

AGENDA
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SIGMA DELTA CHI FOUNDATION
TIME: 9 A.M.
SEPTEMBER 19, 2016
SHERATON NEW ORLEANS

1. Call to Order – *Leger*
2. Roll Call – *Limor*
 - a. Leger
 - b. Gratz
 - c. Dubin
 - d. Limor
 - e. Aeikens
 - f. Albarado
 - g. Baker
 - h. Brown
 - i. Carlson
 - j. Cross
 - k. Evensen
 - l. Fletcher
 - m. Gallagher-Newberry
 - n. Geimann
 - o. Gillman
 - p. Hawes
 - q. Hsu
 - r. Jones
 - s. Ketter
 - t. Kirtley
 - u. Kopen Katcef
 - v. Leeds
 - w. Lehrman
 - x. McCloskey
 - y. McKerral
 - z. Neuts
 - aa. Pulliam
 - bb. Ross
 - cc. Smith
 - dd. Walsh
3. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes - *Leger*
 - a. April 17, 2016, Board of Directors [**page 2**]
4. SDX Foundation President Report – *Leger* [**page 10**]
5. SPJ President Report – *Fletcher* [**page 12**]
6. Foundation Staff Report – *Vachon* [**page 15**]
7. Treasurer Report – *Dubin*
8. Pass-through Contributions - *Vachon* [**page 18**]
9. Programming Committee Report– *Limor* [**page 19**]
10. Officer and Director Elections – *Albarado* [**page 26**]
11. Executive Director Evaluation (executive session)
12. Our future – *Leger* [**page 27**]
 - a. Priority among discretionary programs
 - b. Paying for new ideas
 - c. Generating new ideas

- d. Grants to outside groups
- e. Quill
- f. Fund-raising strategies
- g. Our name
- h. Board membership
- i. Board structure

Informational reports; discussion only if requested:

- 13. Publications Committee Report – *Brown* [**page 31**]
 - a. History Book Update
- 14. Pulliam Editorial Fellowship Update – *Gillman*
- 15. Pulliam First Amendment Award Update – *McKerral* [**page 33**]
- 16. Dates for Calendar
 - a. SDX Foundation board meeting, Indianapolis, April 23, 2017
 - d. EIJ17 – Anaheim Marriott, Sept 7-9
 - e. EIJ18 – Baltimore, Sept 27-29

17. New Business

18. Adjourn

NOTE: The Harper Scholarship recipients and the Maynard Diversity Fellows will be stopping by the meeting between 10:30 am and 11 am to introduce themselves. Be sure to introduce yourself and get to know them at the donor reception Monday at 7 pm in the back of the Sheraton's Rioux Bistro restaurant, 2nd floor.

THE SIGMA DELTA CHI FOUNDATION

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

DATE: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19

TIME: 9 A.M.

SHERATON NEW ORLEANS



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
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SIGMA DELTA CHI FOUNDATION
APRIL 17, 2016
SHERATON, NEW ORLEANS

With President Robert Leger presiding, the meeting was called to order at 8:07 a.m. CT on Sunday, April 17, 2016 at the Sheraton New Orleans.

In addition to Leger, the following were present: Vice president Irwin Gratz; Treasurer Howard Dubin; Secretary Hagit Limor; Directors Sonny Albarado, Rebecca Baker, Fred Brown, Jay Evensen, Paul Fletcher, Patti Gallagher Newberry, Todd Gillman, Kelly Hawes, Bill Ketter, Sue Kopen Katcef, Al Leeds, Bill McCloskey, Mac McKerral, Kevin Smith, Lynn Walsh.

Staff members present for the meeting were Executive Director Joe Skeel, Associate Executive Director Chris Vachon and Membership Strategist Tara Puckey.

Guests included SPJ board members Michael Koretzky, Andy Schotz and Alex Tarquinio.

MINUTES

Upon proper motion by Fletcher and second by Hawes, the board approved the meeting minutes from the Sept. 19, 2015 and executive committee meeting minutes from Jan. 6, 2016.

SDX FOUNDATION PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Leger provided an update on the "Spotlight" movie screening program, Vachon said there were 27 chapters that requested licenses to show the movie. Limor asked if chapters are close together that we might combine programs to save money. McKerral asked about a public element being embedded in the program. He said he thinks that there should be public dialogue and discussion, not just watching the movie for free.

