THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

RE-IMAGINING EDUCATION JOURNALISM: HOW INNOVATIVE BUSINESS MODELS COULD SAVE EDUCATION MEDIA

Washington, D.C.
Tuesday, May 11, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

Presenters:

DARRELL WEST
Vice President and Director, Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

E.J. DIONNE
Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

GROVER "RUSS" WHITEHURST
Director, Brown Center on Education
Herman and George R. Brown Chair
The Brookings Institution

Featured Panelists:

SCOTT JASCHIK
Editor and Founder
Inside Higher Ed

JAY MATTHEWS
Education Writer
Washington Post

VIRGINIA EDWARDS
Editor and Publisher
Education Week

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. WEST: Good afternoon. I'm Darrell West, vice president of Governance Studies here at Brookings and we appreciate all of you braving the rain and coming out. We had a short rain delay there to give people a chance to wander in, but I'd like to welcome you to this forum on Re-Imagining Education Journalism: How Innovative Business Models Could Save Education Media. I think with that kind of subtitle it reflects a great deal of optimism on the part of the co-authors of this paper.

Like many facets of the media in general, education journalism is experiencing a gut wrenching transformation in terms of its business models, organizational structures, audience composition, and news delivery. Old business models have collapsed and new ones are still in the formative stage. Digital technologies have fundamentally altered the way in which news is gathered and delivered, and the way in which consumers access information, and the result is a media ecosystem that is dramatically different from the recent past.

Today we are releasing a paper that focuses on new developments in the field of journalism. We canvassed the views of leaders in the field and conducted case studies of specific ventures and our goal was to re-imagine education journalism and think about new styles of coverage and how news organizations are adapting to the new trends that are unfolding. And in talking with people, including several who are here with us today on our panel, we found that education journalism is transforming into a new digital form that looks and behaves quite differently from its traditional counterpart. There are new content providers, niche publications, blogs, and citizen journalism among other new features.

Now, we argue in the paper that this new ecosystem has several clear strengths such as immediacy, news can be updated minute by minute; interactivity, people can interact with the site, no longer are we talking about one-way communications from

journalists to readers and watchers; and that the new forms are very strong on diversity of viewpoints because it is a very democratic medium that empowers all sorts of people to express their views and even to report on the news.

Digital platforms create opportunities for engagement and interactivity that was not possible with the old media, and when you look at the media organizations represented here today, what impresses me is the range of experimentation that is taking place. The various media outlets are trying lots of new things. Some of the experiments are gaining traction. There are new players with new business models that have appeared on the scene. But we suggest in our paper that these virtues must be linked to the delivery of in depth substantive reporting. We not that for many people the most important source of news remains the old medium and that the key challenge today is to build on the strengths of new media platforms while finding ways to develop high quality coverage that is crucial for civic education and democratic governance.

Today you are going to hear about a number of new innovations being tried by various outlets, this includes online advertising, subscription events, premium sections of news websites, webinars, book clubs, news alerts, RSS feeds, chat rooms, and blogs, among other interesting things. The idea that we heard time and time again was the importance of education journalists creating a culture of community that brings people together and engages them. Of course the $64,000 question is whether this new form is sustainable from a business standpoint.

To think about these and other questions, my colleague E.J. Dionne will moderate a discussion of distinguished experts on education journalism. E.J. is a senior fellow here at Brookings, a *Washington Post* syndicated columnist, and a university professor in the foundations of democracy and culture at Georgetown University.

Joining him for this discussion will be Virginia Edwards, who's the editor

and publisher of *Education Week;* Scott Jaschik, who's the editor and founder of *Inside Higher Education;* Phil Semas, who's the president and editor-in-chief of the *Chronicle of Higher Education;* Jay Matthews, who's the *Washington Post* education writer and also the blogger of his well known blog Class Struggle; and Russ Whitehurst is the Herman and George R. Brown Chair and director of the Brown Center on Education Policy at Brookings.

Before we start our discussion, we would like to thank the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for providing financial support for this project. Their help has been crucial in funding a series of papers on education journalism. We released a paper last November that found limited coverage of education in the national media although more coverage at the local level.

The next stage of our work will feature a national public opinion survey seeking to find out how readers and viewers access information in the new digital world and how they are reacting to these big changes that are taking place in education journalism and we will be reporting the results of that project down the road.

So, with that I will turn the discussion over to E.J.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much and I apologize if you hear me coughing. I woke up this morning without a voice, so I want to thank Robitussin for making it possible for me to be speaking right now. But that will have the advantage of shutting me up a little bit, which often needs to happen.

I just want to introduce this great panel by sort of making two quick points in inviting them to sort of elaborate, comment on those, and also on any other aspect of the paper they found either compelling or wrongheaded or anywhere between those two. The first is, this is sort of -- this is kind of act two of our project. As some of you were here the first time where we put out a paper on how little national -- how little attention national education news gets, in particular, the paucity of education stories on the front pages of

major newspapers, and one of the things we discovered that if it weren't for certain kind of hot-button questions that have very little to do with education, that paucity would be even -- those stories would be even rarer. If Barack Obama had not decided to welcome kindergartners to school, and if that hadn't become controversial, there would have been a lot less national education coverage.

On the other hand, that report also showed how many extraordinary things are happening at the local level. We discovered that all over the country there are blogs like Jay's and whole areas of old media websites -- so-called old media, and I'll get to that -- devoted to a very serious discussion of education and in fact the local is where the rubber hits the road, it's where parents are, it's where kids are, and so that kind of inspired us in our report here to see how could you make national coverage more like the good local coverage.

And so one distinction, I think, that begins to dissolve is old and new media because the old media have used these -- the many tools now available to expand coverage and the paradox is that the very, sort of, technological changes that are making it harder for newspapers and other older media forms to pay the bills, are also making it possible to do extraordinary work.

But then in doing this work, and that's why we're so grateful that we have Virginia and Scott and Phil here, there is a long history of great journalism on education in what we'll call niche publications, and I think that the other distinction that is breaking down is the notion of a niche publication because all of these publications can now reach a very broad audience of anyone who has an interest in these issues, and indeed Jay, on his blog, and bloggers all over the country, can sort of call attention to the good work these folks are doing.

So, our second paper, you might say, is more upbeat than the first. We'll

have a third act and we'll see how we'll resolve this mood swing that we had. And so I'm going to call on our panel in the following order: I'll ask Virginia to go first, followed by Scott, followed by Phil, followed by Jay, and then our own Russ Whitehurst so we can sort of bookend distinguished Brookings scholars at the beginning -- I'm not including myself in that -- Darrell and Russ.

So, Virginia, welcome. It's really good to have you here.

MS. EDWARDS: Thank you very much. You know, I've got several points I'd like to make and I'm just going to kind of go through them. I hope it knits together. I don't know about this whole media thing, you know, I don't want to think that I'm that in more ways than one, but --

MR. DIONNE: I'd actually put you in the new.

MS. EDWARDS: In the new, okay. All right.

MR. DIONNE: Jay and I are proud old.

MS. EDWARDS: But there are two points, though, relevant to that, one is, right off the bat, I'm struck as the media folks have worked to transform themselves, ourselves, that people can get quite rigid about thinking there's one answer or another, and I have to say that you're not going to get that out of me. I think that the more people recognize that we're in the middle of something very fluid and the need to be nimble and the need to be really open-minded about what could be, what might be, what needs to be, to support this is really, really important, and I can tell you a little bit about how we got where we are, but I think it underscores this kind of openness and nimbleness.

We are a nonprofit. A lot of people are pointing to the potential of nonprofit media at this time as important, but I'll quickly point out that we're a nonprofit that's run like a business. More than 75 percent, more than three-quarters of our income comes from business operations, business income, which is to say advertising and sponsorships and

paid subscribers and other ways people pay for our content.

We were early adopters of the Internet. We soft-launched edweek.org in 1995 after working on it for nearly a year. We hard-launched in 1996, so we've been at this quite a while and we were one of the first periodicals online, shortly after the *Chronicle*, I'll note.

I think that the fact of us being in the education business, again, particularly higher education, made us hyper aware of the Internet early on, so anyway, that's a little bit about that.

We knew nearly from the beginning that we wanted to charge for our content in some form. I don't call it a paid model anymore. We call it some kind of -- call it a hybrid model, call it what you will, but there is a mix of people needing to pay for some content on our site, for access to some of the content, and then of course a bunch of content that is free and open.

It's all about serving the audience. One thing about being a nonprofit is that you can be, I think -- not that for profits are any less focused on the end user or the customer -- but it allows us to, in part because we go after grant income, be very, very focused on what mission we're trying to serve which in this case I make no bones about the fact that we're advocates. We are advocates for better public schools and we're advocates for better public schools in the name of improving educational outcomes for all kids.

So, it sounds like a lot of blah, blah, blah, but get over it, that's where we are in our nonprofit mission.

We came up with two strategies early on to think about as we were working our way from 1995 to where we are today, and granted, again, this was quite iterative. One is, as a journalistic organization, we knew we were journalists. That was our number one asset, the independence, the accuracy, the high quality we could bring to covering

something as journalists. So, we had this whole umbrella of stuff we called the 24/7 strand of our work.

The other strand of our work, and Darrell, I think you did a terrific job -- wherever Darrell is -- of summarizing the report because I made a lot of note of the interactive kind of features that websites now allow us to harness as part of our strategy. So, that is a very explicit, deliberate part of our strategy. Even as a news organization, it's the web 2.0 interactive features, the community building features, nothing particularly new there.

So, where we are today, it was in the report, I was kind of surprised to read my words coming back at me about the raincoat, if you saw that.

MR. DIONNE: (inaudible)

MS. EDWARDS: I know. I mean, you know, it's got a little raciness to it, but I feel very strongly that still we are mainly known for being the publishers of *Education Week*, this thing in print, but the fact is we have dozens of products now ranging from a half dozen e-newsletters to live events to webinars to chats to special reports, custom research to, of course, the print weekly newspaper and other special reports we do through the course of the year.

