ASJMC INSIGHTS

Spring 2015

INSIDE:

Addressing Assessment of Learning Outcomes:
One Approach to ACEJMC Compliance with Standard 9

They Want Me to Fundraise?
Navigating the Transition from Professor to Chair, Director,
or Dean with a Fundraising Mission

Uncertainty and Change:
Applying News Media Experiences to Innovation in Higher Education

What Should Journalism Schools Teach?

From the Editor
Sea Change Might Improve Management
Effectiveness, But Requires Courage
By James L. Stewart

ASJMC INSIGHTS

ASJMC**INSIGHTS** SPRING 2015

Contents

From the Editor

SEA CHANGE MIGHT IMPROVE MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS, BUT REQUIRES COURAGE

By James L. Stewart, Nicholls State University

When I arrived at the registration desk for the ASJMC Winter Workshop in Tampa, Fla., this February, I received a copy of a book titled *Turn the Ship Around: The True Story of Turning Followers into Leaders,* as did the other registrants.

The author, retired U.S. Navy Capt. L. David Marquet, was scheduled to be the keynote speaker on the first morning of the workshop.

I looked at the book jacket and discovered that the work was based on Marquet's service as a submarine commander for the Navy.

My initial reaction was to think, "Great. What could a former submarine commander have to say about management that would be of use to a room full of academic administrators?"

To my mind, there could not be two more divergent worlds.

I've never served in the Navy, but I have long held the impression that leadership on any maritime vessel was by necessity extremely autocratic. It was my understanding that at sea there are times when the safety of the ship and crew depends on immediate response to commands, with no time for discussion and certainly none for debate.

On the other hand, it had been my experience that any action taken on a college campus was usually the result of a decision-making process closely resembling a trail drive where the herd was comprised of feral cats.

As Marquet spoke, I realized that I had been both right and wrong.

He explained that while the Navy, and the military-at-large, does have a strong tradition of top-down leadership, he found that pushing authority downward to the level where critical decisions were being made and the actors had more direct knowledge of the issues could actually be a more effective approach.

He found that his crew performed better under this system, as the members took more initiative and became more invested in the ship's performance.

I began to get very excited by the possibilities he was presenting (I was so taken with his presentation that I read most of the book that very evening). I mean if this approach could work on a Navy ship (or boat, if we're going to employ the term sailors use in reference to U.S. Navy subs), it seemed that it could certainly be applied on a college campus.

I know on my campus there's always talk about the importance of "Faculty Governance." We're expected to serve on committees ad nauseam, and we're getting surveys every time we turn around.

But here's the thing. Marquet was very clear in making the point that for his system to work, it had to be based on more than mere lip service. He noted that he had been to all kinds of training sessions where officers had been instructed on the value of "empowering" subordinates.

But, he said, in practice the concept often devolved into little more than the overuse of a trite catch phrase. Authority of leadership truly had to be surrendered for this approach to be successful. And he found officers were often afraid of taking that risk, as they were the ones to be held accountable for any failures on the part of the crew.

His plan is dependant on the courage of leaders.

I could feel his pain.

On campus, while there is usually the appearance of broad participation in decision-making, the bureaucratic nature of the process usually dilutes its potential effectiveness.

The other problem was that for some of us in the room, the people who could have most benefited from the lecture were not in there. I know the senior administration from my school was not present.

Had there been representatives of the administration there, they could have heard Marquet explain how the rewards they might reap were worth the risk demanded of them under this management approach.

I didn't think MY explaining to the president why academic departments (such as mine) should be given greater decision-making authority would have quite the same effect as hearing Marquet say it. Even recommending the book to upper management on campus might be seen as a little self-serving.

Then there is the problem of overcoming the inertia of long-held processes.

But, if it can happen on a Navy submarine, it can happen anywhere.

And if the impetus for this change is not coming from the top, maybe it SHOULD come from the bottom of the management ladder.

I guess courage is required on both sides.

ADDRESSING ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES: ONE APPROACH TO ACEJMC COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARD 9

By Jeffrey B. Hedrick, Jacksonville State University

A common term used in reference to the evaluation of learning outcomes is *assessment*. Seybert (2002) noted assessment of student learning outcomes is emerging as a major issue for higher education in terms of accreditation that colleges and universities in the 21st Century need to address. The Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications instituted major changes to standards that went into effect in September 2004. Beginning with the 2005-2006 academic year, programs writing self-study reports were required to use a new Standard 9: Assessment of Learning Outcomes, which has historically become the area of noncompliance cited most often by accreditation review teams. A second change addressed in this study is the addition of statistics as one of the eleven areas in the new Standard 2: Curriculum and Instruction, something only alluded to previously as "numeracy" in the old Curriculum Standard 3.

The current study assessment was performed in the research capstone at a small southeastern university with a communication program of approximately 250 students that was reaccredited in 2014. The research course was the only one within the program that addressed statistics, and special emphasis was placed on attaining evidence of compliance for this competency accordingly.

Literature Review

ACEJMC Accreditation Issues. A review of the Accrediting Council's decisions from the ACEJMC news releases over the past seven years, limited to those entitled "Accrediting Council Decisions," reveals the tendency on twenty-one occasions to grant provisional accreditation or re-accreditation at the undergraduate level. The provisional stipulation is applied when a program is found in noncompliance of one or more of the nine standards, with a follow-up visit in two years to ascertain whether the issue has been corrected (or not).

Standard 9: Assessment of Learning Outcomes. Learning assessment (through Standard 9) has become a cause for concern among schools either seeking accreditation or re-accreditation. ACEJMC revealed that over the last six years schools were found in noncompliance for Standard 9 most often, fifty-eight times (54.2 percent) out of one hundred-seven instances ("Noncompliance Findings," *ACEJMC Ascent,* 2014). In 2011 and 2012, ACEJMC identified which programs, if any, were found in non-compliance ("Accrediting Council Decisions," 2011 & 2012 news releases). Of the documented reviews of thirty-six undergraduate programs, the findings cited Standard 9: Assessment of Learning Outcomes the most (see Table 1), with 50 percent noncompliance noted in 2011 alone.

Previous Studies of Learning Assessment. Weir (2010) went so far as to characterize the assessment of learning outcomes as a "preoccupation of higher education" (124), something relevant to all disciplines, not just the field of journalism and mass communication. A study by Vitullo and Jones (2010) of business school assessment practices notes a paradigm shift with respect to how higher educators view learning, with a closer focus on whether the student is learning, rather than examining whether skills or content are taught within a course. The need for direct measures of learning was noted, along with identifying the benefits of examining the results of measures of learning in an effort to improve curriculum. This pedagogical shift is reflected in the documented changes made by ACEJMC that include the introduction of assessment as Standard 9.

Pretest-Post-test Assessment of Student Learning. Previous research (i.e. Michlitsch & Sidle, 2002 and Weir, 2010) tends to advocate direct measures of learning outcomes such as the pretest/post-test, those that many consider as more reliable. Todd (2009) mentions that public relations education assessment is often done in capstone

courses, and that entrance/exit examinations are one common method for assessing student learning of knowledge and skills essential to that profession (73). Differences between two groups (entering, exiting) were evaluated using two-tailed t-tests, unlike the analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests used by Dimitrov & Rumrill (2003) with the pretest/post-test format.

Current Study Objectives. *Research* and *statistics* were identified as two competencies to be measured in the research course-embedded assessment. This prompted the instructor to design pretest/post-test instruments to address these Standard 2 curriculum areas. The current study investigates the implementation of this assessment strategy within the research course.

RQ1: Which research and statistical concepts will the students have the most difficulty learning?

RQ2: Is the pretest/post-test format an effective way to assess learning outcomes within a mass communication research course?

Based upon Cusatis and Martin-Kratzer (2010) survey findings that identified concerns about math education, one hypothesis was formulated with respect to difference(s) in learning outcomes when assessing two curriculum competencies (*research* and *statistics*).

H1: Students will show more improvement in the acquisition of research-related knowledge, as opposed to gains in scores related to their knowledge of statistics.

TABLE 1:
2011-2012 UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS RECEIVING NONCOMPLIANCE, BY STANDARD

ACEJMC Standard	2011 noncompliance		2012 noncompliance		2011+2012 noncompliance	
	# of schools	% of total[a]	# of schools	% of total[b]	# of schools	% of total[c]
Standard 9 Assessment	10	50	4	25.00	14	38.9%
Standard 3 Diversity	4	20	1	6.25	5	13.9%
Standard 2 Curriculum	3	15	1	6.25	4	11.1%
Standard 1 Mission/Gov.	2	10	0	0	2	5.6%
Standard 4 Faculty	0	0	1	6.25	1	2.8%
Standard 5 Scholarship	0	0	1	6.25	1	2.8%
Standard 6 Stu. Services	0	0	1	6.25	1	2.8%
Standard 7 Resources	0	0	1	6.25	1	2.8%

Note. No schools were found in noncompliance of Standard 8 Prof/Public Service; these figures reflect only those schools undergoing review in the six-year cycle (excludes provisional schools undergoing second review, where the auditing team does not review all standards for compliance).

[a] 20 undergraduate programs underwent review in 2011; 8 were found in all compliance with all standards.

[b] 16 undergraduate programs underwent review in 2012; 8 were found in all compliance with all standards.

[c] percentage(s) is based on the 36 total programs that underwent review in the 2011-2012 period.

Methodology

The development of effective direct measures of student learning for the mass communication research course began with the creation of examinations that could be administered in the pretest/post-test format. Special consideration was given to the internal and external validity of the design, with the instructor including only those items that were introduced either in the course textbook or material distributed as handouts. Where reliability is concerned, an effort was made to introduce the same instructional components in the same exact order throughout each semester.

