

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
HONORS EXCELLENCE OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Media Ethics: Between Iraq and a Hard Place



Volume II ~ Number 2 ~ April 2003

DR. JAY BLACK
POYNTER JAMISON CHAIR IN MEDIA ETHICS
FOUNDING CO-EDITOR, JOURNAL OF MASS MEDIA ETHICS
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA ST. PETERSBURG

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
HONORS EXCELLENCE OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Media Ethics: Between Iraq and a Hard Place

DR. JAY BLACK
POYNTER JAMISON CHAIR IN MEDIA ETHICS
FOUNDING CO-EDITOR, JOURNAL OF MASS MEDIA ETHICS
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA ST. PETERSBURG

APRIL THIRD ~ TWO THOUSAND THREE
THE HONORS COLLEGE
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
MARY ANN WOLFE THEATER ~ BISCAYNE BAY CAMPUS

Honors Excellence Occasional Paper Series, Volume II, Number 2

©2003

The Honors College at Florida International University

University Park Campus, DM 233

Miami, Florida 33199

All rights reserved

Edited by John Kneski

ISSN: 1538-1668

Dr. Jay Black

Poynter Jamison Chair in Media Ethics

Founding co-editor, *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*

University of South Florida, St. Petersburg

Prof. Black is founding coeditor of the *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* and published and consults widely on issues of journalism ethics, professionalism, moral development, codes of ethics, etc. He was first author of the Society of Professional Journalist's new handbook, *Doing Ethics in Journalism*, which went through four printings in 1993 and has been updated for publication by Allyn & Bacon.

His textbook, *Introduction to Mass Communications*, came out in its fourth edition in January 1995; each of the earlier editions has been adopted by some 250 universities. Dr. Black holds a Ph.D. in journalism and sociology from the University of Missouri, an MA in journalism and English from Ohio University, and a BA in English from Miami (Ohio) University. He has worked as a reporter and copy editor on four newspapers in Ohio and Missouri, and has been a journalism professor in Ohio, Missouri, Utah, Alabama, and Australia.

Media Ethics: Between Iraq and a Hard Place

by Dr. Jay Black

INTRODUCTION

You honor me and the discipline of ethics with your invitation to join you this afternoon to participate in your lecture series and to talk shop about ethics in the news media and public relations. Steve Fjellman's invitation said you agreed to invite someone from the academy who could speak "a little more broadly about ethical issues than the professionals might." Now that's a daunting challenge, but one I naively and humbly accepted.

When the invitation arrived a couple of months ago it seemed reasonable to put on my green eye-shade editor's hat and take stock of the state of media ethics scholarship. After all, as co-editor of an international journal specializing in media ethics since 1984, I've read many tens of thousands of pages of manuscripts and sifted and sorted through a vast array of scholarship in the field. Along the way I probably have killed off a few pine trees with my own scribblings on a variety of media ethics issues. It would have been interesting to me and at least two or three of you to engage in such a stock-taking exercise.

However, given what's going on outside this room today, I just can't do that. My own—let alone your—boredom threshold would be quickly reached if we spent this half hour parsing academic media ethics in the abstract. Moreover, we would be squandering an opportunity to explore something much more relevant: the state of media ethics beyond—but not exclusive of—the academy; the state of media ethics in what passes for "the real world," a world that should be, but is not necessarily, informed by the academy. As

a journalist/public scholar, I cannot ignore the richness of today's real life laboratories in media ethics, and I suggest we consider some lessons from those labs as we take stock of the enterprise.

So, what seems to be going on "out there," in media-land? What are journalists and PR practitioners up to, ethics-wise, in today's War in Iraq? What trends, if any, can we note in the media-public nexus since 9/11? How can news media practitioners, mere mortals that they are, process and gate-keep information professionally, objectively, and ethically during times of such high international dudgeon, and how can public relations practitioners operate effectively and ethically in the same environment? How do we, as faculty and students and scholars, filter these images and trends through our own systems of values? And then, how do we ethically and responsibly "teach" this stuff, when we ourselves are very likely to be burdened by strong (and perhaps unexamined) prejudices and when we have been granted the awesome power of the classroom lectern?