SPJ PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Fletcher discussed some upcoming events, including the FOIA bill to fix FOIA by 50, their trip to the White House and Walsh's trip to SXSW to spread the word. He also shared that the SPJ board passed a new member category for non-journalists who support SPJ's mission. He briefly talked about the Society's strategic planning session in Scottsdale. He updated the Foundation on SPJ's board meeting, which took place the day before. Lastly, he shared that the board approved a \$10,000 LDF request to the Lens in New Orleans.

McKerral asked Fletcher what's the difference between Associate Memberships (which already exist) and Supporters. McKerral also asked for clarification about the regional delegates, which were approved by the SPJ board.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Chairman Brown shared that he and Evensen had a meeting with Skeel and Quill editor Scott Leadingham. The committee felt that at this time it was a good idea to continue to have a print publication, but recommend that the news related to operations of the Society (such as chapter news) be online only.

Brown also shared that he talked with Marion Street Press regarding the history book. A list was sent to Brown of some things that still need to be completed.

Brown talked about wanting to update the ethics book because SPJ adopted a new code in 2015 and the market for ethics books is changing. Limor weighed in that she would like to help and there is a need; Smith asked about making an e-book vs. print product. McKerral said a company he knows of in Indiana might be helpful to get an e-book in the works.

Ketter asked why we are still printing Quill if there are some negative economic situation from this. Evensen said he worries that if you don't have it, it gets lost online.

PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE REPORT

Limor shared that the board charged the committee with developing the Dr. J idea. She said they worked to try and answer some of the questions that they thought would come up. Limor explained that the Foundation has been doing things the same way for decades. The goal was to work on something that is different, unique.

Vachon explored funding and shared some of the possibilities: being absorbed into the foundation's budget or outside funding. She has looked at foundations and is working with SPJ member Sam Stewart, who has experience with foundation funding. Leger said he spoke to a member of the SDX Foundation board who might be interested in funding it. But that member declined.

Limor said the committee wasn't asking for official action today, but wanted to know if the board supported the concept as it stood today.

Gallagher Newberry asked for a brief history about how the group arrived at this position. Limor explained that this would be cohesive vs. the way current resources/help is spread out among volunteers. This position would be able to help connect people and resources and figure out how to best help journalists.

Gillman shared that he's not sure if a person with the necessary skills and experience exists. Leger asked Skeel to speak about his hiring philosophy. Skeel explained that SPJ's business model is to hire ambition, leverage that for the betterment of SPJ and train up along the way.

Baker said the SPJ board asked about what this position does over one year. Also, could this be done as a one year fellowship? Limor said she was against doing it for one year. She said it was not enough time to get up to speed.

Gratz said it might make sense to hire someone for a relatively good salary and then have him/her develop the position over a year, communicate with us about what's possible and what's not possible. He agreed that it might be hard to find someone who would apply for a job that ends in one year.

Walsh said that there might be people interested in the position as a one year, but might not be best solution as they are building a reputation (if that is what this group wants). McKerral wants to know who will pay for it, compared it to an endowed chair at a university. Ketter suggested a three-year endowment or investment because Knight and other journalism funders are seeding organizations. They want groups to eventually fund programs on their own.

Gallagher Newberry asked if we are talking about foundation money or is this something crossing over to SPJ. She asked if there someone on staff already who could handle this.

Gillman discussed the position in terms of strategic value: when other organizations coming to SPJ as the umbrella organization. Walsh pointed out that maybe a focus should be on branding.

TREASURER'S REPORT/BUDGET

Dubin shared that the Foundation will be spending more than they are taking in. This is a result of the market downturn over the prior four quarters.

The Foundation spending policy says it will liquidate up to 4.5% of its assets to fulfill budget obligations. However, Dubin and the Finance Committee recommends that the Foundation scale that back to 4.25% for this year.

Skeel, who prepared the budget, said that it was constructed with 4.25% in mind.

Gillman asked if the percentage was to supposed to fluctuate each year. He said it seems the point of the spending policy was that in lower years, the Foundation would liquidate less. In good years, it would liquidate more – because the dollar amount tied to 4.5% changes every year as the value goes up or down.

Hawes credited Dubin for his work as treasurer over the years, making sure the Foundation's assets stay safe and grow. Gratz supports the 4.25% because he doesn't believe that funds will be growing as much within the next couple years.

Leger shared that he wasn't sure the Foundation should be changing the percentage every year. Gratz said asking staff to prepare budgets with different sets of numbers wasn't ideal.

