students have changed, too: They’re less engaged in the broader world and in the promise of journalism than they were in the years of Vietnam and Nixon and Watergate, although they do want to be more engaged with their communities where they think they can make a difference. They’re less able to afford a journalism education than the students of a generation ago. (I recently came across a fee card for my senior year of university and found, to my amazement, that my total tuition bill for senior year was all of \$1,500.)

Indeed, many of our students’ families are asking the hard question that was unthinkable even 10 years ago: Is a journalism degree — is college, for that matter — worth it?

Virtually everything about journalism has changed in the past generation. Virtually everything, that is, except journalism education.

It may not be entirely fair to level so broad a charge at our discipline: Many schools, mine included, offer coursework in new fields such as multimedia or social media. Some are offering doses of entrepreneurial journalism in their offerings. Many have opted out of the “silo” mentality of traditional journalism education.

Still, not enough have done so. And the irony is that the same forces that eviscerated newsrooms over the past 10 to 15 years now threaten higher education generally and journalism education in particular. Many of us in the leadership of journalism education left newsrooms to come to the academy, some of us because our jobs in the newsroom went away. What can we do to avoid that same fate for our programs and institutions?

Finishing my 25th year of teaching and administering a journalism program in a liberal arts college in the Midwest, I have found that the world of teaching journalism has shifted considerably in the past generation. Let's start with the students in our classroom: They're a much different breed than we encountered not so many years ago.

A recent headline at the Poynter Institute's website drove this point home. On Feb. 3, Poynter reported that, "Students Are Tired of Hearing There's Never Been a Better Time to be a Journalist." It featured a bingo-game-styled photo of clichés from guest speakers that two Boston University journalism students say they and their classmates roll their eyes at hearing. Some of the bon mots that at least some of our students are tired of hearing:

- "Free press is the foundation of a healthy democracy."
- "How many of you read the *New York Times*? Good!"
- "Do you want to be first, or right?"
- "We tell stories."

As a journalist trained in the heyday of Woodward and Bernstein, I went into the business to do just those things that at least some of our students today find passé. And that well illustrates that the journalism graduate of 2014 will not be the journalism graduate of 1981.

There was a time when journalism students went from the university primarily into the newsrooms of traditional media — newspapers, magazines, radio and television. Then they started moving into public relations and advertising. And there still is a core of young people entering our programs who are passionate about reporting and delivering news to the public, using whatever tools they need to do so.

Today, however, many journalism students seem to be interested in simply getting a job. Their parents would love for them to get any job.

Even when we expand our definition of media to include social media and the digital world, many of our students aren't pursuing those lines of work with their journalism degrees. How many of your students seem to pursue their studies out a vague sense that the degree will be a "practical" means of building the "communication skills" that an employer will someday find attractive?

As the *2012 Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Graduates* illustrates, news consumed by journalism

students is shifting in character and source. Fewer than half as many 2012 journalism graduates (36.6%) reported reading a newspaper within the past day than did the graduates of nearly 20 years ago (81.7%). They're similarly less likely to get news from magazines, television or radio. It's no surprise that they're more likely to get news from mobile devices and social media, as that's the case with the broader world. But it seems likely that their connections with and definitions of "news" are more fleeting and transitory than would have been the case a generation ago. (Tell me: If you encounter a headline that someone shares on Facebook, or a tweet accompanied by a short link and hashtag, does that constitute following the "news"?)

The point: Journalism students aren't necessarily interested in practicing journalism, at least not in the way that journalism schools have traditionally defined the field. Few are interested in working in newsrooms, and many aren't interested in work in public relations or advertising or production. They may be interested in going to graduate or law school. But the odds are that an increasing number simply don't know what they plan to do with a journalism degree.

What we need to be able to do is make the case that there are many applications for a journalism degree beyond working in newsrooms or agencies or pursuing graduate study. Then we need to do better at ascertaining what it is that attracts our students to our programs in the first place.

When the national average for student debt on graduation is nearing \$30,000, and two-thirds of students graduate with debt, the day is nigh when students and their families balk at making an investment that will be difficult to pay when the average starting salary for journalism graduates is but \$32,000 per year.

By and large, 18-year-old first-year college students either don't know where their lives are heading, or they haven't lived in a world in which journalism played a compelling role in building their communities or their nation. It may indeed be the case that there's never been a better time to get into journalism, but it's going to take plenty of selling to convince students and families that that's the case.

The first thing we can do to sell journalism is understand who our future students are likely to be. More students are drawn to journalism as generalists who like writing and "expressing" themselves but are rather naïve when it

comes to reporting and researching. If we're going to educate students who are as likely to want to work as fundraisers or corporate researchers as they are to cover politics or shoot video, we need to stop complaining that they lack the passion and ambition that many of us had as undergraduates and begin showing them how the ideas and skills we teach apply to a wide array of future jobs. Employers have complained for decades that college graduates are poor writers: We run the programs that can address that shortcoming, even if our students are unlikely to work in a high-profile news organization or public relations or advertising agency

We can also acknowledge and value the contributions to journalism education provided by practitioners. More than a few journalism programs, seeking legitimacy within the academy, have passed up professionals in pursuit of doctoral faculty with little if any professional experience. In many schools and departments, professionals form a kind of second class of faculty, serving as visiting faculty or in term appointments. If they are eligible for tenure and earn it, they're many times limited in their abilities to secure faculty promotions.

Masters- and even bachelors-credentialed faculty who teach well, serve the profession and conduct scholarly and creative development should be recruited to teach journalism. They should be treated with the same respect and avenues of professional advancement as those faculty members with doctorates. Journalism programs can develop equitable criteria that will ensure that the researcher and the practitioner can be rewarded for their work in building knowledge in the field and training the next generation of journalists, broadly defined.

If we want to best serve our students, we need to provide incentives for the best teachers to work in our programs. Those are the teachers who can attract, teach and retain the students who are the future of journalism.

Brian Steffen is chair and professor of Communication & Media Studies at Simpson College in Iowa, where he has served on the faculty since 1989. His Ph.D. is from the University of Iowa. Before entering the academy, Steffen worked for eight years in community newspapers and for the Associated Press.

ISSUES OF EDITORIAL CONTROL, PRIOR RESTRAINT, AND PRIOR REVIEW FACING STUDENT NEWSPAPERS ON PUBLIC UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES IN OHIO: ADMINISTRATIVE, FACULTY AND STUDENT PERSPECTIVES

By Terry L. Hapney, Jr., Marshall University, and David M. Lucas, Ohio University

Introduction

Recent headlines illustrate that the struggle continues between student journalists and administrators on public university campuses nationwide. The back and forth centers on student journalists' objective of reporting on the activities occurring on the campuses and administrators' hesitance to provide the necessary information to ensure the students can do their jobs, as charged by the student newspapers for which they work. Examples of headlines include: "UCLA adopts policy limiting access to faculty work" (Santus, 2014, para. 1); "Purdue Exponent photographer detained by police while covering campus shooting" (McDermott, 2014, para. 1); "Appalachian editor calls for open chancellor search in front-page editorial" (McDermott, 2014, para. 1); "Oregon State adviser resigns over public records dispute with university" (Santus, 2014, para. 1). Journalism administrators, in particular, are working in environments in which they may find themselves at odds with university administrators from other disciplines or those more senior to them. This is an issue they should consider as they deal with these other entities and develop strategies for evolving their own academic programs.

This article examines issues of editorial control, prior restraint, and prior review on public university campuses in an important state in America's heartland — Ohio. It provides a review of necessary literature; the method of the study; specific instances of issues of the struggle over editorial control, prior restraint, and prior review on public university campuses in the state; and concludes with final thoughts on what continues as a real problem for student newspapers throughout the United States.

Review of the Literature

Litigation and literature reveal an ongoing conflict between university and student newspaper personnel. It is important for administrators in higher education who "do not understand the role of the student press or the basic tenets of press freedom" to gain an understanding about to whom student newspapers report and the policies governing them on public campuses (Kanigel, 2006, p. 8).

Administrators having a better understanding of the role of student media and freedom of the press would aid in setting policies related to student newspapers, deciding funding for the publications, creating better working relationships between administrators and student journalists, and, in most cases, allow both administrators and student journalists to avoid litigation against one another. Much of the problem with higher education student media, as reflected in the litigation and literature, is the result of higher education administrators' interpretation of *Hazelwood*.

Consistent with the First Amendment, public high school teachers and administrators may exercise "editorial control over the style and content of student speech in school-sponsored expressive activities so long as their actions are reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical concerns" (*Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier*, 1988, p. 260).

In most cases, the courts have permitted limitations on university student newspapers only when the content is copyrighted, libelous, obscene, or when administrators prove that a significant and imminent physical disruption

on the university campus will occur as result of the content of the newspaper (Applegate, 2005).

Applegate added that there are intrinsic differences between high school and university student journalists, with the most basic being the apparent age difference. Further, high school students do not usually reach the age of 18 until their final year in high school; university students are nearly all 18 or older, lending, hopefully, to the difference in maturity level (Applegate, 2005).

The more than 60 federal and state court cases that dealt with student newspapers at public colleges and universities were nearly unanimous that First Amendment rights apply in higher education just as they do elsewhere in journalism (*Channing Club v. Board of Regents of Texas Tech University*, 1970; *Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Education*, 1967; *Hays Co. Guardian v. Supple*, 1992; *Lueth v. St. Clair County Community College*, 1990; *Miami Student v. Miami University*, 1997; *Milliner v. Turner*, 1983; *New Times v. Arizona Board of Regents*, 1974; SPLC, 2009; Reed, 1985). With this in mind, recent years have seen the circuits split on whether *Hazelwood* applies in higher education. The result is permitting the attitudes of who is sitting on the bench to define both student journalists' First Amendment rights and university administrators' ability to control college/university-sponsored speech at public institutions (Hapney & Lucas, in press; Hapney & Russo, 2013; *Hosty v. Carter*, 2006; Ng, 2008; *United States v. Miami University*, 2002). Applegate (2005) contended that the Supreme Court's inaction in addressing whether university student newspapers are empowered with the same freedoms of the press as mainstream newspapers or designated restrictions imposed on them by administrators is causing dispute in the lower courts and uncertainty as to what standard should apply to university student newspapers. As these lower-court decisions are not binding in all circuits, uncertainty remains until the Supreme Court rules on this issue.

As reflected in the litigation, students and newspaper advisers do not always experience freedom of press because administrators may not be respecting that right. One-half of the desired public university newspaper scenario is one in which students are practicing responsible journalism that comprises fair, accurate, and balanced reporting in exercising their freedom of press rights. The other half consists of higher education administrators respecting student journalists' rights without intimidating, bullying, and stifling student journalists and their advisers, as has been the situation in many of the court cases on this subject. Administrators, faculty members, and students need

to understand their roles in relation to student newspapers on public university campuses.

Method

The research documented in this paper is one part of a much larger study on student newspaper governance on public university campuses in Ohio (Hapney, 2012). This article deals specifically with issues of editorial control, prior restraint, and prior review facing student newspapers on public university campuses in Ohio. It outlines the perspectives of administrators, faculty members, and students.

The original study that garnered the bulk of the data presented in this article utilized a mixed-methods research design that was predominantly qualitative (Ridenour & Newman, 2008). The researcher used a survey questionnaire to gauge the attitudes of administrators, faculty, and students regarding student newspapers on Ohio's public university campuses. Then, the researcher visited any university campus that had experienced litigation, as indicated in the responses in the survey, between student journalists and administrators. He conducted qualitative research via interviews and focus groups on those campuses to discover the specifics of what issues student journalists, faculty members, and administrators faced at those institutions relating to student newspapers.

The study included 11 universities: University of Akron, Bowling Green State University, University of Cincinnati, Ohio University, The Ohio State University, University of Toledo, Kent State University, Miami University, Cleveland State University, Wright State University, and Youngstown State University. Three additional state universities were eliminated from the study for various reasons affecting rigor. Of the 11 participating universities, four had instances of litigation. Interviews and focus groups provided the data for the study and were all conducted in the informants' natural, professional/academic environments.