Instrument Development. Wimmer and Dominick's *Mass Media Research* textbook served as the resource for questions concerning both research and statistics within the pretest and post-test. There was emphasis placed on learning the research process (see Table 6 for more) throughout the term, with students expected to apply this process to their survey projects (13). Most of the statistics questions were basic in nature, and included the definition for mean, median, mode, and range, as well as the ability to identify/calculate these within simple distributions.

Administering Pretest and Post-test. The final survey research project required students to understand diversity as an important consideration when searching for possible independent variables. A smaller section on diversity was added to the assessment accordingly. The pretest was administered the second day of class, with the post-test during final exam week after projects had been completed.

Sample. The study sample group (N=134) was comprised of junior- and senior-level communication students from sections of a mass communication research course spread out over six different terms. The first "wave" of students, those enrolled between spring 2007 and spring 2008, constitute sixty-one (45.5 percent) of the study sample; that group provided data for the self-study when applying for initial accreditation in 2008. Results from the remaining seventy-three (54.5 percent) students recruited from fall 2012 until fall 2013 were included in the re-accreditation self-study. The same instruments and handouts were used for both cohorts, with the only significant difference being that students in the second cohort were allowed to share work within smaller groups for part of their final survey project (see Table 6 and discussion section for more). If the overall scoring of the post-test by semester is any indication, a degree of internal reliability was maintained throughout the study period (see Table 2).

Results

RQ1: Which research and statistical concepts will the students have the most difficulty learning? Based on the mean scores for the various questions contained in both the pretest and post-test, there were seven topics that many of the 134 participants struggled with (see Table 3). The minimum acceptable level for all areas was operationalized as a score of 60 percent or better (a grade of

TABLE 2:
CONSISTENCY BY SEMESTER: MEAN POST-TEST SCORES BY LEARNING OBJECTIVE

Term/(Enrollment)	Research	Statistics	Diversity	Total
Spring 2007 (22 students) 21 valid[a]	70.0%	64.2%	66.1%	67.0%
Fall 2007 (22 students)[b]	68.0%	72.8%	65.6%	69.8%
Spring 2008 (19 students) 18 valid[a]	71.9%	61.3%	66.7%	66.7%
First wave average (61 students)	**70.4%**	**67.3%**	**67.0%**	**68.7%**
Fall 2012 (25 students)	71.0%	65.6%	77.1%	69.4%
Spring 2013 (22 students)[c]	73.7%	70.0%	71.9%	71.9%
Fall 2013 (26 students)	67.8%	64.9%	73.2%	67.2%
Second wave average (73 students)	**70.7%**	**66.7%**	**74.1%**	**69.4%**

[a] One student each from the Spring 2007 and Spring 2008 terms was excluded from the longitudinal study because they did not take the pretest.

[b] Semester started with twenty-seven students; five dropped early, most retaking the course in Spring 2008.

[c] Five students who failed in fall 2012 and repeated were excluded on their second course attempt.

"D"), matching the university policy that considers this passing for most general education courses. Within statistics, those questions with lower scores on the pretest tended to be those students failed on the post-test, with the lowest areas for students being (a lack of) under- standing of probability sampling and inferential statistical analysis.

RQ2: Is the pretest/post-test format an effective way to assess learning outcomes within a mass communication re-

TABLE 3:
ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES: MEAN STUDENT SCORES FROM PRETEST/POST-TEST

Category or Concept	Percentage		Difference
	Pretest	Post-test	from Pretest[a]
Section I. Basic Research Concepts – 5 Variables Passing[b] Post-test			
1. Research Questions & Hypotheses	38.6	74.4	192.9%
2. Eight-step Research Process	11.8	91.3	770.9%
6. Different Validity Types	1.5	61.9	4150.0%
7. Advantages of Survey Research	23.2	80.8	348.5%
8. Different Survey Question Types	29.3	65.3	222.5%
Section I. Basic Research Concepts – **3 Variables Failing** Post-test			
3. Qualities of the Scientific Method	12.6	48.8	386.7%
4. Mass Communication Research Methods	5.4	59.5	1100.0%
5. Purpose of Validity/Relation to Reliability	16.3	52.7	324.7%
Research Competency: 8-Variable Mean	**17.4**	**70.6**	406.4%
Section II. Basic Numerics and Statistics – 6 Variables Passing Post-test			
9. Sampling Definitions	14.8	81.5	550.4%
12. Systematic Random Sampling	1.3	74.7	6005.0%
14. Distribution Definitions	60.8	97.3	159.8%
15. Mean Application	54.7	92.5	169.1%
16. Median Application	29.7	83.6	281.2%
17. Mode Application	67.8	87.1	128.2%
Section II. Basic Numerics and Statistics – **4 Variables Failing** Post-test			
10. Probability vs. Non-Probability Sampling	3.6	42.2	1189.5%
11. Sampling Purpose & Random Sampling	15.2	45.8	302.0%
13. Inferential Statistical Analysis Definition	2.2	27.4	1294.1%
18. Percentile & Std. Deviation Definitions	3.3	49.3	1523.1%
Statistics Competency: 10-Variable Mean	**22.0**	**67.0**	304.3%
Section III. Diversity and Research – All 3 Variables Passing Post-test			
19. Definition of Diversity	21.5	65.9	306.4%
20. Dimensions of Diversity	10.5	72.1	682.4%
21. Applications of Diversity in Research	6.5	72.5	1114.8%
Diversity Value: 3-Variable Mean	**10.9**	**70.9**	650.0%
Combined Test Final Score	**18.6**	**69.1**	370.9%

[a] Percentage Difference over 1000 percent was oftentimes an indication more so of those questions that most all students did not answer on the pretest or answered incorrectly, particularly when the post-test score was still less than 60.
[b] Passing percentage defined by the minimum level, operationalized as a score of 60 or better ("D" grade).

search course? From an experimental perspective, care was taken to ensure that every student underwent the same treatment, and the data collected were analyzed using paired-sample t-tests, similar to Todd (2009) that involved assessment within a public relations capstone course.

There were gains of significance (see Table 4) in test scores, within all three sections of the pretest/post-test format. The Pearson test for paired-sample correlations revealed the research (.247, p=.00), statistics (.417, p=.00) and combined total scores of students (.356, p=.00) were also of significance, with the correlation for statistics the strongest. There was only one variable (diversity) not yielding any significant correlation. These results provide evidence that yes (response for RQ2) the pretest/post-test format can be an effective way to assess learning outcomes within a mass communication course.

TABLE 4:
ANALYSIS OF LEARNING OUTCOMES, BY STATISTICAL TEST

Paired Differences	Paired Samples *t*-test			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Pair 1 *Research* Section I				
Pretest-Post-test	-53.19	15.047	-40.923	.00[a]
Pair 2 *Statistics* Section II				
Pretest-Post-test	-43.18	14.761	-33.863	.00[a]
Pair 3 *Diversity* Section III				
Pretest-Post-test	-15.60	5.555	-32.501	.00[a]

Paired Variables	Paired Samples Correlations		
	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 *Research* Section I			
Pretest-Post-test	134	.247	.00[b]
Pair 2 *Statistics* Section II			
Pretest-Post-test	134	.417	.00[b]
Pair 3 *Diversity* Section III			
Pretest-Post-test	134	.013	.88
Pair 4 Combined Total			
Pretest-Post-test	134	.356	.00[b]

Groups	One Way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)		
	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups *Research* Section I Pretest-Post-test	189.206	.954	.55
Between Groups *Statistics* Section II Pretest-Post-test	309.933	1.785	.01[c]
Between Groups *Diversity* Section III Pretest-Post-test	11.178	.585	.86

Note: Three different tests were performed: two that had been used by previous researchers assessing the pretest/post-test format (Todd, Reich, Ragas & Tran) and the most popular used between two variables (Pearson correlation).

[a] t-test is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), Pairs 1, 2, & 3.
[b] Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), Pairs 1, 2, & 4
[c] Significance found only between Statistics pretest and post-test scores.

The data were then subjected to one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), the assessment method often used (e.g. Dimitrov & Rumrill, 2003; Reich, 2013; and Ragas & Tran, 2013) when identifying outcomes of change on a larger scale. The one significant change in score(s) was in the statistics portion with F= 1.785 (p = .01) using this analytical method.

H1: Students will show more improvement in the acquisition of research-related knowledge, as opposed to gains in scores related to their knowledge of statistics. The plotted distributions were not symmetric, but a good sign was the closeness of the mean and median scores for all three sections in both the pretest and the post-test (see Table 5).

The mean paired difference between pretest and post-test within the research portion (section I) and the statistics portion (section II) is contained in Table 5, with the research gain (306 percent) outweighing the statistics gain (204 percent) by exactly 50 percent improvement. This figure rejects the null hypothesis for H1, in that the mean (average) student showed more improvement in the research portion of the pretest/post-test assessment, as opposed to the statistics portion.

Discussion

Weir (2010) referred to assessment as a "process rather than a goal," (125) an ongoing one with one objective being to bring about change in student learning outcomes. ACEJMC itself has been focusing on Standard 9 during the 2008-2013 span when reporting accrediting council decisions through articles in the *ACEJMC Ascent* newsletter and its news releases. Standard 9: Assessment of learning outcomes has in fact dominated those instances when review teams have found a school in noncompliance, with articles by Kumar (2013), Legg (2013), and Hipolit (2013) concerning ETSU and USF at least mentioning this standard when these schools were not reaccredited. A 2011 article by Bill Reader questions the value of accreditation, but at the same time acknowledges the value of a "thorough self-study" every six years.

