# "SNAKE YOUR WAY TO SUCCESS":

# INNOVATIONS IN COLLEGE JOURNALISM EDUCATION

# AT SELECT INSTITUTIONS

By

Kendra Benner

Senior Honors Thesis

School of Journalism & Mass Communication

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

April 23, 2015

Approved:

Dr. Lois Boynton, Thesis Advisor

Dr. Rhonda Gibson, Reader

Dr. Anne Johnston, Instructor

Journalism educators are tasked with preparing students for the rapidly changing media industry. But, educators face the challenge of keeping up with the evolving industry while navigating elements of higher education that oppose innovation. However, many journalism educators are managing to innovate despite these challenges. In-depth interviews were conducted with eight innovative journalism educators. Their responses indicated several insights about innovating in journalism education, what drives innovation, and the nature of an innovator. Given the importance of innovation in journalism education, understanding what drives innovation in this context is vital. This study provides insights into how innovative educators work and think, and recommendations of how journalism administrators and educators can encourage innovation in their schools.

**Acknowledgements**

Without the following people, this project would not have been possible. Thank you to the following people: Dr. Lois Boynton, for the dedication of your time and expertise for my project, and your sincere enthusiasm for what I discovered during my research; Dr. Rhonda Gibson, for your willingness to serve on my committee and the valuable feedback you have given me; Dr. Anne Johnston, for your months of guidance and encouragement; Prof. Jim Hefner, for your tenacious support; Meghan Sobel, for your kindness and help; Mom and Dad, for your selfless love; Kyle and Mary, for your generosity and jokes; my friends, for your thoughtfulness; and God, for blessing me with these people and giving me the ability to do this project.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

# Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

## Introduction

Journalism educators are trying to figure out how to prepare students for the rapidly evolving industry. As the journalism field quickly changes, journalism schools are attempting to keep up. The Carnegie-Knight Initiative (2011) on the Future of Journalism Education indicated that, when the report was initiated, "journalism education was in trouble…and the economic model for journalism had collapsed." This challenge is made even more difficult in the context of the higher education environment, which is often slow to change (Castañeda, 2011). Furthermore, the purpose of journalism education is being called into question from people inside and outside of the industry. At the advent of the digital era, journalism education began to experience identity shift that it continues to undergo. What is the purpose of a journalism education, and how do schools provide students with it (Humanes & Roses, 2014; Ullah, 2014)?

As journalism schools undergo great change, educational innovators are trying new things and exploring what the identity of journalism education could become. Recent scholarship indicates that journalism schools need to reinvent themselves, but there is concern that some changes are not in the best interest of students. In addition, recent scholarship suggests that there is a disconnect between what journalism students are taught and what they need to know in the professional journalism world. This is not a new issue for journalism schools, but the stakes are higher as journalism degree enrollments are on the decline (Becker, Vlad, & Simpson, 2014).

In effort to evaluate the effectiveness of current innovation in journalism education, prior research has examined specific innovations at singular institutions. These studies have typically evaluated the structure and effectiveness of one innovation, such as a media entrepreneurship courses or online journalism degree programs (Castañeda, 2011; Rojano, Aguilar, & Cortes,

2014). Few studies have inquired into the innovators who created or carried out the new ideas, including what motivates them, how they work, and how they evaluate their work. My study fills this gap in the literature. This study looks into several different types of journalism education innovation at eight institutions.

The purpose of this research project is to inquire into the innovations that are currently being developed and carried out in college journalism education. I also aim to understand the innovators who are working with these innovations, the innovators' motivations and processes, the role of evaluation in innovation, how innovation in journalism education could be improved, and the meaning of innovation.

In the following section, I will discuss prior scholarship related to this topic and the theoretical grounding for my study. This will provide the background for my study and show the gap in the literature that my study fills.

**Literature Review**

Journalism education is in a period of evolution. When discussing the study of journalism education at a broad level, the literature focuses on the following themes: (1) the purpose of journalism education is being called into question as the news industry has fewer jobs and shrinking paying audiences, (2) a need for journalism schools to quickly reinvent themselves, but how challenging that is, given how slowly innovation and change happen in higher education, (3) a concern that changes are not in the best interest of students, and (4) there is a disconnect between journalism education and the journalism industry.

Prior scholarship suggests that the purpose of journalism education is being called into question. Journalism schools are in an identity crisis as news entities have been cutting jobs since the beginning of the digital revolution (Fleming, 2014).

Traditionally, a journalism degree was thought to be "a pathway to a career in news," according to Fleming (2014). But in light of shrinking newsrooms and dwindling paying audiences, a journalism diploma is no longer a neatly paved path to a news career. The practical purpose of journalism education is being called into question. International studies have asked what the purpose of journalism education is in the respective country's individual cultural contexts (Ullah, 2014) and how well their students perceive the schools are fulfilling their purpose (Humanes & Roses, 2014).

Scholars have not reached a consensus on what the purpose of digital age journalism schools should be. But, some scholars are making the case for several, related ideas that are tied to helping students prepare for the realities of the digital media world. Camp (2012) suggested that the purpose of a journalism school is to find solutions to the challenges of fast-moving technological change, and more specifically, do so in conjunction with their greater, overseeing university. Barrett Ferrier (2013) said that journalism instructors must decide if one of their objectives is to prepare students for the evolving media industry, and if they decide as such, media entrepreneurship courses can help instructors fulfill this objective. John Pavlik (2013) said that the purpose of journalism education is closely tied to innovation and entrepreneurship in media. Claussen (2011) said that journalism schools should have media entrepreneurship classes to help graduates get jobs in the journalism industry, and media entrepreneurship classes teach skills that are difficult to teach with traditional journalism classes.

Several studies suggest that the purpose of journalism schools is preparing students for the realities of the digital media world (Barrett Ferrier, 2013; Camp, 2012; Claussen, 2011; Pavlik, 2013). Pre-digital era, the purpose of journalism schools was largely to lead and launch students onto a well-worn path to a media career (Fleming, 2014). In the past, journalism schools

led students into well-established career trajectories, and now, their purpose is to prepare students for the changes and challenges they will face. Before, journalism schools were on the offensive; schools trained students in the concepts and skills schools believed would launch students into a successful media career. Now, schools are on the defensive; schools prepare students to navigate the unpredictable digital media landscape. Journalism educators are no longer exclusively passing down the knowledge and skills that made them successful. They are helping students face the challenges of the digital world (Barrett Ferrier, 2013; Camp, 2012; Clauseen, 2011; Pavlik, 2013).

Prior scholarship also indicates that journalism schools need to quickly reinvent themselves, but innovation and change happen slowly in higher education. Researches have presented different ways that journalism schools should reinvent, including online degree programs (Castañeda, 2011), business-focused media entrepreneurship courses (Rojano, Aguilar, & Cortes, 2014), media literacy courses (Fleming, 2014), hiring more new media-specialized faculty (Du, 2010), and implementing journalism history into curriculum (Rabe, 2014). Furthermore, the 2013 Annual Survey of Journalism Mass Communication Enrollments found that enrollment in journalism programs decreased for the third year in a row at all degree levels (Becker, Vlad, & Simpson, 2014).

From a university-wide perspective, Biddix, Chung, and Park (2015) suggest that college classrooms of all academic disciplines could be revitalized with student-driven use of mobile technology to facilitate in-classroom learning. Given the digital nature of journalism education, student-driven utilization of mobile technology is a natural fit for journalism curriculum; in-classroom use of mobile technology is another possible means for journalism schools to reinvent themselves.

Media entrepreneurship courses were the most-common type of curriculum innovation that emerged from the literature. The researchers who studied media entrepreneurship courses argued that media entrepreneurship classes add depth to journalism programs in a non-traditional way (Barrett Ferrier, 2013; Claussen, 2011; Pavlik, 2013; Rojano, Aguilar, & Cortes 2014). Furthermore, Claussen (2011) said that the skills taught in media entrepreneurship classes are vital to gaining employment in the journalism industry, yet those skills are difficult to teach through traditional academic models. Rojano, Aguilar, and Cortes (2014) said media entrepreneurship courses add value by preparing students to be self-employed by teaching them to be autonomous and entrepreneurial.

Several studies noted the difficulty for journalism schools to reinvent in the slow-to-change environment of higher education. In "Disruption and Innovation: Online Learning and Degrees at Accredited Journalism Schools and Programs," Castañeda (2011) studied the factors that inhibited the development and execution of online journalism degree programs. Castañeda found that these inhibiting factors were faculty skepticism, a shortage of technological know-how among faculty, and a lack of support within schools. Castañeda also said that these factors are largely influenced by the environment of the educational institution. According to Castañeda (2011), "Change at any large organization, especially educational institutions, often moves at a glacial pace. For the last decade or so, journalism educators have had to profoundly rethink decades of fairly standardized reporting and writing pedagogies." Moreover, according to Fleming (2014), the philosophic foundation of journalism education is heavily based upon instructional norms, which traditionally do not help students overcome the challenges of the digital age.

Du (2010), however, noted a factor that may help the development of innovation in journalism schools. Du cites Sutherland (2003), who found that administrators who perceived the pressure of a rapidly changing environment were more likely to respond to the need for innovation.

Prior scholarship also suggests that journalism schools should strengthen their relationships with their overseeing bodies in order to better adapt to changes. Camp (2012) and McDevitt (2014) argued for stronger relationships between journalism faculty and the respective outside entity. While Camp analyzed the relationship between journalism schools and their greater university counterparts, McDevitt analyzed the relationship between a journalism school and its advisory board. Both authors came to the conclusion that during a time of rapid technological change, journalism schools would benefit from closer ties with other university entities. Stronger ties would allow journalism schools and the overseeing bodies to help each other find solutions to the challenges of fast-moving technological change. As journalism educators experience uncertainty and instability during this time of rapid industry change, university entities outside of the journalism school itself may serve as a source of stability.

The third theme that emerges in the literature is concern that recent changes in journalism education are not in the best interest of students. In "Disruption and Innovation," Castañeda (2011) referenced one participant who said that he or she questions whether online degrees are being developed with the best interests of students in mind.

Journalism scholars located outside of the U.S. also expressed concern that journalism education in their respective regions over-emphasizes Western ideals, to the detriment of journalism educators and students (Du & Lo, 2014).

In "Arguing the case of the 'Janus element,'" Rabe (2014) argued from a different perspective; Rabe said that in order for journalism education to move forward in a way that serves students well, it must incorporate journalism history into curriculum. Rabe said that journalism curriculum should be restructured in a way that includes journalism history as an important component. According to Rabe (2014), "with [the journalism education industry's] almost monocular focus on technical abilities and the 'here and now needs' of newsrooms…Journalism History as an important component of j-curricula is overlooked." Rabe argued that journalists must have an understanding of the history of their profession and its role in their respective countries in order to succeed. She said that journalists should simultaneously look forward and backward, like Janus, the ancient Roman god of beginnings and transitions, because knowledge of the history of their profession will help journalists insightfully report on various political, economic, cultural, and economic realities in their countries.

In addition, prior scholarship indicates a need for greater student involvement in journalism education. Several researchers stated that journalism educators should increase the level of students' involvement and direction of their own education (Biddix, Chung, & Park, 2015; Rojano, Aguilar, & Cortes, 2014). Rojano, Aguilar, and Cortes (2014) said increased involvement helps students become self-directed, autonomous, and entrepreneurial-minded when they enter the professional media industry, which are important skills for self-employed journalists. Similarly, Biddix, Chung, and Park (2015) found that educators have a "great opportunity" to revitalize college education by incorporating student-driven use of mobile technology to facilitate learning. However, as Humanes and Roses (2014) observed, journalism students themselves are just one of five major actors that exist in journalism education, and it

will require significant paradigm changes to get journalism students in the drivers' seats of their own education.

The fourth theme that emerges in the literature is the existence of a disconnect between journalism education and journalism in practice. Several studies cited a difference between what journalism students are taught and what they need to know in the professional world. In "Media Literacy, News Literacy, or News Appreciation?" Fleming (2014) said, "…the practical purpose of journalism education has become a problem now more than ever as news professions adjust to digital age realities of fragmenting audiences and disintegrating newsrooms." Prior scholarship also suggests the challenges of the rapidly evolving industry are driving this disconnect. According to Du and Lo (2014), in Hong Kong there is a difference between the skills that professional online journalists believe they need and the skills that journalism students are taught. Journalism educators focus more on broad concepts, but professional journalists say that students need to learn specialized skills (Du & Lo, 2014). In the article "Hackademics at the Chalkface," Harcup (2011) quotes Zelizer's (2009) summary of the problem: "a dissonance between journalism as it is practiced and journalism as it is studied."

In fact, in Europe, there is significant debate over whether aspiring journalists should even go to a formal journalism school. According to Humanes and Roses (2014), the perceived quality that journalism students in Spain have of their training is lower than students in Mexico, Australia, and the U.S. Since there is more debate over whether aspiring journalists should get formal journalism training or go straight into the profession, it seems the disconnect between the worlds of journalism education and professional journalism may be even greater in Europe than the U.S. (Humanes & Roses, 2014).

Rojano, Aguilar, and Cortés (2014) suggested the potential solution of journalism schools increasing the presence of media entrepreneurship courses and business instruction in order to help students succeed in the professional world. Also, researchers in countries outside of the U.S. proposed addressing this disconnect by contextualizing journalism education to the geographic location of the school, rather than inheriting American journalism education traditions (Du & Lo, 2014; Ullah, 2014).