The principal investigator traveled to the four university locations, interviewing Student Journalists (SJ), Student Affairs Administrators (SAA), Journalism Faculty Members (JFM), Student Newspaper Advisory Board Members (SNABM), and administrative Legal Team Members (LTM). This article provides examples of specific problems facing the student newspapers in the areas of editorial control, prior restraint, and prior review on these campuses.

Issues of Editorial Control, Prior Restraint, and Prior Review Facing Student Newspapers on Select Public University Campuses in Ohio: Administrative, Faculty, and Student Perspectives

Editorial Control/Prior Restraint/Prior Review—Hillcrest University (HU)

Administrator.

The SAA pointed out that the biggest issues have been related to wrong facts in the student newspaper at HU versus the editorial content itself or even the nature of the story. There has been no litigation between the student newspaper and the university during the time the SAA has been at the institution. "But I think there may have been before that," she acknowledged. The SAA has never witnessed a time when any attempt was made to censor, engage in prior restraint, or engage in prior review of the student newspaper. She did say that a former HU communications administrator would sit down at the beginning of each academic year and talk to the student journalists about the importance of accuracy, the importance of researching stories, and about knowing facts. "It was more an educational approach than a control approach," the SAA stated.

Student.

Problems between administrators at the university and the student newspaper do occur, according to the SJ. University administrators tell the student staff members when administrators feel they have made a mistake. The administrators do not try to change anything in the paper's stories except to say the information was wrong. The SJ pointed out that he's never had to deal with prior review or prior restraint at HU. The paper, after the fact, gets complaints sometimes. The student editors have the final say if an issue arises. They seldom even call their adviser. When they do call the adviser it is for advice on legal issues. The SJ sees the newspaper as operating in an environment in which it is free to publish and be a newspaper. Specifically, it is a watchdog and an instructional activity, according to the SJ.

Faculty.

The JFM said she sees her job, in part, as educating the university community about how the student newspaper works. "The university here pretty much gets it," she indicated. "I mean, there've been a few cases where I've had to (deal with administrators). But, overall, they pretty much get the facts that these are kids learning and we need to let them learn." Most HU administrators will call the editor, not the adviser, when there are problems,

the JFM maintained. She said there are a few people at HU who, if they do not get satisfaction, will call her. But, most of the time the JFM is not that involved in the day-to-day operations of the newspaper. "They're very good about letting us know when we make mistakes . . . but, generally (there is) no strong-arming," she remarked. The JFM stated that so far there have been some pretty strong advocates for freedom of the press at HU.

The JFM has seen instances of problems arising between the HU administration and the student newspaper staff. Most of these instances, according to the JFM, have related to "stupid" things the students have put in the paper. The JFM declared that the students produced "this horrible issue" that contained racist, sexist, and other inappropriate language: ". . . [T]here (were lots of) problems with that . . . But most of it was dealt with pretty well within . . . the (student affairs dean) got involved in that. And we had a few sessions to talk about why some of these things weren't appropriate."

There have been no cases of censorship, prior restraint, or prior review during the JFM's time at HU. "(The administration) just (tries) to teach people," the JFM reported. "Like a parent. 'You really shouldn't be doing that!'"

Editorial Control/Prior Restraint/Prior Review—University of Tomorrow (UOT)

Administrator.

The SAA recognized that the student newspaper is independent of UOT. The paper had financial ties to the university prior to her arrival at UOT. It also became independent prior to her time at the university. "It's my understanding that the whole basis for the paper leaving and becoming independent had to do with a disagreement with administration," she commented.

Student.

The SJ commented that the student newspaper is an independently run operation. "Our job is still to serve the university (community)," she added. "So, we do have to work with . . . university administration and officials to receive information for stories that (are) relevant." As far as content decisions are concerned, it is always the section editor's decision, but then after they make the decision to include a particular story, the editor-in-chief has the final say in what runs in the student newspaper.

The SJ indicated that there had been times when controversial topics student journalists were covering caused the university administration to push back at them. There

were no reports of direct censorship attempts, but there were other attempts to hamstring the student press, such as by making access to information difficult. Student journalists were able to thwart these attempts by relying on the open-records law. The staff has been disappointed by instances when administration refused comment on issues.

Faculty.

The JFM maintained that the paper's independent status came about as the result of a former university president engaging in censorship. This presidency lasted for just a year-and-a-half. "There was a dissatisfaction among the faculty and unrest over the paper because of the censorship," he noted. The change to independent status took place in the late 1990s.

The SNABM pointed out that a number of issues led to the newspaper's independent status. There was a dispute between the university president at that time and the student newspaper. Rumors and reports in the local metro daily newspaper stated that there were allegations of attempted censorship by the president. He had threatened to withhold the paper's funding and withdraw student journalists' stipends if they did not change their reporting method on a particular story. "That was the straw that broke the camel's back, so to speak," the SNABM remarked. The president was gone after 17 months.

The SNABM commented that he has always taken a "very cautious" approach to ensuring the students know he is there to provide guidance. "We're not here to tell them what to do, what to write or anything like that," he explained. He indicated "facts are facts" and if an administrator has messed up, he/she needs to "take (his/her) lumps." "If (he/she) did not, 99 percent of the time it is going to explain itself."

Editorial Control/Prior Restraint/Prior Review— Taylor White University (TWU)

Administrator.

The SAA described the relationship between the university's administration and the independent student newspaper as "very good." The SAA said that the role of the student press on campus is understood and appreciated. This was not the case upon the SAA's arrival.

The SAA recounted:

Right as I came here ... The student life committee of the faculty senate, some member of the faculty wanted to have greater oversight (laughter) . . . With the help of the adviser we kinda resisted,

advocated for the students and I think the problem . . . wasn't with any of the content. It had to do with how the students were selected to be in charge of the paper. And, I think the faculty member's perception was that the students picked their friends and not people who . . . were best for the job. And so, we kinda tweaked the selection process and that concern went away.

He said he has not heard anymore about this issue in three years.

The LTM noted the administration at TWU has had to weigh in on items that have been published in the two student newspapers in the past. She offered that one such instance happened many years ago when she first arrived at the university. There was a lawsuit against the lab newspaper attached to the curriculum. It involved a faculty member who was the subject of an article; the faculty member claimed that the paper had published misstatements and engaged in libel. During that process the relationship between the university and the student newspaper was clarified with the understanding that newspaper content was independent of university control. To the best of her recollection the suit was dropped.

The LTM indicated she does not believe there have been cases of prior restraint and prior review in relation to the student newspapers at TWU since her arrival in 1990. With regard to the resolution of a major problem between the administration and the student journalists who work for either student newspaper, the LTM is unsure who would have the final say in such a scenario. The LTM stated in the case of the lab newspaper, she thinks there would be an effort to work it out, and in that sense, the administration would, ultimately, come to bear on the decision, again, because it is tied to the curriculum. "I don't think the same would be true with the (independent student newspaper at TWU)," she said. It is not attached to the university's curriculum.

Student.

The SJ explained that there have been no problems between the TWU administration and the lab paper. "No one has ever in my time, even Dr. (JFM), mentioned, I don't think anyone has ever stopped and said, 'No, you can't do it.'" The SJ offered that he has had prior review offered to him "politely," which he declined.

Faculty.

The JFM remarked that there have been no problems between the TWU administration and the lab newspaper.

However, he reported there was once a problem between the faculty and this paper. He stated that faculty members have not liked what the newspaper has written or they feel the criticism of certain topics is unfair. "Sometimes it is fair criticism, but the faculty members have not gone to the administration and said, 'Well, we need to bring these people in.' So that has not happened. They have been upset by it," the JFM declared. There have been no instances of censorship, prior restraint, or prior review in relation to the lab newspaper at TWU, according to the JFM.

If a problem arises between the university administration and the student journalists who write for the lab newspaper, the adviser, the director (of the journalism division), and the dean of the college would resolve the issue. This is the case due to the fact that it is a lab newspaper, a class that is taught by the adviser. "Let's say (the student journalists) wanted to do a story and I didn't allow them to do it then they can always approach the (director or dean)," he recognized. Again, such a structure would likely place the university in the realm of liability should a case go to court, given the way the courts are trending. There have been no instances of litigation between the student journalists working for the lab newspaper and the TWU administration, according to the JFM.

The JFM said the lab newspaper is different from most independent college newspapers because it is a class and grading is involved in it. Despite all the effort he tries to give students to ensure they have as much freedom to run the newspaper, they still have to work within boundaries of a lab newspaper environment. The JFM commented that students do have decision-making power in terms of content and decide in what section of the paper content goes.

Editorial Control/Prior Restraint/Prior Review— Buckeye State University (BSU)

Administrator.

The SAA describes the relationship between the administration and student newspaper at BSU as "fairly good," stating there have been no high-profile issues of problems between the administration and student journalists. She attributes the smooth, collegial relationship to a director in her administrative office sitting on the student media committee trying ". . . to have an open communication between that office, between this office, and the student media manager for sure, and anyone else we need to have open communication with," she remarked. The SAA stated that there have been no issues with re-

gard to censorship, prior restraint, or prior review as related to the student newspaper. The only issues related to these factors have been in the form of public records requests for information the administration has been hesitant to provide. "Generally, our resistance has been that we felt it identified educational records or other information of students," she declared.

In terms of the final say with regard to a resolution if the editors of the student newspaper and the administration were at odds about something, the SAA reported it would depend on the issue. "If it got into the realm of legal interpretation then our legal counsel would be involved in giving advice on that, to both . . . sides of the coin . . . if it was a funding issue, then a vice president might be involved in being the final say on how the funding could or could not be used," she acknowledged. The SAA indicated that she was unaware of any cases of litigation between the paper and the administration.

Student.

The SJ's who were interviewed by the researcher reported that there have been problems between the university administration and student media at BSU. There is strong evidence of integration among all student media at BSU, including the student newspaper, radio station, television station, and online media. The student television journalists stated they have problems regularly simply because they are a television station. They stated that the university president refuses to go on camera. "He'll talk, but he won't go on camera," an SJ said. "As a television station, we need sound; we need pictures." The students commented that when they are doing stories about the campus recreation center or about something happening in dorms that administrators do not permit them to film in those areas. "We're not allowed to talk to the RA's. And that's all their policies. It's tough to talk to authoritative figures for sure."

The student newspaper journalists have a difficult time speaking with BSU's president, too. "Whenever we interview him we have to send our questions ahead of time, so that he, like, reads them over and that gives him an opportunity to give very diplomatic answers," a BSU SJ offered. The student feels the newspaper is not getting a real answer when this occurs. The student newspaper journalists pointed out that this is a new occurrence on the BSU campus. "It's typically been that we set up these interviews and it happens," one SJ remarked.

The only time during a recent academic year that the television journalists recorded the BSU president without

him knowing ahead of time was at a football game. "It was the homecoming game against (another university). He was there and was trying to look like the 'I hang out with students' type of president . . . Our general manager was filming . . . the game and he asked him a couple of questions right away." The broadcast journalism student reported that the president's answers were not anything good, but that was the only time they had access to him.

The SJ's stated that administrators at BSU are trying to keep things from them. "Something's said in a public meeting and they try to make sure that we can't publish it." One SJ was told that he could not report what was said in a public meeting after it had already been said. The students took the information to press anyway.

The students summed up the relationship between the administration and the student media with descriptors such as "Shaky," "Tense," "Rough," "Very rough," and "Hard." Administrators, according to the SJ's, call the student newspaper a derogatory name among themselves and in public meetings. They have heard it and the president told them this in a meeting once. The students agreed that administrators have never really said the students cannot publish or broadcast material in the student media, but they have tried to convince them not to do so. Administrators will say, "it's off the record" and "you shouldn't write that."

The students remarked that they have also had cases in which once they have written something the individuals they interviewed asked them to send them a copy of what was written so they could proofread it first. The students tell their sources, "No, we don't do that."

Leaders in a student organization told the SJ's they were not permitted to attend a meeting. "We did anyways," one SJ offered. "It was a public meeting that was publicized." The SJ's explained that they were covering the meeting and they did get the story. "But they acted as though we were trying to attack them," an SJ remarked. "We were just reporting on what was happening." Another SJ stated this mentality is widespread on campus. "It is frightening, because, you know, I mean we're paying for everything around here. It's a public university," the SJ said.

