1. Call to Order – Leger

2. Roll Call – Kirtley
   a. Leger
   b. Gratz
   c. Dubin
   d. Kirtley
   e. Aeikens
   f. Albarado
   g. Brown
   h. Carlson
   i. Cross
   j. Cuillier
   k. Ensslin
   l. Evensen
   m. Fletcher
   n. Geimann
   o. Gillman
   p. Hernandez
   q. Jones
   r. Ketter
   s. Kopen-Katcef
   t. Leeds
   u. Lehrman
   v. Limor
   w. Maynard
   x. McCloskey
   y. McKerral
   z. Neuts
   aa. Porter
   bb. Pulliam
   cc. Smith

3. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – Leger
   a. April 27, 2014 [page 2]

4. SDX Foundation President Report – Leger [page 19]

5. Streamlining of SPJ and SDX Foundation Activities/Responsibilities – Leger [page 21]

6. Executive Director Evaluation (Executive Session)

7. SPJ President Report – Cuillier [page 23]

8. Treasurer’s Report – Dubin

9. Action items
   a. Pass-through Contributions – Vachon [page 27]
   c. Projects committee Update – Gillman [page 29]
   d. Pulliam First Amendment Award Update – McKerral [page 36]
   e. Policy/Guideline FOI/1st Amendment Group Funding – McKerral [page 37]

10. Officer and Director Elections – Leger [page 38 & 39]

11. Associate Executive Director Report – Vachon [page 40]

12. Old/New Business
   a. Pulliam Editorial Fellowship Update – Gillman
   b. History book Update – Leger
   c. Rainbow Source book Update – Vachon

13. Adjourn
The Sigma Delta Chi Foundation

Board of Directors Meeting

Saturday, September 6, 2014
9 a.m. — Noon
Nashville, Tennessee

Founded in 1961, the Sigma Delta Chi Foundation is dedicated to ensuring that those who carry on the tradition of a free press are prepared for the challenge. Its goal is to support the educational programs of the Society of Professional Journalists and to serve the professional needs of journalists and students pursuing careers in journalism.
MINUTES
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SIGMA DELTA CHI FOUNDATION
APRIL 27, 2014
SKYLINE CLUB
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
With President Robert Leger presiding, the meeting of the board of directors of the Sigma Delta Chi Foundation was called to order at 8:35 a.m. Sunday, April 27 at the Skyline Club in Indianapolis.

ROLL CALL
In addition to Leger, the following board members were present: Vice President Irwin Grat; Secretary Jane Kirtley; Treasurer Howard Dubin; Directors Dave Aeikens, Sonny Albarado, Fred Brown, Al Cross, David Cuillier, John Ensslin (virtually), Jay Evensen, Paul Fletcher, Steve Geimann, Todd Gillman, Tony Hernandez, Bill Ketter, Sue Kopen Katecf, Al Leeds, Hagit Limor, Bill McCloskey, Gordon “Mac” McKerral, Dana Neuts and Sue Porter.

Staff members present included Executive Director Joe Skeel and Associate Executive Director Chris Vachon.

ANNOUNCEMENT
Leger asked for a moment of silence in memory of former board member Ken Bunting.

MINUTES
Upon proper motion and second by Aeikens and Brown, respectively, the board approved the meeting minutes from the January 15, 2014 executive committee meeting and the August 25, 2013 board meeting.

TREASURER’S REPORT
Treasurer Dubin indicated that as long the market is up, the Foundation’s investments are up. The Foundation had $500,000 in long-term equity gains.

PASS-THROUGH CONTRIBUTIONS
The list below represents pass-through contributions that have occurred during the current fiscal year. These pass-through contributions are allowed under IRS rules because they fall in line with the Foundation’s charitable purpose: Education and recognizing journalism excellence.

- Scripps Howard Foundation to SPJ for EIJ14 $5,000
- Scripps Howard Foundation to SPJ for Scripps Leadership Institute $50,000
- Gannett Foundation to SPJ for JournCamp $10,000
- Ethics & Excellence in Journalism for Region 8 Conference $2,500
- Sue Porter to SPJ for SDX Awards Banquet support $500
Upon proper motion and second by McKerral and Geimann, respectively, the board approved the pass-through contributions outlined above.

GRANTS COMMITTEE
The Grants Committee recommends that the Foundation fund the following grant requests:

- SPJ Training Place……………………………………$191,585
- SPJ 2013 Convention Education…………………………$85,000
- SPJ Mark of Excellence Awards support……………………$27,201
- SPJ Diversity Leadership Program…………………………$8,510
- Zombie Stories (M Koretzky)………………………………$2,000
- Student Press Law Center……………………………………$6,000
- Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press…………………$5,000
- Center for Integration & Improvement in Journalism……………$3,500

Total grants awarded………………………………………$328,796

Upon proper motion and second by Gillman and Geimann, respectively, the board approved funding the grants listed above.

GRANTS COMMITTEE: FOI/FIRST AMENDMENT FUNDING
Many state and regional FOI groups are looking for alternative funding sources since the funding from NFOIC is not as available as it was in the past. As a result, it is the feeling of some board members that the SDX Foundation may see more requests from state and regional groups. In the past, the SDX Foundation rarely funded these requests. However, with this shift, board members are questioning if the SDX Foundation board should develop guidelines to handle future requests.

Upon proper motion and second by Kirtley and Aeikens, respectively, the board approved the development of a policy or guidelines for state and regional FOI/First Amendment group requests for the board to review at the September board meeting.

After this discussion, the board then discussed two more grant requests. These requests came from the Colorado Freedom of Information Coalition and the New England First Amendment Coalition.

Upon proper motion and second by Geimann and Albarado, respectively, the board approved $5,000 to the Colorado Freedom of Information Coalition. Fred Brown abstained from voting.

Upon proper motion and second by Ketter and Limor, respectively, the board approved $5,000 to the New England First Amendment Coalition.

GRANTS COMMITTEE: GRANT FROM SPJ FOR ETHICS CODE REVISION TASK FORCE IN-PERSON MEETING
The Grants committee considered a grant from SPJ to fund travel expenses for the members of the Ethics Code revision task force to meet in-person to finish hashing out the work they have been doing online and over the phone throughout the last six months. The intent would
be to have a completed draft for the board and the membership to review prior to the national conference.

The Grants committee did not make a decision regarding the grant request, but instead chose to bring it to the board for discussion and a decision.

Discussion centered on whether or not it was the role of the foundation to fund such a meeting.

**The motion to approve the SPJ grant request to fund an in-person meeting for the Ethics Code revision task force failed.**

**Fiscal Year 2015 Budget**

Executive Director Skeel answered questions about the proposed budget. Skeel then shared some highlights, noting that the presented budget was approved by the Foundation finance committee.

**Upon proper motion and second by Dubin and Aeikens, respectively, the board approved the Fiscal Year 2015 budget.**

**Explanation of Finances**

Skeel provided an overview, via a PowerPoint presentation, about how the finances work and why the foundation is selling some assets.

*Appendix A – Finance PowerPoint*

**Pulliam First Amendment Award Criteria**

McKerral explained that after reviewing last year’s entries, the committee felt the award criteria needed to be reviewed because of the range of entries. However, Russ Pulliam indicated that entries from news media outlets that aggressively cover important public issues best mirror the original intent behind the endowment. As a result, the criteria will not be revised.

The committee is interested in developing a student/student media award. McKerral shared some initial recommendations with the board and will come back with something more developed for the next board meeting.

**Educational Programming**

What if the SDX Foundation took ownership of SPJ’s educational programs? Instead of passively approving grants, what if the foundation actively oversaw programming? What if SPJ could spend more of its time and effort in the advocacy arena?