## Theoretical Grounding

### Diffusion of Innovations.

My study is grounded in Diffusion of Innovations theory. According to the theory, originally published by Everett Rogers (1962), innovations spread among the individuals in a social system in a specific pattern over a period of time. In Rogers' theory, an "innovation" is a broad label for anything that is believed to be new by an individual, which informed the definition of innovation I use for this study.

According to Rogers (1962), innovations diffuse to the individuals in a social system in a pattern, sometimes dissipating and sometimes becoming widely adopted and "self-sustaining." Innovations diffuse to the "innovators," characterized by a willingness to take risks, high social status, high financial liquidity, being social, and having interaction with other innovators. According to Rogers, innovations diffuse in a five-step process (Knowledge, Persuasion, Decision, Implementation, and Confirmation). The theory also states that motivation to adopt an innovation varies depending upon the situation.

Since Rogers' original publication in 1962, he has published three updates to the theory (1983, 1995, 2003), and diffusion of innovations theory has been applied to thousands of studies from diverse fields (Sargent, 2015). A new study was published in February 2015 that looked at

the diffusion of innovation in education, specifically the diffusion of pedagogical innovations in the Chinese education system (Sargent, 2015). Sargent (2015) cites literature that shows "ideas can be transferred effectively in the context of *homophilous* networks between individuals of common status, who share common meanings and understandings."

Grounded in prior scholarship on this topic, I will justify my study. I will use my discussion of relevant scholarship and theory to frame an existing gap in the literature, which I have designed my study to fill.

**Justification**

Recent studies have examined single innovations in college journalism education, but no study has taken an in-depth look at several innovations at several institutions. I aimed to fill this gap in the literature with my study.

I also aimed to provide insight into the processes, both successful and unsuccessful, that the innovators used and the motivations that drove them to innovate. From these insights, I drew connections between the innovators' successful, innovation-driving processes.

Furthermore, the role of evaluation in the process of innovation is also absent from prior scholarship. Studies have analyzed how effective certain innovations are. But, they have not looked into the innovator's process of evaluation. This information could provide future researchers with the background and language to explore the role of evaluation in the process of innovation on a broader scale.

Since I conducted in-depth interviews with a small number of subjects (eight) at a small number of locations (six), I cannot draw generalizable conclusions about what processes lead to successful innovations. I hope my results provide a "jumping off point" for future researchers interested in college journalism innovations. My study could provide information on the

language and context of the innovators, which could help future researchers develop broader studies that yield more generalizable conclusions. My study could provide background knowledge for future researchers who develop a large-scale survey of journalism education innovators.

To structure my inquiry into journalism education innovation, I created the following research questions. My research questions address the innovations that are happening in journalism education, the innovators who work with these innovations, the state of the field of journalism education innovation, and the definition of innovation.

**Research Questions**

RQ1: What innovations in college journalism education are currently being developed and executed at select institutions in the U.S. and around the world?

RQ2: Who are the innovators that are working with these innovations and what are their motivations and processes?

RQ3: How do the innovators evaluate their innovations, if at all, and what is the role of evaluation in innovation?

RQ4: In the field of journalism education innovation, what is working and how could the field be improved?

RQ5: What is the definition of innovation?

This concludes the discussion of my scholarly and theoretical approach to my study, including the relevant scholarship and theory, how I justified my study as fulfilling a gap in the literature, and my research questions. Next, I will explain my method.

In Chapter 2, I describe how I conducted my study. Chapter 2 explains how I approached the study, my method, definitions of key terms, limitations of my study, and my data analysis process.

# Chapter 2: Methods

## Statement of Positionality

Since I am journalism student, I have experienced a variety of journalism teaching methods and heard a variety of philosophies on education and innovation. I have naturally developed opinions on what the best teaching methods and educational innovations are. I also recognize that, although I have researched journalism education methods at other schools, the majority of knowledge I have about journalism education is from my experience at the UNC School of Journalism & Mass Communication. UNC educators have shaped my beliefs about the best teaching methods.

Furthermore, I know more about innovations in journalism education that are present at UNC, such as media entrepreneurship classes, which may have influenced what I classified as a "journalism education innovation" and my comfort level discussing certain innovations in an interview. I also acknowledge that, as an American, my definitions of "innovation," "journalism," and "education" are significantly influenced by Western ideals. Although these biases are present, I conscientiously remained aware of them and I set them aside as much as possible during data collection and analysis.

## Study definition

In order to answer the research questions, I conducted in-depth interviews with eight innovative journalism educators, using grounded theory to guide my analysis to better understand what innovations they work with, their processes, how they evaluate, the field of journalism education, and the definition of innovation. Their peers identified these educators as innovators.

Interviews were conducted with eight innovative college journalism educators. Of the participant pool, five educators were male and three were female. Two sets of two educators work at the same institutions (two educators work at City University of New York and two educators work at UNC-Chapel Hill).

I recruited participants using email recruiting and snowball sampling. First, I asked faculty at the UNC School of Journalism & Mass Communication whom they recommended as innovators in the field of journalism education. Then I sent recruitment emails to those educators. Those emails included a question that asked if the educators recommended any other innovative educators that I should talk to. If those educators responded with names of educators they recommend, I sent recruitment emails to the people they recommended, and I continued this process of gathering a snowball sample until I confirmed interviews with eight educators.

Through this study, I sought to provide insight into the processes that the educators used and the motivations that drove them to innovate. I inquired into the educators' process of working with the innovation and what influences or inspires them as innovators. To better understand how the innovation works, I asked the educators to describe the innovation(s) that they have created or worked with, how they began to work with it, and how they are working with it now. Furthermore, I inquired into how the educator knows if the innovation is successful, what about the innovation worked, and what didn't work. Finally, I put the data in the context of the overall industry of journalism education by asking the educator to comment on the state of innovation in the industry and recommend ways that the process of innovation in journalism education could be improved. (See Interview Guide in Appendix B.)

During the interviews, I sought to understand the educators' processes and motivations to innovate in the educator's own context and language. In addition, I aimed to draw connections

between the educators' processes that worked, as well as identify the “best practices” of journalism education innovation in the context of those specific institutions and make recommendations on how educators can help journalism students enter the rapidly evolving media industry. I also wanted to understand how these educators define innovation.

McCracken’s philosophy of “allow[ing] respondents to tell their own story in their own words” informed my approach to conducting the interviews (McCracken, 1988). I was cognizant of key terms that the participants used, especially “innovation,” and I probed to understand what the participant meant when they used key terms. I also kept in mind the assumptions that I brought into the study, including assumptions I made about the participants, their institution, the innovations they work with, and how they approach and conceive of innovation. I also remained open to discovering other assumptions of mine throughout the interview and data analysis processes (McCracken, 1988).

I conducted the interviews by phone, Skype, or in person. I held the interviews in-person with the two educators who work at UNC-Chapel Hill. I conducted those two interviews individually in the educators’ respective offices in the UNC School of Journalism. The remaining six interviews were conducted via phone or Skype, depending on what mode the participant preferred. I conducted four interviews over the phone and two over Skype. The interviews lasted between 62 and 82 minutes. These interviews were held over the course of about two weeks, from Feb. 18, 2015 to Mar. 6, 2015.

Prior to each interview, I obtained consent from the participants. Seven participants emailed me a copy of the consent form with their signature, and one participant wrote in an email that he gave his consent. The consent form satisfied the IRB consent form requirement and ensured that each participant was willing to be recorded and have his or her name used in

concordance with his or her answers.

I recorded the interviews using audio recording apps on my iPhone, and I typed notes on my MacBook as the educator spoke. After the interviews, I went through my notes and copyedited them for spelling and punctuation mistakes. I hired a transcription service to obtain text transcriptions of the interviews.

**Definition of terms**

**Innovation:** To define innovation for the purposes of this study, I am borrowing from the first part of Baregheh, Rowley, and Sambrook's (2009) definition of innovation: "the multi-stage process whereby organizations transform ideas into new/improved products, services or processes." For the second part of my definition, I am borrowing from part of O'Sullivan's (2008) definition of innovation: an innovation is a process "…that adds value." Since the innovations I am studying are in the educational sphere, I am concerned with innovations adding value for the educational institution, which includes students, faculty, and administration. My definition is also informed by Rogers' (1962) definition of innovation as anything that is perceived as new by an individual. I define innovation as, "the process whereby organizations transform ideas into new/improved products, service or processes that add value to the educational institution." I let go of my definition of innovation when I started my interviews because I wanted to understand how the participant defined innovation in their own words.

I studied innovations that are both technological (for example, a virtual reality class) and non-technological (for example, a media entrepreneurship class).

**Journalism Educator:** I defined "journalism educator" as journalism administrators, tenured professors, assistant professors, or lecturers at college-level educational institutions, including four-year universities and colleges, two-year institutions, and community colleges.

Although I was interested in interviewing educators from different types of institutions, my participants were all located at four-year universities. This was likely because I asked faculty at UNC, a four-year university, to recommend participants, and then I gathered a snowball sample from those recommended educators, who also all work at four-year universities.

**Innovator:** In my study, I refer to the group of eight participants as "educators" and "innovators." However, some of the participants did not classify themselves as innovators. (I discuss this further in Part II of Findings.) My intention is not to put words in their mouths, so much as I want to discuss them as a group of people who were identified by their peers and me as innovators. So, throughout the remainder of my study, I will sometimes use the word innovator to describe the participants. However, it is important to note that some of them did not self-classify as innovators.

**Study limitations and exclusions**

Since I interviewed a small number of participants at a small number of locations, I am not able to draw generalizable conclusions about what innovations are being developed in journalism education as a whole, the processes that lead to successful innovations, or the motivations that drive all innovators. But, from the information I gathered from these specific innovators, I hope my study will provide a "jumping off point" for future researchers who conduct large-scale studies on journalism education innovation.

Since I asked UNC School of Journalism & Mass Communication faculty to recommend educators that they believe are innovators as potential participants, my study was skewed to include educators who have a connection to a faculty member at the UNC School of Journalism. Furthermore, since I asked UNC School of Journalism faculty to help me identify innovative educators as potential participants, I naturally relied on those faculty members' definitions of

"innovator," which may or may not be similar to my definition. Before sending recruitment emails to these potential participants, I researched the educators' work online to make sure it fell within my definition of innovation.

My study excluded college journalism educators who do not speak English, which limited the number of international educators whom I tried to recruit.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**

Since I asked experts to share their knowledge on the area of their expertise, their responses were connected to their names. This poses no risk to the participants of criminal or civil liability, nor damage to their financial standing, employability, or reputation. The fact that the participants were asked to share their expert opinions in their field would be more likely to increase their professional reputation than damage it. Furthermore, part of their job as a university educator is to share their expertise in their field.

**Data Analysis**

I used a coding process informed by grounded theory (McCracken, 1988). First, I used open coding to organize codes that emerged. I read printed copies of the transcripts and noted codes by hand on the transcripts. Approximately 40 codes emerged at this stage.

Next, I uploaded my transcripts into the coding program Dedoose. I reread my transcripts and digitally recorded the codes in Dedoose. During this step, approximately 10 more codes emerged. Then, I used axial coding to organize those codes into emerging themes. At this stage, I organized the codes into 10 themes and 28 subthemes. Finally, I used selective coding to identify overall themes, understand the relationship between these themes, and relay them back to theory and prior scholarship. Overall, five themes emerged, and I grouped them into two parts.

This concludes the discussion of my method. Next, I will report my findings and discuss the implications of my findings.

In Chapter 3, I describe the results of my study, what the results mean, and how they relate to prior scholarship and theory, as well as greater implications for future researchers and journalism educators and administrators who want to innovate.

# Chapter 3: Findings & Discussion

In my study, I set out to discover what innovations are happening in journalism education. I looked at this topic through the lenses of how innovative educators approach the processes of innovation and evaluation, how the field of journalism education could be made more innovative, and the educators' beliefs about the definition of innovation.

As I did this research, I uncovered that innovative things are new and evolving, and often they are not fully structured or clearly defined. Similarly, the themes that emerged from my data did not have clear separation between them, and they were flexible in how they could be structured. For the sake of discussion, I have organized my findings into two parts: one, what these innovators do, and two, how these innovators think about what they do. However, I want to clarify that the themes in these parts are quite connected; the division does not mean the themes are independent of each other.

Part I, what these innovators do, addresses research questions RQ1, RQ2, RQ3, and RQ4, which aimed to understand what innovations in college journalism education are currently being developed and executed at select institutions in the U.S. and around the world (RQ1); the innovators that are working with these innovations and their motivations and processes (RQ2); how the innovators evaluate their innovations, if at all, and the role of evaluation in innovation (RQ3); and what is working in the field of journalism education innovation and how could the field be improved (RQ4).

Part II, how these innovators think about what they do, also addresses research questions RQ2 and RQ4, as well as RQ5, which aimed to understand the definition of innovation.