Faculty.

The SNABM describes the relationship between the student paper and the university administration as "fairly typical." "I think . . . the president . . . himself, has been known to make somewhat snarky comments about the

(student newspaper) . . . in public events," he recognized. The SNABM said it is usually with faculty and staff members. "But, it, nonetheless, rubs people the wrong way," he added. The SNABM commented that this type of dialogue is inappropriate on the university president's part. "He should know better. I think it's a reflection of a failure on his part that that happens." This explained, the SNABM indicated that there are open lines of communication and the administration, in general, has been very supportive of the independence of the publication.

The SNABM reported that the hardest issues center on issues of taste, when university administrators say some material is inappropriate. The SNABM said the administration also shows annoyance when students have demanded records that the university really does not want to give them. In these circumstances, the university, according to the SNABM, is "stonewalling." "It's not so much active . . . interference or threats, but it's just like well, you know, good luck, you're not gonna get this easily from us," he noted.

It is a constant battle, according to the JFM. "They use embargos here incredibly loosely. They'll tell a student, well, you can't report on that yet. We're not ready to talk about it." The student media leaders, according to the JFM, proceed with reporting it if they know about it. "They tried to withdraw an announcement in a public committee meeting for the board of trustees a couple of weeks ago. They announced it and then said, well, this is embargoed so media can't talk about it. That's not how it works, you guys. That's basically what we told them. I don't think they get it."

The SNABM offered that there have been no explicit instances of censorship, prior restraint, or prior review since his arrival on the BSU campus. In terms of complaints, very rarely does the administration go directly to the student journalists, according to the SNABM. Instead, they complain to the dean of the college or the director of the journalism program. They expect them to do something. "Their response, historically, has very consistently been 'that's not our role; when it comes to content, the students make the decisions,'" the SNABM declared.

The JFM offered that in the student media bylaws they are making it clearer that BSU cannot influence content in publications. If an issue between the administration and the student media could not be resolved she would invite the administrators involved to sit down with key

student leaders, the advisers, and possibly the director. The JFM's goal is for the student journalists to solve the problems with whomever they may have conflict. The JFM indicated that she thinks it is very important that student journalists have editorial independence so they can make their own decisions. She says it helps having an advising structure because students do not always know what to do.

Conclusion

The research efforts reveal that a natural tension exists between administrators and students from the universities studied. This tension pits the administration against the student journalists in the sense that administrators feel they must reign in the student newspaper staff to prevent legal entanglements, public relations problems, or academic disruptions. The administrators, for the most part, avoid censorship but instead engage in pre-emptive messages, serious warnings, or various attempts at review. Sometimes the administrators expressed distrust, lack of respect, or some contempt for the activities of the paper but no serious attempt at censorship was detected.

Student newspaper staff members, on the other hand, envision their task as serving as a watchdog over university activities and actions. Most express little concern over the control attempts of administrators. Students seem to take their jobs as journalists very seriously and want to

publish the facts, whatever they may be and wherever they may lead.

The data reveal that students and newspaper advisers do not always experience freedom of press because administrators wish to control the message. The students seek to practice responsible journalism that comprises fair, accurate, and balanced reporting in exercising their freedom of press rights. The administrators seek to respect the student journalists' rights, but sometimes end up intimidating, bullying, and stifling student journalists and their advisers. Administrators, faculty members, and students need to understand their roles in relation to student newspapers on public university campuses and the tension that naturally exists among the three.

More structured, collaborative communication between the university administration and student journalists would tend to ease the tension and allow better message flow on a regular basis. An administrators' message or guest editorial to explain issues on campus might also help. In the end, the research reveals that a better understanding of roles, mission, and responsibilities for both university administrators and students would provide a more successful and fulfilling experience for everyone involved.

Dr. Terry L. Hapney, Jr., is an associate professor in the W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communications at Marshall University. Dr. David M. Lucas is an associate professor at Ohio University.

REFERENCES

- Applegate, D. A. (2005). Stop the presses: The impact of *Hosty v. Carter* and *Pitt News v. Pappert* on the editorial freedom of college newspaper. *Case Western Reserve Law Review*, 56, 247-281.
- Channing Club v. Texas Tech University, 317 F. Supp. 688 (D.C. Tex. 1970).
- Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Education, 273 F. Supp. 613 (M.D. Ala. 1967).
- Hapney, T.L. (2012). *Student Newspaper Governance on Public University Campuses in Ohio: Higher Education Administrators Vs. Student Journalists* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Dayton, Dayton, OH.
- Hapney, T. L. & Lucas, D. M. (in press). Open records requests at state universities in Ohio: The law, legalities, and litigation. *AURCO Journal*.
- Hapney, T. L., & Russo, C. J. (2013). Student newspapers at public colleges and universities: Lessons from the United States. *Education Law Journal*, 14(2), 114-124.
- Hays County Guardian v. Supple, 969 F.2d 111 (5th Cir. 1992).
- Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier, 484 U.S. 260 (1988).
- Hosty v. Carter, 412 F.3d 731 (7th Cir. 2006).
- Jacobellis v. State of Ohio, 378 U.S. 184 (1964).
- Kanigel, R. (2006). *The student newspaper survival guide*. Ames, Iowa: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lueth v. St. Clair County Community College, 732 F. Supp. 1410 (E.D. Mich. 1990).
- McDermott, C. (2014a.). Purdue Exponent photographer detained by police while covering campus shooting. Retrieved from: <http://www.splc.org/news/newsflash.asp?id=2652>
- McDermott, C. (2014b.). Q&A: Appalachian editor calls for open chancellor search in front-page editorial. Retrieved from: <http://www.splc.org/wordpress/?p=6085>
- Miami Student v. Miami University, 522 U.S. 1022 (1997).
- Milliner v. Turner, 436 So. 2d 1300 (La. Ct. App. 1983).
- Ng, R. B. (2008). A house divided: How judicial inaction and a circuit split forfeited the First Amendment rights of student journalists at America's universities. *Hastings Constitutional Law Quarterly*.

New Times v. Arizona Board of Regents, 519 P.2d 169 (Ariz. 1974).

Ridenour, C. S., & Newman, I. (2008). *Mixed methods research: Exploring the interactive continuum*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Santus, R. (2014a.). Oregon State adviser resigns over public records dispute with university. Retrieved from: <http://www.splc.org/news/news-flash.asp?id=2649>

Santus, R. (2014b.). UCLA adopts policy limiting access to faculty work. Retrieved from: <http://www.splc.org/news/newsflash.asp?id=2654>

Student Press Law Center (2009). *SPLC legal brief: Student press freedom at public colleges*. Retrieved from <https://www.splc.org/legalresearch.asp?id=9>

MIGRANT FROM PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISM TO ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION EXAMINES DIFFERENCES, REAL AND OTHERWISE, BETWEEN FIELDS

By Jerry Ceppos, Louisiana State University

When the late Reese Cleghorn, dean of the University of Maryland's College of Journalism, wrote perhaps 30 years ago about the differences between industry and the academy, he couldn't have foreseen the changes in both. But his main point would be the same today: Be prepared for a different world if you move from the media industry to a leadership position in a journalism or mass-communication school.

The good folks at the American Society of News Editors searched for Reese's story in the archives of the *ASNE Bulletin* magazine but couldn't find it. All these years later, I remember only one of Reese's points—a light one, at that. I vividly remember that he said academics wouldn't have anything near the expense accounts they had in industry. That's probably still somewhat true, but less so because of the contractions in the media businesses.

So, let's compile our own list of real and perceived differences. I had help from some of the many colleagues who, like me, have moved from news jobs to the academy recently. Let me know if you disagree with the list or want to add items.

Civility

I had heard all of the jokes about academic politics being so barbarous because the winnings are so small, or variations of that: "Academic politics is the most vicious and bitter form of politics, because the stakes are so low," "Politics on the university campus are the worst of all kinds of politics because the stakes are so small." In fact, I have found just the opposite. My lasting memory is of a tense meeting with the IT director, the president, and the provost of the University of Nevada, Reno, where I was dean of the Reynolds School of Journalism. The story isn't very meaningful to anyone but the four of us, so I'll make it brief: We—the journalism school, not the IT director—had won a \$7.9 million gift from the Donald W.

Reynolds Foundation to modernize the technology in our building. The president and provost had asked that we turn many of the important technology decisions over to the IT director. I resisted because of a bad relationship with him and because I believed that the faculty strongly prized our technological independence. You can argue about the merits (most of you probably would put the IT director's technological knowledge over mine), but it's the process that I found more interesting as we met for what I assumed was a showdown. Sure enough, the meeting wasn't pleasant. The IT director took potshots at the j-school. I stood my ground. But never was I ordered to surrender. I confess thinking that the same meeting in industry would have ended in 30 seconds, with the CEO (or publisher or whomever) telling me just how little I know about technology—and ending the conversation right there. But that never happened in our awkward meeting.

I can't tell you the outcome because the IT director and I both left shortly afterwards. However, I can say that, in six years as a dean, I've never been told to do anything that I strongly opposed. And conversations with almost every colleague have been civil. Or as Diane McFarlin, long-time executive editor and publisher of the *Sarasota Herald-Tribune* and now dean of the University of Florida's College of Journalism and Communications, says,

Newsrooms and faculties have many of the same characteristics. Among them are collective intellect, a fierce commitment to the mission, the sense of a higher calling and a recognition that change must be embraced. So, it feels like familiar territory. The biggest difference is that you don't hear nearly as much cursing in the academy as you do in newsrooms."

Is all of that a reflection of the cultured academy....or of an uncivilized industry? You'll have to decide.

Promotion, Tenure, Hiring

Most of us agree with Diane McFarlin, who says, “The tenure and promotion process is certainly the biggest difference [between the industry and the academy]. Next on my list is pace, especially when hiring. The search process in the private sector is measured in weeks. Here it is a process of many months, and, if a first choice falls through, the process can take a year.” Kristin Gilger, associate dean at the Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication at Arizona State University, used almost the same words. Reminiscing about her life at newspapers, she said,

I could interview and hire someone in the same day—running it by only my boss and possibly HR. At the university, you spend time on job descriptions, search committees and perhaps a faculty vote—as well as a plethora of university policies and protocol, including the formal opening and closing of application periods, using a common set of questions that all candidates will be asked, formal reference checks, etc. I’m not saying it’s bad, but it’s definitely different.

Gilger is a former deputy managing editor for news of the *Arizona Republic*. My observation is that careful (but fair) selection of search-committee members and a limit on the number of searches each year could speed up the process. But numerous obstacles are in the way—particularly, in the case of recent LSU applicants, the issue of spousal hires, which can be enormously complicated. My concerns about promotion and tenure are greater than those about searches because it’s so new to me: The idea of “up or out”—achieving tenure or leaving—is different from anything in the newsroom. So is the idea that an unsuccessful applicant for tenure has a year to find another job, not exactly the norm in newsrooms and not the best way to energize a professor. (My epiphany about the year’s notice at most schools actually involved an untenured faculty member in a very well-paid position: I told him that he seemed misplaced—but had a year to find another job. I noticed that he wasn’t around very much that next year. I later was told, but never did confirm, that he moonlighted that year in a weekly teaching job at a university 218 miles away!)

I also worry that too many schools put too much weight on the number of research publications rather than on their quality or their influence on the media professions. Finally, I’m concerned that the P&T process seems so mysterious to many junior faculty members.

Philanthropy

Every industry friend who asks me for advice about applying for an academic administrator’s job has worried about his or her lack of fund-raising experience. Actually, getting donors excited about giving isn’t very different from getting CEOs excited about increasing the size of the newsroom (or sparing it from cuts): Enthusiasm, pride, success, and identifying the CEO’s hot buttons all work. They also work for donors. But, unlike most editors who joust with their bosses, many administrators will tell you, with surprise in their voices, that raising money is among their most interesting duties.