Part of Standard 9, Indicators (c) states, "the unit collects and reports data from its assessment activities *and applies* the data to improve curriculum and instruction" (9. Assessment of Learning Outcomes, 2014). Between 2009 and 2011, ACEJMC site teams noted that 15 of the 28 noncompliance findings (53.6 percent) for Standard 9

TABLE 5:
STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON PRETEST AND POST-TEST BY LEARNING OBJECTIVE

Research	Pretest	Post-test	Difference
mean	17.36	70.55	+53.19 (306%)
median	16	71	+55
range[a]	0 to 59	26 to 99	+26 min.

Statistics	Pretest	Post-test	Difference
mean	21.13	64.31	+43.18 (204%)
median	21.5	63	+41.5
range[b]	0 to 75	12 to 96	+12 min.

Diversity	Pretest	Post-test	Difference
mean	2.84	18.43	+15.59 (549%)
median	2	18	+16
range[c]	0 to 16	8 to 26	+8 min.

Note: All figures represent points earned, unless reported as a percentage.

[a] There were 100 points possible in the Research Section.
[b] There were 96 points possible in the Statistics Section.
[c] There were 26 points possible in the Diversity Section.

were related to either "insufficient measures" or lack of follow-up, (not) using the collective data to consider changes ("Assessment continues to lead in standards noncompliance," *ACEJMC Ascent*, 2011). Open-mindedness with respect to considering changes/improvements within courses is one of the benefits of assessment, and the program in this study successfully underwent accreditation review twice without being cited for noncompliance with any standard, including the focus of this study, Standard 9.

Several areas for improvement in the current research course would not have been identified without assessment, the most significant being students' failure to comprehend how diversity relates to survey research. As one justification for Standard 9, the reader's attention is directed to Table 2 and the improved performance(s) in diversity (Section III of the exam) between first-wave students (67.0 percent) and second-wave students (74.1 percent). This improvement has possible significance only after knowing what arguably brought it about. The instructor reviewed 2007–2008 student evaluations of the course and elected to make one change: the first-wave students had to do the entire survey paper individually, but second-wave students (2012– 2013) were allowed to work on the first half of their research paper as a group (see Table 6 for what defines the first half), formulating their hypotheses and crafting their survey instrument (questionnaire, step four) together; the data collection and analysis in steps five to seven remained individualized, while step eight was skipped.

What followed in the second wave was increased interest in understanding the importance of hypothesis testing, and an appreciation of the relevance of *diversity* with respect to identifying independent variables. This "group"

dynamic in second-wave students might also have been an extraneous variable that confounded the paired-sample correlation analysis of scores for the diversity section. Some students arguably benefited (or not) from being in groups when formulating hypotheses, and in turn learned (or not) about the importance of diversity in research when studying human subjects (their survey projects).

Limitations of the Study. The student's comprehension of the terminology of scientific research was observed to be limited, and the typical student struggled with the idea of paradigm-based research while oftentimes unable to discern the difference between a scientific theory and a scientific law. The lack of a theory prerequisite necessitated inclusion of this instruction within the course, a limitation with respect to research and statistics time-wise, as considerable time had to be devoted in order for students to understand the significance of hypothesis testing. A research question and hypothesis exercise were necessary, as the critical thinking skills of many were lacking, students not making the connection between theory and hypothesis formulation. Again, these scenarios also suggest the advantage the second wave had, in terms of more time available to devote toward steps 5 through 7 of the research process, effectively completing the student's research project(s).

Research instrument design. There are many limitations to the current study, particularly with respect to the instrument design and the inability to attain a second coder for the scoring of those responses that have a subjective element. This became most evident with *diversity*, the only area where there was not a finding of statistical significance when performing a paired-sample correlation, identifying it as the "weakest" section.

TABLE 6:
EIGHT-STEP RESEARCH PROCESS

First Half of Survey Project		
	1.	Select a problem
	2.	Review existing literature
	3.	Develop a hypothesis or a research question
	4.	Determine appropriate methodology/research design

Second Half of Survey Project		
	5.	Collect relevant data
	6.	Analyze and interpret the results
	7.	Present the results
	8.	Replicate the study (if necessary)

Source: Roger D. Wimmer and Joseph R. Dominick, *Mass Media Research: An Introduction* (Boston: Wadsworth Publishing, 2014), 13.

The construction of such an instrument proved to be more complex than originally anticipated, and an effort was made *not* to give the same identical examination twice. Inequities between the pretest and post-test invariably made the post-test the easier of the two, as evident by the inflated percentage increases found in Table 3. A noticeable contributing factor to the disparity between pretest and post-test scores was that the pretest was not graded for performance (participation only inducement), thus no motivation to do well (unlike the post-test). The end objective was assessment of learning outcomes, and it was felt the post-test was a fair instrument, not an easy one, based on the mean scores of students taking it (around 69 percent overall as shown in Table 2).

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study. A *strength* was using direct measures, followed by the comparative analysis of paired data. While cumbersome to administer and time-consuming to grade, the pretest/post-test format proved to be beneficial in providing an outline for instruction, along with instruments that were more objective than those previously employed. Questions within the statistics section were objective in that students either responded with the correct answer, or they did not, and the results for this competency were significant. A perceived weakness was the lack of similar equity between the research and diversity sections. These sections contained many short-answer questions where subjectivity in scoring may have influenced the results. The site team evaluators for both the initial accreditation and reaccreditation visits were satisfied with the results included in the self-study report, and did not ask any questions concerning the teaching of statistics in the mass communication research course. In this regard, the pretest/post-test format proved to be an effective means of providing data for compliance with Standard 9, assessment of learning outcomes. The second team was impressed enough with the overall self-study report that ACEJMC asked that it be shared as an example on the website, a possible model for other smaller programs.

Areas for Further Research. Just as the process of assessment of learning outcomes has been identified as an ongoing process, so should research concerning ways to improve assessment. ACEJMC requires programs to take the results of Standard 9 and provide evidence they are using them to make changes and adjustments. An observed avenue for further study or improvement would be the incorporation of a *critical thinking* section, one area that students have struggled with. For instance, many students did not understand the difference between a research question and a survey question. Research studies such as this one have revealed shortcomings in the instrument used, as well as possible deficiencies in what areas are being assessed, that might assist future programs in their own assessment efforts.

Jeffrey B. Hedrick, Ph.D., is an assistant professor of communication at Jacksonville State University.

REFERENCES

9. Assessment of Learning Outcomes (2014). Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. Retrieved March 21, 2014 from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/PROGRAM/STANDARDS.SHTML#std9

2013 ACEJMC Publication (2013). Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. Retrieved March 21, 2014 from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/2013_ACEJMC_publication.pdf

Accrediting Council decisions (2014). News Release May 6, 2014. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/2014%20ACEJMC%20News%20Release.pdf

Accrediting Council decisions. (2013, June). *ACEJMC Ascent* 20(2), 4. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/ASCENT/20/20_2.pdf

Accrediting Council decisions (2013). News Release May 3, 2013. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/2013%20Accrediting%20Council%20Decisions.pdf

Accrediting Council decisions (2012). News Release May 2, 2012. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/ACEJMC-%20News%20Release%202012.pdf

Accrediting Council decisions (2011). News Release May 9, 2011. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/2011%20Accreditation%20Decisions.pdf

Accrediting Council decisions (2010). News Release May 10, 2010. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/2010%20accrediting%20decisions.shtml

Accrediting Council decisions (2009). News Release May 1-2, 2009. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/09%20accrediting%20decisions.shtml

Accrediting Council decisions (2008). News Release May 3, 2008. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/07%20accrediting%20decisions.shtml

ACEJMC accrediting standards (superseded). Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. Retrieved March 21, 2014 from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/PROGRAM/STANDARDSOLD.SHTML

ACEJMC News Release Index Online (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/BREAK.SHTML

ACEJMC Newsletters Online (n.d.). *ACEJMC Ascent.* Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/ASCENT/ASCENT.SHTML

A Guide to Assessment of Student Learning in Journalism and Mass Communications. (2001). Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/Assessment_Guide.pdf

Assessment continues to lead in standards noncompliance. (2011, June). ACEJMC Ascent 18(2), 2. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/ASCENT/18/18_2.pdf

Assessment leads noncompliance findings. (2012, June). ACEJMC Ascent 19(2), 2. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/ASCENT/19/19_2.pdf

Assessment leads noncompliances -- again. (2010, October). ACEJMC Ascent 17(3). Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/ASCENT/17/17_3.shtml

Becker, L. B., Vlad, T., and Kalpen, K. (2012). 2011 Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments: Enrollments Decline, Reversing the Increase of a Year Earlier, and Suggesting Slow Growth for Future. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 67(4), 333-361.

Becker, L. B., Vlad, T., and Simpson, H. A. (2013). 2012 Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments: Enrollments Decline for Second Year in a Row. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 68(4), 305-334.

Council makes accreditation decisions. (2011, June). ACEJMC Ascent 18(2), 3. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/ASCENT/18/18_2.pdf

Cusatis, C. and Martin-Kratzer, R. (2010). Assessing the State of Math Education in ACEJMC-accredited and Non-accredited Undergraduate Journalism Programs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 64(4), 356-377.

Department of Communication, Jacksonville State University. (2006). Self Study Report. Submitted to Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications.

Dimitrov, D. M. and Rumrill, P. D. Jr. (2003). Pretest-posttest designs and measurement of change. Work 20, 159-165.