So, I think that's just the name of the game and I think that's where we're pointed going forward. It's this continued diversification, continued serving of our audience and kind of even further niche kind of ways with better targeting. We're big users of web analytics, all the things that I'm sure you guys like already know about.

So, I'll close my five minutes by noting that I really am very energetic and enthusiastic about where we find ourselves with education journalism now. I am one of the people who sees this as a positive time. The notion of a golden age in journalism that was defined by the late '60s, '70s, '80s, and '90s, I think is, for those of us who are somewhat

myopic about what journalism has looked like over the longer span of time, I think it's also somewhat arrogant to think that only Journalists with a capital "J" are the people to keep us informed and to provide information, but what I do think is that the -- to me it's kind of ironic. When *Education Week* was born in 1981, it was born at a time when education wasn't a national field at all, at last K-12 education wasn't, and the notion that somebody in Oregon would want to know what somebody in Vermont was doing, we were -- I wasn't here then, but we were told we were foolish to think there was any kind of national market for the notion of K-12 education news and information.

Well now the problem isn't that we don't know that we need to know this, it's that there's too much information, that we're awash in this kind of dissonance of information that we can't sort out and that we don't know what to make of, so this is where I think the role of high quality news and information providers can be played. So, that's where the opportunity is. It's in building a big tent, having your own content, but also looking to others to provide some of that content, whether it be other news organizations, other independent and respected information outlets as well as, I think, the wisdom of the crowd, meaning that users and other folks who you can tap to be content generators.

So, I will stop there and turn it back to E.J.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. In instinctively like all attacks on golden ages because they never were as golden as we see them now.

Scott, please pick up from there.

MR. JASCHIK: Hi. It's good to see a lot of my sources and readers in the audience. Hopefully, I didn't offend any of you this morning at least.

And I'm really excited about this discussion and the report and I was pleased by the more optimistic tone of this report and our first panelist here today because I think it's a really exciting time in journalism and so I want to speak to a few of the themes,

one is this idea of niche versus traditional publications because I think the model of journalism that is emerging in a healthy way right now actually has a few characteristics. It's a shift from print to online, that's the shift that's gotten the most attention, but it's also a shift, I think, of -- from geography as the organizing principle, to interest subject, whether it be education as I think of *Inside Higher Ed*, or technology as C-Net News, or the media industry as in Media Bistro, or politics as in Politico. The organizing principle isn't defined anymore solely by, do you live in Washington or Baltimore or Chicago. I think there's a shift from paid content to free content. While there are lots of exceptions -- outstanding exceptions -- to that, I think that's the way things are flowing, and I think it's a shift from a sort of ivory tower, talking down to readers, to creating a community. And I think those encompass the characteristics of a lot of the journalism entities today that are in fact succeeding.

And so one of the things I'm pleased about the report is that I'm tired of all the reports saying journalism is going away. Journalism is changing right now and that's tough.

So, what's new and what's different? So, niche publications aren't new. Think about places like BNA that have been providing specialized information for a long time. And as I was getting ready today I called over to BNA and asked how much one of their tax newsletters costs, and one of their tax newsletters costs $4,260 for 5 people to have access. And they're still doing very well, I think, and so you have this model of highly specialized paid content that used to come in newsletters that were delivered, now comes both newsletters and e-mail.

So, what's different? Why is this model going, I think, to free? One is I think your audience affects your journalism and I think that if you are a tax newsletter covering -- that charges $4,200 a year, well, guess the perspective that you have as you're writing about tax issues? There's nothing wrong with that perspective, it's part of it, but I

think your audience affects everything. And as I look at the *Inside Higher Ed* audience, I'm very proud of our graduate student readers, of our adjunct readers, of our new faculty who don't have an expense account. I'm very proud that it's as easy to read Inside Higher Ed if you're at Howard as if you're at Harvard. And the reality is, not everyone has an expense account and when you are open, when it doesn't cost an individual fee or a site license, we hear from people who we wouldn't hear from otherwise and they feel equally part of our community and I think that's really key.

We had a big story about grad -- rankings of doctoral programs this week and I heard from as many grad students about that story as graduate deans. I want to hear from both of them and so I'm excited, I see that model as affecting us.

At the same time, I think that model of openness means you are less beholden to big names. Our bloggers, our columnists, aren't necessarily famous. I think actually we're making them famous, but I'd rather do that than be defined by, say, who's on the op-eds of the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post* which are generally people who have already made their names.

In other ways, though, I think we are, and a lot of other publications, we can be very old-school. I actually worry when people talk about new versus old -- I think there are a lot of good values of old-school journalism, so for instance, we believe in checking our facts. We don't link to student newspapers as sources of news. We do link to some good journalism out there, but we're very careful about what we do and if we think it's important, we go and do our own story. We don't let linking to news replace news gathering. We approve every comment before it goes live. That takes time, but it also means you don't have spam or libel on your website. And in terms of the sifting function that you mentioned just before, we also don't try to just put up every link we can find. We think about, does this matter, and talking to our readers, they really care about that and want us not to, you know,

they always say, if you get more people, don't double the amount of news you give us, but continue to sift for us. That seems to be what they want.

I think there are ways that this new model can help traditional publications. We just started a relationship with *USA Today* where one of our articles each day appears on the *USA Today* website, and so we pick the article that we think would be of interest to a broad audience, not just the educators who make up our core audience, and so we're getting new readers, they're getting new content, and we only agreed to do this in part because they didn't use it to outsource their journalism or to eliminate any journalism jobs.

I want to talk briefly about some of the other models that were mentioned in the report that I have some concerns about. Government support of journalism, while the tax credits might happen, big picture, I just don't see it happening. Foundation support, I think, is a very tricky issue and I want to encourage people to be cautious about it, and I don't mean here any offense to the outstanding journalism in *Education Week* which is supported in part by foundations.

Right now, I think, there's a crisis in journalism and people see all these unemployed or underemployed journalists and stories that are not covered, so I think people are very excited about the idea of more foundation-supported news entities.

To give you an example of why I'm skeptical, an outstanding -- and there's a lot of good journalism being produced this way -- one of those nonprofit entities recently ran a story about the University of Phoenix and the day that that story ran I got calls from Phoenix lobbyists saying, do you know who funds that news organization? It's a foundation with ties to somebody who hates us. And it was very interesting how they were able to link the -- to attack a story by looking at the funder. And what that points to is that most foundation-supported journalism -- and again I'm talking about entities that are entirely foundation-supported -- tend to rely on a small number of funders which puts them at risk of

being tied to those funders, of many of these funders also are key players in higher education, and even if they're very good, they deserve close scrutiny. Foundations also change interest. You know, a foundation is excited one day about education; tomorrow they may be excited about curing malaria or whatever. I'm not sure it's a stable, long term source.

I also think a lot of the foundation supported journalism is focused on big hits. You know, let's write this great piece that we'll pitch as a magazine piece for the New York Times Magazine or whatever, as opposed to, I think a lot of the best journalism, even the big pieces, come from solid beat reporting, from people who really know what they're doing, and so what I would most like to see in the future is creating more business models for the great startups that have been created with foundation funds. We've got a Gotham Schools representative in the audience here today. I think a challenge should be that Gotham Schools and the others like it, we need to find a way to make their founders rich enough to pay well, support good journalism, and keep them healthy for the long term, and I worry that with --

MR. DIONNE: The Gotham Schools person can applaud right now.

MR. JASCHIK: Yeah, and I'm worried that everyone's so excited about any salvation for journalism that they're not asking tough questions about this foundation support. So, I see a lot of exciting ideas and I really appreciate that Brookings is putting attention on this important question. Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. I was sitting here thinking, Jay, if only we could get people to pay $4,200 -- 7- or 800,000 people to pay $4,200 for the *Washington Post*. It would really revolutionize -- there's so much good stuff there. And I want to welcome Phil. Scott and Phil actually used to be colleagues and it's a sign of what is happening in this world that Scott left *Chronicle*, started his organization -- started *Inside*

Higher Ed, and the lions and the lambs sit down together, compete, do good work together, so we've very grateful that you're both up here with us.

MR. SEMAS: Thank you. I don't know about old media and new media. The *Chronicle* is a little over 40 years old, so I think we're probably middle aged media. I think Ginny (inaudible) is right that at this point we need -- we really need a mixed approach. We do everything that *Education Week* does and that *Inside Higher Ed* does. You know, we blog, we tweet, you know, we're on Facebook, we're on LinkedIn, we do three daily e-mail newsletters, we do five weekly e-mail newsletters. You know, we're a lot more than just a printed publication. We've expanded in a number of ways and now in addition to the printed version of the *Chronicle*, we sell the digital edition that has 14,000 subscribers. We have site licenses which is a way to make the *Chronicle*, in effect, free on college campuses to, you know, everybody, so we are reaching, I think, as broad an audience as we ever have.

One of the ironies is that our print circulation has gone down in the last 10 years, but yet we are reaching more people than we ever have. We have 1.3 million people viewing our website every month. You know, our most popular newsletter reaches 128,000 people every day. We have 42,000 people reading our community college newsletter, that's more people than read any of the publications that are aimed at community colleges. As I said, we have nearly 1,000 site licenses which means that on 1,000 campuses now, all of our web content is free. So, we have to continue to do that.

I admire very much what Ginny has done at *Education Week* to diversify their revenue stream. One of the problems I think those of us in the middle-aged media face is that all of our growth is online, but yet a significant majority of our revenue still comes from the print and I think the print still has a role to play.