Pace of Change

Don’t laugh, but many newsroom people who move into the academy bristle at the slow rate of change in the academy. “The academy is a place where no one ever utters the words, ‘Hey, let’s give it a shot,’” Ken Paulson, the new dean of the College of Mass Communication at Middle Tennessee State University and former editor-in-chief of *USA Today*, told me. “Every new idea has to be vetted extensively and every potential stakeholder has to weigh in. That has merit, but it also makes truly bold moves few and far between.”

“Many universities are slow places; that is, they’re slow to change,” Gilger said. “I feel lucky that at the Cronkite School we are able to move fast to respond to changing needs, technologies and modes of communication. The academy needs to be more innovative, more open to change and quicker to move, just as the industry does.” As my predecessor at LSU told me, the academy operates by committee. True, but, instead, I sometimes enjoy just kicking around the bold moves that Paulson mentioned during hallway conversation and informal parts of faculty meetings. If there’s enough conversation, most folks are comfortable with the idea by the time that formal action becomes necessary. I call that “shared conversation,” a subset of shared governance.

The Academic Vocabulary

Peggy Kuhr, vice president for integrated communications of the University of Montana, former dean of its journalism school and a former top editor at the *Spokane Spokesman-Review*, introduced me to the idea of an academic vocabulary, or at least an academic mindset. I think Peggy meant this: You can go in with guns blazing to change the academy, but many colleagues think less about revolution and more about routine issues: winning

tenure...or publishing that next book...or signing students up for a brilliant new course without resorting to a vast advertising campaign. In short: You wouldn't go in with guns blazing to the newsroom, saying, "All I want is great journalism. So don't worry about tomorrow's paper." Don't do that in the academy either.

Individual Contributors

Silicon Valley, where I lived and worked for almost 30 years, rejoiced in the "individual contributor," the brilliant scientist who focused on his or her work rather than on managing the company or chatting up stock-market analysts. Sure, the newsroom had its individual contributors, perhaps the investigative reporter who didn't know what editors do and didn't care. But not many folks were in that category. More might be at a university. Accommodating them takes work for a newsroom person but the work can be worthwhile if your individual contributors produce outstanding research or outstanding teaching or both. It's not always easy, though.

Pam Luecke, chair of Washington & Lee's Department of Journalism and Mass Communications and former executive editor of the *Lexington Herald-Leader*, enjoys the "rhythm" of the academic year. But she accurately observes, "One unexpected consequence of this longer horizon is less of a sense of common purpose than I found in most newsrooms. Not until I left the newsroom did I appreciate the unifying power of a staff working together as a team, every day, to cover the news and put out a newspaper. In a university, we all work to educate our students, of course, but the incentives of tenure and promotion tend to reward individual achievements more than collective ones. I had thought a college would be the ultimate 'collegial' place but, in many ways, newsrooms are more so."

Mentoring

If I ever went back to a newsroom, my first step would be to establish a formal mentoring program, which is routine at many schools. I'm sure that some newsrooms have such programs, but I don't know of any. In the academy, good mentors can help with everything from managing the pitfalls of the promotion-and-tenure process to writing syllabi. As Donna Bertazzoni of Hood College in Frederick, Md., wrote in something of a companion piece to this article, "Professor Discusses Transition from Newsroom to Classroom," in the Autumn 2013 issue of *Insights*: To help a new faculty member coming from the newsroom,

An important first step is to ask a senior member of the department to serve as a mentor. That person can provide advice about teaching, developing syllabi and managing the classroom; advising students and extracurricular activities; identifying a research topic; serving on committees; and all of the other intangibles that make up the daily life of a college professor. While it helps if that person has also successfully transitioned from industry, the key is to identify an individual who knows what is important at your institution and who is willing to take the time to discuss problems and answer questions.

The author wasn't suggesting mentors for new administrators coming from industry, but I suspect all of us have identified faculty members who can help us on the issues most foreign to us, such as promotion and tenure. Putting my newsroom hat back on, I have to wonder how it is possible that newsrooms have gotten along without formal mentors for hundreds of years.

The Bottom Line

In my six full-time years in the academy, I often have said to myself that the built-in happy events each year are the best part of my job. Pam Luecke articulated better than I have exactly what I've been thinking:

One of the best things about moving from the industry to teaching is the academic calendar. After decades of facing daily deadlines, you suddenly find yourself thinking in terms of semesters and four-year student careers instead of tomorrow's newspaper. There's a pleasing rhythm to the academic year, with meaningful opening convocations, bittersweet commencements and blissfully unstructured summers. You still work as hard as you did in a newsroom, but the pace is more humane and (usually) more within your control.

Jerry Ceppos was executive editor of the San Jose Mercury News and vice president for news of Knight Ridder, among other positions in his 36-year newspaper career. During that time, he was active in journalism education and has served on the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications for 24 years. Formerly the dean of the Reynolds School of Journalism at the University of Nevada, Reno, he now is dean of theanship School of Mass Communication at LSU. He can be reached at jceppos@lsu.edu.

STATE OF CHANGE: AUTHOR RECOUNTS HIS EXPERIENCES, LESSONS FROM PROGRAM TO BRIDGE BETWEEN NEWSROOM AND CLASSROOM

By Keith Oppenheim, Grand Valley State University

One of the challenges in journalism education is making the connection between the professional world and the classroom. The pace of change in the former has been dramatic. The pace in the latter has been plodding. Educators may feel it's hard to keep up and are eager for ways to evolve their teaching for the digital age.

Those factors played a part in a program designed to immerse college educators in real-world settings. In 2012, I was one of six recipients of an AEJMC-sponsored grant through the Scripps Howard Foundation, titled *Social Media and Multiple Platforms: Learning from the Pros, Bringing it to the Classroom*. The grant offered six different externships at various media outlets across the United States. Recipients would spend two weeks in a newsroom. The idea was to translate that experience into meaningful teaching, so students have a better understanding of a professional landscape that requires new skills in multimedia and social media.

I came to this opportunity after making my own career change. I had spent more than 25 years as a TV news reporter, the last eleven as a correspondent for CNN. Since 2009, I've been teaching broadcasting at Grand Valley State University in Michigan where, since my arrival, I'd been working on a converged curriculum with the journalism department. Like many educators, I felt a sense of urgency. I worked in a program that had to evolve and felt an acute need to keep abreast of changes in the field. This externship struck me as a way to go back to a familiar environment that, in some ways, might no longer be so familiar.

The grant program, now in its third year, included these locations for externships in 2012: *The Chicago Tribune*, C-SPAN, *El Nuevo Herald/Miami Herald*, *The Knoxville News Sentinel* and Scripps Networks Interactive, *The Oregonian*, and WEWS-TV. I applied to go to WEWS-TV, Channel 5, the ABC affiliate in Cleveland. It was the one local

television station on the list, and given that I'd spent 15 years in local news, I thought the experience would give me the contrast I was looking for. I knew what the jobs in TV newsrooms had been. I had less of an understanding of what they'd become.

I made arrangements with Colleen Seitz, the station's director of new media. Colleen had been a producer at WEWS since the early 90s and later in the decade, she led the station's efforts to connect with viewers and readers online. During my visit, Seitz directed a team of five staff who managed the station's website and all its social media applications. In terms of management structure, she was on the same level as Jill Manuel, the station's news director, who headed a newsroom staff of more than 80. That leveling in the organization was one example of the premium put on digital platforms.

I asked Seitz if I could make a short documentary video of my experience. I explained that, like the multimedia journalists I would be covering, I would be doing something parallel: shooting, writing and editing on my own, acting as a one-man band. She assured me that would be fine and agreed a movie would be an effective way to bring the subject matter back to my students. I was pleased that the station seemed so receptive, but I still had reservations. My experience as a reporter led me to believe managers and employees of media companies make for some of the most reluctant interviewees. In this business, there's always a corporate goal to promote a certain image. And even though WEWS-TV is owned by Scripps Howard, the company behind my grant, I wondered if management would truly be comfortable allowing a professor with a camera to run around the station asking questions.

However, when I arrived and was greeted by the news director, Jill Manuel, I was pleasantly surprised. She essentially encouraged me to do what I wanted and

was refreshingly frank about the state of her news operation.

“Any legacy newsroom is going to have a tough time,” Manuel said. “Because we’ve been doing things the same way for thirty to forty years.”

Manuel described Cleveland as a unique market. It’s pretty good size, the 17th largest in the country. But, it tends to be neither a stepping stone nor a destination for many people trying to climb. There’s a reason for that. Cleveland’s not flashy, but it is truly a nice, affordable place to live. As a result, many employees at WEWS are long-time veterans who, at least until a couple years ago, had become comfortable with their routines.

So as changes have accelerated in the news business, the pressure on staffers at places like Channel 5 have been exceptionally tough. A decade ago, reporters would go out with a photographer and complete one to two stories per day. Deadlines were consistent at times like noon, 5 and 11. Website producers tended to rewrite stories that had already aired. Now, that system had been drastically altered.

“Deadlines are five minutes ago when it comes to the web,” says James Pollack, the station’s managing editor who runs the assignment desk. “In a traditional broadcast sense, you have your newscast, you can always push to those newscasts. But now, with the web, the deadline already passed.”

Kelly Hainer, the executive producer for the morning news, said there really are no breaks. “Now you’re essentially on-air all the time. Because of the web, because of Facebook, because of Twitter, because of phones, you are constantly on.”

In other words, the multi-platform era had created a mix of two models of journalism, each operating alongside the other. In the old world, deadlines were periodic. In the new one, they were constant. For a television station, particularly one with an older staff, the question was how to make the transition to serving both of those models at the same time.

On a hot Monday in July, I started shooting my doc by hanging out with the web team. The web staff sat in a section with a bunch of computers and TV monitors, fairly close to the assignment desk. Like many newsrooms, when people have important information to pass along, they shout, sort of like throwing a basketball to

another player to keep things moving. For that reason, the web team is centrally located so the demands of the online world don’t get sidelined.

Tina Kaufmann, a producer, explained how she coordinates web traffic. That means updating the station’s website, Facebook page and Twitter feed for computers, tablets and cell phones. Sometimes, web producers like Kaufmann write the stories themselves. Other times, they ask reporters, producers, photographers and even managers to make those contributions themselves. It’s a mix.

It was the middle of the day, prime time for web teams. “It’s my job to get the site ramped upon all of our different categories here for the noon hour,” said Kauffman, “because the noon hour is our most heavily trafficked hour on the website.”

The reason for high mid-day viewing is surprisingly simple. Users go online, particularly to read news, while they’re at work eating lunch in front of a screen. To me, that made sense. As a professor, I was now doing that nearly every day.

Kauffman showed me a web-tracking program called Chartbeat. It gives her immediate feedback on how any story is doing on the site, including comparisons to how well other stories are being read.

“These are all the stories people are looking at,” said Kauffman as she pointed to a list of numbers on the screen. “If these aren’t in our top seven, our homepage showcase on our website, I need to go back, tweak it, rearrange them, so these are the things people are seeing.”

With instant data, the team can respond to what the audience likes. At the core, the web is a way to meet a growing and sometimes new audience. Increasingly with the next generation, viewers are consuming more news online and less on television.

“We have seen television ratings erode,” said news director Jill Manuel. “You’ve got to be able to identify new ways of reaching customers, because if you don’t do that and just kind of stay set in your ways, then you’re going to get left behind.”

I would learn there is one grand assumption in this new era of television news. It’s the belief that if stations connect with young people online, those same people will become hooked on the website or social media feed and at some point, turn to watching TV newscasts on a regu-

lar basis. That connection may be fueled as much by hope as necessity. Mike Waterhouse, executive producer for the web team, says in many ways, everything the station does in the digital world is meant to be a driver to television.

“The way people are consuming media is so different,” says Waterhouse. “They’re less likely to turn on the TV when they go home to watch on local news, so we’re trying to find ways to drive them to that platform because that’s where we make all of our money.”

It is true online revenues for media companies are going up. One of the best examples of that is “pre-roll,” those 15-second ads that viewers are required to watch before they can access news video. Still, the numbers remain lopsided. Broadcast advertising still represents the bulk of revenue for a television station. So now, the push is to get users from Twitter, Facebook or the main website to watch a broadcast.