**Table 1:** *Educator descriptions*

As Table 1 shows, I spoke with a variety of educators. The educators represented a range of degree levels, seniority levels, and lengths of time at their institutions.

| | Name | Current Institution | Length of time worked for current institution | Current job | Highest degree obtained | Prior experience in professional media industry? | Gender |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participant 1 | **Carrie Brown** | City University of New York (CUNY) | 6 months | Director, Social Journalism at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism | Ph.D. | Yes | F |
| Participant 2 | **Matt Sheehan** | University of Florida | 4 years | Director, Innovation News Center; Lecturer, Department of Journalism | M.B.A. | Yes | M |
| Participant 3 | **John Clark** | UNC-Chapel Hill | 4 years | Executive Director, Reese News Lab; Lecturer, School of Journalism & Mass Communication | M.B.A. | Yes | M |
| Participant 4 | **Sara Peach** | UNC-Chapel Hill | 5 years | Associate Director, Reese News Lab; Lecturer, School of Journalism & Mass Communication | M.A. | Yes | F |
| Participant 5 | **James Breiner** | University of Navarra (Pamplona, Spain) | 2 months | Visiting Professor of Communication | M.A. | Yes | M |
| Participant 6 | **Donica Mensing** | University of Nevada, Reno | 16 years | Associate Professor and Academic Chair of Reynolds School of Journalism, at end of spring semester 2015 will become Associate Dean | Ph.D. | Yes | F |
| Participant 7 | **Dan Pacheco** | Syracuse University | 2.5 years | Endowed Chair in Journalism Innovation at the Newhouse School of Public Communications | B.S. | Yes | M |
| Participant 8 | **Jeremy Caplan** | City University of New York (CUNY) | 6 years | Director of Education, Tow-Knight Center for Entrepreneurial Journalism at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism | M.S. and M.B.A. | Yes | M |

**PART I: What these innovators do**

In part one, I address what the innovators do, which includes the process of how the innovators innovate, what innovations they are working with, the challenges they face, and how they navigate those challenges. Part I uncovers the context in which the innovators work, and it provides information about the educators' experiences.

Part I lays the foundation for Part II, 'how these innovators think about what they do.' With an understanding of what the innovators do, how they work, and the context of where they work, we will better understand the innovators' thought processes, terminology, and theoretical approaches to their work. By first examining what the innovators do, we will be grounded in the practical aspects of the innovators' work, and we will better understand the theoretical aspects of their work.

Under the umbrella of 'what these innovators do,' three themes emerged from the interviews: a) The nature of academia opposes innovation, b) "The Daily" and how it affects innovation, and c) Aspects of the innovators' processes, which one educator articulated as "snak[ing] your way to success." The first two themes speak to the obstacles that the educators face as they try to innovate within academia, and the third theme speaks to how the educators manage to innovate in spite of those challenges.

**a. The nature of academia opposes innovation**

The first theme that emerged is the educators' indication that the nature of academia opposes innovation. The participants suggested two ways in which the nature of academia opposes innovation: (1) academia moves slowly, but innovation moves quickly, and (2) the focus of academia is the internal, but the focus of innovation is the external.

**i. Academia moves slowly, but innovation moves quickly**

*"It defies logic that a graduate program in journalism could come so far so fast."*
– ACEJMC Report on CUNY Graduate School in Journalism (2014)

*"Some of the structures that universities have put in place to govern curriculum are holding back the pace of change that our industries require."*
– Matt Sheehan, Director of the Innovation News Center at University of Florida

Six of the eight participants talked about the challenge of academia moving at a slow pace, but innovation requiring a fast pace. This reinforced scholarship that referred to the slow pace of change in any large organization, especially educational institutions (Castañeda, 2011).

The educators brought up several ways that this dichotomy manifests itself. Curricular change was the most frequently discussed example. Five of the six participants who talked about the slowness of academia brought up curricular change.

Matt Sheehan, director of the Innovation News Center at University of Florida, said that some of the ways academia is structured oppose the fast-moving curricular changes that an innovative curricular approach requires; if an educational innovator is trying to keep up with the fast pace of change that the industry demands, he or she will have to change the curriculum at a quicker pace than the structure of academia is set up to allow. Mr. Sheehan said:

"Some of the structures that universities have put in place to govern curriculum are holding back the pace of change that our industries require. The curricular process could take – a short curricular revision is probably a six-year cycle from idea to full implementation. Six years is an eternity in business today. Not just the information business, but all business, and massive disruption is happening at such a rapid pace."

Mr. Sheehan said that the structure of academia shouldn't allow for changes that are too quick because that would lead to "whiplashing back and forth" between different approaches. But, the curricular reform structure isn't as "nimble" as it could be to drive innovation.

Mr. Sheehan suggested that the slowness of curricular reform structure is analogous to the slow pace that characterizes the professor's job, particularly the tenure-track professor job. The job often entails long-term, slow-paced research projects and is characterized by a holistic, non-reactionary perspective. He said that perspective sometimes presents a challenge to the rapid pace of innovation. Mr. Sheehan said:

"The cliché of the ivory tower, 'We're above it all, we don't have to deal with the daily stuff because we have the luxury of having an academic job of being more holistic and long-term and not reactionary' – that's a different perspective but sometimes it makes it challenging for looking at unique ways and pivoting in the innovation there because if you study something for years before you make a determination of next steps to act, and that's not a nimble system – that can be a good thing because you don't want to be whiplashing back and forth, but sometimes a small tweak becomes a big tweak when you use words like 'curricular reform.' That brings up images of lots of meetings and committees, where often you can accomplish the same goals by rethinking something simply without the process."

From Mr. Sheehan's responses, a picture emerges. It can be challenging for professors to innovate because their job naturally lends itself to a slow pace, and furthermore, the processes of their institutions can be slow. Professors have to navigate the two layers of slowness in order to innovate.

Jeremy Caplan, director of education at the Tow-Knight Center for Entrepreneurial Journalism at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism, also said the traditional curricular reform process is not the most-effective way to change curriculum. He said:

"Particularly in the academic world, people will want to step on the committee and spend two years just casting in and writing proposals and that sort of stuff, and I think a lot of that is – it is traditional, but it is not necessarily the most effective and useful way to go about some things."

Another educator, Dan Pacheco, endowed chair in journalism innovation at the Newhouse School at Syracuse University, said accreditation standards are an obstacle to speeding up the pace of curricular reform. He said that although it's easy to create new elective classes, changing a core part of the curriculum is hard. He said:

"Accreditation makes it hard – if you want to create electives it's easy, but changing a core part of your program – it's really hard. There's a lot of bureaucracy. It's a three-year process to get it changed. That's the harder problem to solve and no one has solved it yet. I think the accreditation standards need to change themselves before it can be solved. They need to allow for more flexibility…"

Two other participants also said the slow pace of academia often correlates with rigidity and structure, and the fast pace of innovation often correlates with flexibility. The dichotomy of "rigidity of academia versus flexibility of innovation" wasn't brought up as frequently as the dichotomy of "slow pace of academia versus fast pace of innovation," but the correlation between the two gave a clearer picture of what the innovators said drives and stifles innovation.

Several responses also indicated that processes are highly prioritized in the academic world, which can lead to more slowness. Mr. Sheehan said that more emphasis is put on carrying out procedure than accomplishing what the procedure was created to do. He said:

"Because of the nature of academia, the process often trumps the outcome. Case in point: I've sat in a faculty discussion that took 40 minutes of 'fixed versus flexible seating in a classroom.' We get so beaten down by running the gauntlet of what we have to do, what we want to do, that sometimes we'll say it's not worth it, or could say it's not worth it. There are a great number of very dedicated people. Individually every faculty member has a great vested interest in it and has a lot of value to add. Sometimes we can be the worst people to be around."

Carrie Brown, director of social journalism at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism, said that academic processes trump outcomes during curricular evaluation. She said that the process of accreditation ends up trumping the purpose of accreditation because the process is large, slow, and bureaucratic, and it doesn't allow educators to quickly incorporate the feedback into their work. She prefers faster cycles of evaluation that help her quickly incorporate the feedback into her work. She said:

"I find that whole process ended up being so…I mean, get the point, right – I mean, that is great; evaluate what you are doing. But then it gets so bureaucratic and so complicated that then you are spending all your time doing that and not actually bringing it back into your daily work. So I mean, I am a bigger fan of kind of the faster cycles of, you know, O.K., people are telling me this, now here is how I can very quickly make adjustments to the syllabus or to the

curriculum on the fly rather than in this sort of big, unwieldy, massive process that requires like 50 binders worth of printouts to get to it."

From these responses, another picture started to emerge. During the length of a typical curricular revision (three to six years), massive disruption in the journalism industry is happening. The culture of academia encourages the prioritization of processes themselves, and the purpose of the process (such as reforming curriculum, or evaluating the quality of a journalism school) is forgotten or forsaken. A curricular change may be irrelevant by the time the curricular reform process has been completed, and the seeds of innovation have been stifled.

Journalism administrators who want their schools to be more innovative should look at slow, inflexible curricular reform processes as an illustration of what discourages innovation in journalism education overall. Rigid and slow-paced processes discourage innovation. Allowing quick change only within less-vital aspects of the school, such as elective courses, is not enough to be innovative. Administrators should take a risk and allow for flexibility and fast-paced change in significant aspects of the school, such as curricular evaluation and core curricular reform. Administrators should examine the various structures and processes within their schools and create more flexibility and opportunities for fast-paced change.

Furthermore, the participants specifically called accreditation into question. In order to increase innovation in journalism schools, the effectiveness of accreditation standards should be re-examined. In fact, several aspects of accreditation oppose innovation. It is slow-paced (large-scale evaluation happens every six years), the standards are rigid, and it puts great emphasis on procedure. In order to encourage innovation, accreditation should be altered to create faster cycles of evaluation and feedback, allow for greater flexibility in terms of evaluation metrics and the process of curricular reform, lessen the bureaucratic over-emphasis on procedure, and put

greater emphasis on educators' successful implementation of the feedback obtained from evaluation.

Next, I will explore the second theme in the category of 'the nature of academia opposes innovation.'

**ii. "Do what you do best and link to the rest": The focus of academia is the internal, but the focus of innovation is the external**

> *"So my colleague Jeff has a saying, 'Do what you do best and link to the rest,' in terms of writing and journalism, meaning, you don't have to write about everything if somebody else has already written wonderfully, beautifully, effectively about it. But you have to say, 'I am going to link to that other person' ... So we think the same way about teaching ... I would think that is a very unusual view in the academic world."*
> – Jeremy Caplan, Director of Education, Tow-Knight Center for Entrepreneurial Journalism at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism

Seven of the eight participants indicated that the focus of academia is typically on internal entities, but the focus of innovation is typically on external entities.

Mr. Pacheco, endowed chair in journalism innovation at the Newhouse School at Syracuse, said he had success with collaborating with a professor from a different department on data visualization. Mr. Pacheco described the culture of academia as silo-driven, and he said that this structure leads people to incorrectly believe that they have to be an expert at everything. He said:

"That's a skill – learning where you end and someone else begins. Our silo-driven culture at universities tends to lead people in the wrong direction. They think, 'I have to know all of this stuff and be an expert at everything.' You don't. You just need to be an expert at what you're really good at."

Mr. Sheehan, director of the Innovation News Center at Florida, said innovation can be both individual and collaborative. He said in journalism education, educators are trying to breed the "unicorn" who has all of the necessary skills, however, that unicorn does not exist. He said:

> "We like – especially in journalism education – we're breeding the unicorn, that special amalgamation of all the skills that are required. But the truth is, no one is the unicorn, so you need people who have strengths in areas that you don't, and that's a good thing. But then conversely, sometimes good ideas go to die in committee. They generally die in committee. It's that balance you have to strike. You have to know when the best time is to blaze that path by yourself or to bring in other people."

There is a potential implication here for journalism schools and their philosophy of teaching students how to use numerous platforms (Massey, 2010). Massey (2010) found there is a modest demand among newspapers and TV stations to hire for multi-platform skills. So, Massey's findings suggest that multi-platform skills could help students get jobs. However, journalism administrators should be aware that if students only gain moderate knowledge about numerous platforms, rather than expertise in a few select platforms, it might discourage innovation among students. Journalism schools may increase innovative student work if administrators craft curriculum so that students gain in-depth expertise in one to three areas, such as media platforms or areas of research.

With in-depth expertise in a certain area, a student or professor understands the area's current limitations and where the opportunities for innovation are. Therefore, he or she is knowledgeable enough to push the area's boundaries and innovate. This is less likely to occur if the student or professor only has moderate knowledge of many different areas.

Though the educators differed in how they apply this idea, several educators brought up that innovators do not need expertise in everything. Instead, they just need to master a few areas in which they want to excel.

Dr. Brown, director of social journalism at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism, said institutions have high expectations for professors to be great researchers, teachers, and advisors. She also indicated that being an innovative professor requires a large time commitment to research and sift through new, innovative ideas that are emerging. This time commitment is hard to manage alongside all of the other roles professors are expected to excel in. She said:

> "I think some professors may be outstanding researchers, and they should be given a lighter teaching load. But, you know, if you have a faculty member that is an extremely innovative teacher, you know, perhaps their research expectations can be decreased a little bit. I mean I think we just need to – it is sort of a no-brainer in some ways, like different people have different strengths and we could as leaders nurture and grow those strengths rather than, you know, just sort of trying to force everybody into the same box no matter what they are good at and, you know, expecting them to just excel at absolutely everything all the time."