These questions, and many others, are being entertained by both the SPJ board and the foundation board. The SPJ board discussed it during its meeting the day before the foundation board meeting, and the Society is in favor of exploring the idea with the foundation.

The next step is for the foundation board (the governance committee) to determine if there are any bylaws changes that would come along with this shift. They will look into this
before the fall board meeting. In addition, as board members have questions and thoughts about this shift, Leger encouraged them to contact him.

Appendix B – Leger memo – Educational Programming

SPJ President’s Report
SPJ President Cuillier shared an update from SPJ’s board of directors’ meeting, which took place the previous day. The committee revising the ethics code is still going strong and they hope to have a draft for the delegates at EIJ14. The advocacy fund concept continues to move forward. The task force charged with exploring the idea of changing SPJ’s name to the Society for Professional Journalism has made a recommendation that the organization not change its name, but instead make itself more attractive to the next generation of journalists. As a result, the task force is now taking on the job of developing ideas on ways to make SPJ more attractive. SPJ has created a new staff position – communications strategist. Interviewing and hiring will commence immediately.

SDX Foundation President’s Report
Leger provided an update on the history book. Marion Street Press plans to have a manuscript for review by June 1 and is aiming to have the book available at EIJ14.

He also provided an update on the Pulliam Editorial Fellowships projects. The 2012 recipient, Philadelphia Daily News editorial page editor Sandy Shea, expects to have published her work on poverty and its causes by the time this meeting occurs. We will link to her work from our website.

The 2013 recipient, Hugh Bailey of the Connecticut Post, has taken his leave of absence to research how communities are reclaiming abandoned industrial sites. We await an update from him.

Projects Committee
Committee chairman Todd Gillman provided an update on the projects that the Foundation funded as of the August 2013 board meeting:

- For Journalism
  - Some funding was used to record material for a Hardware for Journalism course that will show journalists how to build sensors and work with sensor data such as air quality and soil moisture. The money helped with some travel costs which meant that FJ could make the course free and open to the public. In addition, For Journalism built a training search engine.

- SPJ Investigative Reporting Summit with IRE
  - The first of the three workshops was held by the time this meeting took place. A report about all three workshops will be provided for the September board meeting.

- Photographers’ rights workshop with NPPA
  - At the time of this meeting, two programs had been held so far. Reports are that both were very successful. A report of all workshops will be provided for the September board meeting.
BOARD MEMBER TERMS
Terms for the following board members will expire in September 2014:
  - Fred Brown
  - Jay Evensen
  - Jane Kirtley
  - Dori Maynard
  - Mac McKerral
  - Sally Lehrman
  - Sue Porter
  - Kevin Smith

EXCELLENCE IN JOURNALISM CONFERENCE UPDATES
The board was reminded that the Excellence in Journalism 2014 conference is in Nashville, Sept 4-6. The 2015 conference will be in Orlando, in partnership with NAHJ, Sept 18-20. The 2016 conference will take place in New Orleans Sept 18-20.

NEW BUSINESS
SDX AWARDS PROGRAM
Board member Bill Ketter shared his concerns about the circulation numbers for some categories and about the transparency of the identities of SPJ’s judges.

Some members of the SDX Foundation board also happen to sit on the SPJ awards committee and these members indicated that the awards committee is tackling these concerns.

ADJOURNMENT
Upon proper motion and second by Geimann and Fletcher, respectively, the board voted to adjourn the meeting at 11:20 a.m.
SDX Foundation
Finances

How do they work,
and why the heck are we selling assets?
How does SDX get its money?

SDX generates revenue in four ways

1. Contributions
2. Rent from its tenants
3. Cash from interest and dividends
4. By selling up to 4.5% of its investments

For this discussion, we will focus on Nos. 3 and 4
Interest and Dividends

Revenue stream No. 3

- The SDX Foundation’s portfolio contains investments that pay interest and dividends.
- Some of that interest and dividends is reinvested, which buys more investments. Some comes to us in the form of cash.
- It is this cash that is one of the Foundation’s four revenue streams.
- This year, that amount is $232,552.40

Interest/Dividends

Not reinvested

Reinvested

Cash for budget

Buys more investments
Selling 4.5% of our investments

Revenue stream No. 4

• The Foundation’s spending policy states that it will sell up to 4.5% of its investments each year in order to fulfill its charitable purpose.

• Why 4.5%?

  – Historically, the market grows by 8 percent. Spending 4.5% of that 8% is a safe number that allows the Foundation’s assets to keep growing – by about 3.5% per year.
  – In years when the market performs less than 8%, having a spending policy such as this allows the Foundation to keep its spending levels (and programs offered) more consistent. It helps limit the impact that the market’s volatility may have on operations.
  – In years when the market performs better than 8%, spending only 4.5% allows us to make up for bad years, or “pad” for future years.

• Selling up to 4.5% of the Foundation’s assets (based on the average balance of the prior four quarters) will generate about $483,000 for this year’s budget.
Selling Investments

I don’t recall us selling assets in the past, what has changed?
Two things:

1. Bonds

- In years past, bonds that were purchased by the SDX Foundation matured.
- When they matured, the Foundation received huge influxes of cash.
- We used this cash to help meet our budget obligations before selling assets.

Note: All of the bonds that we purchased have matured. We haven’t purchased more because low interest rates make them unsavory investments. This means we have no more influxes of cash coming our way.
2. Interest & Dividends

Then

The interest and dividends that came to us in cash were lumped into the overall available pot. Then, we calculated 4.5% of the overall pot for budgeting purposes. Therefore, only 4.5% of this cash was made available.

• If we did that this year, we would have $10,465 of cash from int/div. available instead of $232,552.

Now

We set this cash aside before the 4.5% is calculated. Therefore, it is not part of the overall pot. That means this cash is in addition to the 4.5% of our investments.

• Why do we set it aside? Because the spending policy is in place to protect our investments. It states that selling 4.5% of our investments is safe.

• Any cash that spins off is excess money. It is no longer an investment. It can be used to further the Foundation’s missions.
## Here's an example how it works

### Then

- $400,000 = 4.5\% \text{ assets}$
- $10,000 = 4.5\% \text{ of int/div.}$
- $410,000 = \text{Revenue for Budget}$
- $232,000 = \text{Actual cash from int/div.}$
- $200,000 = \text{Bond income}$
- $432,000 = \text{Actual cash revenue}$

Note: The actual cash in the door was continually greater than the budgeted amount. So, we never needed to sell assets to cover our budgeted expenses. The result is that we built up a surplus of cash over the years.

### Now

- $400,000 = 4.5\% \text{ assets}$
- $232,000 = \text{cash from int/div.}$
- $632,000 = \text{Revenue for Budget}$
- $232,000 = \text{Actual cash from int/div.}$
- $0 = \text{Bond income}$
- $232,000 = \text{Actual cash revenue}$

Note: This scenario represents us using the spending policy as it’s designed. We will sell 4.5\% of our investments to meet our budget.

*Dollar figures above are only examples for illustration purposes.*
Pros and cons

Then

• Allowed for faster investment growth.
• Protected investments during the lean years, which allowed for quicker recoveries.
• This approach is for any foundation whose main goal is *growth* of capital.

Note: Because all of our bonds have now matured, we would still be selling some of our assets under the old model.