We do, as I said, a mix of content that's both free and we do have some content, obviously, that we ask people to pay for. Unfortunately, we can't charge $4,200

either, much as we would like to, and if I could invent a product for which I could charge $4,200, I would probably do it, although I don't think it affects the -- I don't think it affects our journalism, the fact that people are paying -- I think we continue to do a good job -- anymore than it affects the *Washington Post*'s journalism the fact that some people pay for *The Post* and some people don't. But we are, I think, reaching out in new ways to a much wider variety of people. I think the point about niche publications reaching more broadly; for example, we provide a feed of higher education news to *The Post* website regularly. We have had some arrangements with the New *York Times*. We've had conversations with various people and I think there's some interesting things to do there.

This is certainly a transitional period and I think we're all still trying to find our way. I have a sign in my office from the eminent philosopher Yogi Berra who once said that it's hard to make predictions especially about the future, and so if anybody tells you they think they know where we're going to end up, don't believe them because nobody knows. If you think back five years, how many people were predicting that there would be something called Twitter that everybody would be using and -- to generate news.

One of the other things that we're doing at the moment is expanding from a national publication to a global publication. We're going to launch at the end of this month a global edition of our website. We're doing this entirely on line. We can't afford, obviously, to do print overseas, but we will have a global edition of our website. We'll be expanding our global coverage and we hope bringing in additional advertising and site license and subscription revenue as a result and I think that's the kind of thing that we need to continue to keep looking at as well as all the other things that Ginny and Scott have mentioned that we have to do.

So, I think I'll stop there.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. I'm always grateful when somebody

quotes Yogi Berra. My favorite Yogi-ism is, “Nobody goes to that restaurant anymore, it’s too crowded,” which sort of raises some interesting media questions. I am particularly happy my colleague Jay Matthews is here. I loved his feisty critique of our earlier report on his blog, partly on the general theory, I don’t care what you write about me as long as you spell our names right, but also -- actually, he didn’t put our names in, but he cited the report -- but also let me just read you one paragraph. “Maybe national education news is hard to find, maybe it deserves to be, as boring and repetitive as it can be, but education reporting, at least the local kind that fills most of my days, is alive and well and provides more than 1.4 percent of what Americans read in their newspapers each day.”

And as some of you know, I’ve covered politics for a long time. The best politicians -- Clinton, Obama -- always take a critique, absorb it, and say, actually, that’s what we’re saying in the first place. And so, as you will see when you look at the report, we easily absorb Jay’s critique and make the point that what we were arguing all along was that we think national reporting needs to be a whole lot more like local reporting.

So, Jay, we’re very glad we agree with you.

MR. MATTHEWS: Thanks, E.J. My reaction to that report was based on my basic optimistic nature and so I’m much happier with the new report we see in front of us which I think is a terrific summary of where we are and some of its suggestions in particular, the pooling of resources amongst all the education reporters out there makes sense to me.

You know, optimists have a problem. I’m very optimistic, the glass is always half full for me. I married 43 years ago a woman who is very much on the pessimistic side and this is, you know, a crisis in our marriage often. At certain points she’s referred to me as the Pollyanna from hell, which is probably true in some respects.

So, I thought there was much in this report to applaud, particularly optimistic, but it -- in the last paragraph of this report, even for optimists like me, goes too far.

The notion that we can get more respect for education reporters strikes me as simply not in the cards. If we're talking about mainstream media, you know, cable networks and big newspapers that are trying to make a lot of money, it's not going to happen. Rarely -- occasionally, those of us who occasionally write a book will be able to talk our way into about two minutes on MSNBC and that's about once every five years. That's about the extent of the attention we're going to get and I think, however, and I'm going to take you on a little journey to where I think the optimism is there in this report and in my own view, what's happening in education, which will take us to a place where education reporters will get more than enough respect, but we're not going to be rock stars like the political columnists who we see all the time.

Now, E.J. and I think of this discussion, I think, we both think of it in agricultural terms. You've just heard from three people who are sort of the hardworking farm managers. They're in the office, they're trying to make sure the crops get in on time and, you know, they get a good price for their goods. E.J. and I think of ourselves as the field hands out there harvesting those crops. And from our point of view, there's less numbers and more thematic and feel to what's going on and I think there's much to be happy about.

I made a list of some of the things that are -- I think are better now in the new age of media than the old age, and indeed I am old media and will probably die that way, but the new media has really probably lengthened my life several years because -- because of the Internet, because I can now be a blogger, my wife and I can move back to California which is our plan next year, and I can continue to blog until I'm too demented or too stiff.

MR. DIONNE: That will help you actually.

MR. MATTHEWS: Yeah, I'll just keep going. It doesn't really matter where I live, so that's a plus.

There is, I think -- and this is -- actually, E.J. mentioned this earlier today, we've got more space. One of my mentors and heroes of *the Washington Post* is Bob Kaiser, who 25 years ago, before any of us knew there was going to be an Internet, did this interesting calculation in which he discovered that in *the Washington Post* each day there was only 6.25 inches of copy for every working reporter we had. Now, that's -- I worked out the number, that's about 250 words, which is just nothing. I mean, before E.J. was a distinguished columnist he was, you know, a gut-wrenching, data savvy reporter and he knew -- he could crank out 250 words in about 2 seconds, right? That was nothing and that felt like constraint. You know, either you felt constrained and you tried to look for other places to write and people like me would go out and write books because you couldn't get enough stuff in the paper, or you'd take very long lunches, you had a lot of downtime during the day because you only had that 6.25 inches to fill each day.

Now we've got the infinite reaches of the Internet and I think for a lot of us, perhaps that's too much for some of us, but it really does allow us to get deeper in a way that we haven't before.

Two, we can be more specific. I mean, things like the -- I do this rating thing in Newsweek, it's coming out in about a month of high schools, there are going to be about 1,600 high schools on this list who have reached a standard of AP and IB test participation, and there are things you can do with that that, you know, it welcomes in people, they can now look up their own school very quickly on the Internet, they can push a button and see how that school did in previous years, things we could never do before. So, we can be specific and go to databases and do things with numbers in education that we never could do before.

Third, and I think this is most important, we've got a better story now than we did 20 years ago. I started in education in 1982 when I stumbled into this guy Jaime

Escalante who was a teacher in East L.A. He became famous six years later when they made a movie about him, but it's interesting to compare what happened to Jaime, who was the star of that -- of education reporting in that day. He did great things at the one school and he got a show on PBS that some people watched, but he never really changed the conversation. People would look at -- talk about Jaime and say, well, that was a movie. That's Hollywood exaggerating things. Or they'd say, you know, he was a genius teacher, he helped those kids, but he didn't really change anything.

He was a lot more than that, but it was really hard to convince people because there was really no great fallout from what he did other than attitudes changed in some places, but people still believed that low income kids really couldn't do much more than they ever could.

Now we have -- and my last book is about two guys, Mike Feinberg and Dave Levin, who started the KIPP schools. They are the direct intellectual descendents of Jaime Escalante, but they are very different in their impact and the people like them in education, very different in the impact on what's going on in schools. They created -- they now have 82 schools, they're showing developments in growth in lower income achievement in those 82 schools that Jaime only had 1 school in, their message is going out through all kinds of young hard working educators who are creating what I see as a critical mass of young educators coming up in a very different attitude and very different interests in what's going on in schools and greater optimism for what we can do in schools.

We've got old media and new media, we've got old educators now we've got new educators and there are two, I think, clear optimistic points that's important to this discussion, to tell about that. Number one, you have a youth movement in journalism.

I'm glad that the representative, Gotham Schools, whose name is Elizabeth Green, raised her hand here. I recognize her from her picture on the web though we've

never met before. She's one of the examples. I mean, are you 25 years old yet, Elizabeth?

MS. GREEN: I passed that a month ago.

MR. MATTHEWS: A month ago, okay. She's still younger than I was when I started my career at *the Washington Post* after I got out of the army. There were reporters like Michael Birnbaum on our staff who's younger than Elizabeth and is just cranking out great breaking stories all the time, you know. And I run into people -- there's a guy down in Jacksonville, Topher Sanders, who's working for the newspaper down there doing wonderful work about AP -- there are people like that all the way and I think they are motivated by their sense that their age group. People are going into schools now, have this spirit, this insurrection spirit, some of them go into Teach For America, but all of them have seen what happens in schools where you have schools that work, where you have schools like the KIPP schools, where you have a strong principal who creates a team of teachers who are all working in the same way to raise kids' achievement. And that is an -- has an inspirational force on reporters these days that we never had a generation ago. And so I think that creates an excitement, no matter if we get respect or not, amongst the people who might be thinking of journalism, that we didn't have 30 years ago and that's a big plus. And I think it's one of the two things that's going to take us to new places in journalism once our managers -- our wise managers -- figure out how to handle the money, we're going to have plenty of people who are eager to get into the stuff and do it no matter what kind of attention they got because they know how important this and how much change (inaudible) to kids.

Number two, this sense of change, I think, is going to infect not only the teachers in this new generation, but people outside it. You know how Teach For America works, people come in and they may be two years in the classroom, they might work a little longer. A lot of them, you know, eventually go off and do what their mothers wanted them to do, go to grad school and become lawyers and doctors and public interest officials, and they

will go off and do careers in other places, but that experience of spending some time in the classroom is going to have a remarkable affect on the attitude of this generation in all walks of life toward education reporting. And so I think we are building to a whole new era of education and the way we treat kids and the way we raise them up.

I mean, Elizabeth had a piece, the cover story, in the *New York Times Magazine* a few weeks ago about new ways -- methods of teaching, which was, I think, the closest the *New York Times* has ever come to describing, in vivid terms, this new generation coming into schools. There are writers like her all over the country now who are making their impact felt, and they are going to influence readers and get them excited. The readers will have their own experiences, and that will take us to a place that I think will be much better for the business and for education at the same time.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very, very much. And Elizabeth, you're now the hero of this conversation so you'll have to join it.

My colleague Russ Whitehurst is to education data what Nate Silver was to baseball data and is now to political data and it's great to have him as a colleague. Russ.