Another educator, Donica Mensing, associate professor and academic chair of the Reynolds School of Journalism at University of Nevada, Reno, talked about letting students dig into their individual strengths as a characteristic of an innovative new class at the school. She said that in this new studio class, the students do not do the same thing each semester. Students bring their individual strengths to the class and work as a team on something that changes every semester. She called this "converged teamwork collaboration." She said:

> "So now we have a new studio class in which it could be any project-based work. So students will take the new studio, and each semester it will change. My dream is that the students will come to us and say, 'We want to do a project about X,' and the faculty will respond to student demand, rather than us saying, 'Oh I have always wanted to do this. I will see if I can interest some students.' So when I advise the freshman and sophomores, now I always talk to them about that class and say, 'You should be thinking about what would you like to do in a new studio.' The other piece of that class that I think is really important is collaboration. So the students are not all doing the same thing. They are each bringing their strengths to the class and working as a newsroom or as an organization when they bring their expertise, and they learn to communicate and work with others on a team. So I think that converged teamwork collaboration is really an importance for students."

Mr. Caplan indicated a similar idea. He said that the approach at the Tow-Knight Center for Entrepreneurial Journalism at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism is different from the

philosophy of most universities. Mr. Caplan and his colleagues subsidize students to take outside workshops on topics that the school doesn't offer because they don't have expertise in every skill their students will need to complete their projects.

He said he and his colleagues would rather focus on making the things they do teach as useful as possible, and not concentrate on gaining expertise in additional areas. He made the point that this is different from the traditional academic approach that says, "'We are the teachers…and you are here to study from us.'" He said:

> "So my colleague Jeff has a saying, 'Do what you do best and link to the rest,' in terms of writing and journalism, meaning, you don't have to write about everything if somebody else has already written wonderfully, beautifully, effectively about it. But you have to say 'I am going to link to that other person' to offer better service to the reader than trying to regurgitate everything or reiterate it in your own way and do it less effectively than the other person who has expertise in that area.
>
> So we think the same way about teaching, and again that is a very unusual. I would think that is a very unusual view in the academic world. Most universities would not say, 'Oh yeah, we are going to send our students to take outside workshops.' They would be very reluctant to do it. Their job is to teach and we are the teachers and we know how to teach and you are here to study from us. And we think of things – I think of things and we think of things a little differently. We think that people have a goal, and we have a goal for students to accomplish as much as they can and come away with as much as they can from this period, and if some of that means outside workshops supplementing what we are doing here, great. That means we can concentrate on making the stuff that we teach here effective and awesome and useful as possible."

The educators applied this idea of "innovation is embracing external connections and collaboration" both in how they personally work as an innovator and how they encourage their students to work. This consistency of the participants' personal philosophies and what they teach their students was a reoccurring theme in the interviews, as well. The educators' answers indicated that they practice what they preach, especially when it comes to working in a way that embraces the external and fosakes the idea that they need to be an expert at everything. Although university professors, research-wise, typically specialize in a narrow area of interest, the educators indicated that they have observed professors hesitate to seek help beyond their silos.

The educators' answers indicate that the dichotomy of 'academia vs. innovation' also manifests itself in how academia is marked by proprietary desire to keep information and people internal, but innovation is marked by openness and a desire to connect with external entities, such as professors and students from other departments within the university and outside organizations.

There are numerous examples of interdisciplinary work and engaged scholarship among faculty in American universities. For example, the Thorp Engaged Scholars program in the Carolina Center for Public Service at UNC-Chapel Hill encourages and facilitates interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty (Carolina Center for Public Service, 2015). Furthermore, Syracuse University invests in 11 interdisciplinary research clusters to encourage highly collaborative research across the university (Syracuse University, 2013). But, although universities are doing interdisciplinary work, the participants suggested it should be done more frequently to increase innovation.

Next, I explore the second theme that falls under the umbrella 'what these educators do.'

**b. "The Daily" and how it affects innovation**

In addition to these two "academia vs. innovation" dichotomies, several educators characterized their experiences in light of what they referred to as "the daily." "The daily" refers to the pressure that media organizations have to constantly turn out content as a part of the daily news cycle, which often is an opposing force to employees' ability to dedicate time to thinking about long-term plans or innovation.

John Clark, executive director of Reese News Lab at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, previously worked at Capitol Broadcasting, which he said was a "wonderful, wonderful place in terms of local media innovation." He described "the daily" like this:

"It is like, holy crap, you are constantly making decisions, trying to run a business, trying to run an organization, and I am constantly making decisions where I am weighing the pros and cons of the daily news cycle, which you have to do. 'This is what we are called to do, this is our mission,' versus, 'We need to go over here and blow stuff up, well, wait a minute.' Those two, I mean it is just that constant turn back and forth, and we did some good things at Capitol that dealt with that… So I mean this week it was all about news. You don't have time to sit back and create the next great thing there because you have got everybody that is in your market turning to you for information, and I know that is not an exaggeration. We watched it happen."

Sara Peach, associate director of Reese News Lab at UNC-Chapel Hill, talked about "the daily" as acting in opposition to media organizations' ability to dedicate time to thinking about the long-term business plan. She said:

"I think a major challenge for media organizations is they are constantly trying to turn out new stories. They always have to have the next month's magazine or the next newspaper or in online the next story right now, and that is why they get taken away from thinking about what is the long-term plan for the business, which is completely understandable."

In fact, some educators said that journalism schools experience "the daily" less than professional media organizations because schools are not under as much pressure to constantly turn out content, and, as a result, employees at journalism schools have a unique opportunity to innovate that professional media organizations don't have. Mr. Clark said that the potential to work in an environment that had less pressure of "the daily" is part of what drew him to leave his job at Capitol Broadcasting and take his job at UNC-Chapel Hill. He said:

"It happens, but there is so much that goes into the daily cycle and I enjoyed it and I miss a good piece of it. But to be able to come here and be like, you know what, there isn't that crazy daily cycle that I have to deal with**.** That thing that so many people wish they could say, 'Oh if I didn't have to deal with this I might come up with something cool or awesome,' and it was a chance to give it a shot, and it was home."

Dr. Brown, director of social journalism at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism, also indicated that journalism schools have a unique opportunity to innovate in a way that professional media organizations can't. But, she took it a step further and said that journalism

schools should actually be leading professional media organizations in some ways because schools don't have as great a risk of losing significant revenue if their innovation fails. She said:

"Journalism schools should be the ones leading because in some ways – we have – I mean, we are not in a for-profit organization where, you know, if you screw up you could see your revenue tank. In some ways we have more opportunities to just try new things because we are relatively sheltered from that."

Ms. Peach, associate director of Reese News Lab at UNC, said that she and Mr. Clark have less pressure to turn out "the next story," and they can take time to think about the long-term business plans behind the innovative products that the students in the lab create. She said:

"I think that is really good that the lab exists because we don't have to turn out our content. We can take time to think about business."

Actually, Ms. Peach added that when Reese News Lab was first established in 2011, the lab was a digital newsroom that produced daily content. They turned out "a lot of stories and in lots of different media, but on a daily basis." She said that she and Mr. Clark started to feel like they weren't fulfilling the mission of the lab: to innovate. She said that they got into the same "trap" of "the daily" that professional media organizations experience. So, during the summer of 2013, she and Mr. Clark shifted the focus of the lab from digital news to entrepreneurship products that are financially sustainable. She said:

"So it was great, but we kept coming back to, 'We are supposed to innovate and we don't feel like we are doing that.' Like I was saying earlier, we were kind of in that same trap that media organizations go into. If you are turning out content you can't – it is really hard to step back and try to do something really different. So I guess it was just in the summer of 2013. Not that long ago we decided for that summer we are going to just lights out on content. We weren't going to do anything more, and ever since then it is clearly been a really good decision because what we have been able to do is create this niche for ourselves that is really different from anything else in the school. And if students want to get digital skills there are other places in the school they can get that, but we are the only people working on entrepreneurship and asking that question, 'Well, is it going to be financially sustainable?'"

Other educators also indicated that the trap of "the daily" that media organizations experience is analogous to what journalism schools experience. These educators said that tenure-

track professor jobs are a manifestation of journalism schools' own version of "the daily." In describing the continuous demands of the professor's job, Dr. Brown, from CUNY, said:

"…there is teaching, there is research, there is service, and at the school that I was at before, all three of them were considered to be a very important piece of how you were evaluated. And, you know, in service is sort of a way to do teaching, but we were doing individual advising for between 50 to 70 undergraduate students every single semester, in addition to supervising masters' projects, serving in committees. So I think there is a lot of even people who really, genuinely care about being a great teacher – when you are under like sort of extreme pressure, but at the same time to publish your papers and, you know, get the grants and do – I mean it just becomes a lot of things to focus on."

Dr. Brown said that where she works now, CUNY, is more cognizant to innovation. She said there is less pressure on professors to produce research, which allows her to focus on teaching and curriculum. She said:

"…we have a lot of luxury here because this isn't really a research institution. I am only one of two Ph.Ds. in the whole school, and so, I mean, people are certainly doing a lot of outside journalism projects, but this isn't a publisher perish in terms of academic publishing environments, so that gives people a relative luxury to actually focus on teaching and curriculum. Whereas in other jobs you are trying to do that while you are also under extreme pressure, you know, to do really high volume of research."

She said she even saw one of the most innovative professors she knows burn out and leave the field due to the demands of the position. She said:

"I mean I have actually seen a lot of – I mean not a lot – but I have seen some people who have basically opted for a career change just because – one of the most innovative professors I know ended up actually leaving the field and going to do something else because it was just an incredibly, you know, incredibly time consuming, very, very long hours, you know, and after a certain point people are burning out."

Dr. Brown said in a lot of journalism schools, there are "three or four [faculty] that are doing a lot of the newer stuff, and they are really carrying a disproportionate amount of the load." She described the challenge of the professor to innovate under the pressure of numerous institutional expectations as:

"There is probably, I mean not here where I am now, but there is probably only like a small number of people that are really doing the most innovative, new stuff, right, and that they

are kind of bearing the brunt of that responsibility of kind of keeping up with the times, and I think it really is hard. I mean I think that is one of the real biggest barriers that we have to innovation, and it is really hard to do when you are under a lot of other constraints and you have a million other responsibilities."

Mr. Sheehan, from Florida, also indicated that the tenure system is a challenge to innovation in journalism education. He took it a step further and said that although a "job for life" as a tenure-track professor is great, it encourages professors to focus on themselves instead of collaborating with others. There is a negative effect on productivity and the professors get overwhelmed. He said:

"Another challenge in higher education is the tenure system itself. Tenure, particularly here at UF, teaches professors that they are the only ones that they can rely on and are responsible for. There's not a systemic fostering of collaboration. Tenure is a difficult task, but what you're mentored to do is keep your head down, focus on you and focus on your research, and you're the only one that can do your research. That creates a system where, 'You all can do that you want to do, and I'm just going to focus on me.' If everyone does that, nothing gets done. That's the base model, and I think there are a lot of dedicated people that aren't stuck in that mentality, but that is the tonality that our tenure system fosters. It's easy to get overwhelmed and when you get overwhelmed people shut down, and that becomes a liability."

James Breiner, visiting professor of communication at University of Navarra in Pamplona, Spain, provided an international perspective on the issue. He said the structure of universities around the world encourage professors to produce scholarly articles that are typically focused on the past, instead of looking to the future. He said:

"The institutional structures of universities – they are similar all the way around the world, and they reward professors for publishing peer-reviewed articles, and those things tend to be rather historical-focused based on what has happened in the past."

Several participants said "the daily" gets in the way of innovation and thinking about long-term goals, but Mr. Clark, from UNC, had a contrasting view. Mr. Clark said "the daily" actually does not get in the way of professional media organizations because daily content funds the operation. A tension emerged between keeping up with the daily cycle and pushing forward to innovate. He said:

"…I am being very careful and guarded to not come across as saying, 'Oh, the daily news gets in the way.' Because while it does, it doesn't, because that is what you do. I mean that is – you have to. It is the cash cow. It is what you do and that is what you have to do today and we are going to get to tomorrow.

It is just hard to reconcile some of that. It is just a constant tension and you are talking about – we talked about earlier what stinks and stuff. I want someone to understand that tension. It is really easy to say, 'Screw it, I will just stop printing my newspaper and we will just go all digital.' You will be hungry tomorrow. It is just not – those decisions are not easy. I mean they look like they are easy, but they are not."

The responses are consistent with Clayton Christensen's (1997) theory of the Innovator's Dilemma, which states that companies spend too much time and money serving the needs of their current customers and pay too much attention to what those customers want right now. As a result, companies sacrifice investing time and money in emerging, innovative technologies that will drive business in the future (Christensen, 1997). In describing his experience with "the daily" at Capitol Broadcasting, Mr. Clark actually referenced Innovator's Dilemma. I did not expect my findings to support Innovator's Dilemma because I thought it was only applicable to professional media organizations, rather than journalism schools, since professional media organizations turn out a daily product. I was surprised that Innovator's Dilemma also described the experience of people working in journalism academia; but the results suggest that academics actually do turn out a version of a daily product, which takes the form of numerous students, classes, and scholarly research.