“Initially, when we were in its infancy, I thought the exact opposite,” said assistant news director Dave Kaplar. “If I give them too much information on the web and on Facebook and everywhere else, it gives them too much reason to *not* watch television. Our research has shown otherwise. We had a research presentation that said 17 percent of our Facebook users are more likely to watch more television because they are Facebook friends with us.”

I don’t dispute that connection, but I continue to have doubts about the idea that social media leads to TV news viewing. Of course, time will tell, but what I see in the students I teach is a group of media consumers who have exceptionally high demands for immediacy and non-linear viewing. The young people I observe like control over the stories and content they choose to view. Why would they evolve into habitual watchers of a newscast?

The answer may be in the personalities. TV and Radio are no longer the best formats for immediacy. The Internet is. But WEWS, like any station or network, offers a consistent cast of anchors and reporters, a TV family that can give every newscast a sense of connection that few other media can replicate.

In addition to understanding how the web team works on the inside, I wanted to get a sense of how things have changed on the outside and in the field for on-air staff. Now, pretty much everyone who reported for Channel 5 was called a multimedia journalist or MMJ. The roles

between technical and editorial staff, which had previously been clearly defined, were now blurred.

“I am shooting video, which I never did before,” said anchor Lee Jordan. “And I’m editing, so now when I go out, whether I shoot my own material or I go out with a photographer, I edit my own stories.”

Jordan has been an anchor at Channel 5 for 25 years. She is an established news personality in the Cleveland market, but that did little to soothe her anxiety a few years ago when her job began to change.

“I think it’s been difficult initially, just as a steep learning curve for is everybody,” she said. “Suddenly, you feel a little incompetent in your job. And that’s not necessarily very comfortable.”

In fact, discomfort was a theme in a lot of what I saw. Mind you, I was impressed at the dedication of the staff, and the speed at which they worked. But the multi-tasking didn’t look easy.

I really got a sense of that when I spent a full day with Joe Pagonakis, another veteran of the station. He’s the “Troubleshooter” reporter on the consumer beat and has been at WEWS for 18 years. However, Pagonakis showed the energy of a newcomer. In fact, the station paired me up with him because management felt he was a good example of somebody who had really embraced change.

Pagonakis works by himself more than half the time. He shoots, writes and edits a TV story, and in the few spaces he has in between, he’s on his cell phone, updating the web, Facebook and Twitter. On this day, Pagonakis was assigned to do a piece about an organization called “Rebuilding Together,” a group that works on revitalizing neighborhoods by getting volunteers to spruce up a cluster of nearby homes. I interviewed him in the car on the way.

“Right now, I’ve got two broken ribs,” he said. “I fell off a ladder trying to get rid of a wasp’s nest on Sunday. But it’s not that bad and I figured, I wanted to make sure you had the full experience of what your students are more likely to experience in the coming years.”

When we got to the site, Pagonakis performed all his duties while talking to me as I was recording video. He greeted one interviewee, then turned his head toward my lens to add pointers on how to be an MMJ.

“There’s a whole series of checks you have to make. First thing, level your sticks (tripod). Second thing, white balance. Third thing, make sure your focus is correct. Always. Those three things are like a mantra: bang, bang, bang.”

Pagonakis worked like the Energizer Bunny. I could see he enjoyed being on the move, but it would be unfair to say this fast pace was entirely his choice. This, I would find, is the new speed. There was never a break. Pagonakis was either composing something on his phone, shooting, interviewing or driving. Then he would go back to the station to write some more. It seemed unsustainable to me, but Pagonakis argued, reporters can manage it all.

“I think every journalist has way more capacity than they know,” he said. “A lot of people may say they think quality could suffer. I only say in the shorter term, because any journalist who has abilities will be able to assimilate all these roles and still do an outstanding job where there will not be holes journalistically.”

It struck me that Pagonakis’ conversation was partly a demonstration to management. He certainly didn’t want to appear to be a complainer, and he took pride in showing how well he can juggle. But an outing I had with another reporter was different, because she didn’t feel the same need to present a positive front.

Stephanie Ramirez was truly a newcomer; she’d been at Channel 5 for only a few months. Still, she seemed pretty seasoned, particularly at the multimedia tasks. At Temple University, Ramirez had been trained to be a backpack journalist. She got further experience at a Brooklyn cable outlet. I headed off with her to a house fire in Strongsville, a suburb about 20 miles south of downtown Cleveland. No one got seriously hurt in this incident, but there was a fair amount of structural damage. Ramirez gave me a sense of what it’s like to cover a story like this as a one-man band.

“I used to play the drums,” she told me. “And you have to be able to play different drums, play different melodies with two hands and two feet, so I pride myself on being able to do different things.”

Indeed, Ramirez mixed the roles of two or three people into one. She carried gear, shot b-roll and conducted interviews. She made friends with the deputy fire chief who gave her great access to the scene. She was also good at making neighbors feel comfortable and inter-

viewed them with a camera on her shoulder and mic in her hand.

But one thing didn’t go her way. Ramirez wanted to interview the homeowner, a woman sitting on the front lawn and clearly going through a tough time. Ramirez was careful to approach her delicately.

“I had my phone in my hand, I had my camera on my side and I didn’t have a pen and a piece of paper,” she said. “So as I am trying to pump her for information (knowing) I’m not going to remember anything, I asked her if I could talk to her on camera instead. The moment I did that, she completely shut down. She flipped out, she didn’t want to talk to me anymore, whereas if I had a pen and paper and I didn’t look like I was out there to get something, I’m just writing what’s going on, she probably would have opened up to me.”

Bear in mind, this has long been a frustration in TV news. I remember feeling jealous of newspaper reporters who had the edge at getting interviews, because the intimidating presence of video cameras often leads people to just say no. Having a partner also makes a big difference. It’s easier to get people to talk on television if there is a separate videographer — and the reporter is listening and conversing, but not holding a camera. Somehow, the perceived intrusion is less.

Dave Kaplar, Channel 5’s assistant news director, believes that in the multimedia age, stations have to make compromises.

“If Stephanie doesn’t have a camera in her hand,” he said, “or doesn’t have to reach for the camera, she has a better opportunity to just talk with someone before the camera ever starts rolling. It is a trade-off. The occasional incident is going to be a by-product of the MMJ world.”

Stephanie is able to talk with ease about what goes well and what doesn’t. For better or worse, having her body loaded up with gear, so much so there isn’t room for a pad and pen, is the job she knows. But others at WEWS are now performing tasks they never expected or even wanted to do.

Bob Fenner is a videographer at the station and also a multimedia journalist. He has made the transition from what was primarily a technical role to spending at least half of his time reporting and writing.

“I think they want to do more with less,” said Fenner. “I think we’re no different than any other industry out there.”

I joined him on a day when he had a challenging assignment. The country was reeling from a mass shooting that left 12 people dead at a Colorado movie theater. The gunman, James Holmes, had just appeared in court with spooky red hair, evoking comparisons to the Joker in Batman. Fenner was assigned to get a reaction piece and focus on how someone with a history of instability was able to legally buy firearms.

A good part of our morning was spent while Fenner was not shooting pictures or going anywhere. He was on the phone, trying to convince a gun shop owner and a manager of a firearms school to go on camera. Unlike some reporters, he’s pretty low key, which may be the secret of his success. Both interviewees said yes. When we walked into the gun store, the proprietor noticed what’s new.

“Oh, you have to set it up and do it all,” he asked, observing that Fenner was shooting the story and asking the questions.

“We wear different hats,” Fenner replied. He later acknowledged that one of the benefits of being an MMJ is he can manage his time better and doesn’t always have to collaborate with a reporter. I then asked what’s hard about it.

“Everything else, pretty much. I went into this business more interested in the technical aspect of it, and now I’ve had to learn how to write and voice track. I’m not sure I’ll ever be comfortable with it. Over time, I guess it’s getting a little bit easier but when you’ve done one thing for twenty years and now you have to do new things, you kind of feel like you’re starting over again.”

I left WEWS with a lot of material and began to work on a script for what would turn out to be a 22-minute video. As I wrote, I wanted to capture the sense that I was impressed with the station, not only for its reporters making strides toward change as journalists, but also for their willingness to talk about it on camera.

I also wanted to reflect the intense challenges I saw and not produce something that was promotional. Out of

concern for accuracy, I sent management and various staff people I interviewed the script ahead of time. I would revise the script only if I thought something inaccurate had been reported. To the station’s credit, it accepted the story, warts and all, and ended up holding a series of viewings so the staff from the entire station would watch it. The piece, entitled *Non-Stop News*, can be viewed through this link on Youtube:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=37xE39Xmsoc&feature=youtu.be>

During the following academic year, two of the station’s managers spoke to students and faculty at Grand Valley. Colleen Seitz, the leader of the web team, spoke to one of my classes about how excellent web coverage had become something viewers demanded more and more, and how stations were striving to meet that demand. Jill Manuel, the station’s news director, held a forum during which she conveyed how it’s tough to get a newsroom of 80 people to add Facebook, Twitter and web-writing to their day.

I kept getting back to that gnawing feeling that, with all of the station’s impressive efforts to change and be transparent, there was a disconnect. Despite what research said, I remained skeptical that the Twitterers of today would become the TV viewers of tomorrow. In the video, and in the public forum at Grand Valley, Manuel acknowledged there may be a growing audience online, but audiences for television news may get to the point where there could be even more drastic change.

“I think there’s going to be a smaller piece of the pie,” she said. “And so what I think is going to happen is you’re going to see fewer companies in every market that are creating content, so in this market (Cleveland), instead of four TV stations, there’s going to be two.”

And that left me with even more to think about. The reason I pursued the grant and this project was to convey to students what they need to do to be successful in a multimedia world. But if Manuel is correct, that task will become even tougher if there are, yet again, even fewer jobs to be had.

Keith Oppenheim is an assistant professor at Grand Valley State University.

WORLD JOURNALISM EDUCATION CONGRESS EXPLORES METHODS FOR RENEWING JOURNALISM THROUGH EDUCATION

By Robyn S. Goodman, Alfred University

The World Journalism Education Congress¹ desire to improve the quality of journalism education and journalism practice worldwide led to its third global conference, the WJEC-3, in 2013. The WJEC-3, hosted by the European Journalism Training Association and the Flemish/Dutch Network of Journalism Institutes, ran July 3-5 in Mechelen, Belgium. The conference's main theme and title, "Renewing Journalism through Education," attracted 340 media scholars, journalists and professionals from some 50 countries.²

The WJEC-3's many key programs and events included its Syndicate Team Program and innovative teaching,³ research paper and panel presentations. It also featured distinguished speakers/participants, including Irina Bokova, UNESCO Director-General;⁴ Joe Foote, WJEC convener; Nico Drok, WJEC host and VNOJ chair; Anna McKane, former EJTA president; several Knight Chairs, including Jeff Jarvis, Dan Gillmor and Mindy McAdams; renowned journalism education scholar Mark Deuze, University of Amsterdam; and UNESCO Chair Jan Servaes along with UNESCO communication specialist Fackson Banda, who presented UNESCO's latest journalism education syllabi for worldwide audiences.⁵

This article focuses on syndicate program findings, which represent the conference's main conclusions. The syndicate program, an interactive conference highlight, was overseen and administered by WJEC syndicate chair Robyn Goodman and steering committee host coordinator Nadia Vissers, with invaluable help from on-site venue assistant Leen Van Tolhuysen. The program encourages all conference attendees to join themed discussion groups focused on several of the most crucial issues in journalism/journalism education today.

These syndicate discussion groups focused on how to teach journalism students to better understand, and more effectively handle, critical journalism issues. The groups

were linked to, and elaborated on, the conference's six sub-themes, which were introduced during first-day panels and examined throughout the conference. The sub-themes and syndicate topics, 13 in all, were determined by WJEC and conference host members. Both are listed in the table on p. 27 (Vissers, 2013, p. 4).

In an attempt to keep syndicate discussion groups interactive and small, about 16 attendees each, some syndicates offered simultaneous, parallel sessions. For example, the Storytelling, Young Journalists on Global Issues, Citizen Journalism and Civic Journalism and all three research on journalism education-themed syndicates held two concurrent sessions.