Now

• Allows for corpus growth, but at a slower rate.
• Makes market “hits” a bit tougher to take because at some point we will sell when the market is in decline.
• This approach is for any foundation whose main goal is to fulfill its charitable goals while *preserving* its capital over the long-term.
We are selling assets because…

1. We are using the spending policy as intended.
2. We want to maximize the Foundation’s potential in reaching its charitable goals (mainly, training journalists).
3. We want to maintain the quality and consistency of the training programs we have built.
4. We no longer have huge amounts of bond revenue coming in.
APPENDIX B

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 9, 2014
FROM: Robert Leger, President
SUBJ: Educational Programming
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors

We’ll have a full agenda for our April meeting, and not a lot of time to get through it. I’d like to start the conversation early on one item: a change in focus for the Foundation.

Let me start with the background.

Twice a year, we ask 29 highly accomplished men and women who have already made substantial donations to the Foundation to travel to Indianapolis and the site of EIJ for fairly short meetings. We approve a budget, ratify grants and discuss a policy matter or two. This frustrates me. It hardly seems like we’re making the best use of the talent around the table.

Last March, Dave Cuillier, Joe Skeel and I got together in my backyard to talk about the big picture of SPJ. (Actually, I think Joe just wanted to sit in the sun.) Joe came with an idea that addressed my desire to better respect your time and talent, while also advancing SPJ’s needs. What if SDX took ownership of SPJ’s education programs? Instead of passively approving grants, what if we actively oversaw programming?

There are a number of advantages to this proposal, as I see it:

- It positions this board to be more entrepreneurial. Do we see holes in journalism training that need to be filled? Instead of waiting for someone to ask for a grant, we can move to fill that hole. And we have some experience. While not intended this way, when we set aside $250,000 to invest in promising programming, we essentially created a pilot project in being pro-active. The discussion in selecting projects made the most of the talent gathered around the table.

- It allows us to better leverage other sources of funding. In the past year or two, Gannett Foundation and Kiplinger provided funding for some SPJ core programs – programming we had approved grants for. Joe and Chris were bound to use our funding for the programs we earmarked it for; if staff capacity prevented adding programs, they had to return the money to us and then submit another grant to get it back. But if SDX “owns” educational programming, we can more easily shift that funding to a different program or recycle it into the next year. Chris can use it to match funding from other foundations, allowing our money to stretch farther.
Together, these two benefits position us to become a force greater than our $12 million corpus. We can actively generate ideas for programs, look for partners and do incredible good in improving journalism, and thereby protecting it.

There are potential disadvantages:

- To make this pencil out for SPJ, we need to also take ownership of the money-losing Quill magazine. But there could be a silver-lining here. Might we be more willing to make drastic changes, such as online-only publication, than a membership-elected SPJ board would be? And yes, we can debate whether that is a good or bad thing.
- As we became more entrepreneurial, would we be less interested in making grants to outside groups such as Reporters Committee, SPLC and so on? I believe those grants are valuable, and I would hope we would find a way to protect against diminishing them.
- Long term, would an entrepreneurial SDX become less of a supporting foundation for SPJ? How do we guard against that, or should we?

You’re smart people. You will think of other pros and cons worth raising. That’s what I hope to do through this note.

We will need to talk about how we provide programming. Do we hire our own staff? Or do we contract with SPJ to deliver our programming? It’s going to be the same people, supervised by Joe (and his successors), so I see this as a difference without much of a distinction.

I also believe programming should continue to be marketed with the SPJ name, perhaps along the line of “the SPJ Training Program, presented by Sigma Delta Chi.” That’s where the brand recognition is.

I’ve discussed this idea with some of you. The first question several of you raised was: Will SPJ go for this?

So I asked that question of the SPJ executive committee at its January meeting in Nashville. The group backs this idea. As they’re all receiving this message as members of the SDX board, they can speak for themselves, but I heard strong support.

And this is why: Making this shift frees SPJ resources to devote to advocacy, something we don’t fund. Those of you who have read President Cuillier’s speeches and columns know this is important to him. Those following him on the ladder appear to share his enthusiasm.

Next question that some, probably all of you, are asking: What are the financial implications?

Joe produced three potential budgets for President Cuillier and me:
1. Status quo. SPJ, after hiring a communications manager, has a surplus of about $10,000. SDX, after funding SPJ requests, would have $75,000 to grant to outside groups. Last year, we filled outside grants for $15,000.

2. SDX takes ownership of all educational programming except Quill, makes no grants to SPJ except for EIJ. In this scenario, SPJ finishes $55,000 in the red. SDX has a surplus of $156,000. It’s a non-starter.

3. SDX takes ownership of all educational programming, makes no grants to SPJ except $82,000 for EIJ. In this scenario, the SPJ surplus rises to $65,000. The SDX surplus shrinks to $24,000 available for outside groups. We can adjust these numbers by reducing support for EIJ, which shrinks the SPJ surplus and increases the SDX amount dollar-for-dollar.

This is based on 2014-15 forecasts numbers. When the market drops, we would have to make cuts, including outside grants. But we do that now.

The bottom line of the third scenario: SDX operates more like its own business, generating revenue through extra support from the likes of Kiplinger and the Gannett Foundation, and less like a parent with a checkbook. Personally, I find this a healthier situation for both of our organizations and boards.

What do you think? Please raise questions so we can chew over details and legalities now, allowing us to devote our time in Indianapolis to getting to the nub of the issue: Do we want to do this?

P.S. Grants and Finance committees should continue their work as though there will be no change. If this board surprises me and decides to fully embrace this change in April, we can adjust. But I expect we’re looking at a longer conversation, with no action before Nashville, and a transition over a year’s time or so if we go in this direction.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 19, 2014  
FROM: Robert Leger, President  
SUBJ: President’s Report  
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors

I look forward to a great meeting and a great EIJ14.

We have a full agenda. We’ll continue our conversation about taking full responsibility for the educational programming of SPJ, including Quill. You’ll find separately a report from the combined SDX/SPJ executive committees on issues involved in the transition and recommendations on resolving them.

I continue to be a strong proponent of doing this, and urge the board to take the plunge for the 2015-16 fiscal year. It gives us a more proactive role, truly making us the educational foundation of SPJ. It frees SPJ to more fully focus on advocacy for better journalism and more open government. There are few risks in going down this road and no impediments to retracing our steps. Unlike media companies spinning off their newspaper divisions, if our transition doesn’t work out we can simply hit command-Z and undo it.

That’s my opinion. I look forward to hearing your thoughts.

Portfolio
Despite its recent dip, the stock market has been good to SDX. Our portfolio at the end of July stood at $12.7 million, up 3 percent for the year. That’s after paying our grants and bills. Kudos to Howard Dubin and the finance committee for a solid investment strategy.

Pulliam Awards
Committees led by Mac McKerral and Todd Gilman have selected winners for the two Pulliam awards.

-- The Associated Press will receive the Pulliam First Amendment award and a check for $10,000 for fighting back after the government grabbed its reporters’ phone records. “Spying on the public’s watchdog raises the threat to a free and independent news media to an even higher level,” the committee noted. “Rewarding the AP for its effort serves to refocus attention on this horrible incident and perhaps send notice that journalists haven’t forgotten.”

-- Farah Stockman of the Boston Globe will receive the Pulliam Editorial Fellowship (and $70,000) at the Association of Opinion Journalists convention in Mobile, Ala., Sept. 21-23.
The daughter of a white father and black mother, she plans to study the effects of desegregation 40 years after busing sparked a violent reaction in Boston. She intends to use that history “as a starting point to spark a larger national conversation about race in America today and our prospects for successfully addressing inequalities of race and class in our schools in the future.”