Ms. Peach, from UNC, also said journalism schools have their own version of "the daily," demonstrated in how journalism educators churn out students and scholarly research semester after semester. She suggested a plan to make this better and increase innovation in journalism schools; she said that journalism schools should remove a group of professors from their teaching requirements for the semester and put them "in a weird little room together" to collaboratively identify opportunities for innovation.

She said this solution reflects the structure that has been successful for her and Mr. Clark in the Reese News Lab at UNC. She said:

"I think it is possible that it is kind of a corollary to what is happening in newspapers, that you still have to turn out all these students all the time and that is where your energy ends up going rather than coming up with a new thing. So the solution for that is to, I think, take a group of people and say, 'You are not teaching Introduction to Advertising this semester. You are not teaching Introduction to News Writing. You are going to work on what is next for this school and try some experiments.' Just let them be in a weird little room together… not just take one person out and give him or her some leave, but to take a group of them and put them together. The one force working against that is the tenure requirements. So there would have to be some kind of careful navigation of that."

Although a sabbatical takes professors out of daily demands, this solution would drive innovation more effectively. Administrators should consider removing a few professors from their teaching duties for a semester and place them on a collaborative team whose only duty is to figure out how their school could innovate.

Next, I explore the third theme that falls under the umbrella 'what these educators do.'

**c. "Snake your way to success": Aspects of the innovators' processes**

> *"The innovator tries a lot of sprints. You try something and you measure the results, and you have results and you do more of that. If you don't, move in a different direction and try something else, and eventually you snake your way to success."*
> – Dan Pacheco, Endowed Chair in Journalism Innovation, Newhouse School of Public Communications at Syracuse University

When I began this study, I wanted to find out how the innovators approach the processes of innovation and evaluation. Although no single, step-by-step process emerged that all of the innovators use, there were aspects that came up with multiple innovators. I compiled some of these themes in a way that has a logical flow, but there wasn't one "innovator's process" that all of the educators use.

The reoccurring themes among the educators' processes were: (1) the foundation of their process is a continuous cycle of "experimenting" or "testing" different ideas, (2) they gather perspectives from a number of different people to inform their decisions, (3) the importance of learning from what they do and what others do, (4) evaluation is constant – so constant, in fact, that evaluation almost becomes the process itself.

Seven educators indicated that their process is built upon a continuous cycle of "experimenting" or "testing" different ideas. Mr. Caplan, from CUNY, described his and his colleagues' process of creating the Entrepreneurial Journalism curriculum as a series of testing different theories they had about what curricular approaches would work. He said:

> "Well anything you start – almost anything, at least in my experience – anything you start you learn a lot about it by doing it and putting it out there in the world. And, you know, what you think would make for a good schedule or what you think would make for a good curriculum is based on a theory, and you have to test the theory against the real world. And so when we tested the courses by putting them into the real world, and we had real students and we had real classes running, we learned things about the way the schedule works and the way that the classes worked and what questions people asked about what they needed, and so each year we adapted."

Four educators indicated that an aspect of innovating is gathering perspectives from many different people to inform their decisions. Mr. Clark, from UNC, said he gets feedback from multiple people when he makes decisions about Reese News Lab. He said:

> "Multiple people get involved. I listen and pay attention and get input from different people because what I think is a good idea, other people may not. So the people that are in the school that I would bounce ideas and still do, Jim Hefner, Steven King, Joe Bob, Sara Peach, who is the associate director at lab. She and I worked very closely. How are we going to do this, what are we going to try, how is this going to work. So it is not in a vacuum, per se. You got to get some different perspective of it."

Six educators talked about the importance of learning from what they and others do. Mr. Pacheco, from Syracuse, said not only do the students learn from him in his new virtual reality class, but also he learns from them. In two weeks, one of his students even surpassed his skills.

He said that he believes that model drives true innovation, and he thinks it's the model of the future. He said:

"It's like 'guiding' verses 'teaching,' experiential learning. That's where things become truly innovative. It's this wonderfully messy process where we all learn from each other."

Six educators said continuous evaluation is an important part of their process. Four of those six educators said they quickly incorporate the feedback into what they are doing. Evaluation appeared so constant that the process of innovation and evaluation of innovation were nearly one and the same.

Dr. Brown, from CUNY, said the cycle of constant evaluation is a key part of innovation. She said:

"I mean I think at the end of the day, that is, you know, that is just what we have to be doing, and I think we can learn a lot from Silicon Valley and start-up culture where they are constantly getting feedback from their customers or their audience and feeding it back into what they are doing to make it better."

Three themes about evaluation emerged from the interviews: (1) the importance of continuous evaluation and quick incorporation of feedback, (2) the subjectivity and uncertainty that comes with evaluating innovation, and (3) how the educators deal with that subjectivity, including examples of metrics they use.

Ms. Peach, from UNC, said continuous evaluation and quick incorporation of feedback is important because otherwise an innovator will "go down the wrong path for a long time." When she was a new teacher at UNC, she evaluated her work frequently. She said:

"I think if you want to come up with a new way of doing things quickly you need to evaluate pretty often because otherwise you are going to go down the wrong path for a long time. I think, starting out as a new teacher, it was really helpful to have the class give feedback."

Mr. Clark, from UNC, also said constant evaluation is key. But, he took it a step further and said nothing should ever stay the same. Discussing the potential for Reese News Lab to change in the future, he said:

"So, will it change? Absolutely. Nothing should ever stay the same. Everything should be in a constant state of looking at itself and, 'Are there better ways of doing it?' You know just for example this semester we changed up a good bit, and then we took the lab this semester and said, 'All right, we are going to take ideas that have been created, and we are going to move them forward. Let's try and put them in the marketplace let's see what happens.'"

Another educator, Mr. Caplan, from CUNY, uses this approach in how he evaluates his students' projects. He said that he offers his students feedback as much as he can, and, instead of using grades as the principal form of feedback, he uses questions. He said:

"Yeah I mean we get feedback – we try to get feedback continually. So now we have meetings continually and we try to offer sounding board as much as we can. We try to reflect the questions back to people because often times it is most helpful when you don't just get an answer, but you get a question back or a question that helps you to think further back. We don't focus too much on grades."

Among six the participants who said they evaluate continuously, four said they like to quickly incorporate the feedback into what they're doing. This was characterized as "faster cycles of feedback that you can very quickly incorporate," "making small course corrections," being "more nimble," and a way to "snake your way to success."

The participants indicated that this approach to evaluation drives innovation. Dr. Brown, from CUNY, spoke to how she came to realize the importance of quick cycles of feedback:

"There is a book called *The Lean Startup* by Eric Ries that I thought was really – you know just helped me kind of think about the ways entrepreneurs do things, and then when I sort of match that up with some of the theory about how organizations can become better learners and communicators, that was really kind of helpful, too, because it added sort of another dimension from outside of our field to kind of think about, 'How can you be more nimble?' you know and 'How can you more quickly incorporate feedback into what you are doing so that you can make it better?'"

When Mr. Pacheco gave his thoughts on the characteristics of an innovator, he talked about fast cycles of evaluation, experimenting with different ideas, and learning from what he does. He said that the innovator tries a lot of little "sprints," and "eventually you snake your way to success," and that process has brought him success at the Newhouse School of Public Communications at Syracuse University. He described the process like this:

> "The innovator tries a lot of sprints. You try something and you measure the results, and you have results and you do more of that. If you don't, move in a different direction and try something else, and eventually you snake your way to success. This is the environment at Newhouse. That is how I have successes."

Though Mr. Pacheco was the only educator who used the phrase "snake your way to success," several participants discussed the concept. The idea of "snak[ing] your way to success" means an innovator tries many different ideas in short spurts, evaluates the ideas in quick, constant cycles, and makes adjustments to the ideas according to the evaluation results. An innovator repeats this cycle of trial, evaluation, and adjustment. "Snak[ing]" is a visual description of the cycle. An innovator "snake[s]" as he or she repeatedly tries an idea in one direction and adjusts it post-evaluation to go in another direction. The adjustment pushes the idea into a new "trial" stage, starting the cycle all over again. He or she continues the cycle of trial, evaluation, and adjustment until the idea is successful. (However, the innovators' definitions and measurements of success vary, which I will discuss later in this section.)

Since evaluation is constant in the innovators' process, the trial and evaluation stages may occur simultaneously. An innovator could try out an idea while evaluating it at the same time.

For example, an innovative educator has his or her students experiment with a new technology for ten class days. At the end of the first five days, the educator evaluates the success of the experiments. On the sixth day, he or she incorporates the results of the evaluation and

tweaks a couple aspects of the experiments. The first five days were the "trial" stage in which the innovator tried out a new idea in a short spurt, and simultaneously he or she was in the "evaluation" stage.

The key to "snak[ing] your way to success" is every stage happens quickly. Each quick adjustment brings the idea to a new "trial" stage, and therefore a new cycle. Thus, the overall cycle happens quickly, as well. This leads to innovation because an idea is quickly being refined through constant feedback. As the innovator completes each stage of the cycle, the innovator "snake[s]" one step closer to successful innovation. Furthermore, this cycle drives innovation because the fast cycles allow the innovator to surpass "status quo" ideas and move quickly toward what's new. The educator avoids getting caught in the rut of the same, old idea; he or she is experimenting, evaluating, and adjusting so quickly that he or she speedily moves towards new and better ideas.

The idea of "snak[ing] your way to success" suggests that an innovator's process of adopting an innovation is not as linear as Diffusion of Innovations theory suggests (Rogers, 1962). Rogers (1962) suggests that individuals adopt innovations through a five-step decision-making process: (1) Knowledge, (2) Persuasion, (3) Decision, (4) Implementation, (5) Confirmation. According to Rogers (1962), the steps occur in a static order and they do not cross over. The educators indicated these steps, but they suggested that the steps could occur out of order, repeat, or occur simultaneously.

In concordance with the theory, the educators indicated that they are exposed to information about an innovation (Knowledge), they seek more knowledge about the innovation (Persuasion), they decide to adopt the innovation (Decision), and they employ the innovation and evaluate its usefulness (Implementation). But in a departure from the theory, the educators seek

additional information about the innovation through outside feedback and personal evaluation (Persuasion), adjust how they use the innovation, evaluate the usefulness of the adjustment (Implementation), and repeat this cycle until they reach success. At the point of "success," however the educator defines "success," they may decide to use the innovation for a period of time, until they evaluate again and re-adjust it. The educators did not indicate a concrete "Confirmation" stage where they officially decide to use the innovation or not. Instead, they continue to constantly evaluate the innovation and adjust the innovation in response to evaluation results.

The educators' responses suggest a malleability of innovation that is not present in the Diffusion of Innovations theory. The theory implies that an "innovation" is static; an innovator decides to accept or reject the innovation in its original state. After the decision to accept or reject, the innovator uses the innovation indefinitely (if they choose to accept it) or stops using the innovation completely (if they choose to reject it). However, the educators' responses indicated that an innovation is malleable, and this conception of innovation is vital to the idea of "snak[ing] your way to success." The educators indicated that an innovation is living and changeable. As the educators "snake" their way to success through trial, evaluation, and adjustment, they are altering the innovation from its original state. The educators mold the innovation until the innovation is in a state that works for the educator, which is the point of success.

In Diffusion of Innovations theory, an innovation is a static thing that is either fully accepted or rejected by an individual; but the educators suggested that they continuously put an innovation through trial runs, evaluate it, and adjust it until they believe they have reached

success. The educators confirmed the theory's steps of adoption. But the educators indicated that the steps are dynamic; they could occur simultaneously, out of order, or repeat themselves.

Moreover, the evaluation piece of innovating is typically not clear-cut. Five educators said even as they try to evaluate their own innovative work or the innovative work of their students, it is challenging because evaluating innovation employs a level of subjectivity and uncertainty.

Mr. Breiner, from University of Navarra, said he used several different metrics to evaluate his students' innovative projects in a media entrepreneurship class. But, he said even those metrics were subjective. He said:

"I look at the quality of the final product that they produced from a number of different perspectives because was it rigorously researched, was it well thought out, was it creative and then I give it a grade. Just like if this were a short story I was teaching literature, what do I think of this, how much did they put into it, how creative was it, did they stretch themselves at all. I mean that is part of it is I like to see students stretch themselves a little. Those are all very subjective things."

Mr. Sheehan, from Florida, said evaluating innovation is subjective and uncertain because if a student has an idea for an innovative project, but the project never happens, it is hard to evaluate. He asked, "How do you evaluate something that didn't happen?" He said that question confounds professors who have been "brought up on traditional models." In fact, he said the lack of professor knowledge of how to navigate the subjectivity of evaluating innovation discourages innovation in higher education. He said:

"Sometimes the education and innovation don't mix because of the evaluation challenges. Sometimes it's very hard to measure innovation failure, and innovation failure has to be accepted. We see in students who haven't had experiences in improv and failure getting scared by failure, and it's all about the strategic [element] of it, building in points of failure, and sometimes that's really hard to evaluate from an educational perspective. How do you evaluate something that didn't happen? Particularly profs who have been brought up on traditional models, don't know how to evaluate it, I think that's what holds us back in innovation particularly in higher education."