All syndicate groups met three times, the third of which focused on reaching conclusions and making recommendations for colleagues worldwide. This third session was especially important for syndicates with dual sessions, since both groups met for the first time to determine joint findings.

Syndicate Team Results

The resulting syndicate reports suggest how journalism educators worldwide can work more pro-actively to shape their field, through their students, to improve journalism and help build a higher quality civic life. Each report concludes with five specific recommendations to get colleagues started. Due to space limitations, this article highlights findings from seven syndicates, each representing one conference sub-theme.⁶ However, additional syndicate reports can be found at the WJEC website (<http://wjec.ou.edu/congress.php>) and the WJEC-3's host site (<http://www.wjec.be>).

The following syndicate reports are presented below:

- I. Coping with Spin and Pressure
- II. Storytelling

- III. Young Journalists on Global Issues
- IV. Empowerment through Information and Media Literacy
- V. Journalism in a Network Society
- VI. Role Perceptions and Professional Values Worldwide
- VII. Quality Assurance in Journalism Education

Syndicate Summaries

I. Coping with Spin and Pressure

Meeting summary report by rapporteur Steffen Burkhardt, University of Hamburg/International Media Center Hamburg; syndicate expert Leendert Van der Valk, University of Amsterdam; background report by Van der Valk and Mirjam Prenger, University of Amsterdam; chair Yael de Haan, University of Applied Sciences Utrecht, The Netherlands, and team members.⁷

Over the past decades journalism education in many countries has been confronted with a radical change in the field of professional communication. The number of communication experts, public relations officers and spin doctors has grown steadily, while simultaneously the number of independent journalists has dramatically decreased. For example, in the Netherlands PR/propaganda workers now outnumber journalists roughly 5-to-1 (Van der Valk & Prenger, 2013). In the growing online communication market, entrepreneurial journalism, social media and PR are combining in new ways.

Journalism schools need to react to this development by preparing their students to deal with this new PR economy.

Journalism schools need to teach students how to cope with spin and pressure in this new reality. Educators must teach PR goals, methods and strategies, how to negotiate and how to analyze media and communication studies research.

Education institutions' first key step should be clearly communicating the differences between PR and journalism education and making sure everyone at their institution understands their approach. Journalism schools already teaching PR often take one of two approaches: they completely separate journalism and PR education (and teach how to work in journalism or PR) or combine the two (how to work in PR and journalism). Regardless of an institution's approach, antagonistic or symbiotic, it must be transparent. A related code of ethics explaining one's approach, sent to students, faculty and sponsors, can help achieve this goal.

Teach students that PR professionals are not their enemies. And prepare them for dealing with PR people by teaching them the following:

1. How PR works and how PR people target groups
2. How to understand statistics
3. How to use research, including social exchange the-

Conference Sub-themes:	Syndicates – Teaching journalism students to better understand/more effectively handle:
1. Professional ethics in journalism education	1a—Accountability and Transparency 1b—Coping with Spin and Pressure
2. Investigative journalism in journalism education	2a—Data Journalism 2b—Storytelling
3. International reporting in journalism education	3a—Young Journalists on Global Issues 3b—Reporting Europe
4. Media & information literacy in journalism education	4a—Empowerment through Information and Media Literacy 4b—Young People and the News
5. Media & empowerment in journalism education	5a—Journalism in a Network Society 5b—Citizen Journalism and Civic Journalism
6. Research on journalism education	6a—Shifting Goals of Journalism Education 6b—Role Perceptions and Professional Values 6c—Quality Assurance in Journalism Education

ory studies

4. How to play the game and negotiate
5. How to find, use, check, evaluate and verify sources to reduce reliance on PR agents and social media
6. How to manage their time to help them avoid PR as a “solution” for running out of time
7. How to interview like a researcher
8. How to fact-check
9. How to make construction of the news part of the story, in order for audiences to understand how sources spin information and to break PR narratives.
10. How to protect themselves and other journalists if their credibility is attacked by spin doctors

Journalism schools need to teach the mechanisms and methods of PR and spin in order to make students aware of their influence on agenda setting and storytelling. Accordingly, make sure students are well-grounded in media effects research and the following theories: source, priming, framing, agenda setting and cultivation.

How should the above skills, competences be taught?
Some quality methods follow:

1. Best-practice examples (how to work with PR agents in crisis communication situations, etc.)
2. Role-playing (students playing PR and journalism roles and learning to negotiate)
3. Stakeholder analysis (identify whose interests are involved)
4. Network analysis (in order to check sources)
5. Case studies and reflection (train students how to cope with PR and spin before and after publication, with a focus on how to use, and not be used by, PR officials)

In addition, the following books may help sensitize journalism students to spin and how to deal with it: Chris Genasi's (2002) *Winning Reputations: How to Be Your Own Spin Doctor*; Paul Richard's (2005) *Be Your Own Spin Doctor: A Practical Guide to Using the Media*; and Tim Burt's (2012) *Dark Art: The Changing Face of Public Relations*.

Recommendations

The group's top five recommendations follow:

1. Make your institution's approach toward PR and journalism education transparent and release a code of ethics explaining to students, faculty and sponsors your position.

2. Make your journalism students aware that they cannot avoid contact and confrontation with PR and spin since all organizations have PR agents.

3. Teach your journalism students not to see PR professionals as enemies since they must work with them in the public sphere.

4. Teach the mechanisms and methods of PR and spin in order to make students aware of their hidden influence on agenda setting, framing, priming and storytelling.

5. Train students how to use different didactical approaches so they can use PR instead of being used by it.

II. Storytelling

Meeting summary report by rapporteur Sarah Markewich, Howest University College of West Flanders, Belgium, with help from rapporteur Hans Paukens, MedienQualifizierung - Akademie für Hörfunk und Medien, Germany; syndicate expert/background report by Tjirk Van der Ziel, Ede Christian University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands; chairs Jeremiaah Opiniano, University of Santo Tomas, Philippines, and Luuk Sengers, Story-based Inquiry Associates, The Netherlands, and team members.⁸

Storytelling has become a blanket term that could mean just about anything. This group focused its storytelling sessions on the challenges of teaching longer stories with a clear narrative (storyline) holding it together and how to do so more effectively.

They agreed that teaching storytelling is an especially difficult task due to many students' lack of basic listening, observing, interviewing, story identifying and structuring skills and a lack of time to teach them. And the fact students are reading less and less on their own does not help.

Skilled storytelling techniques not only attract audiences to stories, they help them better understand them. As Van der Ziel (2013) explains, “Humans see events most clearly when news events are organized as a narrative” (p. 2). To capture valuable themes and present them as memorable stories, “Journalistic storytelling uses literary techniques. It is about finding true stories and crafting them to give readers an experience they won't soon forget” (p. 2).

Despite a wealth of information on storytelling techniques and the importance of teaching them, — the

group agreed that storytelling elements should permeate all journalism classes — educators often do not have the time to even scratch the surface of this topic since it requires so much in-depth training and practice.

Yet many journalism teachers still try to teach storytelling (identifying stories, finding story lines, structuring them, etc.) via a wide variety of methods and creative approaches, including Story-based Inquiry (<http://www.storybasedinquiry.com>), the Ladder of Abstraction, Photovoice (which tells stories through photography and grassroots activism), deconstruction, peer review and the use of themes, myths and archetypes. New Journalism texts also help.

Additional techniques include turning off the sound in videos and judging the students' narrative techniques by the strength of the images alone. Another is turning off the images and assessing the students' work by the strength of sound alone.

Educators should also share with their colleagues what storytelling techniques they are teaching so overlap can be scaled down and student confusion can be avoided.

Even though a massive number of approaches to storytelling are widely available, there is a serious lack of scholarly research on teaching journalism students storytelling skills. As storytelling becomes more and more essential to the field and the teaching of journalism, more such research, worldwide, is needed.

Recommendations

After a final meeting between parallel groups, this combined syndicate group agreed on the following recommendations for colleagues worldwide:

1. Storytelling needs to be clearly defined so everyone (students, faculty, administrators, etc.) understands what exactly needs to be taught, advocated and promoted.
2. Educators should push students to embrace self-learning: to read, study and produce more out-of-classroom stories. This will expose them to more storytelling techniques and give them much need practice applying them to their own stories.
3. There needs to be much more curriculum sharing so teachers at the same institution know what their colleagues are teaching in order to increase efficiency

and decrease overlap. Storytelling curriculums from other schools should also be reviewed and shared, and the next WJEC should help with such efforts.

4. A long list of storytelling resources should be gathered and shared among those who teach storytelling so its teaching is less ad-hoc.

5. More storytelling research directly related to teaching journalism students should be conducted globally and shared among colleagues worldwide. The next WJEC could help with such efforts as well.

III. Young Journalists on Global Issues

Meeting summary report by rapporteurs Derek Thorne, One World Media, UK, and Tobias Troll, Concord Europe, Belgium; syndicate experts and background report authors Patrick Leusch, DW Akademie, Germany, and Stefan Verwer, Lokaalmondiaal, the Netherlands; chairs Fackson Banda, UNESCO, France, and Verwer; and team members.⁹

Participants agreed that to truly understand local issues, one must understand their regional, national and global context. Accordingly, they argued that reporting on and explaining these connections should be an essential part of journalism education and training young/future journalists. Participants also agreed that global reporting is not about reporting on a particular place or places; it is about an approach to journalism — making connections.

They agreed “exotic” associations with global coverage need to be challenged since, in reality, global connections are with us all of the time — they are part of our everyday lives.

And they discussed key features global reporting should encourage, including collaboration, modesty (a need to accept that one cannot know everything), being informed but curious, challenging one's own perspectives, stereotypes, assumptions and dominant narratives and pursuing new angles and perspectives.

They agreed dominant narratives about global reporting and the media need to be challenged. For example, global reporting entails much more than just covering developing countries' news. In addition, global reporting should not assume that Western countries' problems are echoed worldwide. For example, Western media industries' financial difficulties are not being shared in India and China today.

The group also looked at issues on a more pragmatic level. For example, student journalists need to be taught to engage and inform their specific audiences. They also must learn about communication technologies and how they can help them make global connections. The group agreed that a global reporting mindset — one that sees the world's interconnectedness — would improve the quality of a journalist's overall reporting, not just his coverage of "other places."

It discussed a key practical recommendation: teaching journalism students to collaborate. Since collaboration can be practiced on a basic level, beginning with students working with their own classmates, it's relatively easy to teach/practice. Students could also collaborate with local journalism students in other schools, local journalists, local community members, etc., and, online (or via travel when possible) with regional, national and international sources. However, the group agreed that in order for students to truly accept collaboration as a valuable tool in their reporting arsenal, they would need to develop a new, less competitive attitude to their work.

The group also stressed the need to provide journalism students with strong examples of how high quality global reporting can shine valuable light on important local issues. For example, one participant spoke of a local story about a terrorist attack in Bulgaria that did not make much sense until events in many countries — and their connection to the Bulgarian attack — were explained/reported. And another spoke of how a lack of quality global reporting of the European debt crisis — strong connections with IMF structural adjustment programs were often not even considered — led to weak coverage.

Recommendations

After a final meeting between parallel groups, this combined syndicate group agreed on the following recommendations for colleagues worldwide:

1. Global reporting should be taught as an approach/mindset that looks for interconnections linking different parts of the globe.
2. Educators should expose their students to different realities, which may take students out of their comfort zone. For example, faculty can start by introducing students to local diverse students, faculty and community members, facilitating online meetings and encouraging international travel when possible.

3. Educators should encourage collaboration (with students, journalists, etc.) as a core element of journalism and facilitate it wherever possible. Students need to possess the ability and motivation to collaborate and to view their work as a co-production. Collaborations should be long-term, ongoing, reciprocal, well-organized, culturally sensitive, well-supported (potentially by staff) and able to produce quality media output. Such collaboration, an ultimate benefit for all students, can encourage institutional buy-in.

4. The journalism curriculum should be global throughout. Since the mindset of global reporting can benefit new journalists in all areas of practice, it should not be considered a specialization.