Last year, you asked for updates on previous winners.
-- The 2012 winner, Sandra Shea of the Philadelphia Daily News, completed her project this summer. It is linked from the fellowship page at spj.org, or you can go directly to philly.com/philly/news/257047041.html to read it.
-- The 2013 winner, Hugh Bailey of the Connecticut Post, completed his eight-month sabbatical researching ways to reclaim abandoned industrial areas. His project is scheduled to run as a three-part series on consecutive Sundays in September.
Hugh encountered a shock when he returned to work: his job on the opinion page was eliminated. Once his project is completed he’ll move to the business desk. Applicants for the fellowship are required to “secure assurances by the editor or publisher that the applicant will be allowed sufficient time to pursue the fellowship without jeopardizing employment.” We don’t require a promise that the fellow will be able to return to the same job. Should we? Can we?

History Book
Marion Street Press continues to work on the book. I will be meeting with Jim Schuette in Nashville.

Thank you
I know it goes without saying, but I’ll say it anyway. Thanks for everything you do for the SDX Foundation, SPJ and journalism.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 19, 2014
FROM: Robert Leger, President
SUBJ: Issues in the Transition between SPJ and SDX Foundation
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors and SPJ Board of Directors

The executive committees of the SDX Foundation and SPJ met via e-mail and then a conference call to discuss issues involving the SDX Foundation taking responsibility for educational programming. On most issues, the group reached a quick consensus. On two, there was extended conversation, some of which extended beyond our conference call.

To summarize:

Staffing
Some members expressed a concern that Chris’ workload would become too much, and that no person could do well at juggling development and planning programs. Others asked if the foundation should have its own staff. Who, ultimately, looks out for the foundation’s interests?

Joe described the current division of labor, which he envisions continuing under the new arrangement. Scott’s time is devoted to Quill, planning training programs and setting up sessions for convention. In consultation with a small advisory committee, he comes up with the ideas and names of speakers. Heather takes charge of the logistics and details. Chris (as well as Joe) checks in and sees how things are going, just as she does with non-SPJ grant recipients. And Chris, of course, works on developing relationships with potential donors, applying for grants to extend our offerings (and leverage SPJ’s dime) and executing development appeals.

So the question was asked: Should these people become foundation employees? That should be a goal, but it’s not workable now. The staff does not operate in silos; there is a great deal of cross training so everyone can jump in and help where needed. Responsibilities overlap: the awards coordinator, for instance, handles SPJ’s massive contests and coordinates the foundation’s Pulliam awards.

If, in our new world, we are able to vastly increase our training operations, we would need more people. That would be the time to look at creating an SDX-specific staff.

The group anticipated further discussion on this issue by the board.

Board membership
This discussion revolved around two issues: Is the board too big? Does it need greater diversity in age and background? This discussion continued via email after our call, and there may be more to report beyond what follows.

A key point was raised by Jane Kirtley: Figuring out what the board is supposed to be is critical to the new direction.

There was some sentiment that the board should be smaller, but also an acknowledgement that the board is its current size because it’s the best place for former presidents to continue
to contribute. Steve mentioned that he had once contemplated the idea of creating an advisory group of former presidents, who could have a set number of representatives on the foundation board.

The programming committee was seen as the place where younger voices were most needed. Dana Neuts and Irwin Gratz suggested making that a composite committee of foundation members and younger SPJ members. (This would be similar to the makeup of the group currently advising Scott Leadingham on convention.) Sonny Albarado later noted this would also be a way to develop younger people for board membership.

Others offered the idea of term limits or possibly term “suggestions,” with the option of returning to the board after sitting out a term. Todd Gillman, though, spoke in defense of “old geezers,” noting how much he valued the advice of men and women with extensive experience in the organization.

Again, we anticipate further discussion by the board on this issue.

**Issues on which there was consensus:**
- SDX will continue to support EIJ, and SPJ will no longer submit grant requests for the awards coordinator, chapter grants and other SPJ activities.
- Investment policy should be left alone.
- Bylaws changes (SPJ)
  - Quill Trust. Clean up the language at some point in the future.
  - In principle, give SDX a role in selecting the executive director, reflecting more active role.
  - Details to be worked out.
- SDX committee structure
  - Current committees:
    - Exec (officers, immediate past president & committee chairs)
    - Grants and Awards
    - Development.
    - Finance
    - Governance (becomes an ad hoc committee)
  - Proposed new committees:
    - Programming & projects. (points were raised that this group is most in need of age diversity and needs to guard against micromanaging)
    - Quill (some role in advising on content, but primarily in examining best model for Quill: print and online, or online only).
- No need for an exit plan. If it doesn’t work out, hit Control-Z. (Another reason not to rush bylaws changes.)
MEMORANDUM

DATE: Aug. 20, 2014
FROM: David Cuillier, SPJ President
SUBJ: President’s Report
FOR: SPJ and SDX Foundation Board of Directors

OVERVIEW
I want to thank the dozens of committee volunteers, the staff, the board, and 7,500 members for moving SPJ forward this past year, building on the successes of previous years and advancing journalism in so many ways. I see SPJ accomplishments as efforts that take time – nothing substantial can be finished in one year. We have merely continued the work started by previous presidents and volunteers, and more is to be done in future years. It has been an honor to work with such amazing people, for such an important cause, in so many ways.

ADVOCACY
This year SPJ has ramped up its advocacy to new levels by fighting for press freedom for Connecticut open records, for Joe Hosey in Chicago fighting a subpoena, for photographers arrested in Ferguson, for reporters vying with PIO controls, for student journalists at Otterbein, Georgia and elsewhere, for a federal shield law, for a better FOIA, including testimony in Congress, and for numerous other causes. Our efforts, in some cases, directly affected the outcome, others peripherally. Most of them created an amazing amount of media play and attention that I have never seen at SPJ. Not only have we been covered by organizations with agendas (Russian TV, Fox, Trucker radio), but we have achieved mainstream coverage through CNN, USA Today, New York Times, Washington Post, etc. We’ve done this through several ways:

1. Kathryn Foxhall created an advocacy coalition for the PIO issue that we will now be able to use for further advocacy and future Journo Blitz campaigns. People pay attention when 40 journalism groups speak out together.
2. Our use of social media has increased this year, and that led to some buzz. I anticipate this will only increase because of Dana’s prolific use of social media and staff additions.
3. We continue to build partners in advocacy that have created synergies in the journalism world. Our SDX Foundation grant project with NPPA, our work with SEJ on EPA issues, and other collaborations have yielded fruit, and this will only grow. I will attend ONA in September to see how our groups can jointly further the mission.
4. The new communications strategist provides an avenue for SPJ to be a player when journalism news breaks. We saw that for the first time Aug. 19 with the killing of photographer James Foley. Jennifer Royer contacted me while I was working, drafted a statement, I added a quote, and we had it out the same day. Media outlets, particularly broadcast (including
CNN), contacted us immediately and we were part of the conversation while the story evolved.

I see our advocacy only building. Dana has asked me to serve as FOI Committee chairman this year to keep the momentum going and to groom a successor. We plan to continue building the journalism coalition and work on creating an endowed advocacy war chest. I am excited about what we can accomplish during the next 12 months, and next 30 years. The focus is on the long game, which we can win.

FEDERAL SHIELD LAW
Kudos to Paul Fletcher for his work this year dogging the federal shield law. Our organization helped get senators on board through mobilizing members to speak up and personal visits by me and others with senators who were undecided. To date, we have 56 senators supportive of the bill and need four more to overcome a filibuster. We will continue to push in September, probably the best window for a vote, or possibly after the elections. Senators who need pressure are: John Walsh (D-MT), Joe Donnelly (D-IN), Tim M. Kaine (D-VA), Bill Nelson (D-FL), Jack F. Reed (D-RI), Carl M. Levin (D-MI), and Ron Wyden (D-OR).