MR. WHITEHURST: Thanks. I want to pick up on Jay's metaphor and run with it a bit if I can. So, we've got field hands and we've got the farm managers, and I'm the guy who goes to the supermarket or restaurant and buys the product. So, I want to come at it from that perspective and I have -- because my love is music, I have thought about the issues here probably more in that medium than I have print, because there have been two conflicting developments from my point of view as a consumer of music as it has become digital. One is that a lot of it, at least for a considerable while, became free. You know, if you were willing to use LimeWire or just take a thumb drive from a friend who had an album he or she wanted to share, you got content. When I was growing up, you know, I babysat for a neighbor for six months and the thank-you gift was an album which would probably

have cost $40 in today's terms and was out of reach. So, you know, I was extraordinarily happy to be able to get things at low cost or no cost that previously would have been a stretch for me.

But at the same time, you know, the music industry on the production side, has been devastated by the availability of free content so that while music was always a perilous career, it's become an almost insane career because it's difficult to make a record, difficult to sell a record, difficult to generate the kind of revenue that allows such a career to continue.

So, that's what we have in print, if you will, a lot of free content that makes it extraordinarily difficult to pay for production. But that's where the parallel breaks down. If you look at the music side, people held a copyright, they strenuously tried to protect it through digital rights management, through legal attacks on LimeWire and Napster, through suing universities who were making it easy for students to access music online without paying for it, and in my judgment, they've become relatively successful. It's a lot harder to steal music than it used to be.

But when you get into print, the producers of print have been competing with each other to give it away. They don't act like they own it. They've gone down a path where it has to be free and I think what we're going to see over -- to the extent anybody can predict, over the next decade, is some version of what you've seen the people on this panel talking about which is figuring out how to claw back the commercial rights over the products so that there can be an income stream that will support the continued production of the matter we care about. And the question is how will that be done? It's difficult, I think, for *The Washington Post* to charge for it if *The New York Times* gives it away. And that's why we see these mixed models where you ask people to pay for a little bit of something they're not likely to get for free, you give some of the rest of it away as a teaser, you develop other lines

of business.

And so I think the interesting question going forward will be how do we get people to pay a reasonable amount for it so that we still have it and that what we're getting is the quality product that we depend on. And I expect we will see more of leading publishers beginning to charge for their product as *The New York Times* has announced they will and as *The Wall Street Journal* already does, and the more premium general audience providers who charge, the easier it will be for other people to charge behind that and I think we'll see a variety of business models developing that are sensitive to the need for a market in which people actually pay for what they're consuming.

So, my reaction is also an optimistic one. While each of the farm managers here has developed a slightly different way of sort of balancing the books or more than balancing the books, all of them have figured out ways to negotiate this new marketplace and they and others will continue to be creative as the nature of the marketplace itself changes. Thanks.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. By the way, this panel is so drenched with optimism that I'm going to have affirmative action in favor of any pessimistic question whoever wants to come in. And, you know, with all these farming metaphors I was trying to think what is the educational journalism equivalent of processed cheese food product, but maybe we don't want to go there.

SPEAKER: *USA Today*?

MR. DIONNE: Scott does not agree with that.

SPEAKER: I didn't mean that.

MR. DIONNE: Scott wanted to dissent from what Russ said. I'm going to ask one question. I want to bring the audience in quickly. Since I already called you out, maybe Elizabeth you can ask the first question if you don't mind me putting you on the spot

after all this praise, but let me let Scott dissent from Russ. I'm going to ask one question and then we'll go out there.

MR. JASCHIK: It's definitely the case that good journalism costs money whether it's supported nonprofit or for profit, but I want to -- and it's also the case as was said that there's no one solution, but what I want to object to is the idea that the way to come up with a business plan is to focus on charging for content and I would invite all of you to go and gather all the 20-somethings you know and ask them how many publications they pay to read. And you may be stunned. Because here I am representing a new media model, but I'm old fashioned, I still get *The New York Times* in print at home, I admit it. I subscribe to *The New Yorker* and a bunch of other print publications that come to my home. But my reporters sort of chuckle at that because -- and they take it for granted that information is free and I think that is the way things are going. I think what we're seeing with *The New York Times* is going to be the last gasp of paid content.

Now, what I want to argue is that properly designed, there are business models based on a large audience. Lots of free websites, lots of free information sources don't charge for access. We sell job advertising that is more valuable because of the size of our audience and because of tools that people have to use it online. We sell advertising to companies like Google and HP and Apple and you name -- and to NYU Press and Harvard University Press and some entities in this audience that want to promote their conferences, because of the audience we deliver.

Good journalism needs a revenue stream. I pay my reporters. I don't -- you know, I get very upset when people talk about a certain popular blogging website whose business model is inherited wealth, that really frustrates me. That's not a business model. Journalists deserve to be paid, they deserve health insurance, they deserve the resources to do their jobs well, and so it's important to think of a business plan, but I guess I just -- I really

want to challenge people not to assume that it's based on charging for content. For some that might work, but I just wouldn't start there.

And the other thing to think about is, most publications, so-called old media, never made a majority of their revenue or in many cases even a substantial share of their revenue, from circulation. It was typically a minority share, so I don't think this is such a radical idea, so I just needed to dissent a little.

MR. DIONNE: It's money, and we have a lot of people who want to jump in, so Virginia wants to come in. I'd be curious of anybody else wants to enter that. I might postpone my question. By the way, I would love to have a business model based on inherited wealth, I just want --

MS. EDWARDS: I just want to make a couple quick points. Scott is exactly right in noting that there is no one answer, so, you know, put that right out there, and then acknowledge that news is a commodity, right? Information is a commodity and to the extent you can get it somewhere else, the market will sort it out and will either decide you can't -- you know, you don't have to pay for it because you can find it, or maybe you do have to pay for it because it's delivered in a way you need it, when you need it, whatever.

The one thing I'd push back on, Scott, is as you know, the pendulum on this kind of stuff swings all the time and just to be respectful that the pendulum is now swinging back toward a model of allowing you to charge for access to some content, under some conditions, in some form, however you want to think about that.

So, my main point in this is saying, it's a math problem. This is where I am a farm manager, but make no mistake, I'm a journalist too. I'm a journalist who started and still care passionately about high quality journalism. I just want to get that out there. Right, Jay?

MR. MATTHEWS: Right.

MS. EDWARDS: But I do worry about the numbers a lot and it is a math problem. The reason we still publish in print -- a lot of people ask me all the time, why don't you just stop publishing in print? Guess what? Each issue of *Education Week* in print still makes more money than it loses. And so, you're going to keep publishing what makes money to support this high quality journalism. By the same token, you're going to figure out ways to charge for certain cuts of your content, certain products, so, I'm just pushing back on the idea that -- and I do know the statistics and the research on the young people and they too are recognizing you need to pay for certain things.

So, there is some movement of that pendulum, so that's just my little push back.

MR. DIONNE: By the way, I'm glad you made that point because there are a lot of publications -- Politico makes more money from the print product than it does online.

MR. SEMAS: Yeah, I was just going to make that point.

MR. DIONNE: Jay and Phil on this money question, do you want to pass? You're just a farmhand.

MR. SEMAS: Well, I'll just -- I'll second what Virginia said. I think there are -- I think Scott's right in that there's lots of stuff that you can't charge for and people won't pay for. You know, my favorite example is obviously you can't charge for sports scores because they're readily available online and what we try to do is to pick and choose and, you know, charge for the stuff that we think people -- is really valuable to people and people are willing to pay for.

The bottom line here is to come up with a model, whether it involves giving away the content or not, that will support the kind of enterprise journalism that we really need to do. I mean, we have an editorial staff of more than 60 people, so we need to find -- and as Scott said, it's important to, you know, it's expensive to do that kind of journalism. We

can't do some of the enterprise things we do -- you know, we just did a big piece on self-dealing by college and university board members. I mean, we couldn't do that if -- I've been at *the Chronicle* a long time and, you know, when I came to *the Chronicle* it was smaller than *Inside Higher Ed* is now and we couldn't do, you know, 10 percent of what we can do now because we have enough people, we have enough resources. So that's ultimately, I think, the challenge here is to find the revenue model, whatever it is -- and I don't think it's just advertising, I think it's other things, too -- that will allow us to continue to do the high quality journalism and the enterprise reporting that I think this field desperately needs.

MR. DIONNE: Why don't we go to Elizabeth? We've got a mike coming your way since we put you on -- I'll put you on the spot now.

MS. GREEN: Okay, the question that I've managed to come up with is, I've been thinking about the difference between competition in new media and collaboration. Hearing a lot of ideas about partnership, sharing content, at the same time one imagines that, you know, no business will ever survive if it's in a complete atmosphere of, I don't know, cooperation, of being nice all the time, not wanting to make its own money or something. So, I guess I thought you guys could address that.

And also the cable TV model is another thing I wanted to bring up, that as a person in her 20s -- as you all know how old I am now -- I don't want to pay for a million different sites all at once, I want to pay one time to access everything that I want. That's what -- I pay a lot of money for cable television and I think that other people would pay for Internet use if they could have a package that had *the Chronicle* and *Ed Week* and *Gotham Schools* and *The New York Times,* so.

MR. DIONNE: Jay, do you want to take that up? And thank you for raising the cooperation because one of the things we talked about in the report is, how do you bring together all the good work that people are doing around the country if you actually look

around, and this question of, you know, competition and cooperation? How do you sort of pull that together?

MR. MATTHEWS: You guys are going to have to handle the cable TV model, that's beyond my competence.

It's an interesting point and it occurs to me that when we're talking about the big, jangly topics that get on the cable TV news shows, politics and business, it's hard to be a cooperative because everybody's out to really make a buck. And if you get the -- if you find out who's going to be picked as, you know, Sarah Palin's vice presidential candidate first, you know, that's good for your business. But education, because we don't have as much respect and because we're not -- you know, people don't insist that we beat the other side, I think there's a basis there in our little universe for the kind of cooperation that this report talks about.