5. Educators should share their approaches to, and experience with, global reporting with their counterparts worldwide. A network should be developed allowing educators to connect with one another and to collaborate for everyone's mutual benefit. The WJEC could be a perfect "central hub" for such sharing and/or hosting a network.

IV. Empowerment through Information and Media Literacy

Meeting summary report by rapporteur Esra Arsan, Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul; syndicate expert/background report by Katia Segers, Vrije University, Brussels, and additional syndicate expert Paula Poindexter, AEJMC president, University of Texas at Austin; chair Arnold de Beer, South African Communication Association and team members.¹⁰

Media messages are becoming increasingly more complex and difficult to analyze. Journalism educators often focus their attention on teaching media literacy to media consumers. Although this is an important task, they need to also make sure that journalism students understand how to apply this knowledge to their work. After all, as future content producers they need to understand how to find and report verifiable information via truthful frames while weeding out distorted, deceptive messages along the way. Media-literate reporting can also help empower journalists and citizens alike by offering them information they can use to actively participate in their communities and help change them for the better.

Since the media play such an important role in political life by setting political agendas, speeding up decision-making and manipulating citizens' choices, it's essential

that journalism students learn to deconstruct media messages in order to analyze them, find truthful information and flesh out as much bias and deception as possible. Such skills can also help them distinguish news from advertising and propaganda.

This group focused on how to teach media literacy to young, millennial generation journalism students. First, since they are often not interested in news, educators need to try to peak their curiosity by presenting it in exciting ways that pertain to their lives. Second, since the news young people absorb frequently comes from often unreliable social media sources, including Facebook and Twitter, educators need to teach journalism students how to find credible sources and create accurate information.

Journalism educators must teach students how to use media as an accurate information source. In order to do so, they should help them practice deconstructing stories via a variety of techniques, including showing them how different sources often cover specific events/issues in dramatically different ways. This understanding could help them create better information/messages and better serve society.

The group agreed that since media and political systems vary dramatically worldwide, it's difficult to find a balanced way to deconstruct such messages, let alone to teach students to do so. It also agreed that it's essential to teach media literacy in a non-ethnocentric, culturally sensitive manner. More empirical research is needed to help educators find innovative ways to teach media literacy in different regions and countries.

The group applauded UNESCO's media literacy work worldwide and suggested the WJEC should consider partnering with such efforts in the future.

It concluded that the "truth" about world events should be considered a human right. Accordingly, educators and students who seek out truth via media literacy techniques should feel proud about such humanitarian efforts.

Recommendations

1. Educators need to understand their students' media habits and the media ecology they inhabit in order to truly reach them during media literacy training.

2. Educators must teach students how to deconstruct media messages from different kinds of sources so

they can understand their ideological, cultural, ethnic, nationalist, propaganda and/or corporate biases.

3. Educators need to conduct more empirical research to better understand different media usage in different countries and how to teach media literacy in a balanced, culturally sensitive fashion.

4. Educators must become active social media users so they can adequately navigate their students' media environment and can competently help them critic it via media literacy techniques.

5. Students should be encouraged to make their own media so they can learn to produce better information, become better communicators and get better jobs.

V. Journalism in a Network Society

Meeting summary report by rapporteur Annelie Frank, Linneaus University, Sweden; syndicate expert/background report by Mindy McAdams, College of Journalism and Communications, University of Florida; chair Howard Finberg, The Poynter Institute, Poynter's News University, and team members.¹¹

This syndicate was assigned the task of determining what skills and knowledge future network journalists will need and how to teach such skills.

Mindy McAdams began the discussion by referring to her syndicate background report's (2013) explanation of basic related concepts, such as what is meant by the "network society," what networks are made of and the network society's connection to the field of journalism. In this report, McAdams referenced Van Dijk's (2012) description of the network society as:

A modern type of society with an infrastructure of social and media networks that characterizes its mode of organization at every level: individual, group/organization and societal. Increasingly, these networks link every unit or part of this society (individuals, group and organizations). In western societies, the individuals linked by networks is becoming the basic unit of the network society. In eastern societies, this might still be the group (family, community, work team) linked by networks. (p. 22)

She also referenced Barney's (2004) explanation of what networks are made of — nodes, ties and flows:

A node is a distinct point connected to at least one other point, though it often simultaneously acts as a point of connection between two or more other points. A tie connects one node to another. Flows are what pass between and through nodes along ties.

To illustrate, we might consider a group of friends as a network: each friend is a node, connected to at least one other friend but typically to many others who are also connected, both independently and through one another; the regular contacts between these friends, either in speech or other activities, whether immediate or mediated by technology, are the ties that connect them; that which passes between them — gossip, camaraderie, support, love, aid — are flows. (p. 26)

McAdams explained that in a network society, where almost everything is connected both globally and electronically, the true measure of power is access to networks and control over flows.

As for the connection between the network society and journalism, she explained that while the network society concept can help us better understand journalism today — its products, media houses and how audiences are changing — field theory is a better conceptual tool for understanding journalism itself. Field theory describes a system of influences that affects individuals and institutions. It also is an effective tool for examining “the micro-level practices of individual reporters (professional and amateur) and the macro-level institutional structures in which they invariably find themselves ... situated within a broader cultural, political and economic context” (Compton & Benedetti, 2010, p. 488).

Conclusions/Recommendations

After discussing the above concepts, the group came to the following conclusions/recommendations:

1. Network society concepts, including theories about networks and fields, should be taught in all journalism courses, in much the same way ethics is taught. A theoretical base will help students understand the function of networks and the roles played within them.
2. Teach student journalists that their goal should be to make complex issues understandable, not simplified, and that understanding how networks work can help them achieve such goals. The network should be used as a tool to discover, explore and explain a wide variety of issues.

3. The network empowers everyone to “commit acts of journalism,” become informed, active citizens and promote democratic change. Accordingly, educators should teach students how the network enables citizens’ collaborative efforts to hold institutions accountable and create positive change.

4. Teach students that since there are many ways to practice journalism, and that the technology and tools to do so are constantly changing, it’s important to keep up with innovations and to take risks. Teach journalism as a space for inquiry and experimentation and stress life-long learning.

5. Since many students are embedded in the digital network, they often are uncomfortable with personal encounters and do not understand the value of “off-network” experience. Accordingly, journalism educators should teach students the tools and skills they need to “verify the real.” For example, teach students the importance of directly observing people and events so they can bear witness to society’s most important occurrences.

VI. Role Perceptions and Professional Values Worldwide

Meeting summary report by rapporteur Bharthur Sanjay, Vice Chancellor, Central University of Tamil Nadu, India, with back-up from rapporteur Liesbeth Hermans, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands; syndicate expert Thomas Hanitzsch, University of Munich, Germany; background report by Hanitzsch and Ludwig Maximilians, University of Munich, Germany; chairs Kaarle Nordenstreng and Ari Heinonen, University of Tampere, Finland; and team members.¹²

This syndicate began its debate by reviewing Thomas Hanitzsch and Ludwig Maximilians’ (2013) background paper and *The Worlds of Journalism Study* (worldsofjournalism.org), an academic project that regularly assesses, via some 21 countries, journalists’ perceptions of their role in society and how they influence their work. Participants agreed with *The Worlds of Journalism Study*’s conclusions about four ways journalists worldwide tend to approach their jobs and framed their discussion accordingly.

Hanitzsch (2011) described and explained these four journalistic milieus/approaches/roles, in person and via his research, as follows:

1. “Populist disseminators”: Journalists who pay the most attention to their audiences and, accordingly, are

most likely to cover what their audiences' consider "interesting news" in order to attract bigger numbers. This group tends to see itself as a detached observer who shies away from journalism's monitoring function.

2. "Detached watchdogs": Journalists who value both of their seemingly contradictory roles as detached observers and watchdogs over political and business elite. They provide readers with interesting and important political information for financial and civic life purposes. And although they lack interventionist tendencies, they are the most opposed, among the four groups, to supporting official policies.

3. "Critical change agents": Journalists, critical of government and business elite, who advocate for social change and work toward influencing public opinion and setting political agendas. Of the four groups, they are most likely to push their audiences to participate in civic and political debates and actions and least likely to cater to their audiences' desires and to take an opportunist approach (explained next).

4. "Opportunist facilitators": Journalists most likely to view themselves as constructive government partners in economic development and political transformation. Of the four groups, they are least interested in detached observation, watchdog activities and political information and mobilization functions.

Hanitzsch also explained that while the detached watchdog approach characterizes the way most Western countries view their journalistic roles, the critical change approach is especially strong in the Middle East. And while the opportunist facilitator approach is popular in many developing, authoritarian and transitional countries, he argued that the populist disseminator, since it appears to exist everywhere in the world, is the only truly global journalistic approach.

The group agreed that although such typologies are helpful, they should not be used to pigeonhole countries and media systems. Instead, such groupings should be used as instruments to critically reflect on values underlying different journalism approaches.

Although the group agreed that it's important for journalists to recognize, and be sensitive to, cultural differences that help determine countries' journalistic approaches, it argued that universal ethical aims should be promoted. Accordingly, journalism teachers should not only teach students what role their country's journal-

ists tend to adopt, but what roles journalists worldwide tend to take on as well.

Students should also be taught that overtime such roles can change and that competing roles can exist simultaneously. For example, while the early European press took an activist role in political movements, with market concentration and commercialization came increased detachment. Yet in more recent years, it's becoming more activist again. And, when it comes to issues like the environment and gender equality, both activism and detachment should be considered.

The syndicate also discussed specific goals that journalists should pursue. For example, participants argued that journalists should try to accomplish all of the following:

1. Pursue and report verified information
2. Critically monitor important issues
3. Forewarn citizens about upcoming significant issues and/or crises and their possible consequences
4. Promote social cohesion/integration, especially in developing countries
5. Help citizens better understand their lives by orienting them to matters that influence them most
6. Help citizens empower themselves, encourage active citizenship

Participants concluded that more research is needed to contextualize and clarify journalistic roles worldwide.

Recommendations

After a final meeting between parallel groups, this combined syndicate group agreed on the following recommendations for colleagues worldwide:

1. The roles of journalists and functions of journalism in society should be taught and researched as a central element in journalism education, taking into account cultural and societal contexts.
2. The dynamic nature of professional roles should be recognized in journalism education and be the subject of continuing conversations among relevant stakeholders, including educators, practitioners, researchers, civil society and industry.

3. Journalism education should build upon universal values, such as truth-seeking and public service, and respect human values articulated in international law.

4. Journalism education should promote journalistic practices that emphasize diversity, pluralism and multiculturalism in local, national and global contexts.

5. Journalism education should promote professional roles that are sensitive to issues of inequality, poverty and deprivation within and among nations.

VII. Quality Assurance in Journalism Education

Meeting summary report by rapporteurs Eva Nowak, Jade University, Institute for Media Management and Journalism, Germany; Elisabeth Wasserbauer, Kuratorium für Journalistenausbildung, Austria; Maria Lukina, Moscow State University, Russian Federation. Syndicate expert/background report written by Joe Foote, Gaylord College of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Oklahoma; chairs Paul Parsons, School of Communications, Elon University, and Susanne Shaw, William Allen White School of Journalism and Mass Communications, The University of Kansas; and team members.¹⁵

This syndicate group addressed a wide variety of quality assurance issues, including different methods of quality assurance, the role of peer review, industry involvement in accreditation, assessment, the amount of influence that should be given to different stakeholders and global peer review.

Although similar methods are often used in quality assurance assessments, quality assurance systems tend to be very diverse in different countries and for different types of journalism training, such as in university education, vocational institutions or journalism schools. For example, in the United Kingdom industry accreditation plays an important role, and in the U.S. peer accreditation on a voluntary basis does so. In addition, many countries voluntarily follow modified versions of the EJTA and UNESCO model curricula and standards, although some group participants found them superficial, inconsistent and/or patronizing.

Some schools and/or countries work with state accreditation systems, usually compulsory and established for different subjects and professions – not just journalism. Rankings by private organizations, industry associations or media organizations are frequent in several countries, especially in university training.