At this point it may be useful to do a case study. The natural laboratory I want to take you to is my Monday night "Ethics Across the Professions" class earlier this week. In that course are 45 students, about half from Interdisciplinary Social Sciences and half from Journalism and Media Studies. This week we were concentrating on media ethics; we've already worked on ethics of leadership, health care, business, law, and education, and we've participated in a three-day international conference on professional ethics. So by now the students are reasonably sophisticated about professional power, codes of ethics, conflicts of interest, the nature of truth telling and harm and independence and accountability, etc. They're fairly good at systematic moral reasoning, and can use a variety of ethical decision-making models to think their way through sticky dilemmas. So we should have every reason to expect a discussion of media ethics to proceed at the rational, principled level, right?

Guess again. Not unlike every casual, street-corner, water-cooler, barber-shop conversation any of us have had about media ethics with everyday “ordinary” folks, Monday night’s class quickly degenerated to (or should I say emerged from”) the visceral level of discourse. The claims and counterclaims constituted what we might call “moralizing,” as distinguished from “moral philosophy.” Such moralizing seems to be informed by prejudice, by selective information, by the syndrome Lewis Carroll described as “‘First the sentence and then the evidence,’ cried the Queen.” In short, it was a routine discussion about media ethics!

What were the topics brought up, and how were they dealt with? Well, Peter Arnett for one. The NBC/MSNBC/National Geographic reporter stationed in Baghdad, who was interviewed on Iraqi television, had called the US war effort a failure, and was soundly chastised and fired for crossing the Maginot line that separates reporter and activist. Other students, citing unnamed sources of rumor (including, of course, the ubiquitous internet) said that Geraldo Rivera had also been kicked out of Iraq for having revealed US troop movements. (Of course, we had not yet seen the Tuesday, April 1, stories in which Geraldo denied he was being removed from the war zone and blamed the rumors on “rats” at NBC news, his former employer, and “the pack of lies” from MSNBC, which he referred to as “so pathetic a cable news network that they have to do everything they can to attract attention.” That would have been grist for the media ethics mill the other night; it will have to wait a week, by which time the world would have learned that Geraldo indeed had been booted out of Iraq for sketching troop movements in the sand.)

On another topic, the students got in a tizzy over front page photos of a downed US helicopter on one day and of American prisoners

of war on another last week. This was seen by some as the liberal media's bias against the war effort. (Some did note that after a flurry of jingoistic letters to the editor opposing such coverage, the liberal but not commercially insensitive St. Petersburg Times atoned for its "error" by splashing a huge page one photo of a GI carrying a wounded Iraqi soldier one day, and, the next day, a US military doctor cradling an Iraqi infant. Some seemed to think that was a blatant sell-out on the part of the paper. Others thought it was just common sense.) But those photos of the American prisoners of war, and especially the Al-Jazeera's gruesome footage of US casualties, raised the most ire. How could any international media be so insensitive, and how could any domestic media report on casualties before knowing whether the families of American soldiers had been notified? And then, when families had been notified, why would any responsible journalists shove cameras in their face? Have these people no sense of decency, or privacy?

Another topic the students argued about: Embedded journalists—reporters and photographers riding along with, protected by, and inevitably allied with US troops. They give us great insights to the war, insights lacking in the military-controlled Persian Gulf War of a decade ago, said some of the students. (Some were particularly excited about the incredible new portable technology that brings the war home to us instantaneously in living color, but not everyone saw this as serving society in any meaningful way.) Others countered with claims that there's no way a journalist beholden to anyone for food, clothing, shelter, transportation, safety and a daily ration of news could do anything other than lose professional objectivity and reflect a sort of "Journalistic Stockholm Syndrome." The Pentagon has created as much control over this decade's press as it did in 1991, but is a lot smarter about how it controls us, some of the students said. (As you might suspect, the students majoring in

journalism and those majoring in public relations did not see eye to eye on this.)