Hipolit, M. (2013, August 13). *ETSU Mass Communication department loses accreditation.* Retrieved from http://www.wjhl.com/link/650323/web-extra-report-of-on-site-evaluation-acejmc-undergraduate-program

Kumar, D. (2013, March 18). *USF drops ACEJMC accreditation and interim director Thelen.* The Oracle Retrieved from http://fsne.org/news/2013/03/18/eisenberg-announces-changes-for-school-of-mass-communications/ Posted online by M. Wolfe.

Legg, S. G. (2013, August 6). *ETSU's mass communication program loses accreditation.* Retrieved from http://www.johnsoncitypress.com/article/110010/etsus-mass-communication-program-loses-accreditation

Michlitsch, J. F. and Sidle, M. W. (2002). Assessing Student Learning Outcomes: A Comparative Study of Techniques Used in Business School Disciplines. *Journal of Education for Business* 77(3), 125-130.

Miller, M. S. (1999). Classroom Assessment and University Accountability. *Journal of Education for Business* 75(2), 94-98.

Noncompliance findings. (2014, June). *ACEJMC Ascent* 21(2), 4. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/ASCENT/21/21_2.pdf

Plaisance, P. L. (2007). An Assessment of Media Ethics Education: Course Content and the Values and Ethical Ideologies of Media Ethics Students. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 61(4), 378-396.

Ragas, M. W. and Tran, H. (2013). Beyond Cognitions: A Longitudinal Study of Online Reearch Salience and Media Coverage of the President. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 90(3), 478-499.

Reader, B. (2011, September 25). When Accreditation is a Hindrance, Not a Help. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://chronicle.com/article/When-Accreditation-Is-a/129139/ (accessed on March 18, 2014).

Reich, Z. (2013). The Impact of Technology on News Reporting: A Longitudinal Perspective. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 90(3), 417-434.

Reinardy, S. and Crawford, J. II (2013). Assessing the Assessors: JMC Administrators Critique the Nine ACEJMC Standards. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 68(4), 335-347.

Rosenberry, J. and Vicker, L. A. (2006). Capstone Courses in Mass Communication Programs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 61(3), 267-283.

Seybert, J. A. (2002). Assessing Student Learning Outcomes. New Directions for Community Colleges 117, 55-65.

Todd, V. (2009). PRSSA Faculty and Professional Advisors' Perceptions of Public Relations Curriculum, Assessment of Student Learning, and Faculty Peformance. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 64(1), 71-90.

Values and Competencies expanded to 12. (2010, June). *ACEJMC Ascent* 17(2). Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/ASCENT/17/17_2.shtml

Vitullo, E. and Jones, E. A. (2010). An Exploratory Investigation of the Assessment Practices of Selected Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business-Accredited Business Programs and Linkages with General Education Outcomes. *The Journal of General Education* 59(2), 85-104.

Vlad, T., Becker, L. B., and Kazragis, W. (2011). 2010 Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments: Enrollments Grow, Reversing the Stagnation of Recent Years. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 66(4), 300-324.

Weir, T. (2010). Pretest/Posttest Assessment: The Use of an Entry/Exit Exam as an Assessment Tool for Accredited and Non-accredited Journalism and Mass Communication Programs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 65(2), 124-141.

Wimmer, R. D. and Dominick, J. R. (2014). *Mass media research: An introduction* (10th ed.). Boston: Wadsworth.

THEY WANT ME TO FUNDRAISE?
NAVIGATING THE TRANSITION
FROM PROFESSOR TO CHAIR, DIRECTOR,
OR DEAN WITH A FUNDRAISING MISSION

By David D. Perlmutter, Texas Tech University

Years ago an advertising campaign for a movie asserted that everybody in America would soon be either seeing the film or in line to see it. The claim was hyperbole; but today in higher education it is realistic to project that every chief academic unit officer (chair, director, or dean) is either already fundraising or will soon be asked to do so.

Whereas a generation ago deans were academics who focused on the internal mission, now by some reports the average deans are spending 40 percent of their time on the road working on fundraising. Chairs and directors are close behind — or will be.

The transition, for many academics, is not one without trepidation or surprises. Most administrators have little or no direct experience in fundraising before suddenly getting charged with being the "face and voice" of their units to donors.

Of course, there are preparatory analogs you can draw upon from other contexts. When I interviewed for the position of director of a school of journalism and mass communication that had a heavy fundraising portfolio, I was able to cite my experience as an associate dean for graduate studies engaging alumni for a professional MA program. A friend who was a newspaper publisher before becoming a professor was able to project that his years of community engagement would assist with future donor relationship building as dean. Another dean I know is an expert in interpersonal communication and so was able to claim he knew how personal connections can be built. And so on.

But if you hope to or are about to make the transition to fundraising unit head, there are some tough adjustments to make from the mindset and skill sets of being a professor. There certainly were for me.

To paraphrase the opening line of Peter Mayle's popular travel memoir, "A Year in Provence," my life as fundraiser-in-chief for the academic unit I had taken charge of began at dinner almost days after I became a school director. This first face-to-face donor contact was with an alumnus of the university who, appropriately, wanted to help start a program in training undergraduates for careers in advancing philanthropic causes and institutions, with a specific track to becoming professional development officers — that is, fundraisers. I felt this wonderful, original concept was a great fit with our unit and its focus on oral and written communication skills, persuasion, and public relations.

I and our university foundation development officer met the prospective donor for dinner in Chicago. After minimal small talk, we got down to business. Our idea was to create an interdisciplinary certificate program in "Fund-raising and Philanthropy Communication," and I covered issues from basics of curriculum design to timeline for implementation. Following advice from the development officer with me, I spoke the language of "return on investment": the donor's money would produce timely, measurable results that would help students through defined outcomes.

By dessert we had dealt with all his queries and concerns; a few weeks later he made the commitment and bestowed $100,000 to our new venture. Since then he and several other major donors have committed more to the program, which is now up and running, headquartered at the Iowa journalism school, serving more than 50 students and collaborating with 14 other academic units. A tenure-track hire in philanthropy communication with a focus on social media followed closely afterward.

The story is not unique. Anyone now considering a career in college administration must learn to practice the

art and science of working with donors. In eras of tight budgets, especially at state institutions, many department heads and even faculty are being recruited and instructed (or begged) to join the effort. For example, in spring 2013 at Iowa, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences convened a general meeting of Foundation staff and department chairs to start training the latter more in depth for fundraising efforts in a capital campaign. As one of the presenters, I made this observation: teaching and research in higher education both augment and undermine skill sets applied to donor development. Those making the transition from full-time educator to part-time money raiser should appreciate the similarities and differences between the callings and vocations.

You will be a beginner/amateur instead of an "expert"

By the time your career as a professor has progressed so that you are qualified to be a unit-level administrator, you may have accumulated years of experience, titles, and status as a scholar and teacher. Your new job carries the byline of chair, dean, or director. You are, in a word, a "senior" in academia.

Then, suddenly, you are a freshman again. Many, if not most, administrators drop into fundraising and development without having taken any classes or workshops on the topic and often without even having participated in fundraising and development at a prior pre-administrative post.

So be ready to go back to school as a pupil. Read literature, both research and popular, on fundraising and development. Take advantage of the excellent training workshops available. Most important, become an enthusiastic apprentice to your university foundation's experienced advancement professionals.

You are the spokesperson for everyone, not just your area of passion in teaching and research

A basic tenet of good administration is not to play favorites. You may have a longtime research track in one area of your discipline, but you will fail as a department chair if you appear to be championing that area above all others. Likewise, when you start fundraising you represent everyone and everything that your unit does. You need to be able to explain and show the value of disparate kinds of teaching and scholarship, programs, and projects to non-academics. You are also providing, in the language of accounting, a subcertification that a particular cause is worth supporting — even if that cause was alien to you.

Being a spokesperson highlights the personal trust factor in donor engagement. You are, in the mind and eye of typical donors, the face, voice, and character of your unit. They want to hear what its accomplishments and challenges are — candidly, accurately, and without cant or spin. Officially and legally they are potentially giving money to your unit for some good outcome to help your students or faculty members, but in a very personal sense they are giving the money to *you* — that is, trusting you with it, as its solicitor but also its steward. As a foundation representative explained, "They see *us* as salespeople; they see *you* as the CEO of the company. For any big business deal, they want to meet the guy or woman in charge, not just the sales force."

Accordingly, show and tell how their money is allocated and watch over its continuing benefits.

Learn to listen as well as pitch

Faculty members in some disciplines, such as anthropology and journalism, are trained to be good listeners, and most professors enjoy a good conversation.

But donor engagement has many nuances of interaction that the novice may not pick up on right away. Donor meetings are rarely PowerPoint-aided lectures; at a lunch or coffee meeting donors may have no agenda, and the fundraiser's role is more to hear them than to guide them. Many donors, for instance, prefer not to discuss donations at length. They are willing to make them, and the amount and the kind can be brought up, agreed to, and dispensed with over a few minutes at the end of a two-hour lunch, typically by the development officer who generally attends such functions.

These donors prefer to declare how much they love their alma mater, or reminisce about their wonderful professors, or assert how a program helped launch them to their own professional success. Go to enough such meetings and you will be able to write an oral history of your unit.

The point is to hear them out. You may come into a meeting with a prepared "ask." But donors are not your students and you don't need to stick to the lesson plan.

Learn the language of "return on investment" (ROI)

Donations to universities are often made with idealistic intent. A family whose wealth was gained in the insurance industry who wants to endow a chair in violin to

honor a mother who always loved classical music is in fact trying to create some higher good without any accounting chart attached to it. And the senior generation of donors may well make donations just to "give back" to their old school.