Internal student evaluation and individual quality management systems are often used to improve training and organization. However, for some schools, especially private ones, the most important system of quality assurance seems to be whether students fill courses. In other words, if courses are filled, their quality is assumed to be good. In several countries, voluntary and compulsory elements are combined to create quality assurance systems, elements such as peer review, industry accreditation, quality management systems, rankings, internal evaluations and market considerations.

The role of industry as a stakeholder in accreditation and quality assurance processes was extensively discussed. On the one hand, journalism education has to provide skills, competences, knowledge and experiences that enable students to work in the media industry. On the other hand, media industry demands can overpower and block innovation in journalism training. While industry tends to promote competencies that will be required in the near future, journalism educators focus on competencies that will enable students to adapt to developments that may occur in 10 or more years. Regardless, the syndicate agreed that industry needs should be included in quality assurance processes as long as they are just one of several measurement factors.

The group also agreed that journalism trainers, researchers, students and alumni are important stakeholders that should be included in quality assurance processes. However, syndicate members disagreed on how to include such stakeholders in the process. For example, should they directly take part in decisions or only offer background information and present their concerns/advice? Parents and other funding sources, such as journalism-supporting organizations and programs, were also identified as potentially important stakeholders. As for whether to include civil society and state organizations in this process, the situation in different countries is so diverse that no conclusions were drawn.

The syndicate group also discussed the process of quality assurance. Although different cultural, economic and political backgrounds lead to different learning outcome definitions, assessments and learning outcomes were deemed important enough to be included in the quality assurance process. In addition, participants agreed that there needs to be a healthy distance between reviewers and reviewed organizations, diverse and relevant stakeholders need to be included in the process, and all criteria, processes and decision-making must be

transparent. They also called the role of the state and industry “problematic” since both might abuse their power and influence. And they concluded that all involved in the process must be credible (competence, independent, neutral) and that quality assurance criteria, aims and processes must be updated on a regular basis to ensure their adequacy.

Recommendations

After a final meeting between parallel groups, this combined syndicate group agreed on the following recommendations for colleagues worldwide:

1. Emphasize the importance of peer review in the evaluation process.
2. Include journalism educators, journalists and students in the evaluation process.
3. Ensure that any standards or benchmarks encourage flexibility to allow for innovations in practice.

REFERENCES

- Barney, D. (2004). *The network society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Compton, J. R., & Benedetti, P. (2010). Labour, new media and the institutional restructuring of journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 11 (4), 487-499. doi:10.1080/14616701003638350
- Hanitzsch, T. (2011). Populist disseminators, detached watchdogs, critical change agents and opportunist facilitators: Professional milieus, the journalistic field and autonomy in 18 countries. *International Communication Gazette*, 73 (6), 477-494.
- Hanitzsch, T., & Maximilians, L. (2013). *Role perceptions and professional values worldwide*. Unpublished manuscript.
- McAdams, M. (2013). *Journalism in a network society*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Van der Valk, L., & Prenger, M. (2013). *Coping with PR and spin in the newsroom and in the classroom*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Van der Ziel, T. (2013). *How to educate on storytelling: from follower to innovator*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Van Dijk, J. (2012). *The network society*, 3rd ed. London: Sage.
- Vissers, N. (2013). *Roles in the WJEC syndicates*. Unpublished document.

ENDNOTES

1. The World Journalism Education Council, which sets the agenda for each WJEC, consists of 32 AEJMC-type organizations worldwide (<http://wjec.ou.edu/index.php>). Its WJEC conferences bring together journalism educators around the globe to discuss, and reflect on, journalism education teaching, research and service. The previous two WJEC conferences took place in Singapore and Grahamstown, South Africa, respectively.
2. Reported by Wiel Schmetz, WJEC-3 Steering Committee member.
3. The WJEC-3's innovative teaching presentations were featured in a program called WJEC Ignite, created by Broadcast Education Association (BEA) Executive Director Heather Birks. Peer-reviewed enterprise teaching ideas were presented in five minutes spurts via 20 slides (<http://beaignite.wordpress.com/wjec3>).
4. Irina Bokova's speech was delivered through a video link.
5. UNESCO's 2013 "Model Curricula for Journalism Education: A Compendium of New Syllabi" can be found at: (<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002211/221199E.pdf>).
6. An additional syndicate report was added from sub-theme six.
7. Additional Coping with Spin and Pressure participants: Alain Gerbier, Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada; Americo Xavier, Escola de Jornalismo, Mozambique; Catriona Bonfiglioli, University of Technology Sydney, Australia; Claire Wolfe, University of Worcester; Elena Vartanova, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia; Elizabeth Toth, University of Maryland; François Snelders, Arteveldehogeschool, Belgium; Gie Meeuwis, Fontys School of Journalism, The Netherlands; Kees Boonman, University Leiden, The Netherlands; Nico Kussendragter, Hogeschool Utrecht, The Netherlands; Sil Tambuyzer, University of Antwerp, Belgium; Tom Van Gysegem, Hogeschool West-Vlaanderen, Belgium.

4. Encourage transparency in student recruitment, learning outcomes, evaluation, retention and employment processes.

5. Encourage journalism education organizations worldwide to identify and share their methods of evaluation in order to learn from one another.

Conclusion

The WJEC and its hosts hope that the above syndicate reports inspire you to not only get into the innovator mindset, but to take action for the sake of journalism education and journalism itself. Never has there been so much at stake. Never has it been more important for our voices to be heard and our plans of action to be tried.

Robyn S. Goodman is a professor in journalism at Alfred University's Communication Studies Program. She is a founding WJEC officer and served as the WJEC-1's Program Chair and the WJEC-2's and WJEC-3's Syndicate Chair.

8. Additional Storytelling participants: Alexander Pleijter, Fontys Hogeschool Journalistiek, The Netherlands; Reette Nousiainen, Haaga-Helia, Finland; Michael Huntsberger, Linfield College; Mary Cardaras, California State University, East Bay; Christiaan Pelgrim; Jan Pieter Rottier, Ede University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands; Carin Mannberg-Zackari, Stockholm University, Sweden; Emily Lyons, Texas State University; Ria Gores; Patrick Pelgrims, Erasmushogeschool Brussel, Belgium; Wouter Frateur, Plantijn Hogeschool, Belgium; Don Heider, Loyola University, Chicago; Judy Oskam, Texas State University; Kicki Hultin and Torbjorn Fraenckel, University of Gothenburg, Sweden; Michael Bruce, University of Alabama; Kay Muehlmann, Danube University Krems, Austria; Mark Lee Hunter, INSEAD Social Innovation Centre, France; Gabrielle van Gelderen and Annemiek Bijleveld, Hogeschool Windesheim, The Netherlands; Jan Servaes, City University of Hong Kong; Heather Birks; Broadcast Education Association; Halliki Harro-Loit; University of Tartu, Estonia; Geesje Van Haren, Lokaalmondiaal, The Netherlands.

9. Additional Young Journalists on Global Issues participants: Julia Bayer, DW Akademie, Germany; Ellen van Overmeire, Plantijn Hogeschool, Belgium; Kwinten Rummens, Thomas More Mechelen, Belgium; Daya Thussu, University of Westminster, UK; Hannah Eigeman, Lokaalmondiaal, Netherlands; Paul Werkman, Hogeschool Windesheim Zwolle, The Netherlands; Eva de Vries, Lokaalmondiaal, The Netherlands; Maria Neykova, Sofia University, Bulgaria; Marinka Vukojevic, Free Press Unlimited, The Netherlands; Paulo Nuno Vicente, New University of Lisbon, Portugal; Svetlana Hristova, Beyond Your World project, Bulgaria; Mei Ling Hopgood, Northwestern University; Yinka Kehinde, DW Academy, Germany; Iris de Roover, Thomas More Mechelen, Belgium; Andreia Martins, Coolpolitics, Portugal; Clothilde Redfern, One World Media, UK; Fabio Henrique Pereira, Brazil; Gie Meeuwis, Fintys School of Journalism, The Netherlands; Anna Llado, Radio Television d'Andorra, Spain; Marta Morales, Community Internet, The Social Media Company, Spain; Jeremy Druker, Transitions, Czech Republic; Renaat Bogaert, Thomas More Mechelen, Belgium; Jaap Schuurman, Hogeschool Windesheim, The Netherlands; Janet Key, Northwestern University, Qatar.

10. Additional Empowerment through Media Literacy participants: Peter Burger, Leiden University, Faculty of Arts, Journalism & New Media, The Netherlands; Gonnie Eggink, Hogeschool Windesheim, The Netherlands; Wellington Gadzikwa, Harare Polytechnic, Zimbabwe; Lina Diana Kyaligonza, Mountains of the Moon University, Uganda; Hamdy Naila, The American University of Cairo, Egypt; Marie Jeanne Razanamanana, University of Antananarivo, Madagascar; Ibrahim Sarr, CESTI, Senegal; Alexandra Wake, Deakin University, Australia; Richard Tote, University of Maryland; Alexandra Temenugova, School of Journalism and Public Relations, Macedonia; Kim Fox, The American University of Cairo, Egypt.

11. Additional Journalism in a Network Society participants: Laura Ahva, University of Tampere, Finland; Elena Arbatskaya, Tyumen State University, Russia; David Baines, Newcastle University, UK; David Domingo, Free University of Brussels, Belgium; Gwin Faulconer-Lippert, Oklahoma City Community College; Margaret Knight, University of Central Lancashire, UK; Remzi Lani, Albanian Media Institute, Albania; Battaglia Laura Silvia, Catholic University of Milan, Italy; Tingting Li, Newcastle University, UK; Rick Allen Lippert, University of Oklahoma; Sonia Virginia Moreira, Rio de Janeiro State University, Brazil; Raquel Paiva de Araujo Soares, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Elena Skochilo, American University of Central Asia, Kyrgyz Republic; Melissa Wall, California State University, Northridge.

12. Additional Role Perception and Professional Values participants: Bert Barnes, University of Kentucky; Karel van den Berg, De Mediapraktijk, The Netherlands; Bob Calver, Birmingham City University, UK; Titti Forsslund, Linneaus University, Sweden; Tim Hudson, Point Park University; Roy Kroevel, Oslo and Akershus University College, Norway; Stefan Mertens and Hedwig de Smaele, Hogeschool-Universiteit, Belgium; Andreas Ytterstad, Oslo and Akershus University College, Norway; Hendrik Berggren and Svith Flemming, Danish School of Media and Journalism, Denmark; Cain Butler, West Texas A&M University; Roman Hummel, Susanne Köcher and Dimitry Prandner, University of Salzburg, Austria; Monica Lengauer, Technical University, Dortmund, Germany; Karin Stigbrand, Södertörn University, Sweden.

13. Additional Quality Assurance in Journalism Education participants: Ralph A. Akinfeleye, University of Lagos, Nigeria; Md Assiuzzaman, University of Liberal Arts, Bangladesh; Dane Claussen, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada; Olena Fomenko, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine; Chris Frost, Association for Journalism Education, UK; Marcia Furtado Avanza, Fiam-Faam – Central University, Brazil; Michael Harnischmacher, University of Trier, Germany; Marc-Henri Jobin, CRFJ/Centre Romand de Formations des Journalistes, Switzerland; Megan Knight, University of Central Lancashire, UK; Kinto Justice Mugenyi, Mountains of the Moon University, Uganda; Lutz Mükke, Media Foundation of Sparkasse Leipzig, Germany; Will Norton Jr., University of Mississippi; Levi Obonyo Owino, Daystar University, Kenya; Marianne Peters, WJEC-3, The Netherlands; Lucie Rabaovololona, University of Antananarivo, Madagascar; Volodymyr Rizun; Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine; Maija Saari, Centennial College, Canada; Mohammad Sahid Ullah, University of Chittagong, Bangladesh; Jeff Wilkinson, Houston Baptist University.

The Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication promotes excellence in journalism and mass communication education. A valuable resource for chairs, deans, and directors, ASJMC is a non-profit, educational association composed of some 190 JMC programs at the college level. Most association members are in the United States and Canada. Eight international journalism and communication schools have joined the association in recent years.

www.asjmc.org