



JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR COMMUNICATION ADMINISTRATION

Volume 36, Number 1

Winter-Spring 2017

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration

Editor

Janie Harden Fritz

Professor of

Communication & Rhetorical Studies

Duquesne University

Editorial Assistant

Matthew P. Mancino

Graduate Assistant

Communication & Rhetorical Studies

Duquesne University

Editorial Board

Jerry L. Allen

Professor Emeritus

Department of Communication, Film and Media Studies

University of New Haven

Ronald C. Arnett

Chair, Communication & Rhetorical Studies

Patricia Doherty Yoder and Ronald Wolfe Endowed Chair in

Communication Ethics

Duquesne University

Besty Wackneragel Bach

Professor, Communication Studies

University of Montana

Shannon A. Bowen

Professor, College of Mass Communication

University of South Carolina

Carl M. Cates

Professor of Communication Studies

Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Communication

Arkansas State University

Melissa Chastain

Chair, School of Communication

Spalding University

Paul D. Driscoll

Vice-Dean Academic Affairs

School of Communication

University of Miami

Jerold L. Hale

Dean, School of Humanities and Social Sciences

College of Charleston

William Harpine

University of South Carolina Aiken

Mark Hickson, III

Faculty Fellow, Office of the Vice Provost

University of Alabama-Birmingham

Annette Holba

Associate Professor of Rhetoric

Plymouth State University

Thomas J. Hynes

President

Clayton State University

Danette Ifert Johnson

Vice Provost for Academic Programs

Office of the Provost & VPEA

Ithaca College

Nancy Kidd

Executive Director

National Communication Association

Kathleen Long

Professor of Communication Emerita

West Virginia Wesleyan College

Chris Lynch

Chair, Communication

Kean University

Brian R. McGee

Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

College of Charleston

Michael D. Miller

Chair and Professor

Communication & Theatre Arts

Henderson State University

Timothy P. Mottet

Provost

Northwest Missouri State University

Alfred Mueller, II

Dean of the Division of Arts and Sciences

Neumann University

Craig Newburger

Ohio and Federal Southern District of Ohio

Practicing Attorney

H. Dan O'Hair

Dean, College of Communications & Information Studies

(Interim) Senior Vice Provost for Student Success

University of Kentucky

Helen M. Sterk

Head and Professor, Communication

Western Kentucky University

Charles H. Tardy

Chair and Professor of Communication Studies

The University of Southern Mississippi

Paaige K. Turner

Associate Dean and Professor, School of Communications

Webster University

David Roach

Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences

Texas Tech University

Kelly Rocca DelGaizo

Professor of Communication

St. John's University

Don W. Stacks

Professor, Strategic Communication

University of Miami

Sally Vogl-Bauer, Ph.D.

Dean, General Education and Academic Support Division

Blackhawk Technical College

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration

Volume 36 Number 1 Winter-Spring 2017

Editor's Note

Janie Harden Fritz

1

Legal, Ethical, and Appropriate Interaction

Mark Hickson III

2

**The Basic Course Using GIAs: One Department's Journey
through the Ups and Down's of Establishing a Lecture/Lab
Delivery Model for the Basic Communication Course**

Kathy Brady, Tammy French, and Sue Wildermuth

13

**Student Philanthropy: Learning and Community
Transformation in a College Philanthropy Course**

Daniel Blaeuer

26

Editor's Note

This issue of *JACA* offers a look at internal and external issues relevant to communication administration. Mark Hickson III offers reflections and recommendations for internal communication practices that serve various administrative purposes. This comprehensive examination is a helpful reminder of the multiple communicative tasks administrators must undertake and the way our field undergirds these practices. Kathy Brady, Tammy French, and Sue Wildermuth discuss creative ways of managing resources through the use of Graduate Instructional Assistants in the basic communication course, a departmentally-focused issue that holds implications for the larger university community. Daniel Blaeuer provides a connection between communication courses and the community external to the university through a communication course in philanthropy.

Thanks again to the many reviewers who make this journal's work possible—and to Matthew Mancino, as always, for his ongoing labors of production to put the journal in distributable form.

Legal, Ethical, and Appropriate Interaction

Mark Hickson III¹

Decades ago, a woman who was a student of mine came to my office to ask that she be allowed to drop out of school for the semester despite the fact that the deadline had passed. I took the request to the dean, who trusted me enough to believe that there was a good reason for her doing so. After signing the form and sending it to the dean for his signature, I received a phone call from the Provost who wanted to know her reasons. I told him that the student had given me the reason, but she had given it to me in confidence. The provost also trusted me enough to sign it. Eventually she graduated and became a lawyer in a large city. She had been raped and did not want to report it. In today's world many would say that I had to report. She had given me no details. I had trusted her and her wishes and knew enough about the law to know that if she was unwilling to testify, there was no reason for me to report it. What I knew then and now, is that trust in relationships is fundamental to operating as an administrator.

That was not the only case that I had similar to that. Universities develop courses for administrators on the law—at least the law that one needs to know as a chair. But colleges do not teach courses in relationships and trust. As I have reflected over the years, I decided that we talk about legal issues in communication and we even talk about ethical issues, but we rarely talk about the idea of appropriate interaction. The case of my student was a case in what not to say. I only wanted to know that she was doing all right and would act in whatever way she wished for me to act for her benefit. Her only request was to withdraw from school for a semester and that seemed like legitimate to me.

As a reader, you may have noticed that the term “interaction” is used here instead of communication. The reason for this is that not all talk is communication, nor is all talk persuasion nor is all communication persuasion. We have at least three major reasons for interacting with one another and they are quite different.

We were conducting a workshop for chairs when one of the participants from another university said that he was unable to engage in time management because all of his time was being used solving other people's problems. My response was, “How do you know they have a problem?” Often when a faculty member or student comes into the chair's office, the chair assumes a problem. For example, a student came into my office in the middle of the term. She was complaining about a faculty member who was too difficult and she was afraid that she was going to fail the course. She couldn't know that she was going to fail because it was barely mid-term. She just wanted to talk it out. She didn't want me to talk to the instructor. She didn't want to drop. In large measure, she didn't even want me to assure her. All she wanted was for someone with assumed power to listen. Listen.

Interacting to Communicate

There are times when people want to interact with one another to discover information. When a new faculty member is hired, he or she may want to know what they will be teaching the first semester. This is not an uncommon or unrealistic request. Many times a hire is not complete until July, and school starts in August. That can be a maximum

¹ The University of Alabama-Birmingham

preparation time of a month. The chair should answer this question as soon as possible. Once answered, though, there will likely be another question. The new person will ask whether there is a textbook or a standard syllabus. Again these should be easy answers to easy questions. This type of interaction is about *communication*.

Most faculty meetings will be about information. That is, there is nothing in particular to argue about. At the beginning of the year, a faculty meeting may take some time because there is much to share. The chair should be prepared to share:

- The university's annual schedule
- The final exam schedule
- The course schedule for the year
- Any new policies that have been created or modified since the last meeting
- Budget information
- Calendar of departmental events including meetings for the year

We have had colleagues to say that all of this is unnecessary. It should all be available on a web site. It probably is. The fact, though, is that by sharing all of this at the first meeting, all of it is together which assists everyone in organizing the semester and the year.

In a sense, too, the first meeting of year is a *reminder* meeting. Some people are new and some others did not teach in the summer. For those reasons, people may need to be reminded what should be included in the syllabus, for example. Despite colleges' frequent insistence on not using paper, the information is worth copying.

In addition once all of this information is available, the chair can refer to this document throughout the year to remind people of such things as when final grades are due, when tenure and promotion materials should be submitted, when annual reports are due, when course changes are due, etc.

It is just as important for the chair to share information with the department. Some chairs think that disclosing information will cause conflict, but experience has shown that the conflict will be lessened and less long lasting when information is shared (Hickson & Stacks, 1992). In addition, redundancy is a positive when sharing information orally. It is not as necessary when written or electronic data are presented. But even then it is best to support the paper or electronic copy with oral analysis. Data, in and of themselves, are not necessarily as easily understood as using a variety of ways to reinforce the interpretation of the data.

Interacting to Persuade

It may appear odd at first blush that most of what the chair does is not communication. It is not about the exchange of information. In fact the most interaction is either persuasion or catharsis. Persuasion may be in the form of a hint than an order. Many have described the job of a chair persuading faculty members as similar to trying to herd cats. This can be the case, but it does not have to be that way.

McCroskey and Richmond (1992) have discussed 23 ways to motivate faculty. They include: immediate reward for behavior, deferred reward for behavior, reward from the chair, and reward from others. For the most part, these rewards are verbal. Too often chairs forget the value in verbal rewards. The final type of reward mentioned is internal reward in the form of self esteem. Punishments of the same type are available: immediate, deferred,

punishment from the chair, and punishment from others. Obviously it is better to utilize reward behaviors.

McCroskey and Richmond also have discussed rewards and punishments related to the relationship between the faculty member and the chair. Others relate to the faculty member's relationship to others in the department. Thus, professors can be asked to do something for the good of the department as well as for themselves.

Interacting as Catharsis

Probably the most used type of human interaction is catharsis. We tend to be relatively unaware of this because it becomes almost habitual. It may be in the form of questioning ourselves after another interaction has taken place. We re-play the interaction in the mind. "Should I have said this? Should I have not said that? Was there a better word?" We know that it is too late to re-do, but in a way we give ourselves an examination—an after-the-fact pop test about what just happened.

A most common version is when two colleagues go to lunch and discuss the misgivings of the chair or some other administrator. As catharsis, we need to remember that these interactions are neither for persuasion nor for information. One colleague is not trying to convince the other. They may already be in agreement. Neither is one colleague trying to share information with the other. They may already both have the information. It is simply a venting. They both know that should they want a solution, they have to go to the chair. But it is not worth that. The venting is typically for a trivial matter. But limiting this interaction to faculty is inaccurate. Chairs tend to do the same thing. It is the venting itself that is intended to be the final outcome. Once lunch is over, the day continues.

How many times have we heard statements like this? "The students don't read the book." "They just don't study." "They always blame the instructor." "Several of them always show up late for class." All of these statements may be true, but venting to a colleague will not change the students' behavior. Yet rarely are these statements directed toward the students. Then there is: "We haven't gotten a salary increase in years." "No one works as hard as I do." The speaker realizes that little will be done about the problem [thus, not really a problem] yet the venting continues for days, months, years.

On occasion, the speaker will address the chair with some of these issues. The chair needs to realize that this is neither communication nor persuasion. Listening is the key. The speaker wants to leave the room with the feeling that an important person has listened.