Modern donors, however, typically define "good" through the metric of ROI. They want to know what *measurable* outcomes we project. For example, in outlining the new program in philanthropy studies to the potential benefactor, I eventually laid out a timeline and grid — dates, actions, personnel costs — projecting what would happen each semester for the next two years. I defined and detailed those actions: surveying what was taught toward philanthropy education in all universities and colleges in the United States, redesigning courses, cross-listing courses in business and law and several other disciplines, starting a student club, applying for approval of the certificate program, and so on.

In short, the donor was told: If you help us, we will make these specific things happen. We are accountable. The worst thing to say to a donor is, "You don't need to know about the details; we'll take care of it."

You are a matchmaker, so think about value for both sides

What you consider to be the priorities of the unit should not be forced on potential donors. Yes, you should speak enthusiastically about the greatest needs (phrasing them as "greatest potential areas for success") and your goals for the future. But as a friend of mine who has raised hundreds of millions of dollars for political causes put it, "Don't forget that it's their money and their passion."

So, as suggested above, listening means not just sitting back while a donor recalls the joys of his freshman year; it means finding out what cause really excites him or her and translating that into something that benefits the program. For instance, if the donor indicates an appreciation for a professor who helped during the donor's undergraduate days, you can demonstrate how endowing a professorship in the same area will help attract or maintain such pedagogical and research talent to benefit current and future students.

You are, thus, a form of matchmaker in several senses of the word. You want to connect the good, but sometimes you must say no to ideas that can't work or would not be acceptable to your faculty or would raise ethical issues. Sometimes what donors consider priorities can't or should not be imposed on a unit. In academia, forced-fit gifts are as unsustainable as forced marriages. You are the interlocutor and interpolator between worlds and must make the initial judgments and the continuing projections about what can and cannot work out.

Think long term as well as short term

Another dimension of fundraising is the engagement of external friendships for the unit as a suitable place to assist financially, but not necessarily right away. Consider that professors probably are "medium term" thinkers as professions go. University researchers plan multi-year projects; they certainly enter into tenure tracks lasting six years. But development work can extend decades, even across generations.

For example, many alumni help the institutions they care about through legacy bequests. My job with friends of the school like these is to keep them updated about our progress, ask their advice, and (implicitly) communicate that their future munificence is (and will be) well appreciated. In other cases, I may talk to people whose giving plans are uncertain; we simply want to keep in contact until they decide that they want to give, even if that decision is a long way off. One foundation development officer put it this way: "Sometimes the return on investment of our time will come to our successors."

You are part of a team

Faculty members, of course, are used to working on committees, and many researchers collaborate on projects. But the grit of scholarly productivity often involves solitary thinking, data analysis, and typing.

In contrast, no development or fundraising professional or academic works alone. As the very benefactor who bestowed the philanthropy initiative donation pointed out to me, his own contribution came at the tail end of many contacts with our foundation. Although I was the latest and chief "maker-of-the-case," I was part of a group effort of faculty members, consultants, alumni, students, staff, development professionals, and, of course, the significant intellectual contribution of the donor himself.

An illustration comes from another chapter in the building of the philanthropy communication program. The major benefactor later visited the school after the program had first started. We brought together the faculty member who was the coordinator of the program, the key development officers from the foundation involved in the gift, myself, and, most important of all, a student who

had signed up for the certificate. As prep, we marshaled all the facts (the analytics and metrics, in business parlance): what actions had been taken, progress on curriculum, number of students signed up for the program, support from other donors. I asked our terrific graphics and design professor to put together a one-page newsletter presenting these facts clearly and attractively.

The totality of our presentations was useful, I think, but the student was the real star. Her enthusiasm and her narrative — about how she looked forward to a career of philanthropic causes, including health research — were infectious. At the end of the meeting the benefactor committed another major donation to the program. Yeah team!

In all, my hundred-thousand-dollar dinner propelled me into a time machine where I was an undergraduate again, exploring and learning a novel field with new protocols, rules of engagement, and sometimes counterintuitive wisdom.

It is also a task that is lightened and improved when faculty members see its value, limits, and opportunities. Of course, the average professor is rightly and devotedly focused on his or her own personal teaching, research, and service. But certain professors at certain times can be extraordinarily helpful in fundraising, whether it's presenting to donors about a particular program, helping craft a vision of success for a fundable project, or just writing a "thank you" note for a donation that benefited their work or students.

So don't fear fundraising: Ethically and pragmatically practiced, it is a stimulating adventure that is also patently necessary for the survival of higher education and the prosperity of your unit.

David D. Perlmutter is a professor in and dean of the College of Media & Communication at Texas Tech University. He writes the "Career Confidential" advice column for the **Chronicle of Higher Education.** *His book on promotion and tenure,* **Promotion and Tenure Confidential,** *was published by Harvard University Press in 2010.*

Note: This essay is based on material previously published in the *Chronicle of Higher Education.*

UNCERTAINTY AND CHANGE: APPLYING NEWS MEDIA EXPERIENCES TO INNOVATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By Peter Gade, University of Oklahoma

There is a lot higher education can learn from the experiences of legacy news media during the past two decades.

Like news media, we in higher education suddenly have a lot of competition. We no longer control the creation and delivery of educational materials. Degree programs are no longer geographically defined, entry barriers into our profession are not as clear, and the business model that defined higher education for more than a century is on life-support.

Most of these issues are relatively new to higher education, but they are not new to legacy news media. And they shouldn't be completely new to educators of journalism and mediated communication. Many of us worked in media industries and have watched how media industries have responded (and continue to respond) over a period of years.

Now that we're in academia, it's easy to look at media industries and second-guess the paths they've chosen. But the more prudent path, it seems to me, is to recognize the similarities in our situations, consider the ways news media responded to a complex and fast-changing environment, and use the lessons from their experiences to do better, or — at the very least — not make the same mistakes.

Any scholar who studies change — which I have done since entering the doctoral program at the University of Missouri School of Journalism in 1995 — understands that change is not easy. The basis for change begins with psychological discomfort, a cognitive dissonance borne of recognition that the present state of affairs is not acceptable and awareness that the future is uncertain (Lewin, 1947; Kanter, 1983). Change threatens the stability of successful and fulfilling careers, rewards different and new knowledge and skills, and disrupts work routines. It

takes people out of their comfort zones; successful outcomes are not assured.

But like it or not, it is clear in higher education that change we must. Forces beyond our control are redefining us; the present is not sustainable. However, the outcomes need not be negative. Challenge poses opportunity.

This essay explores some of the parallels between the experiences of legacy media and higher education, broadly, and journalism and mediated communication education specifically. It draws from several disciplines of scholarship that explore change — management, organizational studies, sociology of professions, and media economics. It suggests that as educators and administrators we have agency and efficacy, and we can leverage these to craft change by:

- defining who we are and distinguishing ourselves from competitors,
- developing the knowledge in our field to strengthen journalism education and journalism's position as an essential social institution, and
- providing leadership to spark innovation in participatory and non-autocratic ways.

Define yourself and know the boundaries

There is a popular notion in the digital age that everyone is a journalist. This idea even reverberates in the halls of many journalism schools.

But there are unintended consequences to this line of thinking. By conflating journalism with what every Internet publisher can do, the *value* of journalism — and what distinguishes it from digital publishing — is lost. If journalism can be done by anyone, it requires no special

knowledge or expertise, and it has no specific set of values that guide the work. *It requires no specialized education*. All one needs is access to the technology and some rudimentary skills.

In higher education, much like journalism, digital technology is coined a "disruptive innovation" (Christensen & Horn, 2013), encouraging those seeking an education to think that through media technologies they can achieve their academic desires in an anytime, anywhere, anyplace "on demand" market.

This view is highly persuasive to higher education's primary stakeholders and sources of revenue. Nationally, public support for higher education at the state level was cut 28 percent between 2008 and 2013 (Weissmann, 2013). Increasingly, parents, students and state legislators get sticker-shock at the price of higher education and seek ways to increase access and contain costs (Hiltonsmith & Draut, 2014).

The flexibility and promise of technology become an easy solution. Universities are outsourcing their curricula, and the number of online-based for-profit institutions continues to grow (Kirp, 2013).

However, much like technology blurs the line of who is and isn't a journalist, it blurs the line of who has and has not received a quality education. And by extension, it blurs the line of who is a professor, and what credentials are required to become one.

Nationally, the percentage of tenure-track faculty dropped from 78.3 in 1969 to 33.5 in 2009 (Kazer & Maxey, 2013). Evidence of a superior education — the Ph.D. or terminal degree — is no longer required. University instructors (commonly called "professors") are increasingly part-time, adjuncts who work other jobs, and graduate students (Schackner, 2013).

These trends, of course, illustrate what we have observed about journalism in the past two decades: they are the sign of a weakening profession (Picard, 2009). We are engaged — purposively or not — in the institutional weakening of higher education, the "deprofessionalizing" of the professor.

We in higher education can watch this unfold (as news media did), or we can innovate to reposition ourselves as an essential social institution. Repositioning requires reassessing our values and practices, defining who we are, establishing the boundaries.

Paradoxically, educators can best accomplish these goals by integrating — engaging our stakeholders and collaborating across academic disciplines that have complimentary knowledge. Most important is that we articulate the social and economic value of what we do. Overall, we need to make apparent why institutional higher education is better than the on-demand, cheap and totally virtual alternatives.