Certainly, in our blogs, I'm referring to stuff that Gotham Schools is doing. Gotham Schools has been very nice about, you know, linking to my column just about every week which is just terribly generous, and I think as we -- and we learn, you know, I'm a slow learner, I realize I have to do more of that because that's the future of my own blog is to be linking more with other people so that people will have a sense that we're part of this community so I have to pull up my socks. And so the very nature of the model, at least for us in our less competitive mode, is to speak to each other, link to each other, and indeed quote each other, and keep the conversation going. And it's the conversation I didn't mention, but the other thing that's really wonderful about the new media is that we get to talk to readers and such -- with such frequency and intimacy. I missed that in the old media. I loved getting calls, I loved getting letters; I didn't get that many. Now, you know, I get comments all the time and I can comment in my comment portion of my columns to the comments and we can really get going. It's fun.

So, that part, I think, is a very good point and I think we have the cultural situation where we might be able to cooperate more than in other kinds of beats.

MR. DIONNE: You know, I was thinking about the cable model. The cable model is interesting because you've got a lot of different things going on there. You have, when you buy the cable package, you can get a small package, you can get a bigger package, but then you can add on particular things -- you have movies you can buy one-by-one, and you wonder if that whole model -- so that some people are indeed willing to pay premiums for all kinds of things, you know, for all of major league baseball games or for particular, you know, new release movies or relatively new release movies. And so you just wonder, you know, it's not that just pay one time for, you know, we pay one time for a certain package, but some people want to supplement it.

I was just thinking here, you know, MSNBC could to the worst teacher in the world, Fox could do the least patriotic teacher in the nation, CNN could have some complicated map, touch here for test scores in high school. Anyway, but anybody want to take that or go to anything on the (inaudible).

MR. JASCHIK: Well, I would just say, the question you asked about competition, I think, is really important because I think competition is really good for journalism. And certainly we've seen in a lot of metro areas that used to have competition now have one daily instead of two. And competition is annoying and frustrating because you have to worry about whether the other guy's going to get it. But you know what? It spurs you to get the story first and hopefully best. I actually think -- I worry about some of the ways that people are dealing with competition -- if you try to deal with competition by co-opting your competition so you know they're not doing it, or if you try to control access to information, I think -- you know, but I think having multiple players giving it their best shot at the scoop, at the analysis, ultimately that produces more options for the reader and the best

will survive. And so it is a tricky issue because I think one part of sort of new media economics is finding collaborative relationships. And so I think that's something we've spent time on and I think everyone on this panel spends time on, and how you do that in a way that doesn't frankly relieve the pressure of knowing that somebody might beat you, I think is tricky.

SPEAKER: I just wanted to say how important I think your comment is with regard to the cable model. I think it will be the iPad model, the Kendall model. I think there is a generation, a younger generation and some people from an older generation, who would pay for the convenience for an experience that's good and that -- and for a variety of things that digital presentation can do for us that we can't get just off using Google on our desktop at home. So I think that is part of the future.

MS. EDWARDS: Can I --

SPEAKER: Oh, go ahead.

MS. EDWARDS: Just real quick because I think it's a different take on what's been said. A lot about how the business model works or how the market works, it's really about the audience. It's less about the supply side. It's about the demand side. And so when you really think this through, for one thing I don't think there's an overabundance of excellent educational, education journalism and high-quality news and information and stuff out there. So I think that the notion of getting this aggregated and available is like we're not going to all be in great competition because we're -- I mean, we can all make use of it. And then it's about how you position it to serve your market. It's about the demand side. So I think that's a real important distinction, not just on the supply side and whether we've got the high-quality stuff and we're afraid to give it. We're happy to have a feed on the *Post*. We're happy that everybody's picking us up. We're happy to pick a bunch of other people up because we're serving a very different market than the *Washington Post* is. So, I think the

supply-demand side is an interesting distinction.

MS. STOTTS: Bethany Stotts, *Accuracy in Academia*. I wanted to ask a question about the connection between paid content and the ethos of your companies, say the branding, to the degree to which you may be able to increase the purchasing of your information products based on who's writing it. Not the person, but what does the *Chronicle of Higher Education* stand for in terms of not only what issues it covers, but its reliability, the journalistic ethic, and how that ties into the community element for each of your companies?

MR. MATTHEWS: I'm not totally sure I understood the question, but yes, I do think that part of what we are selling -- if I can use a crass commercial word -- is that we have a certain reputation for the quality of what we do and the quality of the information that we provide and that we think, therefore, that it's worth something and it ought to be worth something to people. And they ought to -- and, therefore, we still are able to get them to pay, whether it's through a subscription or a site license or buying an individual article or whatever method we have.

I think one of the things -- and I don't know if this goes partly back to the cable TV question -- but also I think the other thing is that historically in publishing, you know, we had kind of a one-size-fits-all model. You paid X and you got, you know, what we had. And I think part of what we're moving to is that one size obviously doesn't fit all, and we have to have lots of different price points, starting at free and moving up that, you know, for different kinds of content that people want.

So as Ginny said, it ultimately is about the audience and what the audience wants and what they're willing to pay for. I don't know if that answers your question, but that's the best I can do.

SPEAKER: I do think reputation matters a lot online, I mean, in that when people develop a trust that the person or site they go to will give them accurate as opposed

to questionable information. And I think you can lose that pretty easily. I don't know if that's part of what you were trying to get at.

We've got somebody over here. We've got a lot of hands in this.

MS. PERLSTEIN: Yeah, we're all coming from the same, oh sorry, we're all coming from -- we all work together. I'm Linda Pearlstein with Education Writers Association. And I want to get back to the cooperation issue because it's really important. And to me, it's really important for both resources and quality. In my job as a public editor -- what that is, is I'm a coach for reporters around the country. So someone in Phoenix will call me and say, "Yeah, my school system is thinking about paying teachers based on the test scores of their students. Is anyone else thinking about doing that?" And then I get the same call, you know, the next day from Murfreesboro, Tennessee, or from, you know, whatever. It's really, really striking just how much both -- as the report talks about and as Jay talked about -- national reporters are really writing local stories now, and local reporters are really writing national stories.

The problem is, people don't understand that yet, and they don't know how to do that yet. The local reporters really aren't connected to each other. You know, we have a list server and they communicate that way and it's very helpful, but we wanted to know -- you mention that cooperation in the report, and we were just a little more -- a little curious what form you thought that might be able to take because it's something we're very interested in facilitating as well.

SPEAKER: Well, actually I think we put you in the report very specifically because we were hoping you would have some ideas on how to do that, too.

MS. PERLSTEIN: Oh, we do. We just want to hear yours, too.

SPEAKER: My notion I'd love to have other people hear is that with not a whole lot of extra money -- although you could probably get some money out of this -- you

could create consortiums and people covering the same thing because clearly, these issues come up in place after place and that sort of inner-city, as we say in the report, inner-city districts have certain problems in common. They're different, but they're similar. Suburban districts, and then I've had this obsession for a while with rural education because I don't think they get nearly enough coverage and a lot of rural districts, are really short of money and have problems that are unique to them. I mean, that's where this kind of cooperation might be especially promising. But we were thinking that, you know, it could be oriented toward particular problems they have in common.

How do you share information on, you know, whether what new approaches to accountability or new approaches to curriculum, new approaches to discipline? I don't know. I could think of a number of ways in which this could be organized, but, you know, when we put this in the report, it was partly an invitation. We were hoping -- as least I thought of it as an invitation to people -- to think about how could we pull this off? Because there are, you know, people are obviously noticing exactly what you just said because it's sort of staring us right in the face.

Jay, do you have --

MR. MATTHEWS: We have, you know, two former education reporting greats. Linda Pearlstein, my former colleague at the *Post*, one of them. And Richard Coleman, formerly of the *L.A. Times*, who are doing stuff that never happened when, you know, I was beginning to be an education reporter. I joined the *Post* at age 26 and like most papers, that's what they put me on first, ed beat. There was no training. There was no, you know, source book for EWA. We just sort of tossed into it, and the spirit was exactly what's driving the report. This is just a way station. I wanted to be the China correspondent. This is just something I was going to do on my way to that. And the next step was covering the Virginia Legislature and, you know, teachers were easy and politicians were hard. So that

was our progress. So now, one sign of how much more important people were realizing of education is people of the caliber of Linda Pearlstein and Richard Coleman are dedicating their time to training and finding ways to raise the whole level of the game.

And I had a young reporter -- she's 24 -- came in. She's working for *Mother Jones* in San Francisco came in to see me last week. You know, talking to the dinosaurs, see what he has to say. And she told me, "You know, I've been talking to Linda Pearlstein. She's got a line for me for a job in Texas." Amazing, somebody's actually looking out for young education reporters like that and showing them how to get better. That's clearly to our great advantage.

SPEAKER: Actually, if I could say, since I earlier sort of questioned the foundation role in producing journalism content, this is actually where I think foundations should be putting their education journalism money, which is in replacing what most journalistic entities have stopped, which is all professional development and support for daily newspaper reporters who are writing about education. Through things like Linda's position -- just to give you an anecdote -- I participated in a Hechinger program where I was a mentor for the last three years to different individuals who are writing packages of stories about community colleges, and the program matched a mentor with a reporter. And the first year I did it, I asked -- I said, "Well, won't your editor be annoyed that you're getting guidance from somebody besides him or her?" And the answer was, "Well, no, the editor's thrilled that somebody will actually talk to me about this besides the editor."

And I think the reality of most big-city newsrooms is that there aren't enough people who know about or care about these issues, so I would love to see -- that's where I would like to see foundations do more is support these programs that help the junior education reporter who has to cover twice as many schools as Jay did, and, you know, and file more, but is getting no support.