Managing by Walking Around: Appropriate Talk

As we have mentioned, management by walking around is a beneficial communication technique in the office. In today's world, of course, many teachers spend a substantial part of their time away from the office. In many cases, professors can find a more comfortable and profitable place to undertake research and even to update their teaching techniques. However, most universities require some amount of time each week devoted to "office hours."

While office hours are intended to be times when the students can come by and meet with their teachers, this is also a good time for the chair to stop by the office of each one to exchange updates about what is going on. The time should be devoted to the chair's explaining new policies or new issues that may be coming forward. It is also a good time for the professor to disclose any information about any problems that may exist in the

classroom as well as progress on research. The purpose of managing by walking around is to *build rapport*.

Faculty members may disclose personal information during these times. Many faculty members have parents who are seriously ill or children who may be having health problems or school problems. In most cases, these amount to cathartic talks. In other cases, the professors may be building up to a future problem at work. For example, if an elderly parent can no longer take care of their own lives, the parent may have to move in with the faculty member. This could result in the need for a change in schedule for an upcoming term. The chair should take mental note of these situations. By assisting in this way, rapport is built and future difficulties may be avoided.

Rapport time is a good time for the chair to provide honest positives, as described by Alan Garner. He suggests two ways to transmit positive comments. First, he suggests that you be specific. For example, when telling a faculty member that she is apparently a good teacher, it could be better to state that one of her students had said she really makes me think in a different way than I used to think. In the process, he suggests that you say the person's name, "Jane B said, 'Ms. Johnson makes me think in a different way than I am used to thinking.'" You might even add that you think learning new ways of thought is one of the most important aspects of teaching and learning. Garner adds that your nonverbal communication should match your words. Compliments of this type should be given sparingly though. While some chairs worry that complimenting a faculty member will lead to the professor's bringing up the comment again later when salary negotiations occur. This should not be the case. If your comments do not compare one professor with another one, compliments can be great for rapport.

This is not the time to discuss other faculty members. The chair should avoid rumors and even the fallibilities of others. In other words the content of the conversations should be about the one on one relationship between that faculty member and the chair. By going to the professors' offices, it eliminates the formality of the chair's office as well as the home field advantage.

One concern in this regard is that of topic changing. Because the teacher may have a different agenda, the chair needs to be aware of this so that he or she can take the topic back to what it should be. The level of conversation should be *business casual*. That is to say, topics such as salary increases, teaching loads, annual reviews, and the like should be avoided. If the chair engages in those topics in the rapport building phase, others may wonder what the chair said to them.

Managing Conflict: Students

Many books have been written about managing conflicts in a variety of contexts. Conflicts in academia are mostly about power. Students may come into the chair's office to discuss their professor and/or their grade in a professor's class. There are usually two reasons that the student goes to the chair. In most cases, they fear bringing up a grade matter with the teacher because they feel that a complaint may hurt their grade even further. In other cases, it is simply a power play to get the chair to overrule the professor, even when the student knows the teacher was right. These cases are few, though, because the student does not know the outcome if the student appeals to the chair.

When grade appeals occur, it is important that the chair take several steps. First, the chair should get the student to be as specific as possible. As much as possible, the chair should stick to the facts. For example, what was each grade? Did the teacher have the

grading system on her syllabus? Did the teacher follow the grading system outlined on the syllabus? Once these details have been recorded, the student should be notified that the chair will have to discuss the grade with the professor, and in all likelihood if the grade is to be changed, the student will have to meet again with the chair and the teacher.

The same procedure should be used with the professor. Did she have the grading system on the syllabus? Did she follow the syllabus? Is there agreement about what the individual grades were in the course? At this time, the chair should be able to analyze whether there was an actual numerical grade problem. When the chair meets together with student and the faculty member, the chair might start out with, are we in agreement with the grade on test one? Test two? And so forth. A particular grade may have been recorded incorrectly. The student may have felt that the final grade should have been rounded off. There are a number of problems that might exist, but if no grades were rounded off, there should be no problem. Mostly students want grades to be systematic and fair.

The author once had a case where a student came in complaining about a grade that the student had received in *his* class. Both the student and the chair were adamant that they were right. All of the grades added up, but the chair saw it as a B, and the student saw it as an A. Fortunately the chair noticed that it was not the total grades of the student that was the problem. The problem was that the chair had deleted one of the original assignments and hence was dividing all of the class' grades by the wrong divisor. Several students got their grades changed for the better. It is important to admit you were wrong when you were wrong.

What about when several students complain about a teacher and they are not complaining about their grades? Here we have another story. At times the professor has put too much work on the students; however, this would be an unusual complaint because most students who do well in class do not mind additional work. There may be a question about the nature of the work in terms of its pertinence to the course or how trivial it is. Students may also complain about disorganization even if they made a good grade. In any case, the chair probably needs to discuss the matter with the students as individuals. If their stories sound similar, but not too similar, the chair needs to have a conversation with the teacher. We do know that some teachers engage in what might be called misbehaviors (McPherson, Kearney, & Plax, 2006). Such actions need to be corrected as soon as possible.*

Managing Conflict with Professors

Generally, if the chair has done a good job in hiring, there will be fewer conflicts among professors. However, every chair inherits faculty members from her predecessor. Among those inherited may be the former chair. Problems can ensue for a myriad of reasons from extremely trivial to monumental. It is important that a chair recognize that an issue that appears trivial to him, though, may appear monumental to the faculty members. Below are a few reasons that conflict occurs in an academic department.

Office Space

* These actions, according to McPherson et al. (2006), include being absent, being tardy, keeping students over the time limit, early dismissals, straying from the subject, late returning work, sarcasm and putdowns, inaccessibility to students, unfair testing, unfair grading, showing favoritism, negative physical appearance, and others (pp. 217-218).

Anyone who has seen the movie “Office Space” understands this one. Faculty members do not like cubicles. Most feel that they deserve a real office after spending about 20 years in school to get where they are. That’s the one side of it. Chairs know, however, that there is rarely enough space for everyone. Decisions about space must be made on some system of priorities. The question becomes what kind of priorities? For example, suppose that the longest tenured person is an associate professor, but the longest tenured full professor has been in the department only a year less. Who gets first choice? Does the chair even allow for choice?

In today’s world, most teachers do not use their offices as much as they did 15 years ago. The Internet and the cellular phone have made office hours and writing time more mobile. Even so the teacher’s office is somewhat of a status symbol. The fact is that most faculty offices at most universities look about the same and are about the same size. Whether or not there are windows does come into play. If there are windows, the view comes into play. Which offices have a thermostat also comes into play. These are issues that never arise until the department changes office space or additional faculty members are brought in to the department. But when the issues arise, it is important that the chair reach some understanding about the criteria for what constitutes a “good” office and how the decisions will be made about “good” offices.

Office Equipment

Similar issues occur regarding the type of computer that a teacher may have in her office. In some institutions, these decisions have already been made at a higher level. When the department has to decide, there must be criteria. Do the researchers have a need for the statistical package that others do not need?

Class Schedules

At our institutions almost everyone would like to teach in the middle of the day on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Most students feel the same way. Having taught at a number of places, we find the same to be the case in many places. The scheduling of classes can be a major topic of conflict unless there is a system. As we have mentioned, the best approach is to have a two or three year schedule in place. Some bad ideas about this may be:

- Teach a class at the same time each semester
- Have the same person teach a class every semester
- Change times after the schedule has been published
- The convenience of the faculty member as first priority

There are undoubtedly others. Certainly those that we have listed are based on poor decisions. Obviously if the department has a limited number of faculty, some of these issues might remain unresolved. By having a class at the same time each semester, it may keep some students from being able to take it for several terms. If it is a prerequisite, this causes significant problems for the student. By having the same person teach a class term after term, it may create burnout and causes problems for the student who may not get along well with that teacher. The last two appear obvious. A systematic approach will avoid all of these issues.

Tenure and Promotion Issues

Here we are not talking about an issue with the candidate but an issue with other faculty members. Most of the problems above, as well as this one, may be an issue of *petty jealousy*. As Hickson and Roebuck (2009) have stated, the commodity in academia is usually ego. Issues that may not involve much money or prestige are magnified in an organization where there isn't much in the way of status or money.

The issue of someone else's tenure involves two important factors. The first is, do we want this person around for 20 years or longer? This is a legitimate question. The problem with the answer is that a person may be using the wrong criteria. Many times the issue is that X does not like Y. For practical and ethical reasons, typically no one will say this. Instead they nitpick at the candidate's resume. The rationales vary from not having enough publications, not having published in a more prestigious journals, not publishing consistently, not teaching well enough. Most of these issues should have been handled by the time one comes up for tenure. It is simply unethical to deny tenure, after a six year probationary period. After all of this, the candidate is denied. To avoid this happening, the chair must be vigilant to what is going on during the entire six years.

It is probably better to warn someone early if there are problems with collegiality, which is what not liking the candidate is. During the first probationary period, there should be a review which encompasses these kinds of matters. The fact is that until there is a review, other faculty members know little about the candidate's performance so judgments are only made on interactions (Fritz, 2013). In many cases, the candidate does not even know what causes these negative feelings. Some of these issues might be that the candidate is more popular than other faculty members, the candidate interferes or discusses other faculty members with students (especially in a negative way), or the candidate is a rumor monger. Another example is when a candidate isolates himself from the other faculty member. In short, they are frequently related to too much or too little interaction with the right people.

Promotion and Hiring

It seems strange that some senior faculty members may not wish to have a colleague promoted despite her qualifications. Nevertheless, this sort of mix does happen. There are a number of reasons why this might happen. First, the department may have developed into cliques. When this occurs, some of the faculty want to promote a colleague and some do not. Those who do not will attempt to find any trivial reason that a colleague should not be promoted. We have discussed those previously. Second, a faculty member may simply dislike another faculty member. Third, a senior person may feel that "the standards have been watered down." This approach is basically that the candidate has not been vetted or initiated enough to move to the next level.

Anyone in academia would wonder when reading this why faculty members have inputs into hiring and promotion decisions. It is because academia operates on a different system from IBM or General Motors. The faculty serve on committees for tenure and promotion. While the committee's decision may not have to match the chair's decision, problems could come to fruition when the two do not mesh. Suppose the faculty votes for promotion, but the chair has information leading her to feel that a candidate should not be promoted. Depending on the policies at the institution, that candidate may or may not be

promoted. Whichever side “wins” still must face the other for a long time. The department may begin an uprising against the chair—either passively or actively.

Of course, the biggest division might arise when the department is searching for a new chair. There are a myriad of issues here. Faculty who have been around for a while want to maintain their status from the previous chair. These “status” issues might include someone being a director of a program, a graduate coordinator, an advisor. Many of these status issues also include monetary compensation or a reduction in teaching load.