Knowledge informs practice

Striking characteristics of news media in the second half of the 20th Century were the stability of the industries, their marked growth, and their financial success (Picard, 2011). Journalists largely controlled the creation and flow of public information, determined which stories saw the light of day, decided who got the speaking parts, and how the news was presented and framed. Journalism was what journalists said it was (Singer, 2011).

Because journalism was the province of journalists, one might say journalism was monopolized by journalists; there was no real need for journalists to explain their methods to the public, how they approached their work, and the knowledge that supported their practices.

This situation has had serious negative effects on journalism practice, education and scholarship.

On a practical level, *it has limited journalism to something people do*. Few efforts, until Kovach and Rosenstiel's *Elements of Journalism* (2007) were made to define and explain — in a language that resonated with professionals and scholars and was accessible to students — how journalists' *think* about their work.

The result has been that journalists are confused and often disagree about the nature of their knowledge (Kovach & Rosenstiel discuss this idea in several chapters of their book). The conclusion — agreed upon by practitioners and scholars — is that there is no coherent knowledge base in journalism (Merrill, 2006; Picard, 2009; Becker & Vlad, 2011), to which I add: *there never had to be as long as journalists monopolized journalism*.

News industries demand that journalism graduates have practical skills; scholars want to create knowledge. The two should inform each other, but have developed along divergent paths. Both the industry and academy have contributed to an undeveloped knowledge base and journalists' confusion about the knowledge that explains WHY they do their work in the ways that they do.

This situation is not tenable in the digital age. And it leads to a simple, yet unyielding, conclusion: Journalists' inability to articulate the knowledge that distinguishes journalism from everything else published on the Internet has weakened journalism as a profession and institution.

Management scholar Peter Drucker (2008) describes the situation of journalism well in his writings about the impact of technology on knowledge work. Occupations whose work is based on a theoretical knowledge base employ knowledge workers. These workers obtain theoretical knowledge that is not available to the broader public, usually beginning with higher education. Knowledge work increased throughout the 20th Century, and is widely used to describe what are commonly called professionals: doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, etc.

However, late in the 20th Century, technology-driven innovation became capable of doing some of the work that previously could be done only by knowledge workers. The result, Drucker writes, is the growth of "knowledge technologists," who consider themselves professionals, but "are as much manual workers as they are knowledge workers; in fact, they spend far more time working with their hands than their brains" (p. 37). Knowledge technologists, he asserts, are today's equivalent to manual manufacturing workers of the industrial age, and are paid on a similar scale.

Digital media clearly change the way journalism is practiced, but they do not diminish the need for better educated — more knowledgeable — journalists. Actually the opposite is true: the conceptual knowledge required today is richer and more diverse than in the mass media era, as today's journalists need a more sophisticated knowledge of citizen engagement, democratic arts, entrepreneurship and postmodern values to thrive in a network society.

Ironically, journalism education is moving in the opposite direction, toward a more technology-based, multimedia, practice-oriented curriculum.

Blom and Davenport's (2012) national survey of U.S. journalism program directors reveals that the directors' ideal curriculum centers on practices. Six ideal models emerged with the core classes of reporting/information gathering, multimedia storytelling and writing across media in all models. Conceptual courses were limited to media law and ethics (combined into one course in half the models) and visual communication. History hardly got a mention, making the cut into just one of the six models.

It is little wonder that in the age of Twitter, our students may be good at condensing information into short, episodic bits of appealing information. But knowing how to connect facts to provide context, communicating what the information means, and knowing how to engage citizens beyond subjective he said/she said, right/left debates is beyond their skill set. They don't have the *knowledge* to perform these journalism functions. And, as educators, we cannot expect that they should, because this knowledge is nowhere in the curriculum.

The broader truth is that this knowledge is seldom found in professional journalism, and even the professionals who possess it have trouble putting it into practice (Greenhouse, 2012).

The teaching hospital model, which places professional journalists in teaching positions to create publishable content for news organizations that lack the resources to fulfill the needs of their communities, carries considerable potential and has yielded some promising results, but it doesn't address the knowledge shortfall endemic in journalism.

Francisco and Lenhoff, Youngstown State (Ohio) professors writing about the teaching hospital initiative at their school, express concern that "the goal of publication was overshadowing the pedagogical missions of the classes" (Francisco, Lenhoff, & Schudson, 2012, p. 2687).

In response, Newton (2012) asserts the values of the teaching hospital model, with its emphasis on faculty with "fresh professional experience" helping students and their universities provide public service journalism. These professional faculty are vital to the model, he notes, asking: "Who has a doctorate in mobile media?" (p. 2672).

And, of course, that is the point. Journalism is far more than mobile media, or any technological tool that can be used to produce content. *Journalism is greater than something people do*. It is fundamentally about *knowledge*, about understanding what is important and why, about finding truths and scrutinizing assertions in relation to facts, about nurturing a networked public discourse that facilitates democracy and a healthy society.

If journalism is to be more than a "blue collar" occupation in the 21st Century, it has to be more than a practice. It needs to create valuable public knowledge, and to

achieve this calling it needs *knowledge workers* — well-educated professionals who can draw from a theoretical knowledge base that is not generally accessible to non-journalists.

It is unlikely — and ultimately unwise — for educators to expect that journalism professionals have a sufficient mastery of journalism's emerging knowledge base and the ability to teach it. For this, the university has a central, essential role.

Leadership

In the late 20th Century, despite several decades of eroding news audiences and decreased public trust, news industries were slow to recognize the impact of the Internet and digital age.

And when they did respond, many of the responses — in retrospect — appear dubious at best and desperate: top-down mandates to "blow up" the newsroom and change-resistant journalism culture, a reliance on organizational consultants to restructure news work, the decision to give their products away online without a clear business strategy, increases in the cost of legacy products to offset resources invested in emerging sectors of their businesses, and lay-offs of many of their most seasoned professionals, who were often the most skeptical of management directives.

Many of the same approaches are apparent in higher education today. A quick search of the issues facing higher education yielded these headlines:

• "Why Higher Education Cannot Resist Disruptive Change" (Levine, 2014);
• "How Competition is Killing Higher Education" (Taylor, 2012);
• "Innovation Imperative: Change Everything" (Christensen & Horn, 2013);
• "Exploring Higher Education Business Models (If Such a Thing Exists)" (Harvey, 2013);
• "Tech Mania Goes to College" (Kirp, 2013);
• "Colleges Are Hiring More Adjunct Professors" (Schackner, 2013);
• "Colleges Can Still Save Themselves: Here's How" (Selingo, 2013).

These issues create a complex and uncertain puzzle for university administrators. The drumbeat for change is faster and louder, but the direction to march is far from clear.

Pavlik (2013) calls for "transformative leadership" in the 21st Century that extends a vision for innovating journalism and mediated communication education. The path forward involves an increasing emphasis on entrepreneurship, expanding interdisciplinary opportunities within the university, sustaining innovation to improve — but not reinvent — our programs, and collaborating with digital giants (e.g., Google) that have become sources of innovation and great wealth.

These ideas, rational and well-founded all, mask a most important point, found deep in the article: "Outside of a very few pioneering schools, *those advocating disruptive innovation are often on the periphery of power*" (p. 217) (emphasis added).

The study of transformative leadership emerged in the 1990s as a response to management-based dissatisfaction with existing change models and the discipline of organizational development, which is rooted in Kurt Lewin's scholarship that assumed social change best occurred through participatory, democratic processes (Burnes & Cooke, 2012). Advocates of transformative leadership asserted that organizational development initiatives took too long, were not focused on economic performance and didn't guarantee the organizational results desired by management.

Transformative leadership calls on management executives (or university administrators), as those positioned to see the "bigger picture," to provide charismatic leadership, rally employees around the need to change by extending a vision for a brighter future, and rewarding desired behavior. Transformative leadership was in its ascendency at precisely the time news media industries were in decline and recognizing the need to change.

It is no coincidence that 1990s cries of news executives to "blow up" the newsroom or pronouncements that "the train is leaving the station, you can get on or stay off" were common at the time (Albers, 1995; Haswell, 1995; Stepp, 1995; Peck, 1996; Shepard, 1998).

In today's higher education environment, one can hear these cries again.

Journalists responded to top-down initiatives in the 1990s with resistance. They saw the Internet changing their profession and knew — accepted — that they had to change too, but they pushed back. Why? The body of research on newsroom change, including some of my

own, has found similar results: change was forced down from above, journalists felt left out of the process, changes conflicted with their professional values, and they didn't see how change would address the uncertainties that existed (Daniels & Hollifield, 2002; Sylvie & Witherspoon, 2002; Gade & Perry, 2003; Gade, 2004, 2008). When change became the mantra in news, journalists saw little leadership vision, no real plan, and perceived many managers as autocratic and out-of-touch with journalists' concerns. They felt victims of change, not crafters of it.

Many news managers admitted as much (Gade, 2004, 2008). They had risen to their positions because of their prowess as journalists, and felt unprepared to tackle the complexities of managing organizational change. And most university administrators follow similar career paths; their preparation includes mastering the demands of the academy — scholarship, teaching and service, but seldom management.

Administrators can advocate change, they can even demand it, but — as Pavlik astutely points out — those most capable of executing it are often on the periphery of power. To create innovation, administrators need to be effective communicators and leaders, and just as important, facilitators more than bosses, identifying sources of specialized knowledge and fresh thinking *wherever those resources exist*. Many exist in the profession, but in most cases, they reside and are most accessible within the university. Administrators need to articulate a vision, but also to engage faculty to build participatory processes that can bring that vision to fruition. They may not get all they want; the imperative is to create positive momentum and sustain it.