CODE OF ETHICS
The Ethics Committee and others have worked hard this year to solicit input and craft an updated code of ethics for delegates to chew on. While this process has been a bit more time consuming than I had planned, taking some energy away from my focus on advocacy, I think it has been worthwhile. People have been talking about the need to update the code for some years, and the process had to be initiated. Where it goes from here is not my call, but I am glad this has spurred national discussion about journalism ethics in today’s ever-changing media landscape. That, in itself, has been worth the time. My thanks to Kevin Smith, the committee members, Joe for shepherding the process during the past five months, and everyone inside and outside of SPJ who have provided thoughtful recommendations. Ethics matter!

COMMUNICATIONS
This year we took a big step forward by hiring a full-time communications strategist, which I hope will improve member satisfaction, increase membership, and promote journalism. Already we are seeing the benefits on the advocacy end, but I hope we will also see improvements in our internal communications and our social media use. Also, this year I made it a priority to implement the transparency policy we created under Sonny Albarado’s watch. That meant streaming board meetings live for the first time, and even recording and posting a Skype meeting. It also meant posting society documents online, including the budget. I feel strongly that if we are to hammer government hard on transparency then we must follow suit, even if we are not a government agency. It’s the principle. It fosters credibility and trust with our members and the public, even if it can be a little messy at times. That’s transparency.
COMMUNITIES
This year we launched the Freelance Community and, most recently, the Digital Community. The Freelance Community has had a little difficulty getting rolling – so much depends on a critical mass of active volunteers. We will continue to work on that. This idea, patterned after AEJMC’s “divisions” and common in other organizations, is something I feel strongly could help increase members and member satisfaction. John Ensslin initiated the discussion during this term when he studied the idea of affinity groups. We continued it, and Dana Neuts is working hard to add more communities and get them moving. Stay tuned!

NAME CHANGE
Last year the delegates instructed the board to talk about a possible name change, and we did. A task force led by John Ensslin studied the issue, gathered member feedback, and concluded that there isn’t broad support for a change. They also provided other suggestions that can help the organization address the needs of all our members. I agree with people who say the name change discussion is a bit of a distraction, and that we need to focus on our priorities. But I also think it’s not a bad idea to mull. It goes to the heart of who we are and what we want to be as an organization. I have always thought the organization should be the Society for Professional Journalism, although lately I even favor calling it simply the Society for Journalism. That is what we really are, and what our core mission is about. Strunk and White always urged conciseness in writing. Doesn’t get much more simpler than that. I anticipate this discussion will percolate for years, and I applaud Michael Koretzky for initiating that talk at EIJ13 in Anaheim. I wouldn’t be surprised if it comes up again in Nashville!

STATE OF SPJ AND ITS FUTURE
Thanks to Joe Skeel’s excellent management, with the board’s support, SPJ is perhaps the strongest it has been in years. Our budget is healthy. We have incredible training programs that are building journalism leaders and improving the craft. Yes, membership continues to decline gradually, and that greatly concerns me. We have issues to address:

- **The image:** We need to change perception that we continue to be a cliquish group of old print white guys chewing on cigars and drinking whiskey. Except for the whiskey part, that just isn’t the case. For my small part, this year I replaced the after-banquet leaders suite bash with a dance/gathering open to anyone. Also, while hotels set aside a swanky comped suite for the president as part of the package deal, I will stay in a normal room at EIJ14 and have SPJ use the suite for group meetings and gatherings. Small gestures, but all of our efforts can contribute to this change – including improving member services, diversifying our board, and creating innovative programming and training. This is important if we are to foster SPJ as the “people’s” journalism organization.

- **The reality:** SPJ, primarily through the SDX Foundation, provides amazing training and services for journalists, but I don’t think people realize that. It’s also imperative we develop new services for members to help them on the street with the issues they care about, which might include providing health care plans and career support. To strengthen journalism and society, we need to support journalists.
• **Diversity:** We need to create a much more diverse organization in every way – race, gender, age, medium, etc. This is something that is happening organically, and will continue with Dana Neuts as a freelancer, and in a few years with Lynn Walsh, who has incredible energy, ideas and skills in digital media. I also think SPJ must push hard for increased diversity in journalism as a whole. As an industry, we’ve backslid on that front, and that is unconscionable.

• **Function:** It makes a lot of sense for the SDX Foundation to pick up the education/training part of our mission so SPJ can focus on advocacy and member services. I think it is essential that SPJ takes the lead on fighting for journalism because it is falling in our laps. NFOIC no longer has the support it once had from the Knight Foundation. The Sunshine in Government Initiative faces cutbacks. Other groups struggle to raise money for annual expenses. We need a healthy war chest to provide sustained funding forever, because if we don’t, nobody will. That will be my focus in my post-presidency, and I hope you all will support the cause. We have to do it together.

• **The Vision:** Joe’s vision for SPJ is brilliant, and it will take time to evolve. This will require on all our parts the willingness to change and think creatively. If we cling to what we have always known for 100-plus years then we will slowly wither away and become irrelevant in today’s journalism world. It is essential the board be willing to take risks – to examine the best way of serving journalists. Do we really need to be divided into regions? Do we even need members to help journalists? Maybe, maybe not. What role do chapters play in a world with dying Elks clubs? Can we create partnerships with other groups for mega ElJ conferences and administrative cooperatives? These are big questions, and I don’t have the answers, we need to face it head on.

Thank you, everyone, for setting aside a part of your lives to help SPJ. Every person matters in this cause, and I am proud to know you and work side-by-side in making journalism, and society, better.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 19, 2014
FROM: Chris Vachon, Associate Executive Director
SUBJ: Pass-through Contributions
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors

The list below represents pass-through contributions that have occurred during the current fiscal year.

A pass-through contribution occurs when a person or organization writes a check to the Foundation with the specific intent that it be used by SPJ national or an SPJ chapter. People and organizations do this in situations where they can only contribute to a 501(c)(3) or they are looking for a tax deduction.

These pass-through contributions are allowed under IRS rules because they fall in line with the Foundation’s charitable purpose: Education and recognizing journalism excellence.

At the board meeting, we will vote to approve these pass-through contributions:

Wall Street Journal to SPJ for SDX Awards Banquet Support $5,000
Gannett Foundation to SPJ for EIJ14 Support $10,000
DATE: August 19, 2014
FROM: Chris Vachon, Associate Executive Director
SUBJ: High School Essay Contest
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors

BACKGROUND
I don’t know the history of the high school essay contest that is funded by the SDX Foundation and managed by SPJ.

I do know that it is a time-consuming program for staff, with not much return for either organization.

The program is managed by the SPJ Awards Coordinator. The coordinator updates the website and then works with the SPJ Communications Intern to market the program to high school teachers and advisers. Then the Awards Coordinator reaches out to chapters, multiple times, to secure chapters to judge. Once the contest deadline passes, the Awards Coordinator sorts the essays for judging and sends them off to be judged. In 2014, we did not have enough chapters to judge, so staff judged some of the essays. Some years, chapters who say they will judge, don’t follow through on their commitment. The coordinator usually has to work too hard to get the judging results from the chapters. We receive an average of 215 essays each year.

The top three essay winners are awarded $1,000, $500 and $300 (total of $1,800) from the SDX Foundation.

PROPOSAL
In an effort to maximize the contest’s potential while minimizing the management burden, staff had the idea to partner with a high school journalism organization. We felt they would have a better reach into the high school journalism world and could better give the program the time and attention it deserves.