MS. EDWARDS: Well, and it's also I think important to point out EWA, *Ed Week*, the *Chronicle*, *Inside Higher Ed* were all resources for education reporters already. I mean, it really, I mean, how much more is being written about in an informed way. I mean, I worked on a daily newspaper 20 years ago, and I didn't have access to the kinds of resources that any good daily reporter now has by just going to the Internet. And either going to a news site or going to, you know, the primary source anyway. So I wouldn't shortchange, you know, what is already available.

Now, can we do a better job of organizing it? Can we do a better job of training and making it accessible? You bet, but I'm actually really proud of the role that *Ed Week* and EWA and others have played already in serving as a resource for journalists and writers.

Since I have the mike, I'm going to make one quick point about -- because Scott, it's actually something you noted -- I think that what's really lacking at the local level, Linda, that you're trying to help feed better is good policy in issue reporting because so much of what's happening at the local level is not about education. It's about, you know, the squabble on the school board or some scandal that needs to be -- that people think needs to be covered. But, in fact, that's where I am worried about -- it's kind of two ends of the spectrum. You've got the non-education stuff being passed off as education journalism and then the high, high quality investigative stuff. That's terrific, but you know what we really need is high-quality journalism on issues and policy that isn't just an *Education Week* or the *Chronicle*, or *Inside Higher Ed* or the occasional story in the *Post* or the *Times*. It needs to be I think that's the coverage that needs to make its way out into more newspapers and outlets is that high-quality, informed journalism.

SPEAKER: Thank you for vindicating our first report, the less optimistic report, because I've had -- and one of the things that I worry about a lot is -- and when

Darrell and Russ and I were talking about this -- is we talk a lot about enterprise or investigative reporting. I worry that there aren't enough people wandering around school to school, hanging out at the school board, learning things that you only -- you don't get a lot of these breaks and big stories simply by, you know, investing a lot of resources. There's somebody there who trusts -- who gets the trust of other people and people tell them things. And then one thing leads to another and then you have a big story. Anyway, and I think that's one in the new environment with all the cutbacks that's a thing we're losing a lot of different levels of journalism, not only this.

That lady over there, and then I want to go to the other side of the room and I'll get to you before we go. Yes, please.

MS. SCHERER: I'm Marge Scherer and I'm editor of *Education and Leadership Magazine*. So, it's a magazine for educators by educators, so it's a little different. It's not written by the journalists. But something that I'm aware of in the mainstream media and blogs is what I would call the "bandwagon" effect, that everybody saying the same thing. And they're not really investigating it; they're just repeating the opinions of others. And, you know, your blog about the blogs about the blogs, I mean, and then you write it in the *Washington Post*. I think that's kind of amazing that these things come back and nobody is investigating or studying education. So it's just a concern and how do we encourage more in-depth reporting?

SPEAKER: Jay, people pick you up all over the nation blogging about the blog about the blog.

MR. MATTHEWS: You've put your finger on a real problem. And I -- sadly, it's, you know, a problem that we've had, you know, in the old media, too. You know, you never catch up with a wrong story. It just, you know, spreads around and becomes rumor. Now we have not word of mouth but, you know, e-mail and all kinds of stuff to spread bad

journalism. I think there is a corrective and curative part of what we are doing now in that. The many bloggers out there who are, you know, addressing education can actually tap into expertise that can make a difference.

I write a lot about KIPP. I get a lot of blogs, comments, about KIPP. It's clear to me almost everybody who comments about KIPP in a negative way has never been inside a KIPP school. I keep asking, well, you know, if that's my standard response, and they say, "Well, you know, I know what I know." You know, I devoted an entire, you know, blog post, column, to a woman who had been critical and actually had been inside a KIPP school and reported what she saw. And I was so grateful. I, you know, congratulated her and then I took her blog post and I had the leader of that KIPP school respond point by point so we could actually get a discussion going based on what had really happened. So there is that possibility that we didn't have before, but, you know, bad journalism is going to survive all iterations of journalism I'm afraid.

SPEAKER: This is another really -- okay, I'll be optimistic. This is another role I think for EWA and Hechinger and other collaborations. So let me give you an example. A three-year college degree is a hot issue. And so politicians like to talk about it, and they talk about it, and then local reporters who don't know much about it go and say, "Oh, everyone can graduate in three years." Now, in fact, having done some critical reporting, most students have a tough time graduating in four. And there's a lot of questions educationally about whether it's good to push three.

And the biggest myth of all is that you need a special program to do it in three because in reality from just about every college in America, if you fit certain criteria, you can. Now, so imagine if EWA has -- and it sort of does now, but could do more -- already got three-year degrees have come up in my community. What are the questions to ask?

Or to give another example, perhaps more dangerous, right now there are a lot of interesting for-profit hookups with nonprofit colleges and universities. And I am, frankly, shocked and worried by the amount of puff piece journalism that is done on these, literally pretty much rewriting press releases.

SPEAKER: Can you give an example?

SPEAKER: Oh, an example, you know, -- well, actually I don't want to criticize -- a lot of nonprofit colleges are doing deals with for-profit entities that will create new masters programs, grade papers, hire people, admit students. Some of these are really good. I don't want to trash the sector. Some of these are very questionable. But what I'm amazed by is the number of people who are rewriting press releases. They're not saying, did the faculty vote about this?" Is it accredited? Is there a track record? Are they switching assessment from essay writing to multiple choice for everything? I mean, they're just -- there are questions to ask. And so what I would love to see from EWA and others is on these issues and equivalent K-12 issues, you know, you're a new education reporter. You don't have time to read 10 books. What are 10 questions to ask when this happens in your community?

And actually some of this already exists, but I think there needs to be more of it and have it spread. And then you can help, you know, a lot of the local education reporters are, in fact, gung ho. They're the young -- they're the 20-somethings that we were talking about earlier. They want to do well, but they just need a little help. And what they don't have which a previous generation had was the person in the newsroom who covered education 10 years ago and still really cares and can help them out. Collaboratively --

SPEAKER: Because they've taken a buyout.

SPEAKER: Because they've taken a buyout. Collaboratively, we can help one another out in a way that doesn't affect competition and results in better journalism.

SPEAKER: Thank you, over here in the back.

MR. SCHUCKMAN: Hi. I'm Greg Schuckman. Scott knows this because I wear a lot of hats, but let me just say that I live in Fairfax County. I work for the University of Central Florida in Orlando. I serve on the Northern Virginia Community College Board. I'm a member of the Education Commission of the States, and I'm a PTA president. So I'm kind of spread there.

Something Jay said actually struck me about sort of education reporters being the Rodney Dangerfield amongst journalists, and, you know, how business and politics is really where it's at. And you think about education and more and more it is business and politics. I mean, *Higher Ed* alone is a $400 billion industry. When your rankings come out, I guarantee you that every major local and country and probably state policymaker is going to look and examine that list and figure out where they rank. Northrop's, you know, decision to relocate said in part it was on the K-12 rankings in Fairfax County. So anytime -- and *U.S. News* figured this out obviously with the index -- so the indices and where rankings obsess.

The other thing that made me think about why we're having such a problem here, anytime Pugh or Gallop or Harris or anybody does a poll about what are the top issues that people care about, election year or not election year, education is always in the top five. So if people say that education is a top issue, if we know that business and politics revolve around education issues -- if not daily, certainly weekly -- whether it's K-12 or postsecondary or for profit or nonprofit.

The *Frontline* special last week I'm sure generated some buzz. I read the *Chronicle*. I read *Inside Higher Ed*. I read periodically *Education Week* and I should read it more. And, of course, I subscribe to the *Post*.

But what I guess I'm hearing and what my question is, is for those of us in

the industry, we understand the nuances that we have to follow and what's important in understanding trends and everything else, but for the general consumer out there where education touches them almost every day, whether it's in the value of their house because of the school rankings or where they're going to send their kids to college or how they're going to pay for it or what have you, it seems that education journalism is a self-sustaining entity in its own right in part because politics and business fall so much into that bailiwick.

SPEAKER: "Jay Dangerfield" -- I think that's where you --

MR. MATTHEWS: Yeah, well, you know, you highlight a real tension among journalists, particularly those of us who sometimes write for the mainstream and sometimes, you know, write for I think my blog would be less mainstream because it really just attracts people who are really interested in the topic. And the high school list was clearly -- was conceived by me as a stunt to promote a book. You know, the worst kind of reason to put something out like that. I knew that our bad side in journalism included a fascination with lists and if I had a list with a lot of high schools around the country and a newspaper editor had a couple of these schools in his area, he would have to write a news story about the list. They would then promote my book. But on the flipside --

SPEAKER: I guess the old media isn't that --

MR. MATTHEWS: Exactly, but on the flipside, at the same time, I realized that this way of measuring (inaudible), which was very -- it was based on participation and cause level tests, not test scores. Test scores were a measure of family income. I was actually measuring -- lucked into it -- a pretty good measure it turns out of how hard schools were working, good teachers and staff were working, in a school to get more kids in touch with what college was like and give them a taste of college trauma by having them (inaudible), which turns out to be a really good measure of the quality of the staff of a school. But I'm still stuck with the fact that I'm ranking these schools. If I stop ranking them, people

will stop paying attention. People take the fact that their school has dropped from 90 -- you know, from number 5 to number 6 in the rankings as a huge crisis. And I keep telling them, well, you know, I just did it just to get your attention. Now that I've got your attention, listen to the good stuff I've got.

So we're going to fight that battle forever because I will say, you know, forget about trying to get attention. We're just going to speak to people who are interested in us, but we're still going to have that nut of desire to reach the mainstream. And that will create, you know, all kinds of tensions and misimpressions and that's what we've got to sort of struggle with.