Kanter (1983), author of *The Change Masters*, a seminal book on management of change, wrote that the paradox of change is that there must be a plan, but also recognition that the plan will be altered. Lewin (1947) asserted that change is an iterative process, one that begins with a plan, moves to an action, then an assessment of the action in relation to desired outcomes (learning), and then more action. The process is unfolding and messy, resistance is often rational, and top-down approaches seldom yield successful outcomes (Kotter, 2007).

There is much we can learn from the experiences of news media. The path forward is shrouded by uncertainty, but not impossible to plot. We already know some important starting points.

Peter J. Gade is a Gaylord Professor in the Gaylord School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Oklahoma, where he was head of the journalism area for fourteen years. He is the immediate past-president of Kappa Tau Alpha, journalism and mass communication's national honor society.

REFERENCES

Albers, R. (1995, April). New age newsrooms. *Presstime*, 32-35.

Becker, L., & Vlad, T. (2011). Where Professionalism Begins. In Lowrey, W., & Gade, P. J. (Eds.) *Changing the News* (pp. 249-269). New York: Routledge.

Blom, R. & Davenport, L. D. (2012). Searching for the core of journalism education. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 67(1), 70-86.

Burnes, B., & Cooke, B. (2012). The past, present and future of organizational development: Taking the long view. *Human Relations*, 65(11), 1395-1429.

Christensen, C. & Horn, M. (2013, Nov. 1). Innovation imperative: Change everything. New York Times. Retried 11 Sept. 2014 from: http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/03/education/edlife/online-education-as-an-agent-of-transformation.html

Daniels, G., & Hollifield, C. A. (2002). Time of turmoil: Short- and long-term effects of organizational change on newsroom employees, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79, 661-680.

Francisco, T., Lenhoff, A., & Schudson, M. (2012). The newsroom as classroom. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 2677-2697).

Gade, P.J. (2004). Newspapers and organizational development: Management and journalist perceptions of newsroom cultural change. *Journalism & Communication Monographs*, 6(1), 3-55.

Gade, P. J. (2008). Journalism guardians in a time of great change: Newspaper editors' perceived influence in integrated news organizations. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85(2), 371-392.

Gade, P. & Perry, E. (2003). Changing the newsroom culture: A four-year case study of organizational development at the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 80(2), 327-347.

Greenhouse, L. (2012, Summer). Challenging 'He Said, She Said' journalism, *Nieman Reports*, 66(2), 21-24. Retrieved 14 Sept. 2013 from: http://www.nieman.harvard.edu/reports/article/102769/Challenging-He-Said—She-Said-Journalism.aspx

Drucker, P. (2008). *Management.* New York: Harper Collins.

Haswell, C. (1995, December). Editors wrestle with change. *The American Editor*, 10-11.

Harney, J. O. (2013). Exploring higher education business models (If such a thing exists). *New England Journal of Higher Education*, 1. *Academic Search Elite*, 29 August 2014.

Hiltonsmith, R., & Draut, T., (2014, March). The great cost shift continues. *Demos*. Retrieved 10 Sept. 2014 from: http://www.demos.org/publi-

cation/great-cost-shift-continues-state-higher-education-funding-after-recession

Kanter, R.M. (1983). *The Change Masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kazer, A, & Maxey, D. (2013). The changing academic workforce. *Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges*, 21*(3)*. Retrieved 29 August 2014 from: http://agb.trusteeship/2013/changing-academic-workforce

Kirp, D. (2013, Sept 23.) Tech mania goes to college. *The Nation.* Retrieved 29 August 2014 from: http://www..thenation.com/article/176037/tech-mania-goes-college#

Kotter, J. P. (2007). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved 29 August 2014 from: https://hbr.org-/2007/01/leading-change-why-transformation-efforts-change

Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2007). *The Elements of Journalism.* New York: Three Rivers Press.

Levine, A. (2014, July 6). Why higher education cannot resist disruptive change. *Forbes*. Retrieved 29 August 2014 from: http://www.forbes-.com/sites/realspin/2014/07/16/why-higher-education-cannot-resist-disruptive-change/

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics. In Cartwright, D. (Ed.), *Field Theory in Social Science.* London: Social Science Paperbacks.

Lowrey, W., & Gade, P.J. (2011). *Changing the News*. New York: Routledge.

Merrill, J.C. (2006). *Media, Mission and Morality*. Spokane, WA: Marquette Books.

Newton, E. (2012). Promise, peril of "teaching hospitals." *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 2670-2673.

Pavlik, J. V. (2013). A vision for transformative leadership. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 68*(3)*, 211-221.

Peck, C. (1996). Finding our way means revising our values. *ASNE journalism values handbook*. American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Picard, R. G. (2009, May 19). Why journalists deserve low pay. *Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved 21 August 2009 from: http://www.csmonitor-.com/2009/0519/p09s02-coop.html

Picard, R. G. (2011). *The Economics and Financing of Media Companies.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Selingo, J. (2013, Aug. 29). College can still save themselves: Here's how. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 60*(14)*, A72.

Schackner, B. (2013, April 5). Colleges are hiring more adjunct professors. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. Retrieved 29 August 2014 from: http://www.postgazette.com/news/education/2013/04/05/Colleges-are-hiring-more-adjunct-professors/stories/201304050117

Shepard, A. (1998, May). The change agents. *American Journalism Review*, 43-49.

Singer, J. (2011). Journalism and digital technologies. In Lowrey, W., & Gade, P. J. (Eds.) *Changing the News* (pp. 213-229). New York: Routledge.

Stepp, C.S. (1995, April). Reinventing the newsroom. American Journalism Review, 29-33.

Sylvie, G., & Witherspoon, P. (2002). *Time, Change and the American Newspaper*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Taylor, M. C. (2012). How competition is killing higher education. *Bloomberg View*. Retrieved 29 August 2014 from: http://ww.bloombergview-.com/articles/2012-05-17/competition-is-killing-higher-education-part-1-

Weissman, J. (2013, March). A truly devastating graphic on state higher education spending. *The Atlantic Monthly*. Retrieved 29 August 2014 from: http://www.theatlantic.com/business/print/2013/03/1-truly-devastating-graph-on-state-higher-education-spending/274199/

WHAT SHOULD
JOURNALISM SCHOOLS TEACH?

By *Thomas Kent,* The Associated Press

When new journalism graduates start their careers, what do they need most?

Many answer this question by talking about skill sets.

I'd like to start with something more fundamental: mindset.

However skilled a journalist is in the tools of the trade, however adept a writer or photographer, doing journalism well requires more than those abilities. It requires at least three other elements: *critical thinking, audience focus and professional modesty*. They are critically important, not only to those who work for traditional outlets, but also to journalists making their way in startups and social networks.

Happily, these ARE traits that students can hone in journalism programs.

Finding students who already possess *critical thinking skills* should start in the office of admissions, with application interviews and essays that search for these abilities. In the classroom, critical thinking can be reinforced by the brute-force approach of asking students to write thoughtful opinion columns arguing each side of an issue in the news. Clearly we won't compel them to take positions they find morally offensive, but many political and social controversies have decent and persuasive arguments on both sides. If students in the classroom can't lucidly argue the position of a person with an opposite view, how can they successfully interview people with whom they disagree or report on that interviewee's arguments fairly?

Making critical thinking a focus of journalism education helps prevent dangerous group-think later on. What happens when a controversial issue or person comes up at a publication's daily news meeting and everyone scowls, laughs or rolls their eyes in unison? Assuming the publication makes some claim to objectivity, someone in the room needs to say, "Wait a minute. Is it really that open-and-shut? Does everyone think as we do?" Training students to think from a different perspective will bring this diversity of opinion into the newsroom.

Audience focus means more than learning to tweak a website based on who's clicking where. Website metrics simply show what visitors are selecting from the smorgasbord you've already laid out — not what they'd like to see to begin with. True audience focus means interacting in depth with real readers, in person, before you create your content.

When students are assigned to start writing on a topic, professors should ask them to interview people in hallways and on sidewalks. The answers the students receive might reveal angles the writers had never thought of — and assumptions the writer has made that readers haven't. Readers may also say that, frankly, they have no interest in the subject at all. That calls for rethinking the whole topic. If it's a marginal one, perhaps the story should just be dropped. If it's important, the initial reader reaction is a warning to be taken quite seriously. Reporters need a strong writing angle or multimedia hook to bring readers into something of which they need to be aware.

Journalistic modesty can be one of the hardest values to instill. This is a recognition that a reporter's analysis of a person or situation may be totally wrong. The headiness that comes from a journalist's easy access to important people and places can quickly turn to arrogance.

History is filled with events that were highly unlikely but happened anyhow. Similarly, the history of journalism is riddled with reporters who constructed viewpoints from

anecdotal experience and fallible "experts," then followed those views right off a professional cliff.

Certainly, students shouldn't be so afraid of arriving at a wrong conclusion that they equivocate about everything. But after they've done their best critical thinking, they should constantly re-evaluate what they posted yesterday and last year. They should routinely subject their previous thoughts to new analysis. When they find another way to interpret the facts, it's a moment to return to the keyboard and tell readers about that angle, rather than to be defensive about what they previously wrote.

Beyond these three values, I find many journalism students who are unaware of, or confused by, the current controversy over the concept of objectivity.[1] Is objectivity still a worthwhile goal? Or is it a shopworn value that is rightly giving way to reporters expressing their own opinions?

It's crucial for journalism teachers to help students navigate this issue, taking pains to explode misconceptions on both sides that have roiled this debate.