Speaking of the loss of objectivity and the PR “machine,” it was noted that liberals opposed to the war are angry not just at President Bush, but also at the news media; they say the media have not been aggressive enough in challenging the bellicose agenda of Bush, Rumsfeld, Ashcroft and Company. And they note that conservative radio talk show hosts and Rupert Murdoch’s FOX network are leading the jingoistic rallies in support of the war, drowning out any opposition media. The discussion spontaneously back-pedaled to 9/11, with the attendant concerns about journalists’ patriotism or lack thereof, of flag-waving and sloganeering, of creating and blindly deferring to mass hysteria, anti-Middle East prejudice, and then nationalistic group think—topics that inevitably stir the loins. And so it went. A class of rational thinkers regressed to visceral and anecdotal discourse.

Is anything wrong with this picture? Should we expect more of our students-cum-citizens, or of our media practitioners-in-waiting, of our ethics students?

STUDENTS ENGAGING IN DOING ETHICS

We might accuse them of being knuckle-dragging, mouth-breathing, moral troglodytes (I have to thank one of my students for coining this phrase). But that would be short-sighted and unfair, and make us vulnerable to accusations that we’re pointy-headed liberal professors. Rather, I believe the students’ passion speaks to the importance of understanding media in the political/economic/societal matrix, and the significance (and concomitant difficulty) of grappling with media ethics vis a vis general social ethics and

applied professional ethics.

In retrospect it seems to me that my students, in their animated discussion, were engaging in some essential components of learning and doing ethics. Indeed, they all seemed to be reflecting at least two, if not four, of the five course objectives listed on my syllabus. (The syllabus draws from the Hastings Center, Institute of Society, Ethics, and Life Science, which listed five instructional goals appropriate to any ethics course). At the very least, the discussion revealed the 1) recognition of moral issues and the 2) stimulation of the moral imagination. For some students, the discussion also seemed to 3) elicit a sense of moral obligation and personal responsibility; occasionally, there was evidence of 4) tolerating and resisting disagreement and moral ambiguity.

The fifth objective, the development of analytical skills for the systematic evaluation of moral dilemmas, had been the focus of much of the semester's early work. Ironically (or was it so ironic?), the viscerally engaging subject du jour seemed to result in the students' bypassing the rigorous logic of objective decision-making while they were engaged in recognizing issues/stimulating moral imagination/eliciting a sense of moral obligation/tolerating moral ambiguity.

My job, as a strong believer in the "teachable moment," was to devote class time to help them momentarily pull back from the heat of the debate and systematically work through some of the issues and dilemmas—to bring light to the heat. In reality, all we could get to this week were a couple of the dilemmas. It could take a whole semester just to untangle the issues the class raised, but that's the fun of teaching ethics: We do have an entire semester, in an intellectually safe and nurturing classroom, to do our thinking and caring, to learn how to front-load our decisions so that once we do get out

there in the “real world” we’re armed and ready to think and act as moral agents. (Maybe that’s one benefit the “academic perspective” offers that is not likely to arise from the disconnected snippets, war stories, and moralizing expressed by many of the professionals/practitioners who speak to our classes and to the world at large via their mass media. That academic perspective forces us to transcend—or at least temporarily postpone—prejudice.)

How did I help my students do the necessary work, and how does what I did with them relate to broader questions of media ethics? For one thing, we did some meta-analysis, by noting the need to bear in mind the values, principles, loyalties, professional roles, stages of moral development—and the necessity of having enough information to make informed decisions—reflected throughout our processing of the cases. Each variable can be applied to almost any case study; collectively, they constitute lenses needed to “do ethics” thoroughly and effectively.