As a result the Journalism Education Association has been contacted in order to gauge interest. Its leadership is extremely interested in partnering, with SPJ and SDX Foundation in general, and specifically on the high school essay contest. Preliminary discussions centered on JEA managing the judging and logistics; both groups would market and both groups would be listed as partners or sponsors of the contest; $1,800 of funding would continue to be provided by the SDX Foundation for prize money.

JEA indicated it could make this contest a signature of its annual Scholastic Journalism Week, and it could announce the winners at its national convention.

ACTION
Staff requests that the SDX Foundation Board of Directors consider partnering with JEA on the High School Essay Contest, which bring greater visibility to the contest while shifting day-to-day management from SPJ staff to JEA.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 11, 2014
FROM: Todd Gillman, chair, Projects Committee
SUBJ: Update on 2014 Projects
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors

We touched base with each organization and below is a recap report from each of them about the status of their projects. They supplied an update for the April meeting and again for the September meeting.

FOR JOURNALISM
Amount for the project: $10,000
Update from Dave Stanton, For Journalism founder

For Journalism is using the SDX Foundation grant to foster collaboration in data journalism education. They are doing this in two ways.

First, they are creating three additional courses related to data journalism, but more approachable for people without programming experience. The "project management" course is aimed toward editors and managers trying to build cross-team collaboration to integrate data throughout the newsroom. The "APIs" course is an introduction to reading data from the myriad of structured data sources now available from governments, NGOs and public companies. "Hardware" shows how to use simple electronics to collect data (such as air quality and water) to allow journalists to verify or contest government-reported environmental data.

Second, they are revising their website structure to include collaborative tools for individuals and teams. They will be adding the ability to annotate as well as jump into a video chat with other learners to collaboratively work through challenges.

Some of the additional course material has been created already. The remainder will be captured in September and released to the public for free at the end of 2014. The new website changes to incorporate collaborative functionality will be launched at the end of 2014 as well.

The generous help from the SDX Foundation grant is helping to make existing For Journalism content more collaborative as well as opening up opportunities for new and existing material to more journalists for free.
WATCHDOG: RAISING THE BAR (with IRE & NECIR)
Amount for the project: $48,000
Update from Mark Horvit, IRE Executive Director

We are pleased with the progress we’ve made on the Watchdog: Raising the Bar program. Thus far we’ve held all three on-site workshops, done follow-up consulting and launched the webinar series.

In the first phase of the program, we reached 30 newsrooms and about 60 journalists with the in-person training sessions held in Philadelphia, Chicago and Fort Worth.

After the initial workshop in Philadelphia, we made some changes to the program to include one-on-one time with each news organization’s participants. The goal of this was to improve the connection between trainers and attendees to allow more focus on developing and mapping out stories and provide a base point for post-workshop consulting. The modification worked well for the following two workshops.

Partner organizations that hosted us were Temple University (Philadelphia), Columbia College (Chicago) and Texas Christian University (Fort Worth). The number of applicants grew significantly over the three-month period of the workshops. By the time of the Fort Worth event, we faced very difficult decisions about which organizations to include and which to leave out. Applications came from larger and larger geographic regions. We believe that this was due to news of the project spreading as we offered it, and believe the applicant pool would continue to grow in a second year of the program.

The Webinar series is ongoing, with two having been held (on building sources and strategies for using open records laws). Thus far attendance for the webinars has been low, and we believe that the consulting is a more effective way of maintaining contact with newsrooms than distance learning tools, though we will continue to evaluate as we continue to hold online events over the next few months. The training continued to manifest itself in other ways, with some attendees reporting that they made the materials and information they learned available to their entire newsrooms. This may be a more effective way to reach a broader group of journalists in each newsroom than through distance learning, and could be something we require as part of participation if we continue the program for a second year.

We have had productive follow-up consultation with most of the participants. Three projects, including a three-part series, have already published. Eleven more are in the works and nearing completion. Another 11 newsrooms have actively taken advantage of our consulting services. This means that about 25 of the 30 newsrooms have been involved with us in some way since the initial workshops. We continue to reach out to participants, especially those who want to
take advantage of our services but time as not yet allowed. In addition to in-depth pieces, we are helping participants improve daily reporting by regularly filing public document requests and ask more probing questions.

Among the stories that have been done following the training are:
- A newsroom that took part in the Fort Worth training used open records requests to document that a teacher who had been arrested on child pornography charges had resigned his previous school job amid allegations of sexual harassment of students, but was hired anyway by the new district.
- A Spanish-language newsroom in Chicago (Univision) did stories about the drug cartel connections of a former Chicago resident
- A newsroom in Lake Charles, Louisiana, that delved into water quality issues, including a brain-eating amoeba that killed several residents in the South.
- A newsroom in Minnesota dug in on financial issues at Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, using data analysis techniques and online data visualization tools presented in the workshop.

Among the projects that are being completed and scheduled to run are:
- A newsroom that took part in the Fort Worth training is doing a series on payroll fraud
- A newsroom that took part in the Philadelphia training is doing a project on fraud in a local Housing and Urban Development (HUD) project
- Other projects in the work involve examining Medicare data to look at high reimbursement rates, an examination using data to analyze how a school district is using existing buildings, and more.

THE RIGHT TO RECORD & PHOTOGRAPH IN PUBLIC (with NPPA)
Amount for the project: $6,250
Update from Mickey Osterreicher, NPPA legal counsel

See memo from Mickey, next page
July 28, 2014

Ms. Chris Vachon
Associate Executive Director
Sigma Delta Chi Foundation
3909 N. Meridian St.
Indianapolis, IN 46208

RE: SDX Grant – Right to Photograph & Record

Dear Chris,

Below is a summary of the programs I/NPPA has presented to date with the generous grant from SDX. I have also included a .PDF of the announcements/programs from each event:

Broward County, Florida
January 25, 2014, West Regional Library, Plantation, FL, 12pm – 3pm
Panelists: Marc Rohr, Prof. of Law, Shepard Broad Law Center, Nova Southeastern University; Ron Gunzberger, General Counsel, Broward Sheriff’s Office; Carlos Miller, Journalist/Blogger/Activist and founder of Photography is Not a Crime

Presented in partnership with the Broward County ACLU and Florida SPJ. ACLU was so pleased they paid my expenses (travel, lodging, print program) as well as provided refreshments for 150+ attendees. The night before the program I attended a Dade County ACLU event and spoke about our event scheduled for the next day. Many of their executive officers attended in Broward and they are also interested in doing one sometime later this year in Dade County (Miami).

Washington, DC
January 24, 2014, JW Marriott Hotel, Washington DC 10am – 12pm
Training session at the National Sheriffs Association (NSA) Annual meeting. That session was attended by 50+ laws enforcement officers. Many expressed an interest in doing a program in their jurisdiction and I have followed-up with them. There were no charges against the grant for this event.

Honolulu, Hawaii
February 11, 2014, Honolulu Star-Advertiser, 12pm – 2pm
Lunch presentation with the local chapter of SPJ (see: http://hawaiispj.org/News/osterreicher.html). The program was attended by about 20 journalists. Sterling Morita was extremely helpful. As I was there for another meeting, there were no charges against the grant for this event.

Lombard, Illinois
March 26 & 28, 2014, Westin Lombard Yorktown Center (near Chicago) 10am – 12pm and 8am – 10am
Taught 2 sessions to law enforcement officers at the International Law Enforcement Educators and Trainers Association (ILEETA) on the right to photograph and record during their annual meeting. Approx. 75 attendees at each session. There were no charges against the grant for this event.