Any of these issues may arise without causing any outright conflict. There may be some passive-aggressive behaviors that occur for a while after a decision has been made. In most cases, the repercussions for unpopular decisions will subside in a short period of time. However, when there is an underlying issue, small, relatively insignificant decisions may precipitate things getting out of control. When this happens, both the chair and the department are in trouble. The biggest single communication problem in a department may be bullying.

Bullying and Mobbing

In the popular media today, bullying has been a most significant topic of conversation. According to what we see and hear, bullying has gone far beyond the elementary school guy who takes milk money from the passive, little boy. Both face-to-face and on line bullying have affected children in a negative way. Suicides, in some cases, have been attributed to one’s being bullied. The process of bullying has moved from elementary school to high school to college to the workplace. In academia, we have seen too much of it.

The demographics of bullying are difficult to determine. Many are never reported. Some bullies are highly sophisticated. In 2010, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) sponsored research by professors at Wilkes University in Pennsylvania to survey the concept of academic bullying. They found:

- Bullies were generally between 41 and 70 years old.
- 75% of bullies were men.
- Women who bully typically bully other women.
- Victims are typically between 31 and 50 years old.
- The faculty bully administrators 50% of the time.
- The administrator bullies a faculty member 50% of the time.
- The average frequency of bullying is once a month.

The results do not tell us much about what we need to know. What we want to know is how to recognize a bully before he gets “out of hand,” how to prevent or diminish bullying, and what to do after it happens.

To recognize a bully, we must know something about what causes it. We will mention just a few reasons. First, a person may start bullying because of a decision about his own failure. If a faculty member applies to become chair, and the committee selects an external candidate instead, the internal candidate becomes irritated. He or she may feel that there is a “conspiracy” of sorts about him and/or his competence. The vengeful bullying that occurs afterward may last for months, years, even decades. In part, this is because the bully feels trapped, relegated to teaching freshmen the rest of his life. This notion may help us with the idea that bullies are usually older. Second, a bully may be simply a “tattle tale” that is out of

hand. This person generally does not have enough to do. More time is spent writing e-mails than journal articles. This person has a tendency to spread rumors, which may or may not be true. Third, is the mob follower. The mob follower may not have been involved in the beginning, but after several meetings with the chief bully in a closed and locked door meeting, the follower is convinced that being a rebellious sort is more valuable than not being one. These are issues to watch for:

Selection committees

Tenure and promotion decisions

“Special awards” to selected faculty members

Spending too much time with selected faculty members

Closed and locked office doors

Substantial and face-paced changes in work attendance

These issues are but a few that appear to “isolate” a faculty member. Bullying is typically caused by power differential problems, although such differences may not be obvious. For example, if a faculty member is given an assignment, such as graduate coordinator, another teacher may become jealous, even if there is no additional compensation or lower teaching load. Perceived prestige, in this case, is quite similar to status (Westhues, 2005); Hickson, Bodon, & Bodon, 2009; Randall, 1997).

One key to determining when such bullying is about to happen is to keep track of changes in behavior of individual faculty members. Closed [and locked] doors are typically problem areas. Missing meetings, sitting outside the group at meetings, complaints about relatively minor issues, and complaints about another person receiving some benefit that this person did not get. Such petty jealousies provide the bully an opportunity to “blame” either the other faculty member or the chair. It is important to nip these issues in the bud. This does not necessarily mean giving in to the potential transgressor. In fact, that may simply lead to a series of requests and demands. The potential offender needs to understand his or her own status in the department. It may be a good time for a realistic assessment. It is also a good time for the chair to explain the criteria for a decision.

The tactics for dealing with these “crucial conversations” have been described well (Patterson, Grenny, Maxfield, McMillan, & Switzler, 2012; Patterson, Grenny, McMillan, & Switzler, 2013). There are a few essential elements in this approach. The authors recommend that we “start with heart” (Patterson, et al., 2012, pp. 33-49). The worst thing a chair can do here is to place the situation into a win-lose situation. In part, this is because that is exactly what the bully does. Second, it is important that the chair not lose his or her temper. Certainly the bully will translate that behavior into a win for himself. As difficult as it may be, it is important for the chair to try to empathize with the bully.

These are the times when communication skills truly come into play. The chair should look at an instance like this as trying to find out where the bully is coming from. At the same time, it is appropriate to search for common ground, although not too quickly. The procedure for doing this is by starting with “facts.” As the chair goes through a list of facts, which should be developed before the meeting, and try to determine how many of the facts the faculty agrees are facts. This is an excellent starting point for two reasons. First, you have the possibility of starting out with some agreements (as few as there may be). Second, you can begin eliminating some potential issues that may not be issues at all. After agreeing or disagreeing about facts, it is a good time to use Schein’s (2013) humble inquiry. Asking questions is far more valuable than making demands. If we can think of it this way, we can

use punctuation as an analogy. The facts part is the period. The asking part is the question mark. And what we want to avoid is the exclamation mark.

By starting this interaction before things truly get out of hand, the chair avoids potential disaster. This type of disaster is what is referred to as *mobbing*. Mobbing occurs when several faculty members gang up on one victim. The “closed door” syndrome is frequently the place where the bully attempts to recruit. The expert bully can think of things where the chair not only discriminated against him, but where the chair also discriminated against these other people. In these instances, the department becomes divided, most people throughout the university community become aware of it, and certainly higher level administrators know about it. It reduces productivity—and probably resources—because the dean is using so much of her time dealing with your department.

Managing Privacy

There are cases where the chair needs to manage the privacy of those who enter his office. Students and faculty alike have personal problems that they need to share with the chair but not with anyone else. In this sense, the chair is a counselor. While all public information should be shared, these personal conversations should be kept private. In large measure, a chair who knows how to separate the two is likely to be more successful.

Summary

It is important that chairs utilize appropriate, ethical, and legal communication. While most chairs have little knowledge of the law, it is important that they talk to legal counsel about issues where someone threatens the chair with a law suit. Many will offer advice about such cases. For the most part, though, when a chair acts in an appropriate and ethical manner she is safe from losing a law suit. In advance of potential problems, the chair needs to be aware of what might become issues. While office space sounds miniscule, it can become a beginning point for conflict. Bullying and mobbing can destroy a department. One should always try to look at the situation from the other person’s viewpoint. It’s a great start!

References

- Bell, A. H., & Smith, D. M. (2004). *Difficult people at work: How to cope, how to win*. New York: MJF Books.
- Davenport, N., Schwartz, R. D., & Elliot, G. P. (2005). *Mobbing: Emotional abuse in the American workplace*. Ames, IA: Civil Society.
- Fritz, J. M. H. (2013). *Professional civility: Communicative virtue at work*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Garner, A. (1981). *Conversational speaking: Tested new ways to increase your personal and social effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hickson, M. III, Bodon, J., & Bodon, T. (2009). 2nd ed. Modeling cultures: Toward grounded paradigms in organizations and mass culture. In D. W. Stacks & M. B. Salwen, eds. *An integrated approach to communication theory and research*, (pp. 280-298). New York: Routledge.
- Hickson, M. III, & Roebuck, J. B. (2009). *Deviance and crime in colleges and universities: What goes on in the halls of ivy*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Hickson, M. III, & Stacks, D. W. (1992). Providing information. In M. Hickson III, & D. W. Stacks, (eds), *Effective communication for academic chairs* (pp. 207-223). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1992). Motivating faculty. In M. Hickson, III, & D. W. Stacks, (eds), *Effective communication for academic chairs* (pp. 159-182). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2003). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

- Patterson, K., Grenny, J., McMillan, R., & Switzler, A. (2012). *Crucial conversations: Tools for talking when stakes are high*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Patterson, K., Grenny, J., McMillan, R., & Switzler, A. (2013). 2nd ed. *Crucial accountability: Tools for resolving violated expectations, broken commitments, and bad behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Randall, P. (1997). *Adult bullying: Perpetrators and victims*. London: Routledge.
- Schein, E. H. (2013). *Humble inquiry: The gentle art of asking instead of telling*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Westhues, K. (1998). *The envy of excellence: Administrative mobbing of high-achieving professors*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

**The Basic Course Using GIAs: One Department's Journey through the Ups
and Downs of Establishing a Lecture/Lab Delivery Model for the
Basic Communication Course**

Kathy Brady¹
Tammy French²
Sue Wildermuth³

The basic communication course has many demands placed upon it—and in turn, places many demands on communication departments and their faculty and staff. According to the 2013 National Communication Association (NCA) president, Steven A. Beebe, the basic course serves as the “discipline’s front porch,” making it “the most important room in the disciplinary home of communication studies” (Beebe, 2013, p. 3). Morreale, Myers, Backlund, and Simonds (2016) elaborate further on the critical role of this hard-working course: “The basic course serves to introduce students to the communication discipline, recruiting undergraduates as majors and acting as the primary means by which communication students learn the praxis of communication education while completing their degrees” (p. 338). The multi-section basic course has been identified as “usually central, in many ways, to the general health of the entire academic program” (Sawyer & Behnke, 2001).

In addition to serving the discipline well, the basic communication course also serves the needs of many constituencies outside the discipline because of the important skills the course teaches. One of the most significant examples from within academia is Liberal Education, America’s Promise (LEAP). LEAP self-identifies as “a national advocacy, campus action, and research initiative that describes essential learning outcomes for college students in the 21st century (*About LEAP*, n.d.). Those outcomes include the overarching category of “Intellectual and Practical Skills,” which includes six subcategories, all of which are addressed and enhanced by the basic speech course: inquiry and analysis; critical and creative thinking; written and oral communication; quantitative literacy; information literacy, and teamwork and problem solving” (*Essential Learning Outcomes*, n.d.).

Both the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) (Gray & Koncz, 2014) and the National Association of Colleges and Businesses (NACB) (Ingbretsen, 2009) have identified effective oral communication skills as critical for college graduates. A 2016 survey conducted by NACE of its employer members showed that verbal communication, specifically, the “ability to verbally communicate with persons inside and outside the organization,” is the most important skill desired of employees by employers, outpacing both “ability to work in a team structure” and “ability to make decisions and solve problems.” And presentations, the hallmark of the university public speaking course, were identified by 70% of employed Americans in a sponsored Harris poll as “critical to their success at work” (Gallo, 2016).

The trend of employers either directly or indirectly seeking skill development from colleges and universities has increased. Donoghue (2008) points out, “Skill development, once the exclusive bailiwick of the vocational school, now dominates the curriculum of many colleges and universities. As a result “higher education is job training” (p. 12). The

¹ University of Wisconsin Whitewater

² University of Wisconsin Whitewater

³ University of Wisconsin Whitewater

interest in, and demand for, these communication skills, fostered and demonstrated through the basic course, is not surprising given the results of a 2013 survey conducted by the AAC&U. When the organization surveyed business and non-profit leaders nationally, 93% of survey respondents indicated that “clear communication skills are more important than a potential employee’s undergraduate major” (Hooker & Simonds, 2015, p. 103).