Then I shared with them the 1996 code of ethics of the world’s largest organization of journalists, the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ), and had them frame their discussion in accordance with its four fundamental principles of journalistic practice: 1) to seek truth and to report it; 2) to minimize harm; 3) to act independently; and 4) to be accountable. We looked at each in turn, noting that in seeking truth and reporting it journalists should be honest, fair and courageous in gathering, interpreting, and distributing information; that in minimizing harm ethical journalists treat sources, subjects and colleagues as human beings inherently deserving of respect; that in acting independently journalists try to be free of obligation to any interest other than the public’s right to know, and that in being accountable journalists are responsive to legitimate moral claims made by their readers, listeners, viewers, and each other.

We quickly pointed out that the four guiding principles are intended to work in tandem rather than in isolation, that any given ethical dilemma probably entails a balancing act between or among two or more of the principles in a sort of “right versus right” configuration. (We’re obligated to Rushworth Kidder’s highly readable text, *How Good People Make Tough Choices*, for the “right versus right” paradigm.) How much truth can and should be sought, and how much harm permitted to occur? How much independence can or should journalists have, and how accountable (and to whom) should they be?

Consider what happens when we polarize the constructs. We end up visualizing the journalistic enterprise as either a search for truth or an avoidance of harm, or as either unbridled independence or absolute accountability. In doing so we end up in a mental bind wherein we think we have to tell the raw truth at all costs, even if it means the invasion of someone’s privacy; or, vice versa, that we have to avoid inflicting any discomfort or harm even if it means important truths go untold; meanwhile, we either operate as though the First Amendment guarantees us total independence from government and all other institutions and individual power brokers [a naive interpretation, one too often unexamined in media circles], so we should not hold ourselves accountable nor permit anyone else to do so; or, vice versa, we are so conscious of being accountable to any and all that we lose needed independence. Such are the consequences of polarizing SPJ’s four guiding principles.

I encourage my students—and any professionals who care to unravel the problem and lay audiences who want to better understand it—to reconfigure all four of the constructs as achievable ideals, wherein we seek to maximize truth-telling significant stories the public needs in order to self-govern, while minimizing harm to sources, subjects, and our audiences; and likewise, to maximize

independence from forces that would corrupt the enterprise while simultaneously demonstrating accountability to the moral agents who have the right to ask journalists for a reckoning. Reconfiguring the constructs along horizontal and vertical axes, rather than a polar opposites, essentially frees us to do ethics in journalism.

A CODE OF ETHICS IN PUBLIC RELATIONS

Basically, then, what we see in the code of ethics for journalists is an appeal to moral reasoning rather than an appeal to convention or ad hoc moralizing. The code does not simplistically resolve the dilemmas, but frames them and challenges us to use individual decision-making skills on the task at hand. Thus viewed, the discussions of case studies and practice of journalism become more nuanced and morally enlightened.

Meanwhile, many of the discussions about media performance post-9/11, in particular the current war in Iraq, entail propaganda battles between news media and the Pentagon, or between journalists and agents of persuasion and special interest. Therefore, it was deemed helpful to enrich those discussions with insights from the world of public relations.

Just as the discussions of news media's search for ethical performance were informed by the SPJ Code of Ethics, so were discussions of public relations informed by looking at the code of the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA). In 2000 PRSA adopted an entirely new code of ethics intended to be aspirational and educational rather than punitive. PRSA's earlier prohibitions against misbehavior have been replaced with positive, affirmative moral obligations. The emphasis is on "responsible advocacy."

To be professionally ethical, PR practitioners are asked by their code to embody a half dozen core values: 1) advocacy; 2) honesty; 3) expertise; 4) independence; 5) loyalty, and 6) fairness. Based on these values, the code calls for awareness of:

1) the free flow of information (“protecting and advancing the free flow of accurate and truthful information is essential to serving the public interest and contributing to informed decision making in a democratic society”);

2) competition (“promoting healthy and fair competition among professionals preserves an ethical climate while fostering a robust business environment”);

3) disclosure of information (“open communication fosters informed decision making in a democratic society”);

4) safeguarding confidences (“client trust requires appropriate protection of confidential and private information”);

5) conflicts of interest (“avoiding real, potential or perceived conflicts of interest builds the trust of clients, employers, and the publics”); and

6) enhancing the profession (“public relations professionals work constantly to strengthen the public’s trust in the profession”).