San Diego, California  
April 15, 2014, California Western School of Law, San Diego CA, 6pm – 8pm
Panelists: David Loy, Legal Director, ACLU of San Diego & Imperial Counties; Eric Gaylord, Chief Photographer, ABC 10News; Chief Manuel Rodriguez, National City Police Department; Shawn P. Moran, Vice President, National Border Patrol Council.

Presented in partnership with the California Western School of Law, San Diego Chapter of SPJ, ACLU of San Diego & Imperial Counties and the American Constitution Society. Attended by about 75 people, including law and journalism students, journalists and law enforcement officials. The auditorium at the California Western School of Law was an excellent room and the panel was terrific. It was the first time I needed to provide refreshments (previous programs had food and drink from other organizations) but the 15 pizzas plus water and soft drinks turned out to be the perfect amount.

Los Angeles, California  
April 17, 2014, Deaton Hall Auditorium, LAPD Headquarters, Los Angeles, CA 7pm – 9pm.
Panelists: Comdr. Michael Parker, Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, North (County) Patrol Division; Comdr. Andrew Smith, LAPD Media Relations and Community Affairs Group; Jean Paul (JP) Jassy, Esq., Partner Jassy Vick Carolan LLP; Paul Buck, Staff Photographer, European Press Photo Agency (EPA)

Presented in partnership with the Los Angeles Chapter of SPJ and the Professional Photographers Association of Greater Los Angeles. Attended by approximately 150 people attended. Once again a great mix of students, journalists and police officers. The civic auditorium located directly in front of LAPD headquarters was an amazing facility and people stayed for almost an hour after the event talking to the panel. No refreshments as they were not allowed in the auditorium.

Lafayette, Indiana  
July 10, 2014, Purdue University Police Department Training Room, 8am – 10am, 6pm – 8pm
Presented in partnership with the Purdue University Office of Public Affairs. Each session was attended by about 50 police from areas agencies including the Indiana State Police as well as journalists from local media (newspaper & TV) along with journalism students. The program came about as a result of police interfering and detaining a student photographer while he was attempting to cover a fatal campus shooting. In between morning and evening sessions I met with local media including students.

Dallas, Texas  
Scheduled for October 16, 2014. I will keep you posted.

Thanks again for all your support.

Very truly yours,

Mickey H. Osterreicher

Mickey H. Osterreicher
General Counsel
Application for Second-Year Funding for Watchdog: Raising the Bar
Submitted by Mark Horvit, IRE Executive Director

Watchdog: Raising the Bar, a series of in-person workshops, online training and one-on-one consulting conducted by Investigative Reporters & Editors and New England Center for Investigative Reporting

We believe the training is producing tangible results and benefits in the newsrooms that have taken part and are hoping the foundation will be interested in supporting the program for a second year at the same funding level of $48,500.

We would implement the changes and improvements described above. Additionally, we recommend scaling back the distance-learning portion to allow more time for the one-on-one consulting. We believe that is a more productive way to generate impact from the training and the program overall. We also believe that a more productive division of responsibilities between IRE and NECIR is for IRE to handle the bulk of the organizational, administrative and onsite portion of the program, with NECIR handling the bulk of the consulting and follow-up portion of the workshop. NECIR would still send trainers to each event, as this personal contact is essential to successful follow-up. And IRE would help with follow-up consulting for specific data-related issues.

We also foresee pushing harder for participants to come in with a defined project and commit to communicating with us and completing it within a period of six months to a year. We required three story ideas from applicants this year, but would seek more detail and clearer goals.

We are proposing the following:

- Three regional workshops that reach areas of the country not served by the 2014 program. While we would determine the best locations as the time draws closer, we anticipate holding two of the three workshops on the West Coast and in the Southeast.
- Ten newsrooms would participate in each workshop, sending two journalists each. When possible, this pair would consist of an editor/manager and a reporter. The total number of journalists trained in each location would be about 20 per workshop.
- Follow-up consulting would be held with each newsroom to facilitate projects, stories and stronger beat coverage.
- Other resources would be made available from IRE’s online training collection, including webinars, audio and relevant tip sheets.

Budget (same as last year’s request)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Lodging</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Material Preparation</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web/Online Resources</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$48,500
About the Trainers

**Investigative Reporters and Editors, Inc. (IRE)**

IRE is a non-profit 501c3 educational and professional organization of more than 4,000 members internationally, working to foster excellence in journalism.

Founded in 1975, IRE provides extensive training and resources through seminars, publications and its website: [www.ire.org](http://www.ire.org). IRE also runs the National Institute for Computer-Assisted Reporting (NICAR), a joint program of IRE and the Missouri School of Journalism.

IRE’s mission is to foster excellence in investigative journalism, which is essential to a free society. We accomplish this by providing training, resources and a community of support to investigative journalists, promoting high professional standards, and protecting the rights of investigative journalists. IRE is also the world’s leading organization in providing training for data journalism.

IRE has conducted more than 70 training events each of the past several years, and has extensive experience doing in-newsroom training, in addition to regional, national and international workshops and conferences. IRE has been a leading training organization worldwide in data journalism for more than 20 years.

**New England Center for Investigative Reporting (NECIR)**

The New England Center for Investigative Reporting (NECIR) is a nonprofit investigative reporting newsroom and training center based at Boston University. Launched in 2009, the center’s mission is to boost the quality and quantity of investigative journalism in New England and across the nation by producing high-quality, high-impact investigative reports and by training a new generation of investigative reporters. NECIR is the only center of its kind that includes training as part of its core mission.

Over four and a half years, NECIR has conducted numerous training programs including a joint training with IRE for Hearst Television (2012 and 2013). In addition, the center has conducted investigative reporting workshops for at least 300 college and high schools journalism students from around the nation and the globe as well as training for hundreds of professional journalists, bloggers and citizen journalists worldwide. The center’s director, Joe Bergantino, also has trained journalists in Vietnam and will be conducting an investigative reporting workshop in China in July 2013.

NECIR’s launch sparked a nationwide movement to create nonprofit investigative reporting centers. NECIR has provided guidance to the founders of many of those centers and was instrumental in creating the Investigative News Network (INN), a national organization linking together more than five dozen nonprofit centers.
DATE: Aug. 1, 2014

TO: SDX Board

FROM: Mac McKerral, chair
SDX Grants Committee

RE: 2014 SDX First Amendment Award

Colleagues:

The 2014 SDX First Amendment Award goes to The Associated Press for its fight against the U.S. government spying on the news media.

Again, this was a very difficult choice, and drawing a recipient out of a hat would have resulted in an excellent choice. The nomination pool drew a diverse group of nominees:

- In all, there were 23 nominations.
- Nominations included national daily newspapers (Washington Post, Los Angeles Times) and an international news cooperative, The AP.
- Several individuals affiliated with FOI/FA organizations were nominated, along with educators.
- The nominees included community newspapers, local online news outlets, medium- and metro-sized newspapers, and a local TV station.

The discussion among the committee members was thorough and thoughtful.

As always, the nominations revealed a high-level of quality journalism directed at fighting government for access in order to report on compelling community issues — particularly corrupt law enforcement.

The committee summed up the AP nomination this way:

“The entry involves the White House and a brazen move by the Justice Department to secretly tap reporters' phones. It rises high on the level of importance to the health of the First Amendment. There are a lot of problems out there involving smaller news organizations and smaller governments, but what happens in Washington can set the tone for a lot of those smaller attempts to muzzle the press. And in the unprecedented era of government spying broadly on the public, spying on the public’s watchdog raises the threat to a free and independent news media to an even higher level. We wish the case had a stronger resolution. But rewarding the AP for its effort serves to refocus attention on this horrible incident and perhaps send notice that journalists haven’t forgotten.”