Hawes then shared how the finance committee came to its recommendation.

Skeel then walked the board through the budget, and answered the few questions that were asked.

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and second by Brown, the board approved the Fiscal Year 2017 budget at the 4.25% level.

GRANTS COMMITTEE REPORT

McKerral explained that the committee's recommendation is outlined in the memo. Because of uncertainty with the budget, the committee made recommendations at a 4.5% and 4.25% level.

Smith asked about what people submit in the grant request. And he wondered if we do follow-up throughout the year. Vachon explained the process.

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and second by Brown, the board approved the following grants:

- **SPJ Region 3 Michael Koretzky-Drone program: \$1,500**
- **SPJ EIJ: \$28,000**
- **NPPA: \$7,000**
- **SPLC: \$3,000**

PASS THROUGH CONTRIBUTIONS

Three pass-through contributions were brought to the board's attention.

As explained in Vachon's memo to the board, 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.

Upon proper motion by Leeds and second by Evenson, the board approved the following pass-through contributions:

- **\$500: Vinson & Elkins (law firm) to the Houston chapter for a program called Right to Photograph and Record in Public.**
- **\$500: Austin Kiplinger for the Reggie Stuart Fellowship.**
- **\$1,000 Scripps Howard Foundation in honor of Sue Porter's service.**

STAFF REPORT

Vachon directed the board to her memo, and offered to answer any questions.

She highlighted that Google is very happy with the current training partnership and wishes to expand it in the future.

Evensen asked if SPJ still hoped to partner with the Association of Opinion Journalists. Skeel spoke briefly about how the partnership would work. Gillman asked how AOJ would maintain its identity. Leeds asked Skeel how he calculates the costs for outside groups. McKerral talked about SPJ's membership and how we can find very specific proposals about how they can merge in with us. Ketter said we should be more aggressive in trying to find new partners.

DIVERSITY SOURCEBOOK

Upon proper motion by Hawes and second by McCloskey, the board voted to table the agenda item.

Ledger said he would appoint a committee to work on the future of the sourcebook.

ELDRIDGE AND EMILY LOWE SCHOLARSHIP FUND

Kopen Katcef explained that the Foundation received \$23,950 from an estate gift left 30 years ago. The Foundation received the money in 2015, as a provision in the gift said the funds could not be released until 30 years following Eldridge Lowe's death. The gift is restricted to use for scholarships.

Ledger appointed an ad hoc committee to determine how the money should be spent.

Kopen Katcef shared the task force's recommendation:

- Apply the spending policy, meaning up to 4.5% of the value may be used each year.
- Half of that amount will be given to SPJ's Julie Galvan winner to use for travel to the annual conference.
- The other half will be given to the outstanding student chapter so that they may send a person to the annual conference.

McCloskey asked about pooling the money with the Terry Harper Memorial Scholarship Fund. Sue explained that it is own scholarship fund it needs to stand on its own.

Under proper motion by Kopen Katcef and second by Evensen, the board voted to accept the task force's recommendation and provide annual scholarships to the Galvin winner and scholarships to EIJ for the Outstanding Student Chapter.

STEPHEN GLASS DONATION

Smith moved to accept the \$26,000 donation from Stephen Glass. McCloskey seconded.

Discussion ensued.

Baker asked what choice allows the Foundation to do the most good. She said this donation allows us to do a lot.

McKerral said he boiled his decision down to three factors: Glass's intentions, ethical issues and reputation.

McKerral said he talked with fellow board member Russ Pulliam to get his opinion. Pulliam shared that it is so hard to assess motives in these matters. Therefore, Glass's intentions can't be taken into consideration.

McKerral shared the advice of SPJ's Ethics Committee chairman Andrew Seaman. Seaman said that if the Foundation accepted the donation, it should take a few steps to ensure it is used for something specific and communicated properly.

McKerral said this sounds like a "hefty dose of ethics Febreeze" would be needed to "to take the stink off this."

He added that there is no way to know what would happen if they accepted the money. But, to him, it's not worth the risk.

Ketter also opposed to the motion. He feared the backlash that would come with accepting a donation from a known journalism fabricator.

He said the fundamental purpose of the board is to protect the SDX Foundation and SPJ. He also questioned Glass's motives. He doesn't believe Glass truly cares about making amends. Rather, he feels Glass is using the donation as a way to appease the California Bar Association (which turned him down for a license, stating he had made no attempt to repay the money he cost past employers).