A pocket guide to the PRSA code offers practitioners a reasonably sensible “ethics decision making guide” or justification model. It says that to do ethics in PR, one should:

1) define the specific ethical issues and/or conflict;

2) identify internal and external factors (e.g., legal, political, social, economic) that may influence the decision;

3) identify key values;

4) identify the parties who will be affected by the decision and define the public relations professional’s obligation to each;

5) select ethical principles to guide the decision making process; and

6) make a decision and justify.

This six step process aligns closely with any number of ethical decision-making models to be found in the fields of applied professional ethics. What makes it stand out is the fact that is affixed to the code, as a guide to daily practice in public relations, rather than buried in a textbook or scholarly journal (where academics inclined toward esoterica look for professional ethics models).

There are obvious and philosophically significant differences between the four-point SPJ code and the triple six-pack PRSA code, differences that enliven discussions about news/information distribution and public relations/advocacy. This should not surprise us, given that there are distinctions between the professional roles and moral duties of the two types of communicators. Despite the similarity of key terms (especially the truthtelling mandate and the call for the free flow of information and the avoidance of conflicts of interest), the two fields of communication co-exist in a dynamic tension that may have ethical implications. And any informed discussion of the ethics of mass media in the post-9/11 world would do well to bear in mind that there is truth-telling and there is truth-telling, there is free flow of information and there is free flow of information, there are conflicts of interest and there are conflicts of interest.

What one doesn't read in the codes per se is the ethically significant difference between a professional mandate to gather and redistribute truthful information (aka power) to everyone and the professional mandate to use selective truth-telling to redistribute information among paying clients and selected publics. Please don't misunderstand me. I'm not saying journalism is morally superior to public relations. That's a bandwagon I don't care to jump aboard. I'm merely saying that each discipline has its own professionally

relevant roles and duties, all of which are legitimate in an open society.

Look briefly at what happens when we take a couple of the cases we dealt with in class and process them with insights from moral philosophy and from their respective professional codes of ethics. For instance, Peter Arnett's and Geraldo Rivera's "bad career moves" can be seen as journalistic cases of having gone out on a limb when seeking to tell significant truths, while (apparently) failing to consider the potential for harm—in Arnett's case, harm to the fragile US mandate to wage war; in Rivera's case, harm to specific troops. At the same time, the two journalists' efforts to maintain their own independence came into conflict rather than compliance with the need for accountability—in Arnett's case, to his employers, in Rivera's case, to the military.

If we look at these as public relations cases, we have to focus on issues of credibility and information management. When viewed through the eyes of the two journalists' media management/employers, the behaviors were certainly problematic. And, when seen as public relations issues for the military coalition, the Pentagon, or Washington, D.C.'s fragile control over public opinion, the two cases become absolutely nightmarish. A conscientious governmental PR executive charged with establishing and maintaining positive public opinion would find the two journalists to be out of order and deserving of severe correcting. Not that Arnett and Rivera were expected to abide by the PRSA code of ethics, mind you; it's just that a PR person at the networks or government would be dismayed over the so-called "ethics" of the two journalists. As we said, there is truth, and then there is truth.

Taking the same cases through any number of philosophic justification models would also be enlightening. For example, the popular

“Potter Box,” named after Harvard theologian Ralph Potter, asks us to fully define the moral dilemma, to examine the conflicting moral and non-moral values, to apply a legitimate moral principle, and to sort out our loyalties before making a decision. Such a decision-making process here would have to include the values of truth-telling, national security, and media competition; it could invoke deontological, consequentialistic, virtue, or other principles; it would sift through and prioritize loyalties to self, employers, sources, military, and the publics of—at the very least—America and Iraq. Good minds, rationally working through these problems, could very well disagree on the suggested solutions and pass legitimate judgment on the behaviors of Arnett, Rivera, the networks, and the US military, but at least they would have gotten to those solutions in an open and clear-headed fashion mandated by moral philosophy.