Mr. Sheehan said the subjectivity is not only a challenge for professors to navigate, it is challenging for students. He said the current group of students at Florida has been highly tested and evaluated, and they have been evaluated based upon whether they filled in the correct bubble on a standardized test. He said, in order for those students to be innovative in the future, they have to think in opposition to that binary right-or-wrong approach to evaluation. He said:

> "The sticking point of that is evaluation of innovation is hard, specifically in a metrics-based learning environment – sometimes that runs counter to that. Accepting it and encouraging students to think that is critical to the success of innovative workforce moving forward because, particularly in Florida, most of our students are trained that the education process is, 'Did I fill in the bubble correctly?' And when you're testing boundaries and pushing things, there is no right or wrong answer, and that becomes challenging sometimes, particularly for less secure students, to understand that."

Dr. Mensing, from University of Nevada, Reno, also spoke about the how students from the 'No Child Left Behind Act' era react to ambiguity. (The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 is a federal law that established testing, accountability, and school improvement requirements for schools. The act received attention for requiring states to test students every year in grades 3-8 and once in grades 10-12. Schools were required to make "adequate yearly progress" towards the act's requirement that all students are proficient in grade-level reading and math by 2014. The act was controversial because it placed great emphasis on standardized testing as a means to evaluate student learning (Federal Education Budget Project 2014).) Dr. Mensing said:

> "I think the conversation that we have had on the faculty the last couple of years is that students that have grown up in this 'No Child Left Behind' is highly tested recognition that we have right now. Given the ambiguity is really hard for them."

Even with the subjectivity and uncertainty of evaluating innovation, many of the educators have metrics that they use to evaluate innovation. There is a difference between the metrics that the educators use to evaluate their own innovative work, and the metrics they use to

evaluate their students' innovative work, so the metrics will be organized into those two categories.

In the category of the metrics that the educators use to evaluate their own innovative work, the metrics mentioned by the highest number of educators were students' post-graduate jobs and outside impact. Four educators talked about students' post-graduate jobs. This metric refers to the quality of jobs students get, the success students have in those jobs, and whether students get jobs at all. Mr. Pacheco, from Syracuse, even looks at the number of students who get jobs based purely upon a new media skill they learned in his class.

Four educators also talked about the metric of outside impact. This metric encompasses impact on the local community, the journalism education industry, the journalism industry, and a mention of "impact" in a general sense.

The following metrics were mentioned by three educators each: level of student engagement with the educator's class or program, financial sustainability of the educators' operation (for example, Mr. Clark and Ms. Peach at UNC look at how much money is left to fund the Reese News Lab), and the degree to which their students' products have been successful in the real world.

The following metrics were mentioned by two educators each: the quality of the student experience, the number of professional media organizations that contact the educator with an interest in the students' work, and whether the skills the students gained in the educator's class or program have been useful in their post-graduation jobs.

In the category of the metrics that the educators use to evaluate their students' innovative work, the metrics mentioned by the highest number of educators were (1) the financial sustainability of the students' innovative product and (2) dimensions of the product's audience.

Three educators mentioned each of those metrics. They differed in what audience metrics they use, varying from the size of the product's audience, the engagement level of the audience, and the perception that the audience has of the product. But, all three educators said that it differs for each product what would be considered "success" for that audience metric, which suggests the subjectivity and uncertainty of evaluating innovation.

Other metrics for student innovation that the educators mentioned were the product's feasibility, level of creativity the student had, how well-researched the product is, and how well thought-out the product is.

Sometimes the metrics an educator used to measure their students' work was also a metric they used to measure their own work. There are two ways that the educators talked about this.

One, the educator uses an identical metric to measure students and themselves. For example, Mr. Clark and Ms. Peach at UNC said they use the metric of financial sustainability to measure their own work and their students' work. They said they measure the success of the Reese News Lab in part by how much money is left to fund it, and they measure the success of their students' entrepreneurship products in part by how financially sustainable they are.

Two, the educator measures their own success by how well their students meet a metric. For example, Mr. Caplan said he measures the success of his program in part by how well students' projects meet three assessment statistics.

**PART II: How these innovators think about what they do**

In this second part, I address how the innovators think about what they do, which includes how they define innovation, what they think about different terms like "innovation" and

"entrepreneurialism," what they think the characteristics of an innovator are, and whether they consider themselves an innovator.

This section helps answer my research questions RQ2, RQ4, and RQ5. These research questions aimed to understand: the innovators that are working with these innovations and their motivations and processes (RQ2), what is working in journalism education innovation and how could the field be improved (RQ4), and the definition of innovation (RQ5).

Under the umbrella of 'how these innovators think about what they do,' two themes emerged from my research: a) Dissatisfaction with terms and creation of new terms, and b) Who is an innovator?

**a. 'Innovation' isn't innovative enough: Dissatisfaction with terms and creation of new terms**

When I began my research, I made some unconscious assumptions about how my participants would think about innovation. I anticipated my participants, who were identified as "innovators" by their peers, would have extremely concrete definitions of the word "innovation." I also made the assumption that they would think the word "innovation" was a good term – "good" in the sense that the term has a positive connotation, and "good" in the sense that the term correctly describes what it aims to describe. I assumed they would think the term "innovation" was both accurate and precise.

Beyond thinking about the terminology itself, I also assumed that the idea of innovation was nearly universally thought to be a positive thing. I assumed the educators would think innovation was always a good thing to strive for. The educators' answers showed that my assumptions were false.

Five of the eight educators indicated ways in which they were dissatisfied with the term "innovation." Some examples of dissatisfaction include saying "innovation" was overused, hard to define, almost meaningless, or even a term they dislike or don't use.

Mr. Clark, from UNC, said "innovation" is a buzzword that few people really understand the meaning of. He said for something to be truly considered innovative, it has to be financially sustainable, but typically "innovation" is incorrectly defined as just doing something differently. He said:

> "It is a buzzword and we don't really know what it means. Very few people I think, probably me included…We generally think, 'Oh, we do something differently so we are innovating.' No, not really. I think we are very – we are too quick to throw innovation around without really understanding what it means. Again I am probably guilty of that as well, but that is not a word that I like using very much outside of our discussions around the business of what you are doing."

The educators expressed dissatisfaction with other terms, as well. Four of the five educators who indicated dissatisfaction with "innovation" also expressed dissatisfaction with another term, such as "entrepreneurialism," "journalism," or "convergence." Two educators indicated dissatisfaction with just one term, and four indicated dissatisfaction with multiple terms. Only one educator, Mr. Pacheco, indicated dissatisfaction with a term other than "innovation" (which was "journalism") without also indicating dissatisfaction with the term "innovation."

This may indicate that, for these educators, the state of being dissatisfied with terms – and especially the term "innovation" – tends to be a more universal state, since it was less common for an educator to only be dissatisfied with one term. An implication might be that the educators' dissatisfaction with language, especially when they are dissatisfied with term "innovation," tends to spread to multiple terms.

Six of the eight educators expressed dissatisfaction with one or more terms. Two educators, Mr. Breiner and Mr. Caplan, did not express dissatisfaction with any terms. The term "innovation" was mentioned by the highest number of educators (five). "Entrepreneurialism" was mentioned by three educators. (The educators said, "…it is kind of a weird word," "I hate that word," and it is "overused.") The following terms were mentioned by one educator each: "journalism" ("I don't use the term journalism as much at all anymore") and "convergence" ("To me, 'convergence' is a failed term from the '90s").

The educators who expressed dissatisfaction with the term "innovation" indicated the term isn't sufficient to describe what it aims to describe. Some educators used a different term other than "innovation," and it appeared that for those innovative educators, "innovation" isn't innovative enough.

People who innovate like to do things in new ways, so it is logical that these innovators created new terminology. Some of the new terms that the educators talked about were, "experimentation with a purpose," a philosophy that "we *do,*" and working to be "pedagogically innovative."

Ms. Peach, from UNC, said she doesn't like the word "innovation" very much. She said that "some people have said that experimentation is a better word," but "experimentation" sounds directionless. Instead, she likes the term "experimentation with a purpose" or "experimentation with a strategy." She explained her thoughts behind the new term:

> "So I am not just experimenting for the sake of experimenting, but having a certain goal and having no idea how to get there, but trying lots of different things to see if you can get closer."

Mr. Clark, from UNC, also talked about specific terminology that he uses to describe the work that's done in the Reese News Lab. He expressed dissatisfaction with the terms "innovation" and "media journalism." He said at Reese News Lab, "we *do*." He said:

"...There is a movement around the nation of a lot of these schools to start teaching media entrepreneurship, which is – this is what we are teaching at this school, 'entrepreneurial journalism' is what it is called. I hate that word but I don't care. It is done in a lot of different ways and I think that is because of the people who were there, and again this is not a slight it is just that everybody has different philosophies, which is totally fine. My philosophy here is doing, period. We do."

Mr. Caplan did not indicate specific dissatisfaction with any terms, but he did bring up an alternative term other than "innovative" – "pedagogically innovative" – that he used to describe what he and his colleagues try to do at CUNY Graduate School of Journalism. He said:

"I guess you know we are trying to be pedagogically innovative if that makes sense. That is a clumsy word pairing. Yeah, maybe that is one way to put it."

Mr. Pacheco, from Syracuse, indicated a change in his use of the term "journalism." Mr. Pacheco, whose title at the Newhouse School is 'Endowed Chair in Journalism Innovation,' said he "[doesn't] use the term journalism as much at all anymore." He said when he arrived at the school two and a half years ago, the mission that the school had for him was initially very focused on the journalism programs. Now, he's broadened his focus to "innovative ways to tell nonfiction stories and engage communities of interest with real information." Interestingly, Mr. Pacheco used the term "innovation" quite often during the interview. But, he did not use the term "journalism" very much – and both of these terms are used in his job title.

Mr. Sheehan, from Florida, took it a step further and said he almost doesn't care what something is called. He said:

"It's ['innovation'] become such a buzzword it's almost meaningless. I almost don't care what we call something. Innovation has to be that entrepreneurial mindset that we're always willing to test and stretch, not just do something because we've always done it that way and we

know it works, but think about how we operate and always be looking for ways to create efficiencies or reframing stuff that works a little better."

Next, I explore the second theme that falls under the umbrella 'how these innovators think about what they do.'

**b. Who is an innovator?**

One of the things I set out to study was the educators' definition of innovation. During the interviews, I found that the educators gave more concrete answers when I asked them how they define an innovator, or what the characteristics of an innovator are, than when I asked them how they define innovation. A possible explanation for this is that it was easier for the educators to talk about the characteristics of a person than define a broad concept.

The characteristic mentioned by the highest number of educators was, being willing to do things differently than they had been done before. Four educators mentioned that characteristic. The characteristics mentioned by the second highest number of educators were, curious and willing to experiment. Three educators mentioned each of those characteristics. Those three characteristics speak to an innovators' interest in being connected to ideas that are beyond themselves and what they are familiar with, which is consistent with my finding in Part I that the focus of innovation is the external, or entities outside of the institutional silo.

Mr. Sheehan, from Florida, said a sign of an innovator is a natural affinity for improvisation, which he indicated is a willingness to try new ideas and adapt to changing situations. He even said that if he could redesign curriculum in any way he could, he would incorporate improvisation training to help students navigate the "paralysis of bureaucracy." He said:

"Improvisation is also a great skill for innovators – the 'yes, and' rule. You always respond in improv with, 'yes, and.' Some people just have a natural affinity to that and I think

that's the mark of that. If I could redesign curriculum in any way I could, I would put improvisation in any course."

The characteristics of an innovator mentioned by the next highest number of educators were, creative and able to learn quickly. Two educators mentioned each of those characteristics. The following characteristics were mentioned by one educator each: flexible, optimistic, open-minded, able to rally people around an idea, sees things differently from others, wants to see things improve, wants to see things change, and sees needs and problems and figures out new ways to solve them.

During some of the interviews, the discussion about the characteristics of an innovator led to the educator talking about whether he or she classifies him or herself as an innovator. One educator, Mr. Sheehan, director of the Innovation News Center at the University of Florida College of Journalism & Communications, said although he's sure others would classify him as an innovator, he does not classify himself as an innovator. He said he considers himself a "doer," which is similar to Mr. Clark's statement that "my philosophy here is doing, period."

Mr. Sheehan also said:

"I don't self-characterize as that [an innovator]. I'm sure others would. I consider myself a doer. … I don't like the 'I' word. I'd rather blaze my own path."

Mr. Sheehan's answers to questions about defining "innovation" and the characteristics of an innovator indicated he does not like confining definitions. When I asked him how he defines "innovation," he answered that it has "become such a buzzword it's almost meaningless," and he "almost [doesn't] care what we call something." The definition he gave was, "Innovation has to be that entrepreneurial mindset that we're always willing to test and stretch, not just do something because we've always done it that way and we know it works, but think about how we operate and always be looking for ways to create efficiencies or reframing

stuff that works a little better." He named just two characteristics of an innovator (curious and has an affinity to improvisation), which was lower than the participants' average number of characteristics named (mean=7.125 and median=3).

When I began my study, I unconsciously made the assumption that all of the participants would classify themselves as innovators, since their peers identified them as innovators and their work fit within definition of what I considered innovative. Three participants specifically indicated that they do not consider themselves innovators. Though it contradicts my initial assumption, it makes sense upon consideration of the characteristics of an innovator.