Ketter also shared that Glass never directly harmed the SDX Foundation. Therefore, his donation should be made to whoever currently owns the rights to the publications.

Smith spoke about William Randolph Hearst and Joseph Pulitzer. Those men, he said, ushered in an era of Yellow Journalism. They spent a lot of money to have award given in their names. Today, those transgressions have long been forgotten. Now, they stand for journalism excellence. It's not hard, he said, to draw a parallel to what Glass did. He argues for using the money for ethical training.

Albarado said the board should forget about the money and what good you might do with it. He said forgiveness through accepting the donation shouldn't matter. The only thing that matters, he said, is what will happen to our reputation if we take that money.

Gillman said he could argue both ways, but his opinion has been evolving. Gillman said he became very uncomfortable when he found out that Glass had already been telling people that he gave us the money. Gillman was concerned that the check had been deposited into the Foundation's accounts (in accordance with Foundation bookkeeping policy).

Walsh was worried that the SDX Foundation would be writing a check back to him. She said the optics of that is really bad, and she worries about the fall out.

There was discussion that the money could be transferred directly into his account, eliminating the need to send a check.

Limor said that Glass has more to gain and the Foundation has more to lose. Through the discussion, she said she has been swayed to not accept the money.

Dubin said when he was on the SPJ board, they categorized things as clean money or dirty money. They simply didn't take the dirty money. This seems like dirty money.

The board voted down Smith's motion to accept the donation.

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and second by Gallagher Newberry, the board voted to reject Glass's donation.

GOVERNANCE AD HOC TASK FORCE REPORT

Gratz said that he typically handled board recruitment by himself. This year, he is creating a committee and will create an open period for nominations until May 31. The committee can then evaluate all potential candidates and present a slate in September.

Upon proper motion by Gratz and second by McKerral, the board voted to create a 3-person nominations committee.

Albarado, Hawes and Gallagher Newberry volunteered to serve. Gratz said he would also send a note to those not in attendance to see who all might be interested. The group would be chosen later.

PULLIAM EDITORIAL FELLOWSHIP UPDATE

Gillman spoke about the fellowship and updated the board on the program. He said the size of the applicant pool goes up and down. The group discussed how much harder it is to get applicants who can leave their job for a year, given the industry cuts.

PROJECT WATCHDOG REVIVAL

Hawes shared that journalism needs a good PR guy. Reviving the project watchdog program, which engaged journalist and the public was a way to help change the perception of and share the importance of journalism. A former ad campaign via Project Watchdog was "If the press didn't tell you, who would?"

Gratz shared that SPJ's board is having those very discussions, regarding engaging the public.

Fletcher spoke about SPJ's two new membership initiatives, specifically how one of them is heavily geared toward the public.

McKerral said it's imperative that we find the right messengers. They have to be non-journalists, he said.

BUDGET REALLOCATION POLICY

Leger asked the board to adopt a policy that would give the executive committee more freedom when it comes to allocating money.

The board's recent experiment with offering licenses to show the movie "Spotlight" demonstrated why we need such a policy, he said. The initial offering, supported by \$3,000 in our training budget, sold out in 90 minutes. That was tremendous affirmation of trying a different

approach, and it also spoke to the demand. It was obvious we should do more. Under current board policy, the executive committee could have approved up to \$5,000 in new funding to underwrite more showings.

In his memo to the board, Leger explained that “as Executive Director Joe Skeel noted, we are on track for a healthy surplus. If we reallocated from expense items running well under budget, there would be no need to approve additional spending. This made sense. So the executive committee, working with the understanding that it can act on the board’s behalf, approved a budget reallocation of no more than \$10,000 to underwrite additional showings of “Spotlight,” with the understanding those showings would be followed by discussions with the public about ethics and journalism.”

Leger said the executive committee would be more comfortable with a board policy allowing such action.

“In our new world, we’re not strictly a grant-making foundation,” he said. “We produce educational and training programming, and with that comes the ability to be proactive and seize opportunities when they come.

Under proper motion by Ketter and second by Brown, the board voted to allow the executive committee to reallocate up to \$10,000 during the fiscal year.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Walsh asked about the Foundation’s policy/procedure for cashing checks. Skeel explained that it’s sound financial practice (recommended by our auditors) to deposit checks instead of having them lay around. There is no safe at headquarters. The question is this: How much risk is the organization willing to absorb to not follow those procedures.