However, despite constituencies both inside and outside of academia valuing the skills fostered by the basic course, resources to support the course appear to be tight across the country. “The ranking of ‘financial support’ as a most prevalent problem in the basic course went up from 29.2 percent in 2010 to 43.7 percent in 2015” (Morreale et al., 2016). This is not surprising given the status of funding for public universities. After adjusting for inflation, funding for public two- and four-year colleges is, in total, nearly \$10 billion below funding levels just before the recession (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016, p. 1).

One way of coping with this budget loss is to increase tuition. However, these increases, “while substantial in most states, have fallen far short nationally of fully replacing the per student support that public colleges and universities have lost due to state funding cuts. In nearly half of the states, tuition increases between 2008 and 2015 have not fully offset cuts to state higher education funding” (Mitchell et al., 2016, p. 14). And for some institutions, tuition hikes are not the answer. The authors’ institution did not raise tuition, as state funding cuts were paired with a state-mandated five-year tuition freeze. Another way of coping with budget pressures is to increase enrollment. Public higher education experienced an 8.6 percent increase in enrollment nationally from the beginning of the recession through the 2013-2014 academic year (the last year for which there is data) (Mitchell et al., 2016, p. 10). The authors’ university experienced a 13.2 percent increase from the start of the recession (2008-2009) through the fall of 2016 (University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, 2016). Regardless of how funding cuts are addressed at an administrative level, the end results are often the same when it comes to impacting the basic communication course at the day to day level—the faculty and staff delivering the course are asked to do more with less.

For example, an increase in enrollment means that at colleges and universities where the basic course is required of all students, both administrators and instructors find themselves trying to serve additional students without additional funds to do so. This is by no means a recent problem. In a 1972 edition of *Speech Teacher*, Cheatham and Jordan worried about “the failure of higher education budgets to expand proportionately with increased college enrollments” (p. 107).

According to the National Communication Association, performance-based courses such as Public Speaking shouldn’t have more than 25 students per section (NCA, 2011). Although the authors’ institution offers 3-week face to face summer courses and online courses during the semester that are capped at 25 students, all traditional 16-week fall and spring sections of the basic course are capped at 32 students. As budgets kept being cut and enrollments kept increasing at this institution, the challenges of offering over 2000 course seats per calendar year required some creative thinking to help meet the demand without new resources. The department was already offering 32-seat sections, a course cap which made it difficult to offer all students in the class enough individual speaking opportunities to increase their skills. Making sections larger than 32 was not an option for the basic course. However, creating large lecture sections and assigning multiple “speaking lab” sections to these lecture sections was. Thus, the lecture/lab model of delivery for the basic communication course was adopted for approximately 50 percent of the basic course offerings per term. Honors sections, learning community sections, and other “specialty”

sections of the basic course are still offered in the traditional one-instructor format. Additionally, the authors' department offers online sections, hybrid sections, and winter/summer term sections to fully meet demand.

Program Design

The current lecture/lab delivery model used in the authors' department for the basic course has an instructor of record who is responsible for delivering the large lectures, and for creating all curriculum, assignments, and assessment measures, and policies for the course, as well as for supervising and mentoring the graduate instructional assistants (GIAs). There are five GIAs on the team who are responsible for facilitating discussions and class exercises in the lab sessions of the course as well as watching and assessing student performances. Together, the team instructs 15 sections of the basic class per term and serves an enrollment of 450 students. The course cap was reduced by two students per section to accommodate the shortage of large lecture halls at the university. The slight reduction allows five sections to come together in one lecture hall for a 50 minute lecture lead by the instructor of record (with the current schedule being 8 am, 9 am and 10 am on Fridays). The lab sessions take place in traditional classrooms and are conducted by the GIAs (with the current schedule being 8 am, 9 am and 10 am on Mondays and Wednesdays).

It is important to note that the use of a lecture/lab format for general education courses across the curriculum is nothing new. Science departments have been delivering courses using this format for decades, and lecture/lab models for delivering the basic communication course have been used at large research universities for many years as well. However, the authors' university is a comprehensive teaching-focused university that is part of a large state-wide university system. A lecture/lab module that uses graduate students as part of the instructional team is unique for comprehensives in this system as there are strict system regulations that needed to be overcome. The system has very specific rules about the type and level of training one needs in order to be an instructor at one of the state comprehensive universities. A master's degree in a related field is a minimum requirement. Additionally, hiring of instructional staff is regulated carefully by the system Human Resources Office for fair and diverse hiring practices. Thus, it took a long time and very careful structuring of the program to ensure that the graduate instructional assistants were truly assisting in the classroom, and were not responsible for content delivery or creation. Additionally, the requirements for the position had to be carefully crafted so that they did not conflict with system hiring practices. When the program was approved, the communication department became the only program on the authors' comprehensive university campus to have graduate assistants in any kind of classroom role. All other graduate assistantships on that campus are research or student services based.

The current graduate instructional assistant program developed over a number of years, starting with a team-taught approach in 2007 in which three of the department's strongest public speaking faculty members and instructors collaborated on a combined syllabus. The course included a 96-student lecture section roughly once a week and individual lab sections of 32 students with each instructor. Over the course of three years and the rotation of different instructors, the combined lecture/lab process was fine-tuned. Then the paperwork began seeking system approval to convert this team-taught model to one of an instructor of record and graduate instructional assistants (GIAs). The program has now been in place for 9 years and has operated under three different instructor of records.

Rewards of the Program

Cost Savings

The benefits of the program are numerous. The most significant one is cost savings. The program saves nearly 39 percent per year in comparison to having the 15 sections of the basic course taught by faculty or academic staff. When the program was being developed, the authors' department received excellent advice from faculty at another university who had developed a similar cost-savings program. They stressed that a plan for spending the savings needed to be built into the program and the whole program approved with those spending plans in place. Otherwise, the savings could easily be "lost" to the college or the university over time, and not be re-allocated to the department. When the program was first established, the department received the following benefits:

- Providing an additional one-course load reduction per semester for the Graduate Coordinator (2 courses per academic year)
- Providing coverage for 2 courses per semester for the Instructor of Record (4 courses per academic year)
- Additional course releases (2 per semester) for tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Communication Department (4 courses per academic year)
- Additional 700-level offerings to enhance graduate curricular offerings (1 per semester; 2 courses per academic year)

Unfortunately, during the budget crisis, the department lost many of cost-savings from the program, as they were redirected to the College level and the dean. For example, the monies for research course releases were redirected to the College.

Graduate Student Stipends

The authors' graduate program is able to offer six graduate stipends (five for the GIAs and one research assistantship). Previously, the department had no assistantships. The graduate school had some assistantships that our department's graduate students could apply for, but we had no funds to provide assistantships of our own. These new assistantships allow the department to be more competitive with other comparable graduate programs at attracting and recruiting high quality graduate students.

Reduction in Part-time Adjuncts and Course Cohesion

An additional benefit was a reduction in the number of short-term and often very part-time adjuncts that had been used to cover the course in the past. Because the department tries to take a unified approach to COMM 110, using the same rubrics and several mandatory assignments across all its sections, this instructor of record/GIA-approach provides much more educational cohesion than the department would receive from twelve to fifteen extremely part-time adjuncts teaching the course. Most adjuncts also teach at night, which means that they function largely outside the life of the department, increasing a feeling of isolation and exacerbating the difficulty of maintaining the cohesion in the course that the department seeks. As the department has found anecdotally that students

are far less interested in taking night classes than they were several years ago, a reduction in night courses has also been a plus.

Graduate Student Employability

GIAAs are required to be full-time graduate students (taking 9 credits per semester), which is in keeping with the School of Graduate Studies' other assistantships. In addition to full-time course work, GIAAs are required to perform 20 hours per week of instructional activities related to their COMM 110 sections. GIAAs are on campus much more than students working full time and/or commuting for one or two night classes. In addition, GIAAs interact more with faculty and fellow students, and simply become more immersed in academic life. Building a sense of community is less challenging when students are here for larger amounts of time; thus our GIA graduate students are more connected to the program and, in turn, have a more satisfying graduate experience. They become more connected to faculty and often take part in research because of those connections, receive faculty recommendations, and ultimately, thrive in the job market. Our GIAAs have gone on to a wide variety of professional experiences, including corporate trainers, sales, legislative aides, research analysts, college instructors, and PhD candidates.

Diversity & Global Perspectives

The ability of the program to offer assistantships helps to recruit students from international locations, and from under-represented populations, as well as nontraditional students with professional experience. A greater diversity in COMM 110 instructors enables undergraduate students in these classes to better understand the value of multiple perspectives.

Challenges

While the benefits of the lecture/lab basic course delivery model seem to outweigh the challenges, the goal of this paper is provide an honest, detailed overview of the process of creating this program so that other departments struggling with budget restrictions and growing enrollments can learn from our experiences. Thus, significant time will be spent discussing the challenges faced and the strategies implemented to address those challenges. Some of these challenges evolved over time and some are still being overcome.

Physical Space Limitations

When the program began, the department was able to reserve both the large lecture room and the small lab rooms for all class meeting dates. This allowed flexibility in scheduling. Lectures were usually Mondays and labs were usually Wednesdays and Fridays, but lectures could be moved to Wednesdays or Fridays— or two lectures could be scheduled in one week if necessary. Some weeks could even be all discussion days if students were giving speeches. However, as enrollments across campus increased, demand for classroom space increased as well. It was no longer possible to book both rooms for all class periods. Now the class is limited to three large lecture sections of 150 students each (and course enrollments cannot go any bigger as there is not a lecture hall on campus that seats more than 150 available to us) and lectures must be scheduled back to back in one block of time in

the mornings because that is when the room is available. This is draining for the instructor of record. It is hard to maintain the level of energy and enthusiasm necessary to engage 150 students in a lecture setting when you are lecturing three times back to back. Additionally, as the 150-seat room is in high demand, we are limited each term in what day we can have it. Some semesters we only get it every Friday morning, for example. Thus, regardless of what scheduling might work best for the flow of the class and the timing of various lectures or speaking days, these room restrictions mean that the structure and organization of course content is determined by space limitations rather than by what best enhances student learning. Thus, when planning for a large lecture/small lab course, room availability and scheduling is something that should be carefully examined to see if it can be appropriately adapted to the nature and needs of the course being considered.