Looking at the example of Mr. Sheehan, part of his definition of innovation was having the mindset of being "always willing to test and stretch, not just do something because we've always done it that way…" Since he indicated that he does not like confining definitions and likes to "blaze his own trail," it is logical that he would not like to put a confining definition on himself by self-classifying as an innovator. He indicated that he does not like to define anything at all when he said, "I almost don't care what we call something."

This has implications for the way we think about innovators and how they define themselves. An implication is that innovators do not like definitions, including defining themselves as an innovator. Definitions imply boundaries, and boundaries imply limitations, and innovators prefer to push boundaries and question limitations. An educator's decision to self-classify as an innovator, or not, does not mean they are or are not an innovator. However, there is an implication that an innovator may not actually classify himself or herself as an innovator.

Dr. Mensing, from University of Nevada, Reno, said when she and her colleagues redesigned the curriculum at the Reynolds School of Journalism several years ago, they wanted

to stress the importance of having certain attitudes and dispositions towards life and work, as opposed to making certain content, like AP Style, the central focus of what they teach. She said:

> "…What really matters is that students have a good work ethic, and they know how to teach themselves, and they have a flexible attitude, they are really engaged. So we think of these as dispositions, you know, attitudes towards one's life and work. I don't know exactly how to teach those, but they are always on our mind as being the things around which we want to communicate, and that if our assignments and experiences can stress those attributes and qualities of being – that our students are going to have a much better chance of being successful. If they know AP style that is fabulous, but you know if they don't have it down well but they have these other attitudes, they are going to be okay."

Dr. Mensing said the dispositions they identified that will help lead their students to success are curiosity, resiliency, persistence, work ethic, and an ability to collaborate. Curiosity and persistence are two of the characteristics of an innovator most commonly identified by the educators. Furthermore, resiliency, hard work, and collaboration were common themes of the educators' experiences innovating in academia. (Clarification on why "resiliency" was indicated as a part of innovating in academia: "Resiliency" is defined by the Merriam-Webster Dictionary as "an ability to recover from or adjust easily to misfortune or change." This definition indicates an ability to deal with challenges, which was a common theme among the educators' experiences.)

Given that my study was narrow in scope, I cannot make any broad conclusions about the future of journalism education or the role that innovation will play in the field. However, it is noteworthy that the five dispositions of successful journalism graduates identified by an innovative educator are nearly identical to two characteristics of an innovator and three aspects of the innovators' experience in academia that the educators discussed. There is an implication that as journalism education is changing, even though many aspects of academia oppose innovation, innovative journalism educators may actually be moving toward instilling students with qualities of an innovator.

## Conclusion

Although there are obstacles to innovation in the context of academia, the eight journalism educators I interviewed have found a way to innovate. Despite industry questioning of the purpose of journalism education, these educators are creating value for journalism students through their innovations. Their responses indicated several insights about innovating in journalism education, what factors encourage innovation, and the nature of an innovator. Given the importance of innovations in journalism education, understanding what drives innovation in academia is vital. This study provides insights into how innovative educators work and think.

The educators indicated several obstacles to innovation, which they have managed to overcome in varying degrees. Six of the eight educators suggested academia moves at a slow pace, but innovation requires a fast pace. Quick-moving processes yield more innovative work than slow-moving, bureaucratic processes. Furthermore, seven of the eight educators suggested that the focus of academia is internal entities, but the focus of innovation is external entities. They indicated some educators resist reaching out beyond their silos and incorrectly believe they have to be experts at everything. The educators' responses suggested innovators are experts in only a limited number of areas. When they need help in areas outside of their expertise, they reach out to collaborate with others who can provide expertise. With expertise in a specific area, a student or professor understands the area's current limitations and where opportunities for innovation exist. So, he or she is knowledgeable enough to push the boundaries and innovate.

Journalism administrators who want to encourage innovation should examine the pace and flexibility of the structures and processes in their schools. They should take risks and allow for flexibility and fast-paced change in significant elements of the school. Specifically, core curriculum reform, accreditation, and the role of the tenure-track professor should be examined

as to their effectiveness at driving innovation in journalism education. The results of this study suggest that accreditation in particular should be altered to encourage faster cycles of evaluation and feedback, allow for greater flexibility in terms of evaluation metrics and the process of curricular reform, lessen the bureaucratic over-emphasis on procedure, and put greater emphasis on educators' successful implementation of the feedback obtained from evaluation. Furthermore, administrators who want to encourage innovation should support an institutional culture of experimentation and facilitate intra- and extra-departmental collaboration.

The educators suggested innovation is further discouraged by journalism educators' primary focus on daily demands. The demands include producing scholarly literature, churning out numerous students each semester, and fulfilling the many expectations that institutions have for tenure-track professors. In fact, the daily pressure is analogous to the innovation-discouraging demands of producing a daily news product that professional media organizations experience. The educators' responses supported Christensen's theory of the Innovator's Dilemma; the demand of daily tasks takes people away from innovating. Journalism administrators who want to encourage innovation should give professors an opportunity to escape the daily demands. Although a sabbatical takes professors out of daily demands, there is another solution that would drive innovation more effectively. Administrators should consider removing a few professors from their teaching duties for a semester and place them on a collaborative team whose only duty is to figure out how their school could innovate. Furthermore, professors who wish to innovate should consistently carve out time in their schedule to experiment with new ideas or technologies.

Despite these obstacles, the educators innovate by "snak[ing] [their] way to success." They repeat a cycle of trial, evaluation, and adjustment until they reach innovational success.

They try many different ideas in short spurts, evaluate the ideas in quick, constant cycles, and make adjustments to the ideas according to the evaluation results. An innovator "snake[s]" as he or she repeatedly tries an idea in one direction and adjusts it post-evaluation to go in another direction. Evaluation is quick and constant in this process, so an innovator could try out an idea while evaluating it simultaneously. The "snak[e] your way to success" process drives innovation because the fast cycles allow the innovator to surpass "status quo" ideas and move quickly toward new and better ideas. The educators' responses confirmed the five stages suggested in Rogers' (1962) Diffusion of Innovations theory, however, the educators suggested that stages could occur simultaneously, out of order, or repeat themselves. Furthermore, the results suggested that innovations are malleable; an innovator molds and adjusts the innovation until it reaches the point of success as individually defined by the innovator. From this perspective, innovations are dynamic and changeable.

The results also suggested a high level of uncertainty and subjectivity that is employed when evaluating innovation. Educators who wish to innovate should embrace the subjectivity and uncertainty, but in order to effectively navigate these challenges, they should define specific metrics that will indicate their success. When navigating their own innovative work, the educators most commonly used the metrics of student engagement, financial sustainability, and real-world success of student projects. When navigating their students' innovative work, the educators most commonly used the metrics of financial sustainability and various measurements of the project's audience, which include audience size and engagement. Furthermore, my results brought up the question of how success is defined in journalism education, especially in institutions that want to become more innovative. Administrators should decide whether

innovation is synonymous with success and also clearly communicate the metrics they will use to evaluate success and/or innovation.

Innovators' desire to push boundaries manifested itself in the innovators' word choices, as well. Six educators indicated they disliked or purposely did not use a specific word or terminology. In fact, the innovators expressed the most dissatisfaction with the term "innovation," and several created new terms they use instead of "innovation," including "experimentation with a strategy," "pedagogically innovative," and a philosophy of "doing." For these innovators, "innovation" was not innovative enough, and there is an interesting opportunity for further research of whether innovators tend to label themselves as "innovators" or not. My results also gave insight as to what innovators believe the qualities of an innovative are. The educators said curiosity, a willingness to do things differently than before, and willingness to experiment are the marks of an innovator. In fact, my results suggest innovative educators desire to instill the qualities of an innovator in their students. Although there are many obstacles to innovating in academia, innovative educators want their students to be innovative, too.

Though my results suggest several insights about how these eight innovators work and think in the context of journalism academia, my study cannot provide definitive conclusions about innovators or what drives innovation. The concepts of innovation, academia, and peoples' processes and terminology are so complex that my study scratches the surface of those topics. Because I conducted a qualitative study and not an experiment, I could not determine causality between innovation and the factors that the educators said drove or discouraged innovation. Since my data consisted of only in-depth interviews, I relied on self-reported data from the participants. My data might have been skewed due to social desirability, especially since the participants' peers likely believe them to have expertise in the topics they discussed. It is

possible that they were especially aware of how their responses would be perceived by people in their field who might read my study.

However, my findings provided a great deal of insight about innovation in journalism education. And, there are numerous opportunities for further research on this topic. Research that would solidify what the innovator's process is would be extremely valuable to people who are interested in innovating in academia and other fields. Furthermore, there are opportunities to research how one evaluates innovation (specifically, how one evaluates something that may never come to fruition) and the best metrics for evaluating innovation.

My study provides optimistic insights for the future of innovation in journalism education. Despite the obstacles to innovation in academia, there are educators who are innovating, which suggests a hopeful future for the state of innovation in journalism education as it continues evolve with the rapidly changing media industry.

# Appendices

## Appendix A: Recruitment Scripts

### RECRUITMENT SCRIPTS

### Recruitment Script for Prospective Participants

I am working on my honors thesis at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Journalism and Mass Communication. My thesis is about current innovations in college journalism education. I am interested in finding out about the innovations that are being developed and carried out in college journalism education, the educators who are working with them, and the definition of innovation. As part of my study, I will be speaking with college journalism educators who have been identified as innovators by their peers and/or the literature. You're receiving this message because your peers and/or the literature have identified you as an innovator.

For my study, I will be interviewing approximately ten college journalism educators. If you decide to be a part of this study, you would participate in a 60 to 90 minute interview via Skype or phone. I would like to tape record the interviews and have them transcribed. I'm happy to answer questions you might have about participating in this study. If you are interested in participating, please send me an email at klbenner@live.unc.edu. (I would also appreciate any recommendations you have of other innovators that I could interview.) Thank you for your time. I hope to hear from you soon!

**Recruitment Script for Prospective Participants Contacted by Other Faculty**

Thank you for letting me get in touch with you about my research. As _____ may have told you, I am working on my honors thesis at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Journalism and Mass Communication. My thesis is about current innovations in college journalism education. I am interested in finding out about the innovations that are being developed and carried out in college journalism education, the educators who are working with them, and the definition of innovation. As part of my study, I will be speaking with college journalism educators who have been identified as innovators by their peers and/or the literature. You're receiving this message because your peers and/or the literature have identified you as an innovator.

For my study, I will be interviewing approximately ten college journalism educators. If you decide to be a part of this study, you would participate in a 60 to 90 minute interview via Skype or phone. I would like to tape record the interviews and have them transcribed. I'm happy to answer questions you might have about participating in this study. If you are interested in participating, please send me an email at klbenner@live.unc.edu. (I would also appreciate any recommendations you have of other innovators that I could interview.) Thank you for your time. I hope to hear from you soon!

**Appendix B: Interview Guide**

1. Tell me about [specific innovation] you're doing.
   - Probe: What is it? How would you summarize it?

2. This study is about innovation. How would you define innovation?
   - Probe: What are the characteristics of an innovator?
   - Probe: How would you characterize (sample)? Is it an innovation? Why or why not?
   - Does what you do fall into that category (i.e. an innovation)? Why or why not?

3. How did you begin to develop or work with this innovation?
   - Probe: Did you create it or inherit it?
   - Probe: How did this come about?
   - Probe: How long have you been at your job?
   - Probe: What is your overarching goal with this [specific innovation]?
   - How are you working with it now? What's happening with it now?
     - Probe: Do you have interest in bringing it to other areas or schools?

4. What motivated you to create/continue this [specific innovation]?
   - Probe: Why did you decide to do this?
   - Probe: What did you hope would come of it?

5. How do you work as an innovator?
   - Probe: What was your process of coming up with or carrying out your [specific innovation]?
   - Probe: How did you develop it or carry it out?
   - Probe: Is innovation an independent thing or a collaborative thing?
   - Probe: How would you characterize your interactions and discussions with other innovators?

6. What has influenced or inspired you as you have innovated?
   - Probe: What theories have influenced you?
   - Probe: Are there any contemporaries or peers who have influenced you?
   - Probe: Are there other sources you have used? Conversely, what kind of peer-to-peer interactions have you had?

7. How do you know if your innovation is successful?
   - Probe: What criteria did you use to measure success?
   - Probe: Or, if you were to measure the success, what measures would you use?
   - How successful was/is your innovation?
   - Probe: Do you ask others to help you evaluate the innovation?
   - Probe: What is the role of evaluation when innovating?
   - Probe: Is there a better way to approach the evaluation process than what is being done now?

8. What about your [specific innovation] worked?
    - Probe: What recommendations would you give to someone developing this [specific innovation] at another journalism school?
    - What challenges have you faced?
        - Probe: What hasn't worked?
        - Probe: How are you dealing with what hasn't worked?
    - What advice would you give to someone who wants to innovate in general at another journalism school?
        - Probe: What is it like to innovate where you are? What is the context of where you're at?
    - How would you like to innovate beyond what you're currently doing?

9. Comment on the current state of innovation in journalism education.
    - Probe: What's working? What isn't working?
    - Probe: Is there anything out there that you believe has potential to be successful, that you are excited about, etc.?
    - Probe: How could the way that journalism educators look at the process of innovating be improved?
    - Probe: Comment on the current state of innovation in education in the context of where you are.
    - Probe: What could be done to improve the field?
    - Probe: How is journalism education being shaped by the evolution and reinvention of the media industry? How does that influence your work?