Neither traditional nor "point-of-view" journalism means disregarding fundamentals of the profession, like telling the truth, correcting errors and disclosing conflicts that threaten the fairness of a news report. Similarly, it's an overstatement to say that objective reporting means rote, he-said-she-said transcription devoid of common sense, or that point-of-view journalism is a license to publish unbridled polemics with no obligation to fairness.[2]

A full, fair analysis of both schools of reporting should reveal to students the advantages of each. The objective reporter attempts to suppress his or her own point of view and give equal attention to opinions on all sides of the subject. The point-of-view reporter makes clear his or her own beliefs while at least giving some nod to the positions of the other side. In my view, a rich journalism culture honors both.

Students have a very practical need to ponder the two approaches because their choices today may affect their careers tomorrow. Students who've trumpeted their personal politics on social networks may be less attractive to an objective news organization. Intemperate polemics can make a candidate unattractive even to sites with a political view, if they still value fairness and rationality.

Beyond the objectivity debate, ethics training should include discussion from the ground up of many rules that older journalists take for granted. For instance, students today ask what, exactly, is wrong with accepting a gift from a news source if the journalist is convinced that the reporting won't be compromised by it. Simply quoting from generation-old ethics codes won't cut it; students want to understand why such a rule should be necessary for them today.

The same applies to plagiarism rules. Most students understand that it's theft to put forward long passages of someone else's work as their own. But what about cribbing a few words?[3] And in the age of aggregation, what about the assertion (pernicious in my view) that selecting work from various people and arranging it in a new way is a process so creative in itself that the raw material requires no credit? Students need to talk through these issues, reflecting carefully on the long-term effects of an intellectual culture that pays no heed to the value of original work.

Many ethical issues stem exclusively from the digital age. Should news organizations comply with requests to delete stories and photos from their online archives? Can a news photographer use Instagram filters? Automated newswriting and interactive graphics are major frontiers of modern journalism, but what are the traps to watch out for?

All of these issues can form the basis for an important assignment: creating a personal ethics code. Every journalism student should be challenged to create his or her own code. Students should use it to guide their class writing assignments and social media posting, and to help identify employers who share their principles.

Any such guide needs to start with some of the fundamental principles of journalism, like telling the truth and correcting errors, that we mentioned above. Not everything is negotiable; if students can't accept the fundamentals, perhaps they're more of a propagandist than a journalist.

But on many issues beyond the fundamentals, honest journalists can disagree. Here lie opportunities for superb class discussions. When is a suicide a private matter? When, to the contrary, does newsworthiness require it be reported? What rules should apply to interviewing and photographing children? What happens when a journalist, barred by his employer from accepting gifts, is working in a foreign culture where it's an insult to refuse one? When a reporter edits audio of a newsmaker, is it legitimate to cut out pauses, "uhs" and complete unfin-

ished sentences? Do reporters need to engage on Twitter with everyone who criticizes their stories?

One resource for personal ethics code assignments is the Online News Association's Do-It-Yourself Ethics Code project. It begins with fundamental principles, then guides users through a series of options that digital and traditional journalists are debating.[4] Established ethics codes like those of the Society of Professional Journalists and new ones like Buzzfeed's can be useful resources as well.[5]

Once students have created their own ethics codes, they should test them against modern-day professional dilemmas. Should news companies have republished Charlie Hebdo's cartoons to defend freedom of the press, or were the cartoons simply a form of hate speech that no one should want to reproduce? When is reporting hate speech essential in order to expose it? When does it simply give publicity to haters? Is video of a hostage's killing essential to broadcast because it lays bare the brutality of the killers? Or should it never be broadcast, to avoid spreading their message?[6]

Ethical dilemmas can also be less cosmic than those already presented. For years, news organizations have struggled with how to handle vulgarities. Are profanities – at least the milder ones – part of normal speech these days, or something still to be avoided? What about images that show nudity or obscene gestures? Discussion here can turn on the expectations of different generations of readers; whom exactly are journalists afraid of offending? At the same time, can a complete open-door policy to obscenities and nudity cheapen a news product even in the eyes of young consumers?

The most up-to-the-minute ethics issues involve automated newswriting. How can we assure fairness and quality in stories written by machine? Must every automated story be labeled as such to be transparent with the reader – and if so, what do we expect the reader to make of this disclosure?

A basic understanding of journalism history and law is also essential. Carrying out news assignments requires knowing the principles of such celebrated cases as New York Times Co. vs. Sullivan, for libel law, and Food Lion Inc. vs. Capital Cities/ABC Inc., for undercover journalism. Students should also understand the great variations in shield laws are across the United States and other countries. They sometimes offer far less protection for anonymous source reporting than students imagine.

Most of what I've spoken of so far is on the academic side of journalism. But newsroom managers constantly emphasize that journalism grads also need solid practical skills. Some of these are the simplest, like being able to quickly turn out a crisp 250 words, letter- and grammar-perfect, on a spot news event like a fire or accident. Before a new reporter sets out grandly to afflict the comfortable and comfort the afflicted, he or she needs to be able to produce basic stories and video reports with minimal guidance and hand-holding.

Graduates should also be able to edit sound and video under pressure, quickly set up equipment for live broadcasts and, in these cost-conscious times, calculate an expense budget for a story.

It's debatable that if everything needs to be taught in the classroom. Class time can usefully be used to teach skills like how to edit photos or storyboard a video piece, but ability in sound and video editing comes primarily from hours of practice. Must class hours be devoted to teaching students how to click around standard video and audio software? Can students be reasonably expected to learn such skills on their own, and demonstrate that they have done so? One might hope that any student enrolling in journalism school would be excited enough about these tools to have downloaded free versions and spent hours with them long before arriving on campus. Ideally, journalism tools courses should be master classes focusing on the fine points of editing – not boot camps for students who haven't had the drive to learn everyday software for themselves. But I realize student motivation varies from campus to campus.

Beware also of devoting class time on skills that will soon be outdated. Journalistic tools are evolving at a breathtaking pace, constantly chipping away at tedious work. A few years ago journalism schools thought they were being progressive by forcing students to labor for hours over the intricacies of HTML. Now that most HTML is generated automatically, those hours of study went for naught. What tools taught in your classroom today will be antiquated within a year or two?

One way to unite the theoretical and practical in journalism school is to bring in professional newspeople from the community on a part-time basis. These journalists can quickly identify the job skills needed in your particular region and bring alive the academic knowledge — like understanding libel law — that's essential in working newsrooms. They should give practical assignments, and expect what the students turn in to conform to full pro-

fessional standards. Students should have to produce pieces in all formats — photos, text and video.

It's also a real boon to recruit students who have already worked as journalists, either full-time or freelance. They can share in class everything from it-happened-to-me reporting experiences to tips for working with cranky sources and editors.

Much has been written about the importance of teaching business and entrepreneurship skills in journalism school, so I won't repeat that here — except to say that classes should hear directly from the people responsible for keeping media organizations financially afloat.

This is because, culturally, there can be a big gap between a publication's journalists and business people. At many news companies, journalists are uncomfortable with talk of news as a "product," much less with concepts like strategic planning, marketing and project management. Journalism schools need to help students understand that editorial independence is best guaranteed by financial independence, and to respect those responsible for keeping the lights on.

The surrounding university is also an excellent resource for a journalism school. When news companies seek journalists, they often look for more than plain vanilla graduates armed only with journalism credentials. Training in science, medicine, law, psychology, liberal arts or regional studies can make the difference between being hired or not. Even if an editor's immediate need

is for a general assignment reporter, a candidate with additional depth stands out as a better long-term investment. Competency in other languages is also highly prized by editors, not just for reporting in diverse communities but as a mark of worldliness and determination.

Finally, a word about student safety. I've heard more than one journalism professor speak glowingly about students who, for investigative reporting projects, "almost got killed" in a rundown U.S. neighborhood or some overseas location. Almost getting killed is not a virtue. Instructors should not suggest to students that journalism that involves mortal risk is the ultimate form of reporting.

It has become fashionable for new journalists to venture into dangerous parts of the world with little backup, sometimes requiring staggering efforts to rescue them from captivity. At a time when many experienced journalists have lost their lives reporting stories, journalism students should understand just how much training and experience it takes to work confidently in dangerous environments and the perils of foolhardy ventures. The harrowing publications of the Committee to Protect Journalists[7] can be good teaching tools.

One more thing journalisms schools can teach: write shorter than this article!

Thomas Kent is the standards editor of The Associated Press.

ENDNOTES

1. For a review of the issues, see Riordan, Kellie (2014, Sept. 4). Does journalism still require impartiality? *The Guardian. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/sep/05/does-journalism-still-require-impartiality*

2. My viewpoint: see Kent, Thomas (2014, June 25). Impartial Journalism's Enduring Value. *The Huffington Post. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thomas-kent/impartial-journalisms-end_b_5527922.html*

3. An article certain to provoke discussion is Weingarten, Gene (2014, July 29). When "plagiarism" is merely petty bull-poo. *The Washington Post. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/style-blog/wp/2014/07/29/gene-weingarten-when-plagiarism-is-merely-petty-bull-poo/*

4. The project, in draft form, is available at http://bit.ly/onacrowdsourcing. The author is the leader of this project.

5. A variety of U.S. and international ethics codes are available on the Online News Association project site.

6. A good tool to analyze hate speech is Hate-Speech: A Five-Point Test for Journalists (2014, May). *Ethical Journalism Network. Retrieved from http://ethicaljournalismnetwork.org/en/contents/hate-speech-a-five-point-test-for-journalists*

7. www.cpj.org