Recruitment and Retention of Quality GIAs

Many of the challenges for the department relate to recruitment and retention of high quality GIAs. Unlike some graduate programs, the authors' state does not allow tuition remission. Out-of-state GIA candidates are able to qualify for in-state tuition, and GIAs earn a salary (approximately \$16,000) but they are all still responsible for their tuition bill. Thus, financial incentives are limited in the authors' program. Their graduate program is strong and attractive, but was designed more for working professionals than for potential PhD students. Thus, from within the pool of graduate students, there is a far smaller pool of candidates who are strong students, who can be successful as classroom assistants, and who have the time available to dedicate themselves full-time to graduate school and working as a GIA. While the ability to offer stipends has increased the attractiveness of the program, there is still a struggle to find enough qualified GIA candidates.

To date, the program's most successful recruits are its own undergraduates. As they near the end of the graduate careers, faculty will encourage them to consider graduate school, and will tell them about the department's GIA program. As many of them are considering working in fields where a master's degree is an asset, or where experience in adult education is valued, they benefit from considering a GIA position. Additionally, the graduate program coordinator shares the GIA position possibility with all incoming graduate school applicants. However, the small pool of students in the program who are able to commit to full-time graduate school has resulted in semesters where there have been limited qualified candidates to choose from. This has led to offering contracts to candidates who have potential, but who are more vulnerable to mistakes. The danger in hiring GIAs who require extensive nurturing, training and guidance is the potential that a weak GIA could bring down the quality of the program as a whole. Additionally, these GIAs require an inordinate amount of time and investment on the part of the instructor of record and other faculty mentors in the department. This means that other GIAs do not receive as much time and attention as they deserve and may be asked to do more work independently because the instructor of record is spending so much time on one struggling GIA.

The department is exploring a variety of strategies to strengthen the pool of applicants, including recruiting at collegiate forensics tournaments and increasing the department presence at NCA and CSCA. Talbot, Hartley, Marzetta, and Wee (2015) suggest using undergraduate learning assistants in the classroom in order to accomplish two goals. The first is that strong undergraduate assistants would be able to help support the GIAs with their significant workloads. The other is that the strongest of the undergraduate learning

assistants would make strong GIA applicants. Although the department has not pursued this option, it is an interesting and appealing one.

Stresses of the GIA Position

Each GIA is responsible for assisting with three sections of the basic course—90 students in total, while also being required to take nine credits of graduate coursework (graduate students must be enrolled full-time in order to be eligible for an assistantship). These responsibilities can cause stress. Although the vast majority of GIAs in this program have thrived, there were two instances where GIAs ultimately failed. One was a high-spirited instructor who was very popular with the students and had very strong and natural teaching ability. A perfectionist, he found the position of being both graduate student and instructor too stressful because he could not find the time to complete each assignment and instructor task to perfection. The other was a returning vet in his 50s who seemed extremely motivated for the position and the opportunity to earn a degree that would lead to permanent college instruction. Unfortunately, the stress of the situation exacerbated a preexisting mental health condition, causing the instructor to barely finish the semester. It is essential that programs figure out ways to mitigate the stressors this position can place on GIAs. In the authors' department, new faculty hires have "light" teaching loads the first semester, so they can adapt to the challenges of the tenure track. The authors' program is considering something similar with the GIAs. For example, this upcoming fall, the department has two students who are starting graduate school in September, but will not begin their GIA duties until January. These students will be able to adapt to the rigors of graduate school, and will be able to participate in GIA training to have an understanding of their responsibilities and acclimate to the position before being immersed fulltime.

One factor that makes a big difference in reducing the stress levels of our GIAs is a determined effort by the department and the instructor of record to ensure that the GIAs know they are a valued part of the department staff. The morale of the GIAs is considered throughout the semester. GIAs have a lot to balance in their lives (the demands of graduate school, grading and managing 90 undergraduates, personal lives, etc.), and keeping them in a positive frame of mind is beneficial to everyone involved, particularly during periods of the semester when grading gets overwhelming. For that reason, end of semester celebratory lunches, occasional thank you notes and treats, and appreciative emails and texts are purposely built into the program to help maintain an upbeat atmosphere within the GIA team.

Breakdown of Instructor of Record and GIA Roles

A critical element of the program structure is the breakdown of responsibilities between the instructor of record (who over the years has been a tenured faculty member, a tenure track faculty member, and a permanent academic staff instructor) and the GIAs. The instructor of record is the one who creates all class rubrics, schedules, syllabi and course policies. He or she is also the one responsible for ultimately providing grades for students—although GIAs play a large role in their calculation. It is critical that the instructor of record be the one to provide the final grade, as this helps take "heat" off the GIAs. All disputes and complaints go to the instructor of record, ensuring that graduate instructors are not forced to deal with high-level conflict resolution situations.

The following job descriptions were developed to provide clarification on the roles:

GIAs undertake the following responsibilities:

1. Lead three discussion sections of Speech 110 per semester which includes:
 - facilitating class discussions and in-class activities
 - watching and evaluating presentations
 - grading outlines, reflection papers, etc.
 - proctoring exams.
2. Observe all COMM 110 lectures presented by the Instructor of Record.
3. Hold office hours.
4. Attend training meetings for GIAs and individual conferences scheduled with the Instructor of Record.
5. Participate in evaluation of the GIA program.
6. Attend additional training sessions as needed for D2L, use of Library, LEARN Center offerings, etc.

The Instructor of Record for COMM 110 courses taught in conjunction with GIAs, would be a graduate faculty member (*this policy has changed since the inception of the program*) who has exhibited a high level of teaching ability. The IOR would have the following responsibilities:

1. Preparing and delivering lectures
2. Designing the course and writing the syllabus in consultation with the Basic Course Coordinator.
3. Creating assignments and the associated grading rubrics.
4. Creating exams and quizzes.
5. Setting up a D2L site for GIA sections of 110
6. Being the point person for COMM 110 student concerns and disputes (e.g. student problems with their GIA; academic misconduct issues, etc.).
7. Entering all student grades for team-taught COMM 110 classes.
8. Acting as the substitute when a GIA is unable to meet with his/her class.
9. Participating in GIA selection including developing application materials, talking with prospective applicants, reviewing applications, participating in the interview process, informing GIAs of their selection and responsibilities.
10. Coordinating and leading GIA orientation in the Fall with input from the Graduate Coordinator and Basic Course Coordinator
11. Leading periodic, scheduled GIA meetings
12. Meeting individually with GIAs as needed
13. Participating in GIA's assessments/reviews
14. Participating in assessment of the GIA program.

Talbot et. al (2015) stresses that GIAs should have a consistent presence in the lectures—so that they can be assessed by the faculty member as they facilitate breakout sessions, interact with students, etc. This also helps the students see the faculty as a team. It is up to the individual instructor of record to determine what type of interaction he or she would like GIAs to have with students during the large lecture sections.

Concerns about Student Engagement and Learning

Talbot et. al (2015) states that large enrollment courses are the least effective way to teach, and that student engagement and satisfaction in such classes is moderate at best. Much is riding on the success of the large lecture section, including serving as a key indicator as to whether or not a student will continue at that particular university (Twigg, 2003). Researchers have shown that a sense of community in the classroom instills a greater “greater academic motivation, affinity for school, and enjoyment of class” (Glaser and Bingham, 2009). And this community can be difficult to establish in a large lecture setting. Thus, using the lecture/lab model in a general education course that is important to attracting and retaining new majors is potentially risky.

TAs are very important, but most universities (including ours) allocate little resources and time to training and supporting them. GIAs are graduate students first and TAs second. Despite it being critical to their success that GIAs focus on their own studies first, the demands on their time are extreme. It is imperative that instructors of record take a supportive viewpoint of their GIAs’ educational goals and needs. Given the financial savings that such a course structure has to offer, the change from the self-contained model to the GIA model seems a win for the department, but there is concern that it is not as good for the students (Wildermuth, French and Fredrick, 2013).

Solutions

Training

Given that the large lecture sections employ a more traditional lecture format, allowing for less student feedback and instructor interaction, the ability of the GIAs to provide engaging lab sections that encourage student interaction is key to the success of the program.

The demand for high quality engagement in each of the lab sections places a great deal of responsibility squarely on the GIAs. Talbot et al. (2015) lists 5 research-based things to do in large lecture/lab classes to help counter the fact that they are one of the least effective ways to teach—and number 1 is: use pedagogically trained TAs. Because so much of the program’s success depends on the pedagogical skills of the GIAs, appropriate training is a key component. Existing research clearly supports an emphasis on training for teaching assistants. Instructional effectiveness and overall confidence as teachers were greatly improved when graduate academic programs provided appropriate, consistent, formal and systematic instructional support, mentorship, and support processes (Russell, 2009).

Training at the graduate instructional assistant level provides the opportunity to strengthen the academy as a whole, as some GIAs will continue on to permanent higher education teaching positions. It is still true that most faculty members receive little or no teaching training (Jones, 2008) even though they report spending more time teaching than conducting research (Tulane & Beckert, 2011; Gale & Golde, 2004; Golde & Door, 2001; Magnuson, 2002).

The authors’ program starts training with a two-day intensive training workshop prior to the start of the semester. The goals of this workshop are to begin getting the new GIAs acclimated. This involves helping move their point of view from one of student to teacher, and since many GIAs are joining the program after just finishing up their undergraduate degree, this perspective shift doesn’t always happen immediately. Training elements also include introductions to course policies, course assignments, and the overall teaching philosophy of the instructor of record. Additionally, since the GIAs need to work

closely and ultimately share in the important teaching process for students, the beginning pieces of camaraderie begins forming at this training.

To reach these goals, the workshop is held over two days. On the first day, the instructor of record and new GIAs meet to discuss the responsibilities and expectations for them, for the course, and for the students. They also explore the online course management system. On the second day, the veteran GIAs join the “rookies”, and can lend their insights to some of the common challenges and rewards of the position. The new GIAs seem to appreciate the insights of their new colleagues who they perhaps view as more “in the trenches” than the instructor of record. Together the rookie and veteran GIAs work with the instructor of record on speech grading, and speech norming (watching and grading some speeches together). This is purposefully done very early in the training process; naturally, the new GIAs aren’t usually sure what to look or listen for, and this process often makes them quite uncomfortable. This very early submergence into some of the grading experiences they will be facing, however, serves to help them understand what the early weeks in class will ultimately be leading up to.

Training doesn’t end when the two-day workshop is over. Weekly meetings are crucial for new GIAs, and even for veterans who continually run into new student situations. The weekly training consists of several important parts. First, GIAs are encouraged to discuss troubling or potentially troubling situations or students. Typical topics that surface are students who haven’t attended class for several weeks, a student causing a disruption in the classroom that the GIA isn’t sure how to handle, or students who are causing a conflict after earning poor grades. In the past, however, these frank discussions have also included less common but perhaps more alarming issues such as students exhibiting depressive, withdrawn behaviors, and students who might have been succumbing to other addictive and/or troublesome actions, which allows the instructor of record to be able to get in touch with the proper professionals on campus just in case the student needs extra resources.