Similar decision-making processes can and should be used to resolve the other issues raised by my students. When framed as polar opposites, the issues were:

- news photography that either reflects a seemingly critical stance toward the war or is unabashedly pro-American and jingoistic, that either discloses or glosses over important—though unpopular—truths;
- “embedded journalism” that either offers uncensored views of the action or parrots the military value system;
- overly passive or overly aggressive reportage, each with “attitude”;
- etc.

If the issues are more fully nuanced (which becomes possible when we force ourselves to withhold judgment temporarily) and the professional ethics more thoroughly culled, the discussions and conclusions inevitably move away from moralizing and toward moral philosophy. In the process the exercise ceases to be impassioned “street rhetoric” and becomes academically and professionally

defensible, even pragmatic.

What we've just gone through is an exercise in ethical decision-making. As we do in most of our applied media ethics classes, we've taken some contentious issues and examined them systematically. We've noted that the codes of ethics for the media organizations—in this case SPJ and PRSA—are both advisory and educational. They ask us to do our own thinking rather than imposing minimalistic standards upon us. This doesn't mean that those codes don't get trotted out in the heat of a controversy and invoked by some as Holy Grail. Neither does it imply that turning to the codes will terminate unsophisticated moralizing. But our exercise here today does indicate that the challenge remains for media practitioners (and students and faculty) to do a better job of working through moral dilemmas, and certainly to do a better job of helping the public understand the struggles we go through to get it right.

The Honors College Administration and Faculty

Administration

Ivelaw L. Griffith, Ph.D. (City University of New York), Dean & Fellow

Stephen M. Fjellman, Ph.D. (Stanford University), Associate Dean & Fellow

Caryl Myers Grof, M.A. (Florida International University), Assistant Dean & Fellow

John S. Kneski, M.Arch II (Syracuse University), Assistant Dean & Fellow

Sharon Placide, M.A. (Florida International University), Coordinator of Student Services

Office Staff

Rosa Barredo, Program Assistant

Ana Cortada, Office Manager

Juan Lopez, Information Technology Officer

Lourdes Pereira, Senior Secretary

Melissa Petersen, Biscayne Bay Campus Assistant

Elizabeth Williams, Coordinator of Research & Programs

Faculty Fellows

Irma T. de Alonso, Ph.D. (University of York), Economics
Regina C. Bailey, M.F.A. (Pratt Institute), Art
William K. Beesting, Ph.D. (Florida State University), English
Christopher Brown, Ph.D. (University of Delaware), Biological Sciences
Manuel J. Carvajal, Ph.D. (University of Florida) Economics
Ricardo Castells, Ph.D. (Duke University), Modern Languages
Stephen M. Fain, Ed.D. (Columbia University), Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
Mary G. Free, Ph.D.(University of Georgia), English
Bernard S. Gerstman, Ph.D. (Princeton University), Physics
Bruce Harvey, Ph.D. (Stanford University), English
Bruce W. Hauptli, Ph.D. (Washington University), Philosophy
Marilyn Hoder-Salmon, Ph.D. (University of New Mexico), English
Robert H. Hogner, Ph.D. (University of Pittsburgh), Marketing & Business Environment
James E. Huchingson, Ph.D. (Emory University), Religious Studies
Krishnaswamy Jayachandran, Ph.D. (Kansas State University), Soil Microbiology
Barry B. Levine, Ph.D. (New School for Social Research), Sociology/Anthropology
Felice Lifshitz, Ph.D. (Columbia University), History
Peter A. Machonis, Ph.D. (Pennsylvania State University), Modern Languages
Anthony Maingot, Ph.D. (University of Florida), Sociology and Anthropology
Tomislav Mandakovic, Ph.D. (University of Pittsburgh), Decision Sciences
Pete E.C. Markowitz, Ph.D. (College of William and Mary), Physics
Florentin Maurrasse, Ph.D. (Columbia University), Earth Sciences
Lesley A. Northup, Ph.D. (Catholic University), Religious Studies
Kevin O'Shea, Ph.D. (University of California, Los Angeles), Chemistry
Darden Pyron, Ph.D. (University of Virginia), History
Meri-Jane Rochelson, Ph.D. (University of Chicago), English
Ediberto Roman, J.D. (University of Wisconsin), Law
Caroline Simpson, Ph.D. (University of Florida), Physics
John Stuart, M.Arch. (Columbia University), Architecture
Lorna Veraldi, J.D. (New York School of Law), Journalism & Mass Communications
Michael Wagner, Ph.D. (Florida State University), Music
Christopher Warren, D.A. (Lehigh University), Political Science