10. Can I contact you later if I need something clarified?
    - Do you have any recommendations of other people I should talk to?

**Appendix C: Consent Form**

## Standard Consent Form for Adult Participants

**University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill**
**Consent to Participate in a Research Study**
**Adult Participants**
**Social Behavioral Form**

---

**IRB Study #**14-2820_____
**Consent Form Version Date:** 01/24/15

**Title of Study:** Innovations in College Journalism Education at Select Institutions

**Principal Investigator:** Kendra Benner
**UNC-Chapel Hill Department:** School of Journalism and Mass Communication
**UNC-Chapel Hill Phone number:** (919) 962-1204
**Email Address:** klbenner@live.unc.edu
**Faculty Advisor:** Lois Boynton

**Funding Source and/or Sponsor:** UNC-Chapel Hill School of Journalism and Mass Communication Administration

**Study Contact telephone number:** (630) 639-7777
**Study Contact email:** klbenner@live.unc.edu

---

**What are some general things you should know about research studies?**

You are being asked to take part in a research study. To join the study is voluntary.
You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help people in the future. You may not receive any direct benefit from being in the research study. There also may be risks to being in research studies.

Details about this study are discussed below. It is important that you understand this information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study.
You will be given a copy of this consent form. You should ask the researchers named above, or staff members who may assist them, any questions you have about this study at any time.

**What is the purpose of this study?**

The purpose of this research study is to learn about the educational innovations that are currently being developed and carried out in college journalism education at institutions in America and other countries.

You are being asked to be in the study because you have been identified by your peers and/or in the literature as someone who is innovating in the journalism education field.

**Are there any reasons you should not be in this study?**
You should not be in this study if you are not a college journalism educator.

**How many people will take part in this study?**

If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately ten people in this research study.

**How long will your part in this study last?**

Your involvement in this study will be participating in one in-depth interview that will take approximately 60 to 90 minutes. There will be no follow-up interview or questionnaire.

**What will happen if you take part in the study?**

If you choose to participate in this study, you will take part in one in-depth interview that will take approximately 60 to 90 minutes. You will be asked questions about your experience with innovating in the field of journalism education, what worked, and your motivations for innovating.

There will be no follow-up interview or questionnaire.

**What are the possible benefits from being in this study?**

Research is designed to benefit society by gaining new knowledge. You may not benefit personally from being in this research study.

**What are the possible risks or discomforts involved from being in this study?**
There may be uncommon or previously unknown risks. You should report any problems to the researcher.

**How will your privacy be protected?**

Participants will be identified by name in any report or publication about this study. Your identification will be important to the study to verify the credibility of the study and verify that the participants are experts in the journalism education field.

Although every effort will be made to keep research records private, there may be times when federal or state law requires the disclosure of such records, including personal information. This is very unlikely, but if disclosure is ever required, UNC-Chapel Hill will take steps allowable by law to protect the privacy of personal information. In some cases, your information in this

research study could be reviewed by representatives of the University, research sponsors, or government agencies for purposes such as quality control or safety.

Interviews will be audio and/or video recorded. Recordings will be stored on the researcher's password-protected computer (for Skype interviews) and on the researcher's phone and password-protected computer (for phone interviews). You may request that audio and video recordings be turned off at any time.

Check the line that best matches your choice:

_____ OK to record me during the study

_____ Not OK to record me during the study

**What will happen if you are injured by this research?**
All research involves a chance that something bad might happen to you. This may include the risk of personal injury. In spite of all safety measures, you might develop a reaction or injury from being in this study. If such problems occur, the researchers will help you get medical care, but any costs for the medical care will be billed to you and/or your insurance company. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has not set aside funds to pay you for any such reactions or injuries, or for the related medical care. However, by signing this form, you do not give up any of your legal rights.

**What if you want to stop before your part in the study is complete?**

You can withdraw from this study at any time, without penalty. The investigators also have the right to stop your participation at any time. This could be because you have had an unexpected reaction, or have failed to follow instructions, or because the entire study has been stopped.

**Will you receive anything for being in this study?**
You will not receive anything for taking part in this study.

**Will it cost you anything to be in this study?**

There will be no costs for being in this study.

**What if you are a UNC employee?**

Taking part in this research is not a part of your University duties, and refusing will not affect your job. You will not be offered or receive any special job-related consideration if you take part in this research.

**What if you have questions about this study?**

You have the right to ask, and have answered, any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, complaints, concerns, or if a research-related injury occurs, you should contact the researchers listed on the first page of this form.

**What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?**

All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, or if you would like to obtain information or offer input, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or by email to IRB_subjects@unc.edu.

---

**Title of Study:** Innovations in College Journalism Education at Select Institutions

**Principal Investigator:** Kendra Benner

**Participant's Agreement:**

I have read the information provided above. I have asked all the questions I have at this time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

_____ _____ Signature
of Research Participant Date

_____ Printed Name
of Research Participant

***Only include the following section if consent obtained in-person.***

_____ _____ Signature
of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent Date

_____ Printed Name
of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent

# Appendix D: IRB Approval Documentation

| IRB Number: 14-2820 | Initial | Principal Investigator: Kendra Benner |
|---|---|---|

**By certifying below, the Principal Investigator affirms the following:**

I will personally conduct or supervise this research study. I will ensure that this study is performed in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations and University policies regarding human subjects research. I will obtain IRB approval before making any changes or additions to the project. I will notify the IRB of any other changes in the information provided in this application. I will provide progress reports to the IRB at least annually, or as requested. I will report promptly to the IRB all unanticipated problems or serious adverse events involving risk to human subjects. I will follow the IRB approved consent process for all subjects. I will ensure that all collaborators, students and employees assisting in this research study are informed about these obligations. All information given in this form is accurate and complete.

This study proposes research that has been determined to include Security Level 2 data security requirements. I agree to accept responsibility for managing these risks appropriately in consultation with departmental and/or campus security personnel. The Data Security Requirements addendum can be reviewed here.

**If PI is a Student or Trainee Investigator, the Faculty Advisor also certifies the following:**

I accept ultimate responsibility for ensuring that this study complies with all the obligations listed above for the PI.

## Certifying Signatures:

**Signature:** Electronic Signature Received **Date:** 1/25/2015 03:56:57 PM
Kendra Benner

**Signature:** Electronic Signature Received **Date:** 1/25/2015 04:20:01 PM
Lois Boynton

**The expectation is that this approval is being given on behalf of the head of the Department, Division, or Center. If the chair or director is an investigator on this project or otherwise conflicted in approving it, the Vice-Chair or Chair's designee should review it. By approving, you are certifying the following on behalf of your department, division or center:**

- This research is appropriate for this Investigator and our department
- The investigator(s) are qualified to conduct the research
- There are adequate resources (including financial, support and facilities) available
- For units that have a local review committee for pre-IRB review, this requirement has been satisfied
- I support this application, and hereby submit it for further review

This study proposes research that has been determined to include Security Level 2 data security requirements. I agree to accept responsibility for managing these risks appropriately in consultation with departmental and/or campus security personnel. The Data Security Requirements addendum can be reviewed here.

**If you are approving for other purposes (e.g., CTRC, DSMB, IBC, PRC, RSC, or other review committees), you affirm the following:**

- The proposed submission is approved and may be forwarded for IRB review.

This study proposes research that has been determined to include Security Level 2 data security requirements. I agree to accept responsibility for managing these risks appropriately in consultation with departmental and/or campus security personnel. The Data Security Requirements addendum can be reviewed here.

## Department Approval Signatures:

By signing in the appropriate space, the Department Chairperson(s) is indicating only that he/she has seen and reviewed this submission

**Department:** School of Journalism and Mass Communication Administration
**Signature:** Electronic Signature Received **Date:** 1/25/2015 04:21:22 PM
**Name & Title:** Rhonda Gibson, Associate Prof./acad. Advisor

# References

Baregheh, A., Rowley, J., & Sambrook, S. (2009, October). Towards a multidisciplinary definition of innovation. *Management Decision, 47*(8), 1323-1339. doi:10.1108/00251740910984578

Becker, L. B., Vlad, T., & Simpson, H. A. (2014, December). 2013 Annual Survey of Journalism Mass Communication Enrollments: Enrollments Decline for Third Consecutive Year. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 69*(4), 349-365. doi:10.1177/1077695814555432

Biddix, J. P., Chung, C. J., & Park, H. W. (2015, January). The hybrid shift: Evidencing a student-driven restructuring of the college classroom. *Computers & Education, 80*, 162-175. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2014.08.016

Camp, M. (2012). The J-School Debate: Is the Timing Finally Right for University Journalism Programs and the Rest of the University Community to Work Together? In *JGE: The Journal of General Education* (Vol. 61, pp. 240-263). Retrieved February 16, 2015.

Carolina Center for Public Service. (2015). Faculty Engaged Scholars. Retrieved from http://ccps.unc.edu/fes/

Castañeda, L. (2011). Disruption and Innovation: Online Learning and Degrees at Accredited Journalism Schools and Programs. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 66*(4), 361-373. Retrieved February 16, 2015.

Christensen, C. M. (1997). The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Claussen, D. S. (2011). Editor's Note: CUNY's Entrepreneurial Journalism: Partially Old Wine in a New Bottle, and Not Quite Thirst-Quenching, but Still a Good Drink. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 66*(1), 3-6. Retrieved February 16, 2015.

Du, Y. R., & Lo, S. C. (2014, December). The Gap between Online Journalism Education and Practice: A Hong Kong Study. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 69*(4), 415-434. doi:10.1177/1077695814554294

Du, Y. R. (2010). Teaching Journalism and Mass Communication in the Trend Toward Convergence: A Content Analysis of Faculty Hiring Announcements With a New Media Emphasis. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association,* 1. Retrieved February 16, 2015.

Federal Education Budget Project. (2014, April 24). No Child Left Behind - Overview. Retrieved from http://febp.newamerica.net/background-analysis/no-child-left-behind-overview

Ferrier, M. B. (2013, September). Media Entrepreneurship: Curriculum Development and Faculty Perceptions of What Students Should Know. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 68*(3), 222-241. doi:10.1177/1077695813494833

Hanusch, F. (2013, February). Moulding industry's image: Journalism education's impact on students' professional views. *Media International Australia (8/1/07-current),* (146), 48-59. Retrieved February 16, 2015.

Harcup, T. (2011, February). Hackademics at the chalkface. *Journalism Practice, 5*(1), 34-50. doi:10.1080/17512786.2010.493333

Harcup, T. (2012, January). Questioning the ‘bleeding obvious’: What’s the point of researching journalism? *Journalism, 13*(1), 21-37. doi:10.1177/1464884911400843

Humanes, M. L., & Roses, S. (2014, January). College Students' Views about Journalism Education in Spain. *Comunicar, 21*(42), 181-188. doi:10.3916/C42-2014-18

Massey, B. L. (2010). What Job Advertisements Tell Us about Demand for Multiplatform Reporters at Legacy News Outlets. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *65*(2), 142-155.

McCracken, G. D. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McDevitt, M. (2014, May). When an Advisory Board Turns on Its School. *Academe, 100*(3), 21-25. Retrieved February 16, 2015.

Media Literacy, News Literacy, or News Appreciation? A Case Study of the News Literacy Program at Stony Brook University., 69 Journalism & Mass Communication Educator 146-165.

Merriam-Webster. (2015). Resilience. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resilience

O'Sullivan, D. (2008). Defining innovation. In Applying innovation. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Paniagua Rojano, F. J., Gómez Aguilar, M., & González Cortés, M. E. (2014, January). Encouraging entrepreneurial journalism among university students. *Revista Latina De Comunicación Social,* (69), 548-570. doi:10.4185/RLCS-2014-1024en

Pavlik, J. V. (2013). A Vision for Transformative Leadership: Rethinking Journalism and Mass Communication Education for the Twenty-First Century. In *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* (Vol. 68, pp. 211-221). doi:10.1177/1077695813499561

Rabe, L. (2014, June). Arguing the case of the 'Janus element' in journalism education: Journalism history as essential element in journalism curricula in developing

democracies. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics, 10*(2), 203-211. doi:10.1386/macp.10.2.203_1

Rogers, E. M., & Adhikarya, R. (1980). Diffusion of Innovations: An Up-To-Date Review and Commentary. *Communication Yearbook, 3*, 67-81. Retrieved February 16, 2015.

Rogers, E. M. (1962). Diffusion of innovations.

Rogers, E. M. (1983). Diffusion of innovations (3rd ed.).

Rogers, E. M. (1995). Diffusion of innovations (4th ed.).

Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.).

Sahid Ullah, M. (2014, April). De-westernization of Media and Journalism Education in South Asia: In Search of a New Strategy. *China Media Research, 10*(2), 15-23. Retrieved February 16, 2015.

Sargent, T. C. (2015). Professional learning communities and the diffusion of pedagogical innovation in the Chinese education system. Comparative Education Review, 59(1).

Syracuse University. (2013). Interdisciplinary Research Clusters. Retrieved from http://syr.edu/irc/

Wharton-Michael, P. (2009). Academic vs. Professional Education: Epistmology and Journalism Educator's Academic Work. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association,* 1-36. Retrieved February 16, 2015.