Another part of the weekly meetings includes a walk through the week of lesson plans. A binder is given to each GIA at the beginning of the semester which includes a lesson plan for every class day, all assignments and handouts, and supplemental training materials (articles, etc.) for the GIAs to refer to as needed. This binder is brought to each weekly meeting, and this makes it very easy to cover the expectations for each class period, and the activity and assignment they will be working on and discussing with their students. Having all of the materials in one spot makes meetings flow much more efficiently. By going over the weekly lesson plans, both the instructor of record and veteran GIAs have time to share information about best practices for those lessons.

Finally, weekly meetings include any announcements and/or reminders the instructor of record may have regarding the course, which may include things like reminding GIAs to be firm with attendance and tardiness, etc., letting them know a visitor will be coming to class to make an important announcement, etc.

Additional training also occurs prior to the two big assignments in the class, which are the informative outline and speech, and the persuasive outline and speech. Because the team strives for consistency, norming is a critical form of training. Prior to collecting speech outlines from students, sample outlines are graded and then discussed among GIAs and the instructor of record. This allows for all GIAs to weigh in and discuss how they assess any given element of the assignment, share their thoughts, and see how their opinions stacked up to others. The same practice is done with speeches—the team watches sample speeches and grades them together, and in all cases consistency and uniformity is the goal.

This consistency is an important part of the success of the class. A student in the class needs to feel that he/she would receive similar instruction, and presumably the same feedback and grade, regardless of which of the five GIAs he/she is working with. New GIAs seem to appreciate the high amounts of structure; each lab day usually contains anywhere from three to six items that need to be accomplished that day. Flexibility is permitted in certain spots, however, because complete rigidity can become frustrating for veteran GIAs. One example of an area of flexibility is activities. Although every GIA is expected to facilitate the same activity, the actual manner and format can be determined separately. Some GIAs prefer students to work in groups, some prefer students to work independently, some GIAs prefer to make Powerpoint slides to help debrief an activity, and some prefer just to discuss the ideas orally.

Assessment

There is a lot at stake with our GIAs—if we have significant problems in a classroom, the entire program is affected. For that reason, assessment is important. The first part of this evaluation process is for the instructor of record to visit each lab section of each GIA, thus watching each GIA three times each semester. This allows the instructor to take notes regarding the GIA's teaching style, the class climate, any mistakes or omissions that might have occurred, as well as noting positive behaviors demonstrated by the GIA. Additionally, it's useful for students to see the instructor of record present in their lab class for the period, so they see the instructor as connected to and involved with what goes on in those classes. If any GIA seems to be having problems in their classes, the instructor will visit even more often.

At the end of every semester a performance review is conducted between the instructor of record and each GIA individually, to let each of them know things they are doing well and to provide one or two goals for the upcoming semester. These are based on classroom observations, student opinion surveys, observations of student interactions in the GIA office, etc. This is a great opportunity to offer corrective behaviors, if necessary, as well as to praise efforts and let GIAs know they are valued.

Programs should be encouraged to allow GIAs to evaluate the instructor of record as well. This feedback will be valuable not only to the IOR, but to the program as a whole, and should be valuable in improving not only GIA training, but the large lecture sections as well as the course overall.

Discussion

The program described in this article is a complicated one to execute well because it combines the challenge of the large lecture section with the equally great challenges of the public speaking classroom where few students are willing participants. This means that the teamwork between the instructor of record and the graduate instructional assistants is absolutely critical. Although the instructor of record is, indeed, the supervisor of the GIAs, there must be mutual respect and support for the program to work.

The biggest challenge might be the actual establishment of the program itself for comprehensive universities where instruction by graduate assistants has been frowned on in the past as violating the university's mission of small class sizes taught by professors. Each university will need to deal with their own administration and supervisory structure (such as a board of regents) to establish a similar program.

Other challenges include the financial ability to set up a program where GIAs can receive significant financial compensation for their work. In the authors' case, their university system prohibits the waiving—or even discounting—of tuition for graduate assistants, beyond allowing out-of-state students to receive in-state tuition. Because many graduate students today already have employment or have family obligations that prevent them from full-time graduate study, the pool of students from which these types of programs will attempt to draw is already small. It is advantageous for programs to be as competitive as they can be to attract the best qualified graduate instructional assistants.

There is significant savings to be found in such a program, which can have many advantages for the department housing it. Sadly, these savings may become nearly irresistible for administrators, which is what happened to the authors' department. Most of the flexible funds the department enjoyed from the program were absorbed at the college level and not seen again.

Perhaps the most critical aspect of planning is developing a strong training program. The first year will be critical to start strong out of the gate as there will not be any veteran GIAs to help support the instructor of record and new GIAs. If expectations are made clear – and the critical difference in responsibilities between the instructor of record and GIAs is outlined clearly, this can be a great learning experience for both those in front of the classroom and those in the seats.

References

- About LEAP. (n.d.). *Liberal education and America's promise*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/leap>.
- Beebe, S. (2013). Message from the president: "Our front porch". *Spectra*, 49(2), 3-22.
- Cheatham, R., & Jordan, W. (1972, March). An investigation of graduate assistants in teaching the public speaking course. *Speech Teacher*, 21(2), 107-114.
- Donoghue, F. (2008). *The last professors: The corporate university and the fate of the humanities*. New York: Fordham University.
- Essential learning outcomes. (n.d.) *Liberal education and America's promise*. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/leap/essential-learning-outcomes>.
- Gale, R., & Golde, C.M. (2004). Doctoral education and the scholarship of teaching learning. *Peer Review*, 6(3), 8-12.
- Gallo, C. (2014). New survey: 70% say presentation skills are critical for career success. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/carminegallo/2014/09/25/new-survey-70-percent-say-presentation-skills-critical-for-career-success/print/>.
- Garrison, T. (2011). The oceanography classroom: In praise of teaching assistants. *Oceanography*, 24(3), 309.
- Glaser, H. F., & Bingham, S. (2009). Students' perceptions and other connectedness in the community college basic Public Speaking Course. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9(2), 57-69.
- Golde, C.M., & Dore, T. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Gray, K., & Koncz, A. (2014). The skills/qualities employers want in new college graduate hires. Retrieved from <https://www.nacweb.org/about-us/press/class02015-skills-qualities-employers-want.aspx>.
- Hooker, J.F., & Simonds, C. J. (2015). From the outside looking in: Employers' views of the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 27(12), 102-116.
- Ingbretsen, R. M. (2009). What employers really look for when hiring a college graduate in 2009. Retrieved from <http://ezinearticles.com/?What-Employers-Really-Look-For-When-Hiring-a-College-Graduate-in-2009&id=1979848>.
- Jones, A. (2008). Preparing new faculty members for their teaching role. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 143, 93-100.
- Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1st year. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 41, 306-320.
- Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., & Masterson, K. (2016). Funding down, tuition up: State cuts to higher education threaten quality and affordability at public colleges. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*, 1-28.

- Morreale, S. P., Myers, S. A., Backlund, P. M., & Simonds, C. J. (2016). Study IX of the basic communication course at two- and four-year U.S. colleges and universities: a re-examination of our discipline's "front porch." *Communication Education, 65*(3), 338-355.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2016). *Employers say verbal communication most important candidate skill* [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.naceweb.org/about-us/press/2016/verbal-communication-most-important-candidate-skill.aspx>.
- National Communication Association (2011). National Communication Association's standards for undergraduate communication programs. Retrieved from https://www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/More_Scholarly_Resources/Chairs_Corner/Standards_for_Program_Review_and_Assessment/PDF-SPRA-Standards_for_Undergraduate_Communication_Programs.pdf.
- Russell, J. A. (2009). A survey of basic instructional program graduate teaching assistant development and support processes. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 80*(4), 792-795.
- Sawyer, C. R. and Behnke, R. R. (2001). Computer-assisted competencies in the basic speech course. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 30*, 104-110.
- Talbot, M., Hartley, L. M. et. al. (2015). Transforming undergraduate science education with learning assistants: Student satisfaction in large-enrollment courses. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 44*(5), 24-30.
- Tulane, S. & Beckert, T.E. (2011). *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 11*(4), 44-53.
- Twigg, C. A. (2003). Improving quality and reducing cost: Designs for effective learning. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 35*(4), 22-49.
- University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (2017). University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Historical Student Enrollment Data. Retrieved from www.uww.edu.
- Wildermuth, S. M., French, T. and Fredrick, E. (2013). Finding the right fit: Assessing the impact of traditional v. large lecture/small lab course formats on a general education course. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 7*(1), article 6.

Student Philanthropy: Learning and Community Transformation in a College Philanthropy Course

Daniel Blaeuer¹

Over the past two years, I have been honored to develop a course on student philanthropy in a communication studies department. The course provides students the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to be philanthropists for a semester by awarding a small grant to a community nonprofit. My experiences in philanthropy illustrate how philanthropy and student philanthropy in particular can be an exciting part of a communication studies curriculum and how philanthropy develops organically out of community dialogue efforts. I hope, in sharing the essay, other communities and communication studies departments can develop student philanthropy programs at their institutions to bring nonprofits, philanthropists and higher education together in a win-win relationship to spur community innovation.

Community Giving and KINS Innovation Circles

Malcom Gladwell, in his famous essay *Six degrees of Lois Weisberg*, describes how important Lois Weisberg is to the citizen of Chicago by being the “kind of person who brings people together” (Gladwell, 1999, p. 2). Lois Weisberg, according to Gladwell and I am sure most of those people knew her, had the uncanny gift to facilitate social connections and foster social capital in her community to promote positive social change. I hope every community has at least one Lois Weisberg who labors, often unpaid and unacknowledged, to develop these relationship, but I am glad that at least on the east coast of Florida, Sharon Joy is our Lois Weisberg.

I was lucky enough to meet Sharon Joy as I was facilitating a World Café public dialogue for the Earth Charter in St. Petersburg, Florida. At the time, I was pursuing my doctorate in communication and community engagement. Six years later, I left Tampa for a new job in Miami and remember fondly turning to Sharon Joy to ask if she knew anyone in Miami who could help me get established in my work. I am an academic specializing in community engaged scholarship and the thought of cultivating relationships from scratch was daunting. Of course, Sharon Joy knew people! She quickly emailed ten people giving me a wonderful introduction to the Magic City of Miami.