Walsh asked if it was possible that when a larger check comes in and we aren’t sure who they are, can we ask executive committee if we should cash the check.

Hawes said he applauds staff for having the wherewithal to alert the board that we had the check and that we had a resulting discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon proper motion by McKerral and second by Baker, the meeting adjourned at 11:13 a.m. CT on Sunday, April 17, 2016.

DATE: Sept. 19, 2016
FROM: Robert Leger, SDX Foundation President
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors



PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Colleagues,

I look forward to an invigorating conversation about the Foundation's future during our meeting today. The preliminary email discussion showed some common themes and concerns, which I discuss in another memo within our board packet.

I also hope to move on our "Dr. J" project. A great deal of work has gone into answering your questions from April, and I look forward to that discussion as well.

A few other matters:

--The board will be smaller after this week. We say farewell to three longtime members who chose not to seek another term: Dave Aeikens, with a total of 10 years of the board; Al Cross, 14 years; and Steve Geimann, 22 years. I cannot thank them enough for their contributions and friendship across the years.

Further, SPJ Immediate Past President Dana Neuts wishes to continue her SPJ activity in other realms, and I wish her the best of luck.

We are not inviting any new SDX-appointed members to join our board, as there has been some sentiment to reduce its numbers.

--A question I've been noodling: Should we move our spring board meeting to Friday, rather than Sunday morning? As we saw at our meeting this year, action on our budget can have an effect on the SPJ budget. Does it make sense for us to meet before the SPJ board does, so its members do not have to cross their fingers and guess at what we might do?

We're locked into dates for 2017, so the earliest this change could happen would be 2018. There's time to weigh the pros and cons.

--We've celebrated several wins since we last met.

Farah Stockman, the 2014 winner of the Pulliam Editorial Fellowship, won the Pulitzer Prize for commentary. She's presenting during EIJ 16.

Google nearly tripled its funding for our Google Tools training. Most of the money goes directly into programming, but a portion ends up in our holdings. Congratulations to Associate Executive Director Chris Vachon for her efforts in making this happen.

With a minimal investment, our "Spotlight" initiative sparked conversations about journalism around the country. My home chapter, Valley of the Sun, scored a coup when Robby Robinson was on hand for the screening.

--The stock market has recovered since the first quarter of 2016, and so have our holdings. They stood at nearly \$11.8 million on July 31, just slightly below the level of one year earlier.

The penultimate word goes to Brittany Robb and Krista Johnson, recipients of the Region 7 fellowships we funded in 2015-16. They took the time to send handwritten thank you notes. Ms. Robb's was short and to the point:



To everyone at the Sigma Delta Chi Foundation,
I want to extend many thanks to
the Sigma Delta Chi Foundation for supporting
my summer fellowship with SPS. My experience
with SPS and IowaWatch has helped my
journalism education immensely and I know
these skills I've gathered will continue to have a
positive impact in my future endeavors.
Many thanks and all the best,
Brittany Robb

Ms. Johnson's filled four pages, sharing her experiences in Omaha, and concluded: *"This foundation's choice to invest in my future means the world to me. Journalism is my passion and I want to learn everything I can to make sure I am great at my job. I am now another step closer to achieving that. Thank you."*

The final word follows naturally: *Thank you* for all you do.

DATE: Aug. 19, 2016
FROM: Paul Fletcher, SPJ President
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors



SPJ PRESIDENT'S REPORT

This report will include a recap of SPJ activities since April as well as an overview of my year as president.

INITIATIVES

MEMBERSHIP. In my induction speech last September in Orlando, I noted that SPJ leadership hadn't looked at membership in about 10 years. Virtually every professional association has had issues and declines in membership, especially since the 2008 recession. SPJ was not alone or immune.

We took a different approach to our January executive committee meeting in Arizona and our board meeting in New Orleans in April: In each session, we worked on membership strategy, brainstorming to determine ways to enhance membership, both for existing and potential members.

From that work, two tracks emerged. The first, to be rolled out this fall, is designed to enlist people interested in fighting for journalism and freedom of information and to help those already doing so. Please see the report from Tara Puckey, SPJ membership strategist, included in these materials.

In tandem with this effort, SPJ President-Elect Lynn Walsh led a task force looking for a way to pull in all people who were interested in backing quality journalism and the causes we fight for. Her group developed the "supporters" of SPJ idea.