SPEAKER: You know, I think your question actually points to another group of journalists that we should talk about which are the national and local political journalists. And there I think there's a huge disconnect in that, take -- well, to take one of your hats from Florida -- how many of us learned about the Florida teacher tenure law that got vetoed primarily in the context of stories about the odd Senate race there? And how much coverage did that get from the perspective of what it said about the Governor's intentions as opposed to what is this law about? Now, I'm sure *Ed Week* has been all over it, but in the political press generally, that was missing.

Or to take -- and we've got a lot of governors races this year. Well, let's go back and say, look at the Virginia governor's race. And unfortunately, Jay's not in charge of everything at the *Washington Post*. It would be better if he were, but think how many stories we read in the *Post* about the sort of pathetic political strategy of the Democratic candidate for governor. And, you know, it was true apparently looking at the results, but what's going on right now with budget cuts to education was 100 percent predictable. And it's also 100 percent consistent with what the winning candidate said he would do, which is that he would focus largely on not raising taxes and cutting taxes no matter what. I think the press lets

candidates like that off the hook by not talking about the relationship between those sorts of pledges and what it does to you in your nova role in terms of budgets.

So I think another agenda should be outreach to journalists who don't cover education all the time, but how to get them to ask those questions and include those issues as parts of stories that I think are absent. How many times do they just quote every candidate saying, "I'm going to be the education governor," with no scrutiny of whether that's possible?

SPEAKER: That's a great point, and Virginia wants to jump in. And just so everybody knows, I'll take another over here, then over here this gentleman in the back, and the lady over there.

MS. EDWARDS: Quick, it's really a cliché, but everybody -- it has to be said. Some of the tension on this point is that we all went to school. We all think that we know what needs to happen in schools, what needs to happen even in higher education to the extent you went to college. Really cliché, I know. But the fact is that education and education reporting involves a lot of complicated issues, and that actually was in your report. It was terrific that you highlighted that, had a couple of people saying it, and I think it's exactly right. If you really decide to become a high-level, really -- you decide to become an education journalist and stick it out for a while to the point where -- Elizabeth, if you're going to do this, you're going to have to do it for several more years -- before you're really, really going to, you know, have an historical kind of perspective and really understand the issues in depth. I actually like watching CNBC. I'm kind of a nerd that way. Can you imagine being thrown into covering business without understanding the real issues that those people -- it's like a foreign language. Well, education is no less complicated, but everybody thinks they understand it and they get it and they've got the answers for it.

I'll make one more quick point which is I think this point about supply and

demand that I was making a minute ago is the case for education journalists as well, which is to speak again may be to the EWA point which I'm going to say again, it may be less about the supply of info around as building demand among the education journalists for that info that's already available. So that, you know, this idea of yet ginning up yet another white paper or 10 questions to ask is not as much the problem as building a culture within the education journalism space and among education journalists, of recognizing how incredibly complicated and just how much knowledge they have to gain by, you know, tapping into this info.

SPEAKER: Just so I can get everybody -- we've got a great group of people here so I'm going to take at least two at a time. The lady over here, my old friend, and then right back there, and then we'll go back to you in the back. Go ahead, Peggy.

MS. ORCHOWSKI: Hi. I'm Peggy Orchowski. I'm the Congressional correspondent for the *Hispanic Outlook on Higher Education*. So we're a niche magazine, covering higher ed with the Hispanic slant, and it does really well. And I think, you know, I do some really great stories, but they don't get beyond that particular niche and that's what worries me. There's a lot of -- as you were saying, Virginia -- there's so many good complicated stories and a lot of stuff in *Higher Ed* and especially having to do with Hispanics involves immigration -- big surprise that I'd bring that up.

So what I'm wondering is how -- I don't think my magazine's going to collaborate with the *New York Times*, but how does somebody -- how do some of these stories -- and I think, you know, I've gotten some really good stories -- how do those get in the national press? Because there are things that national press should be aware of that's going on. For instance, the nursing thing. There's a big story today about how many nurses -- and there's nurses here -- and by the way, Scott or Jay, I totally disagree with you. I think national education news and covering (inaudible) is really interesting and, you know, goes

beyond the local because just like this nursing story, nurses are needed. The community college has trained nurses. Community colleges are funded locally, but there's a national need. And health providers want to use (inaudible) people for it when tens of thousands of Americans -- I mean, we have vets from Iraq, want to be nurses. The whole thing is there's not enough nursing instructors. Should there be a national fund for nursing instructors that are going to fund community colleges? You see how complicated this can all get. It's not just a local issue or a nursing issue. Now how do we get the national, some of the mainstream media to cover some of those kinds of stories?

SPEAKER: Hang on and then the lady over here. If you can pass the mike back to her.

MS. FINK: Hi. I'm Eleanor Fink and a local resident and the mother of a New York City high school teacher who used to teach at APR, the Academy of Pacific Rim, in Boston, in Dorchester. And I talk with her a lot and her friends when she was in Boston and now in New York about different issues, teaching to the test versus the importance of testing. The kinds of things you read about in the press mainly from the point of view of Diane Raviture, other people at that level. But you rarely see an article -- and I'm not an avid consumer of blogs -- about what do teachers out in the (inaudible) who are actually teaching think about? Am I being forced to teach to the test? Is there too much of that or not? I would love to see more reporting from -- reporters getting out to schools and actually talking to teachers and principals, assistant principals, others who are actually doing the work from multiple perspectives.

SPEAKER: Two completely different good questions. Who wants to start? Jay, you want to start?

MR. MATTHEWS: I think you're absolutely right. I've used a lot of this space I now have on the Internet to bring teachers in. I've, you know, had teachers as guest

columnists. I, you know, describe what they're doing, particularly if they're doing something really unusual. I try to do it in detail, lots of comments from teachers in responsible blogs and getting more of teachers to use this is absolutely the number one priority for me. I've learned everything important I know about education by talking to hundreds of teachers, and that's what I plan to do the rest of my life. You're absolutely right.

SPEAKER: Well, to take the question of how do you get the national press to cover an issue like the crisis in not having enough nursing instructors. The important thing one must recognize is that this panel is totally unrepresentative in that the *Chronicle*, *Ed Week*, and *Inside Higher Ed*, we are education focused, so we're writing about things that we all think are important in education. Most daily newspapers are not writing about education because it matters or is important to social policy or is important to justice. They're writing about it as a consumer issue. And so they're approaching the stories, say for higher ed, most of their imaginary readers are a suburban parent who is thinking about will my kid get in? How much will it cost me? Will my kid graduate on time? Will my kid get a job or move back in with me? And then those of certain faiths also care about will my kid engage in certain vices while at college? It is a very practical orientation. Yes, it is a very practical orientation, you know, focus.

Now, so take an issue like that -- and because community colleges are always asking me, how can we get attention from the national press? And what I say is, do it as a consumer issue. The supply of nurses affects health care, but you need to approach it not as a social justice, but that this affects the quality of care in hospitals or you play on prejudices that people have.

For instance, there is a common belief, unfortunately, in higher ed coverage that the more students you reject, the more applicants you reject, the better you are. The interesting dynamic that I've written about is it is as hard to get into some community college

nursing programs as it is to Ivy League institutions. People don't realize that because they think of community colleges as open admissions. You play on things like that that will be a hook. If you told them that this is a national crisis, you're going to get nowhere because they're not thinking about that demographic. And you pitch a story to me, and then they'll copy me. So, you know, there are multiple approaches.

SPEAKER: This gentleman has been very patient. Thank you.

MR. RUSSO: Thanks. My name's Alexander Russo. I've got a blog called This Week in Education. I wanted to ask about the role of talent. You guys have been talking a lot about models and math, and it reminds me a lot of education policy discussions about governance and school finance. And I wanted to ask about where cultivating true writing, investigative reporting, talent comes and how come the education beat seems to be so slow and unwilling to do other beats do, which is pluck stars from wherever they are -- Ezra Klein's a good example -- and put them where more people can see them? I wonder why we don't have that system and how come other people out there, practitioners, local bloggers, et cetera. That model seems to be -- and I'm wondering whether the math's not there.

Ginny, maybe you could talk about that?

MS. EDWARDS: Well, I --

SPEAKER: Could I just take two at a time?

MS. EDWARDS: Sure.

SPEAKER: If you could just hand -- that gentleman over there has been patient, also. Thank you, sir.

MR. GRINDSTAFF: Thank you. My name is Hugh Grindstaff and I wonder if you looked at the *National Geographic* model as -- their educational media -- and see how they've done it? How they switched from paper to electronic media and how it's progressed.

SPEAKER: Do you want to take that first, and somebody else --

SPEAKER: Are all of you members of the Press Club, National Press Club?

MS. EDWARDS: Actually, I think Alex's question is important for me to address as well. I think, I mean, the second part of it is so much about the very thing we've been talking about quite a lot, which is the culture of education and the culture of education journalism. And I don't know --

SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MS. EDWARDS: No, no, no. Well, I mean, it's the two parts of saying that, you know, is education valued as, you know, people say it is in polls. And it's not just the top five. It's usually the top two or three in any kind of polling done of the most important public policy or other kinds of issues. But it's -- and I'm not talking about just newsrooms, I'm talking about this tension again between people kind of paying education and the improvement of the schools, paying lip service to it on one hand, and then not putting the resources to, you know, covering it in a good way -- in a, you know, poll kind of way.

So I'm not talking about just newsrooms, but then I would answer part of your question, Alex, with the thing that Jay said, which is I don't buy the contention that we're having a dearth of talent. I think that there is high-quality information and content being produced in myriad ways, not just out of newsrooms -- you know I believe this -- but at all kinds of bloggers and alternative sites and micro sites, whatever you want to call them. So, I just don't buy your contention.