Within a few months, Sharon Joy would insist that I make the four hour trip from Miami back to St Petersburg to join her at a small gathering for a philanthropic giving circle with community change agents. When Sharon Joy, like Lois Weisberg in Chicago, invites you to something and insist that you attend it is difficult to miss it. No matter the distance! The giving circle was aimed at exploring and incubating green innovations and transitioning the local economy to a green economy. Sharon Joy was joined at the innovation circle by Susan Davis Moora who has worked closely with communities and philanthropists across the globe to develop high impact innovation circles, which she calls KINS Innovation Circles (Moora-Davis, 2010). Having been a dialogue facilitator for years, I understood well Ms. Moora’s basic ground rules for a KINS innovation Circle to insure a healthy conversation and productive workgroup. The ground rules are relatively simple and include:

¹ Florida International University

1. Our strategy is generosity.
2. A deal is a good deal when it is good for all concerned.
3. Members contribute what they love to do and do well and little else, in heart-based rather than mind-based behavior.
4. Members sit at the table of unknowing and their co-create their transformative missions for the highest good of all concerned, including Earth
5. Given the KINS diversity, members understand that it will be normal to feel triggered. Thus members agree that, when they fell upset, they will go within and ask what within them is asking to be healed. They feel free to ask for help if needed and, after turning the upset into an opportunity, they may share the story of empowering themselves with the network.
6. Everyone has equal time at the MIC
7. All information is available to all the members all the time
8. Members do their best to return emails and phone calls within 48 hours
9. Cutting-edge information from each constituency is shared confidentially, building trust among members.

Moora's work in group facilitation and networks, as the list above illustrates, focuses on the role of self-work and personal growth in the process of giving and community service. In this way, KINS seeks to attract people with high credibility and integrity in his or her community or constituent groups. The first weekend retreat, a Founder's Retreat in the KINS process, involves periods of self-reflection and meditation as the group collectively tries to image a mission statement and intention for their time together.

The mediation and self-growth process emerges, from my understanding, in a large part from Moora's own history developing giving circles in Chicago. Moora, as she recounts in her autobiography, realized women were often outliving their male partners in high net-worth families and as a result many of these women felt disempowered around their own wealth and influence. Moora invited these women to meet together at Harris Bank to have conversations and to create a place where they could discuss their intentions for their wealth and their communities. Many of the discussions led participants to express a desire to spur networks for women to support each other that led to the Chicago Network and Committee of 200 for female business leaders and CEO's. Others expressed a desire for socially conscious giving and investment practices that led to the development of The Solar Circle, Investor Circle, and Social Venture Network for socially conscious investments.

At the initial meetings in Florida, I was shocked and delighted to find an old student of mine, Ryan, from a *Community, Culture and Communication* course I taught a few years back. The class involved service learning and required a significant community project. My former student did his service learning project with an organic farm and to my memory at least must have decided during the semester that farming was more exciting than my lectures. In any case, Ryan found his passion and was now an emerging leader in the organic farming community and starting small organic farm businesses. Ryan sitting around the circle got me thinking that it would be exciting if Susan Davis Moora's KINs process could be adapted to a university classroom by bringing diverse students into a group to develop an innovation circle. Ideally, it could also connect those students with local philanthropists hoping to make a local impact by sharing the resources needed to bring ideas to life.

At the time of the first meeting, I was just finishing my dissertation and beginning a career as a research professor. I did not know then how my experiences in KINS could connect with my career path and was fearful that it was a distraction. Giving Circles and

Innovation Circles are exciting, but they are difficult to express in one's academic Curriculum Vita and the risk was difficult for me to take at the time. Regretfully, I left the KINS Circle.

Community Giving in a University Classroom

My chance to reconnect with the idea of community giving emerged three years later when two philanthropists approached the university to invite proposals for how a university department could develop a class in philanthropy. The goal of the philanthropists was to create an “ethos of giving” in our students. They wanted students to understand the work of philanthropy and the responsibility that comes with it, to understand the work of nonprofits, and to consider careers in nonprofit organizations. The philanthropists were inspired by similar philanthropy classes at several major academic institutions and the Miami Philanthropists felt the program would be even more important in the South Florida community because the community is just beginning to develop a robust network of philanthropy and struggles with developing strong attachments to the city.

Knowing they had two goals in mind that were unique, the philanthropists issued a challenge to university departments for a proposal. The philanthropist's challenge resulted in a simple idea that The Department of Communication would take one of its existing courses and use the classroom as a place where students would work directly with a community not-for-profit to design a series of projects that would compete for the funds at the end of the semester. The philanthropist's gift would simply pass through the University's Foundation (as a fiscal agent) on its way to the eventual community not-for-profit. In turn, the not-for-profit would invoice the university for the cost of administering the grant.

The design is simple and easy to replicate in communities. Every semester a class is chosen for an applied writing and communication course directed to a community challenge. During the semester, students identify community needs and opportunities while working with local not-for-profits. Students work in teams using their skills as writers, researchers, and advocates to write project proposals for funding at the end of the semester. The instructor invites not-for-profit leaders to a final class presentation to choose the winning organization for the funding. Although, dishearten to see some projects lose it is helpful to see judges often suggest avenues for runner-ups to develop projects and point to opportunities for additional funding.

On the first day of the class, I surprised the students by telling them that this semester they will become philanthropists and work with community groups to develop projects and proposals to make South Florida a better place. I tell the students that I will coach them in the process, provide consultation, and evaluate the class just like any other class with assignments, tests, and learning objectives. The only difference, and it is significant, is that this semester their classroom learning and assignments would all be directed towards giving away a small grant to make South Florida a better place. I insist that my evaluation and the class grade is independent from the actual award of the funding.

As I developed the class in South Florida and researched other institutions, I learned student philanthropy that combines impactful philanthropy with student learning outcomes has worked across the country. Two National Foundations, The Philanthropy Lab and Learning to Give Foundation, support student philanthropy with generous grants. The Philanthropy Lab has been supporting student philanthropy with 50,000 dollar grants per year at a least fourteen universities. The Learning to Give Foundation gives 5,000 dollar

grants to universities to administer in classes and uses large open classes (MOOC's) to distribute these grants.

The national leader of student service learning, The Campus Compact started Students4Giving in 2007 to promote student philanthropy. The Ohio, Kentucky, and Michigan Campus Compact started, Pay it Forward, to bring student philanthropy to over 30 universities. The University of Northern Kentucky has made the largest adoption of student philanthropy in the country with the generous support of the Manuel D. and Rhoda Mayerson Foundation. The Mayerson project has brought student philanthropy to over 1,000 students and over 40 different courses at The University of Northern Kentucky.

The student philanthropy movement has demonstrated itself as an effective method of experiential learning. Research conducted on the Mayerson project by Ahmed and Olberding (2007) report that of the students involved:

“An overwhelming majority of survey respondents indicated that the philanthropy project increased their awareness of social problems (89.6%) and nonprofit organizations (94.9%), their sense of responsibility to help others in need (88.6%) and the community in which they live (82.6%), and their intention to give money to charity (83.7%) and the community in which they (82.6%), and their intention to give money to charity (83.7%) and to do volunteer work (82.6%). The findings suggest that student philanthropy is a potential strategy for addressing some of the issues underlying the nonprofit identity crisis. In particular, philanthropy projects in the classroom may instill and nurture in students the values of public service and the intention to volunteer for, donate money to, and work for a nonprofit. By doing so, the project may help to attract more young people to the nonprofit sector” (Ahmed & Olberding, 2007, p. 612)

A longitudinal study illustrates that the Mayerson student philanthropy program alumni were more inclined to engage in long-term philanthropy and more likely to report volunteering and giving (Olberding, 2012). Research by the Sillerman Center for The Advancement of Philanthropy by Benenson et al. (2014) demonstrates similar findings from the Pay It Forward program. Benenson, Moldow, and Hahn (2014) state that “our analysis suggest that overall engagement in a Pay it Forward course is more significant than any single component of the course in shifting respondents’ philanthropic, volunteer, and work plans (13). The philanthropist wanted to bring the program to Miami-Dade where they believed it would help a community struggling with civic engagement and participation.

Philanthropy as Conversation

A historical approach to philanthropy, like the one done by George McCully (2008) in *Philanthropy Reconsidered*, argues philanthropy in the United States was historically rooted in a notions of collective well-being and the notion of an expansive requirement for community engagement and service fitting a new country where associational community life was important. The historical approach emphasizes that philanthropy once enjoyed a deeper and more expansive notion of service. It was not until the end of the 19th century when industrialization created massive wealth that the modern notion of the private philanthropy foundation emerged. The model of philanthropy many of us are familiar with regarding private foundations and granting process was a new idea. As a result, philanthropy slowly became a professional activity of a professional class. At the same time, wealth become highly concentrated and the philanthropic class would begin the slow movement towards an insular community very different than the rest of America.

This classical notion of philanthropy is rooted in conversation and community service done directly by individuals and not done with a private foundations. The classical approach is more expansive than the image of philanthropy as the wealthy few helping those less fortunate.

As an instructor influenced by ideas of Community Giving from my experiences in a KINS innovation circle, I followed a humanities approach to philanthropy by focusing the class on debate, discussions and presentations on the community. The students begin with discussions of their personal connections with giving and volunteering. Students then discuss community concerns and issues by making student presentations. The presentations are the basis for student efforts at self-organize into workgroups to begin the process of a community based project. Students then write project updates, case studies, and conduct site visits for their organization and problem area.

The philanthropy class challenges students to begin to understand that civic life may require more than just ‘giving back’ to a community after they are successful. The class offers students an opportunity to explore Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler and Tipton’s (1985) thesis in, *Habits of the Heart*, about the moral and social responsibility of an individual and individualism in general to a larger and more expansive notion of community. Bellah is concerned that Americans have a difficult time expressing their responsibility to the collective well-being of his or her community. In this class students are put in a position to give to a community and they start to grapple with an idea of philanthropy as civic service and they their responsibility to a community. Making students philanthropist invites students to explore what they would do to help a community, but now they are approached with the concrete opportunity to do so.

The model of philanthropy fosters student engagement with his or her community and community issues as they hear speeches on immigration, domestic violence, homelessness, youth empowerment. Students learn about the challenges in his or her community and the many organization who are working day in and day out to make a different. As the students listen to the community, they start to understand the complexity of the challenges they hope to address and the numerous civic organizations already working in the field. Listening to the community is dangerous for the students because they begin to move away from Ivory Tower Solutions to imagined and vague problems towards a deeper understanding of an issue that fosters community-based programs and partnerships.