The Honors College

The Honors College at Florida International University in Miami offers the best of two worlds. It is a small community of outstanding students, dedicated scholars, and committed teachers who work together in an atmosphere usually associated with small private colleges. Yet, we do so with all the resources of a major state university, which is one of the nation's top doctoral / research extensive universities. Only 152 universities in the United States hold this superior rank.

The Honors College provides a broad foundation for dedicated students who want to get the most out of their undergraduate education. The undergraduate experience it provides is significantly enhanced by the broad interdisciplinary nature of the curriculum and opportunities to work closely with expert faculty and in the community. The opportunities for graduate or professional study and employment are greatly expanded because of the range of unique activities and academic experiences made available to students in the College. Additional opportunities in The Honors College include mentoring, Gamma Epsilon Phi (formally The Honors College Society), National Student Exchange, and the Pre-Collegiate Summer Institute.

The Honors Curriculum

You may pursue almost any major available in the University and at the same time complete the honors curriculum. The curriculum emphasizes the following activities: Critical, integrative, and creative thinking; Group and independent research; Oral presentation; Close contact between students and faculty; Integration of class work with the broader community.

Admissions

The deadline for Priority Consideration is February 15.

Freshmen: Because admission to the freshman class of the College is limited and competitive, students should complete the application process as early as possible in their senior year of high school. Students should have a minimum high school GPA of 3.5 (weighted) and commensurate test scores on the SAT or ACT. Students who have been named National Merit, Achievement or Hispanic Finalists and Presidential Scholars will be automatically admitted to The Honors College.

Transfer & Current FIU Students: Students with at least a 3.3 in prior college work also can apply to the College at the second or third level. Students transferring from Florida community colleges may compete for transfer scholarships. Minimum requirements: Associate in Arts Degree and GPA of at least 3.5. Membership in the Honors College is required for all transfer scholarship recipients.

The Honors Faculty

“Knowledgeable, caring, enthusiastic, and approachable.” These are some of the characteristics students use to describe the diverse honors faculty. Carefully selected from the more than 1,400 faculty members at the University for their accomplishments as both teachers and scholars, members of the honors faculty take great pride in their close association with their students and are committed to excellence.

Honors Place @ Panther Hall

“Honors Place is remarkable. It’s like home and everyone there is family. We work hard and play hard, driven by our friendship and common pursuit of excellence” - Damion Dunn, Honors Place Resident Assistant.

The Honors Place at Florida International University is on-campus residence living. As an Honors College student, you will have the opportunity to participate in this special campus housing program.

Study Abroad Opportunities

The Honors College currently offers four study abroad programs to its students: summer programs to Spain, Italy, and a new program to the Caribbean. There is also a new fall semester program to Spain.



THE HONORS COLLEGE
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Excellence with Honors

THE HONORS COLLEGE
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PARK, DM 233
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33199
TELEPHONE: (305) 348 - 4100
INTERNET ADDRESS: [HONORS.FIU.EDU](http://honors.fiu.edu)
EMAIL: [HONORS@FIU.EDU](mailto:honors@fiu.edu)