And one of the things that makes me really crazy in these kinds of discussions is when people speak in generalities because there are 16-, 15-plus-thousand school districts. There are, you know, many more than that communities in the country. There are 50 states, 51 if you count the District of Columbia. The quality of journalism in

those communities varies widely. The quality of education varies widely. And, you know, to paint either journalists or educators with this broad brush stroke that we just constantly do, I don't think it's helpful to the discussion. And so -- because those journalists have been a real help to putting education discussions on the policy agenda in state after state and community after community. You know, can't say that uniformly either, but we can point to lots of really terrific examples of that being the case.

Do you want to say something, Jay?

MR. MATTHEWS: Well, I thought Alex's question was really interesting, and I think the answer is -- Ezra Klein, when we hired him, I think had more daily hits than any other blogger at the *Washington Post*. So that was easy. I don't know if there exists in the universe at the moment an education blogger who has that kind of heat on the Internet. So, you know, *Newsweek*, we don't know what's going to happen with *Newsweek*, but my list on *Newsweek* gets 7 million hits a year, so I'm going to be able to find some other place for that list happily and that will be my hobby until I die. But my own blog gets nowhere near that kind of hits, and so, you know, I'm not sure anybody would come looking for me and everybody knows I'm such a company man, I'd never go anywhere else.

Also, I think education reporting has really developed sort of a comfort zone in the papers that they're at, and I think we're harder to move because we've become very fond of the schools we're covering and we want to keep doing it. And once you develop all those sources, it's really hard to pick up and go someplace else.

SPEAKER: I think it also comes back to what's in the report and what Jay talked about earlier that on most newspapers, you know, the education beat is not a prestige beat. And if those newspapers that do go out looking for hot shots, they're going to look for the political reporter or the -- I was -- we've been covering in the last few years about the decline in the number of -- we've been talking mostly here about, you know, education

writers and reporters as if it's all one thing. There are fewer and fewer people on daily newspapers covering higher education. Many newspapers have eliminated the beat or they've combined it with the high school -- with the elementary and secondary beat and as a result, it usually gets short shrift. On most newspapers, you know, most of the people who are covering higher education work in the sports section. And so I think that's an important issue.

On the multimedia question that you asked earlier, I haven't really -- I must admit I haven't examined the *National Geographic* and they're a little bigger than we are, and so we don't have the resources. But I do think that multimedia is an increasingly important part of what we do on the Internet, and we're doing more and more of it all the time, more and more audio and video.

And the video, I'm distressed about the video as someone who has a face for radio, but I think we -- you know, I think that's going to be an increasingly important way of telling stories. And, you know -- but whether it's a business model I think for -- in an area like education -- I mean, *National Geographic*, of course, has got tremendous resources in that area and tremendous subject matter to deal with. But I do think there are important and the interesting way to tell stories is with multimedia and that we're going to need to do more and more of. And I don't know -- I'm not sure what the business model is, if there is one, lurking in there.

SPEAKER: And what's the educational equivalent of the pretty pictures that *National Geographic* made its name on? Or maybe there are.

We have time for a couple of rounds of questions. I also want to make sure I invite Russ and Darrell if they have anything to say before we close, but up front, please.

MR. BAUGI: Dissal Baugi. I'm a former New Jersey local board member and private school board member and community organizer, whatever. I'm wondering if

each of you could share who your primary or the majority of your audience is, and maybe if Dr. Whitehurst also has any information on the majority that would receive feeds from the Institute of Education Sciences?

SPEAKER: Thank you. Anyone else who would want to come in before we close? One of you take your --

SPEAKER: Well, I think in this day and age it depends on which audience you're talking about. I mean, we have actually multiple audiences I would say. You know, we have one kind of audience online where, you know, we are reaching, you know, in -- it tends to skew younger. It tends to be more faculty and, you know, new Ph.D.'s, graduate students, you know, so that online is one audience. Now, there's overlap, of course. It's not that simplistic.

I think that our print and premium content tends to be to some extent to be consumed more by administrators and sort of what I call the "engaged faculty," that is the department chairmen and people who are very involved in the running of the institution. And, you know, I think increasingly we are probably, I think, online reaching out beyond just -- I mean, our audience is people professionally engaged in higher education. That's who we write for, but I think we are -- we see evidence that we are reaching beyond that into, you know, the general public because, you know, so much of the information we have is available to anybody who wants to come read it so --

MR. MATTHEWS: The *Washington Post* newspaper's target of education coverage is mostly suburban parents, particularly in Montgomery and Fairfax counties. They've got -- we have more readers there than anywhere else -- and to a certain extent, people who work in schools. The website gets a lot more readers from outside, and so that group is both parents and same people who read the paper, but the people who are really into this issue for all kinds of reasons. They work in schools or they are policy people.

That's a wider group, but that's sort of the way we look at it.

MS. EDWARDS: At *Education Week* it's very similar to Phil's description. *Education Week* in print is about 50 thousand paid mainly administrators and policymakers and just people at the most think tanks and foundations caring about education policy. And then there are about 260,000 pass-along readers from that, so about 300,000 people see *Ed Week* in print. Online it's much more skewed to teachers and practitioners and even parents in an engaged public. And, you know, depending on the other things we produce, you know, it's going to skew either to the policymakers or to the practitioners. We have channels where we try to serve the technology specialists. Just like Phil said, you can really -- depends what audience.

One point, though, that I think is germane here is that whenever anybody talks about like what you do and who sees it, you start to realize well let's see, if you looked at the website at 2:50 today, you saw what you saw. And maybe you got the e-newsletter this morning, and maybe you're going to tune into a webinar tomorrow, but that's only 3 of the 3 dozen things that you could have seen between now and then.

So, you know, the idea that there's one kind of monolithic audience and one way of looking at this information is specious because you're only going to see and know what you see and know. Right, you know? Which I think is just a really interesting -- again when people start talking in kind of generalizations, you know, did you see that story? I mean, we don't have that kind of water cooler experience anymore of, you know, that shared experience of having seen one story and then talking about it. It's really interesting. Causes real tension, I think.

SPEAKER: Our audience is overwhelmingly people who are in higher education. We have smaller people in government and foundations and trustees, but overwhelmingly people in higher education.

I actually want to go back to Alex's question because I don't think we gave it justice. Because as you were talking about it, I was thinking about a call I got last week from a very good daily reporter covering education who was agonizing over whether to take a job in P.R. And the reason was there was no forward path at this newspaper -- there was no path to be Jay Matthews -- that it was either go cover, you know, maybe a path up would be cover five suburbs' political, you know, town councils or risk getting laid off. Those were the more likely futures than developing a career and a reputation.

And so, again, those of us on this panel are education publications, and so we can promote the talent that we have and give them new opportunities and new beats within education. I really think it's a huge problem that the talented 20-something education reporters at dailies don't see the opportunity. If they want to get to a better publication, leaving education is seen as a better route. And so I actually think the issue -- I don't have a solution, but I actually think that's crucial to the problem.

SPEAKER: I wanted to use your question as an excuse to make a point I haven't had the chance to make previously. You had asked, I think, about the Institute of Education Sciences which I used to lead in the U.S. Department of Education. I think the interesting thing about that is, well, of course, there are multiple audiences and you can get feeds from various sites, but an interesting thing about it is that it generates more traffic than any other portion of the U.S. Department of Education. So that it is producing data and reports and statistics makes it quite attractive to a large number of people who surf the web and have a variety of businesses that they're involved in and needs for knowledge. Here at Brookings, the Brown Center Annual Report on American Education generates more traffic than the rest of the Governance Studies' website against an empirical report.

One of the things I don't think we get enough of in either local or national coverage is coverage of research, of statistics, of the kind of stuff you routinely get in the

coverage of health care, but is quite rare in education which tends to be handled as a personal interest story or a political story. I think, you know, the government figures on web usage suggests that there is an audience for that. *Ed Week* does a great job of it, and I think we need more of it.

SPEAKER: Thank you. I wanted to -- is Doug Lederman still here? Are you --?

SPEAKER: I think he left.

SPEAKER: Oh, you're a partner because our kids are on their high school paper together, and Russ and Darrell indulge me in our earlier report. I worry very much that we're not giving support to those things because actually kids in schools learn stuff. It is a source of information, local, you know, school-based papers are actually a source of real information on what goes on in schools, but Doug is Scott's partner.

But Darrell, before we close, and then I'll have one last thing to say.

MR. WEST: Actually, my comment builds on a point you were just making. First, I want to thank the panel as well as the audience. I thought there were lots of really great ideas here just in terms of looking to the future. But it seems to me the greatest uncertainty when we think about the future is this idea of generational change because the way that young people access information is just very different from those of us who are a little older. I mean, I taught political science at Brown University for 26 years and over time I noticed that the way students accessed information and the sites from which they accessed information were places I'd never heard of. I mean, it was different the way they used information and where they got it. And so I think, you know, what makes our current technology revolution so unpredictable is not how we think the revolution is going to unfold, but how those under the age of 30 are going to push us because they're going to do it in a very different way. So, I think that's a perspective we need to think about as well.

SPEAKER: And I just want to close and make three quick points. First, Scott made a point about what parents don't want their kids doing, and I just wanted to share with you -- a conservative friend once looked at me and said, "A social conservative is a liberal with a daughter in high school." There's a lot to be said for it.

Secondly, Scott -- another point Scott made is this panel is unrepresentative. I have learned in my time at Brookings that all panels are unrepresentative, but that this is really an exceptional panel. And at the beginning, Jay noted his Rodney Dangerfield point. I think these were my sentences about we don't give respect to teaching -- and we don't give enough respect to teaching and we don't give enough respect to education journalism.

And I think if we've done nothing else today, both from this panel and from so many people in the audience, and now St. Elizabeth included, is that this is a field that really we've got to find a way to give more respect for. And that includes paying people, and it includes creating more paths so that people can become Scott and Jay and Virginia and Phil.

And so I want to thank you all very, very much for coming today.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or

counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012