Student comments inevitably highlight the act of transformation in giving and how they learn something about themselves in the process. One student provides an typical response when she writes:

If there were ever a college course I felt directly impacted our lives as students and future professionals in the modern world, it would be [this] course in which we not only focus on the structure of writing effectively, essentially learning how to incorporate ourselves within the professional world because of it, but also on the impact we can make on the world through philanthropy. Being equipped with the opportunity to receive \$10,000 for a social impact project allowed him to gain the undivided attention of his students. [...] The most important lesson to be learned in the class is through the project itself. Realizing the possibilities one has to create change will carry on within us after finishing the course at the end of the semester. [This course] is going to inevitably be one of the most important courses we will ever take during our time here in Florida International University.”

The idea that they learned that they could help others is echoed in another student's comments who wrote: "I believe that this is one of the very very few courses that can not only teach someone something that can benefit them but also shows them how they themselves can benefit others. This course is great in that it puts you in the driver's seat of a project that can potentially help a lot of people." There also seems to be a sense that there is another responsibility to your community that pushes students to do more work in applying themselves in the class a student wrote:

When I first started this class I really had no idea what I was getting into. I believe this class is important not only because it has given me the sense that I can possibly make a change but it creates specific bonds with students that I possibly didn't have the chance of having before. It can be overwhelming but it's the good kind of overwhelming:

Students in these few representative examples are expressing a fact of philanthropy that they experienced in this courses. The fact is that philanthropy and giving are transformational activities that often requires people to grapple with their life's purpose, their family their relationship with precious resources and most importantly to grapple with their role in community. The difficulty of transformation in philanthropy is well documented in the literature on Philanthropy and Giving, noticeably by Theodore Mallon (2004) in *The Journey Towards Masterful Philanthropy* and Susan Davis Moora (2010) in *A Trojan Horse of Love*, but the difficulty is also clearly indicated by the presence of transformational coaching and consulting at most private banks, such as: The Wealth & Well-Being Institute at Gibraltar Private, here in Miami, Florida.

Philanthropy starts to emerge as a recognition that community change requires champions and requires them to recognize that the champions might have to be themselves. As students develop plans and proposals, they realize that many of the first steps in community organizing and community change does not begin with a lack of funding. Instead, many of the first steps don't require funding at all. Students move from a position of lack, where they perceive a lack of resources is preventing them from engaging in a community, to a position of relative abundance where they begin to see that many of the first steps in community change requires them to ask what they can do by themselves.

In my communication course, like the KINS process before, philanthropy is rooted in the process of conversation and self-discovery that emerges as people come together to discuss ones community and ones desires for this community. This is an approach to philanthropy rooted more in the humanities tradition. Student, of course, develop a social scientific approach and begin to grapple with the role of impact assessments, accountability, and transparency in philanthropy. Students start understanding that a logic model should connect community problems or concerns to proposed solutions. Students begin to understand that matching a problem with the scale of intervention is complicated. Indeed, the social scientific approach to measuring, assessment, and counting success becomes clear to my students.

My students leave the class with a recognition that there is often funding (even if it tends to support innovation over operational expenses) from community foundations, corporate donor programs, national foundations, impact investors and crowd funding models. Good ideas and their champions are often in short supply.

Connecting Students and Philanthropists in Conversation

On the flipside, we could explore how student philanthropy influences how philanthropy (as an institution) or philanthropist (as individuals) connect with communities and foster relationships with a community. Peter Frumkin (2008), in his classic text on *Strategic Giving*, highlights that philanthropy is often questioned for its role in the public sphere and its influence on public policy with little transparency or public accountability. Our project at FIU even emerged after the donor read an article in the *New York Times* which criticized the philanthropist desire to influence the curriculum of a university which in turn prompted the university to end its relationship with the philanthropist (Alden, 2014). Frumkin is writing largely within philanthropy after it has emerged as an institution with professional staff and professional grant administrators. I would not be alone in arguing that the professionalization of philanthropy (and the professionalization of society in general) comes at a cost. One cost is philanthropy is seen as an institution quite different than the communities it hopes to serve which has led many to argue for philanthropy and foundation to incorporate and promote diversity (Wagner, 2016). The D5coalition, for example, is a five year initiative to facilitate more Equity, Diversity and Inclusion in philanthropy and grant making. The need for diversity often translates into matrixes to assess how grants are distributed in communities to insure they are distributed in diverse ways. Without necessarily exploring the complexity of diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives in philanthropy, I want to suggest that one of the exciting things about a student philanthropy course is that the students are part of a community and brings with them the diversity of a community. Large institutions, such as Florida International University, have a structural advantage in institutional giving because they are diverse institutions that includes students from every ethnic and economic community in South Florida. Reaching our students adds requisite variety, diversity, and diverse community input to philanthropic strategies. The *Communication and Community Giving Project* allows philanthropic resources to reach communities and people who might not otherwise have access to the resources or feel connect to them.

Brad Rourke (2014), of the Kettering Foundation, in his review of the issues of transparency and accountability in philanthropy states that “the conversation that philanthropy must join [is]: how can we improve our working relationship with citizens while carrying out our public missions?” (p. 14). Rourke is right in recognizing that it may be difficult for relationships of respect to emerge in the often complexed relationships between foundations and grantees or recipients of philanthropic support. When philanthropy was largely individuals giving time, money and energy, they were not “institution” interacting with other “institutions”, but instead they were people working together and forming their mutual interests through conversations, civic dialogues, and civic connections. It is here where I turn back to praise Susan Davis Moora’s KINs Innovation Circle for a desire to make philanthropy a civic and community activity by bring people together for a common mission.

In the end, the biggest virtue I have notice in my student philanthropy course is how it democratizes philanthropy and connects more people to the process of funding and granting. Circling back to Lois Weisburg and Sharon Joy, cities need to foster networks and community connections to do the challenging work of making cities better places for everyone. The truth about resources, whether they are philanthropic (financial resources) or close human relationship (social capital) or technical and intellectual knowledge (knowledge capital) not everyone is equally connected to them all. KINS and Student Philanthropy tries to foster those connections to foster more relationships to get things done in our community. So I am glad that on the last day of my philanthropy class students, many of whom never dreamed of what they would do with 10,000 dollars, learn to struggle with the

transformational act of giving and in the process become engaged in their community. I hope all my students reach a level of financial success to become philanthropist generously giving financial resources to communities in need. I hope even more students, however, understand that they have a responsibility to his or her community even before they are in a position of “giving back”. In any case, I know that at least in one semester each and every student has become a philanthropist in their own right. Each student has given more than what was needed to earn an “A” in my class.

References

- Ahmed, S., & Olberding, J. (2007). Can Student Philanthropy Help to Address the Current Nonprofit Identity Crisis? A Case Study of a Multiyear, Multidisciplinary Project at Northern Kentucky University. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 13(3/4), 593–615.
- Alden, W. (2014, May 29). To Get an A in Philanthropy Class, Give Away \$50,000. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://dealbook.nytimes.com/2014/05/29/to-get-an-a-in-philanthropy-class-give-away-50000/>
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. University of California Press.
- Benenson, J., Moldow, E., & Hahn, A. (2014). Engaging a New Generation of philanthropists: Findings from the Pay It Forward Student Philanthropy Initiative. The Sillerman Center for the Advancement of Philanthropy The Heller School For Social Policy and Management Brandeis University.
- Frumkin, P. (2008). *Strategic Giving: The Art and Science of Philanthropy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gladwell, M. (1999). Six degrees of Lois Weisberg. *The New Yorker*.
- Mallon, T. (2004). *The Journey Toward Masterful Philanthropy*. Five Centuries Press.
- Mccully, G. (2008). *Philanthropy Reconsidered: Private Initiatives Public Good Quality of Life*. AuthorHouse.
- Moorra-Davis, S. (2010). *The Trojan Horse of Love*. Retrieved from <https://thetrojanhorseoflove.com/>
- Olberding, J. C. (2012). Does Student Philanthropy Work? A Study of Long-Term Effects of the. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(2), 71–87.
- Rourke, B. (2014). *Philanthropy and the Limits of Accountability: A Relationship of Respect and Clarity*. Philanthropy for Active Civic Engagement (PACE) and the Charles F. Kettering Foundation.
- Wagner, L. (2016). *Diversity and Philanthropy: Expanding the Circle of Giving: Expanding the Circle of Giving*. ABC-CLIO.

Journal of the Association for Communication Administration

Guidelines for Submission

JACA is a scholarly, academic journal sponsored by the Association for Communication Administration that is committed to publishing invited and refereed manuscripts related to scholarship and research in the administration of communication units at all levels of the academic institution. The journal will consider for publication all scholarship in the broadly defined field of communication that makes a significant contribution to the knowledge of human communication, especially as it relates to the administration of the academic unit.

Guidelines for Submission

All types of manuscripts are considered for publication, including research reports, papers of topical interest, state-of-the-art reviews, and other manuscripts directly related to ACA concerns. Manuscripts may be philosophical, theoretical, methodological, critical, applied, pedagogical, or empirical in nature. Materials published are not restricted to any particular setting, approach, or methodology.

Review Process

JACA uses a blind review process. All manuscripts are initially screened by the editor, who will reject any manuscript without review if it is clearly outside the scope of the journal or fails to comply with the guidelines. Members of the editorial board review all other manuscripts. The final decision concerning publication is made by the editor after examining the recommendations obtained from the editorial board members. Authors normally will have an editorial decision within three months.

Submission of Manuscripts

A copy of the manuscript must be submitted via the Internet in English and must conform to APA (6th edition) guidelines. Manuscripts should not exceed 25 double-spaced typed 8 1/2 x 11 inch pages, exclusive of tables and references, be in 12 point Times New Roman typeface, and submitted in Microsoft Word. Manuscripts must be original and not under review by other publishers. The manuscripts should be written in the active voice and employ nonsexist language.

Manuscript Format

The title page should include the title, author(s), corresponding address, telephone number, and Internet address. Because manuscripts are evaluated through a blind (or masked) review process, author identification should be on the title page only. Any references that might identify the author should be removed from the manuscript. The text of the manuscript (including its title) should begin on the next page, with the remaining pages numbered consecutively. Avoid self-identification in the text of the manuscript. Notes and references should be typed double-spaced on pages following the text of the manuscript. Tables and figures must be numbered, supplied with an identifying title, and placed on a separate page at the end of the manuscript. The proper location of each table or figure should be indicated after the paragraph in which it is referenced by the line "Insert Table [or Figure]" in the manuscript, separated by parallel lines above and below.

Book Reviews

JACA will publish reviews of books on topics related to communication, administration, and/or organizational processes. The reviews should be between 4-5 double-spaced 8 1/2 x 11 pages and submitted electronically to the editor.

Manuscripts should be submitted via e-mail to the editor, Dr. Janie M. Harden Fritz, at harden@duq.edu.