In conclusion, The committee found encouraging the dogged reporting and the work of a number of individuals and organizations dedicated to protecting the right to access and a free press at all levels.

I think we should be utilizing on our website the journalistic work produced by these nominees to educate, inspire and prompt others to take on the heavy lifting of public protection. It is worth noting that the 2013 recipients of the award produced an extensive body of work on police corruption and use of force. And this year’s nominees included four media outlets reporting on similar issues.

Perhaps this is not coincidental.
DATE: Aug. 1, 2014

TO: SDX Foundation Board

FROM: Mac McKerral, chair
SDX Foundation Grants Committee

RE: Grant guidelines

Colleagues:

During our spring meeting, the board charged the Grants Committee with developing some guidelines for assessing grant requests. This charge arose from a discussion about the potential increase in grant requests for Freedom of Information and First Amendment defense from state- and regional-based entities in light of the demise of NFOIC.

Working from a template provided by Jane Kirtley, the committee is recommending that the following guidelines be used going forward for grants, including those for FOI/FA initiatives, noting that there is always potential for exceptions in a case-by-case environment.

The more consistently we handle SDX grants requests, the fairer the process and the less likely it will be to generate bad blood in cases where grants requests are not recommended.

SDX Foundation grant guidelines:

• The programs/projects must be compatible with SDX’s mission.

• In cases involving FOI/FA grants, preference should be given to regional or multistate groups rather than one state, though possible national impact in a very large state should be considered.

• Require that funding be for programs/projects and not infrastructure/overhead. (We should develop specific language for the website stating that SDX does not fund infrastructure/overhead. Grant applicants, particularly universities, look for such a statement).

• Give a strong preference to projects with multiple funding sources. (The board should consider requiring multiple sources of funding, so that SDX is not expected to bankroll the entire project.)

• Grants should show evidence of partnerships with appropriate groups, especially with SPJ entities such as chapters and mission committees.

• In cases of “exceptions” to these guidelines, be mindful of setting precedents.
# Foundation Board Member Terms

**OFFICERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Expires</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Robert Leger</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>2-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Irwin Gratz</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Jane Kirtley</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Howard Dubin</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BOARD MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Expires</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred Brown</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Evensen</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Kirtley</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dori Maynard</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac McKerral</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Lehrman</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Porter</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Smith</td>
<td>9/6/2014</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Gillman</td>
<td>9/19/2015</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin Gratz</td>
<td>9/19/2015</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Jones</td>
<td>9/19/2015</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Ketter</td>
<td>9/19/2015</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Leeds</td>
<td>9/19/2015</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagit Limor</td>
<td>9/19/2015</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Carlson</td>
<td>9/19/2016</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Cross</td>
<td>9/19/2016</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Dubin</td>
<td>9/19/2016</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Geimann</td>
<td>9/19/2016</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russel Pulliam</td>
<td>9/19/2016</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Aeikens</td>
<td>9/19/2016</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ensslin</td>
<td>9/19/2016</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonny Albarado</td>
<td>9/5/2014</td>
<td>SPJ</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cuillier</td>
<td>9/5/2014</td>
<td>SPJ</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Kopen Katcef</td>
<td>9/5/2014</td>
<td>SPJ</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill McCloskey</td>
<td>9/5/2014</td>
<td>SPJ</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Hernandez</td>
<td>9/5/2014</td>
<td>SPJ</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Neuts</td>
<td>9/5/2014</td>
<td>SPJ</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fletcher</td>
<td>9/5/2014</td>
<td>SPJ</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold** indicates term expires in 2014

*Italics* indicates SPJ appointee for one-year term expiring in 2014.

Expiration terms are approximate, determined by annual convention.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 19, 2014
FROM: Irwin Gratz, Governance Chair
SUBJ: Board Nomination
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors

The following foundation board members have agreed to be re-nominated to a new, three-year term:
  • Fred Brown
  • Jay Evensen
  • Jane Kirtley
  • Dori Maynard
  • Mac McKerral
  • Sally Lehrman
  • Sue Porter
  • Kevin Smith

In addition, the following individuals are nominated for initial, three-year terms:
  • Kelly Hawes
  • Sonny Albarado

The remaining members of the board will be approved by the SPJ Board of Directors.

The following board members wish to stand for officer positions:
  • Robert Leger, President (a 2-year term)
  • Irwin Gratz, Vice-President
  • Jane Kirtley, Secretary
  • Howard Dubin, Treasurer
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 19, 2014
FROM: Chris Vachon, Associate Executive Director
SUBJ: Foundation Staff Report
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors

FUNDRAISING
From August 1, 2013 to August 1, 2014, $23,390 was contributed by individuals to the foundation. For comparison purposes, $26,883 was donated from August 1, 2012 to August 1, 2013. And the year prior, contributions totaled $20,230. Within the SDX foundation board we are two people shy of 100-percent participation. Similarly, the SPJ board is just two board members short of 100-percent giving. The staff’s participation continues at 100-percent. Six members and two staff members are set up for monthly auto contributions to the foundation.

Looking ahead at ways to increase individual contributions, I need to know how to better utilize the information about donors and members in the database and so I am attending a database training class in November. Additionally, I will be working to better position information regarding our programs and services in order to illustrate the value of an investment in the foundation.

HANDWRITTEN APPEAL
This appeal, conducted in the spring, raised $2,200. Thirty percent of the donors were first-time contributors and 30 percent of the donors increased the amount over their last contribution.

My plan for the upcoming year is to evaluate the return on investment for this campaign. I like the personal touch of the approach and I think it is noteworthy that new donors, and increased donor amounts, are a result of this campaign. I have attempted to do this program in two ways, one with a smaller and one with a large mailing list and the smaller list produced more money. Clearly, the selectiveness of the audience plays a big part in this program’s results.

I have started researching ideas to either replace, or do in concert with, the appeal, such as approaches using social media and crowdfunding.

1909 SOCIETY
I continue to encourage foundation board members to become 1909 Society members. To date, two board members have made this commitment. A letter went
out to all board members, this summer, encouraging participation; however, to date, no additional board members have chosen the 1909 Society as an option.

One way I hope to increase participation in the 1909 Society is by offering the opportunity to indicate interest, i.e. “I want more info,” in all touches that folks have with the foundation. This has paid off a few times so far. Finding the right audience to which to market this has been challenging thus far, but I will keep plugging away.

**Contact with Individual Donors**
In order to be mindful of expenses, I have tried to combine already scheduled work travel with fundraising contacts. I have contacted some donors requesting meetings before a few trips, but, unfortunately, those folks have politely declined. I will work to keep this in the forefront of my mind as I plan trips. I do think these meetings will be more effective if I have a volunteer leader with me in order to passionately speak to the wonderful world of journalism.

**Grant Submissions from SDX Foundation**
A grant proposal was submitted to the Gannett Foundation to assist with the funding of JournCamps. The Gannett Foundation notifies applicants in September or October about the status of submitted grants. A reminder that the foundation received a grant last year from the Gannett Foundation to fund JournCamps.

A grant proposal was submitted to Excellence and Ethics in Journalism, but it was declined.

Additionally, we have secured another partnership with the Kiplinger Program for the upcoming November JournCamp.

Between Kiplinger and the Gannett Foundation, $17,000 was secured for training last year.

This is an area where I plan to spend more time. Last year, I wanted to get a few partnerships/grants under our belt in order to show that others felt we are good investment/partner. That has been accomplished and so it is time to take this growth area up a notch.