There is a proposed bylaws change at EIJ16 to make this a reality. It's an excellent idea, and a way to expand SPJ's reach and influence.

The second membership track will be coming next year – it's an emphasis on how SPJ helps a journalist at every step of his or her professional career.

Tara and Robin Davis Sekula, chair of the Membership Committee, also partnered this year on some well-executed and successful membership marketing campaigns. Their included some basic membership segmentation to seek to make the marketing more targeted.

SPJ GOVERNANCE – REPRESENTATION. This is a drum I have been beating for several years.

SPJ governs itself as a representative democracy, with all decisions coming from the annual convention. But the only delegates at convention are those that represent SPJ chapters. We did a data-dive in late 2014 to learn that 41 percent – nearly half – of our membership is not affiliated with a chapter. In other words, they have no voice at convention.

Dana Neuts appointed me to chair a task force to study this problem, and to seek possible solutions. When I became president, I asked Alex Tarquinio to continue and finish the work.

She and the other task force members did a great job in coming up with a proposed set of amendments to the SPJ bylaws, which you'll also see at EIJ16. The proposal would establish a system of regional at-large delegates, allowing those who are not in chapters to have representation.

SPJ GOVERNANCE – BOARD STRUCTURE. Earlier this summer, we considered a proposal to redraw the lines of the various regions and reduce the size of the board.

While that effort wasn't successful, it prompted us to think about a more global look at the board's structure and composition.

Working with Lynn, I appointed Region 4 Director Patti Gallagher Newberry to chair a task force on board governance.

Lynn, Patti and I selected a small group of people for the task force; they may select a larger focus group to serve as a sounding board for ideas as they get to work. We will be discussing the work of Patti's task force at the first September SPJ board meeting.

ADVOCACY -- PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERS. The problems with public information officers, including the stranglehold they place on information sought by journalists, remains and is not going away anytime soon.

After two strong letters from SPJ in 2014 and 2015, joined respectively by 38 then 53 other journalism groups, we got a meeting with the White House to discuss PIO practices. In December, representing the 53, I led a group that spoke with President Obama's press secretary, Josh Earnest. Representatives from the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society of News Editors joined us.

Our topic: The trend by public information officers at federal agencies to prevent journalists from doing their jobs and getting information to the American people. The problem has gotten worse, not better, under the "most transparent administration in history," which is what the president called for the day after his inauguration in 2009.

PIOs have become a stifling pinchpoint for information, or in the case where interviews actually are allowed, minders who seek to make sure that the company line is preserved.

Earnest was cordial and the conversation was candid. But even after the meeting, we were not encouraged. All during this year, the Obama administration has been playing out the clock. And neither of the major-party presidential candidates is a fan of the press. I fear the problem will only get worse, no matter who is elected in November.

ADVOCACY -- FIX FOIA by 50. This initiative was nearly a year in the making, reaching success at the end of June.

SPJ is a member of the Sunshine in Government Initiative, a combine of nine journalist and open-government groups. SGI worked tirelessly on behalf of the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, a measure that passed both houses of Congress unanimously. "Fix FOIA by 50" was the mantra, seeking passage of the bill before the 50th anniversary of the act's initial passage.

The bill brings FOIA into the 21st century; among other reforms, it allows for electronic requests and requires electronic documents to be created. There will be a single online portal to submit FOIA requests to agencies. It establishes, by statute, a presumption of openness in our government.

President Obama signed the bill on June 30, just a few days before July 4, the day President Lyndon Johnson signed the first FOIA in 1966. We fixed FOIA by 50, and we gave America a little something extra to celebrate on Independence Day this year.

ETHICS. Under the guidance of Ethics Committee chair Andrew Seaman, SPJ has stayed on top of most, if not all, the major stories affecting journalism ethics.

From Sean Penn's interview with El Chapo (and his allowing prior review of the piece for Rolling Stone) to the rush by reporters into the home of the San Bernardino shooters to the purchase of the Las Vegas Journal Review by the Adelson family (which gave a work-out to the new tenet in the 2014 ethics code, "Be Accountable and Transparent"), Andrew was ready with timely blog posts that gained SPJ a lot of traction on social media.

And the roll-out of the new ethics code continued. Andrew put together a PowerPoint "Choose Your Own Adventure" presentation that we were able to use at a number of regional meetings in the spring. It was well-received each time.

DATE: Sept. 1, 2016
FROM: Chris Vachon, Associate Executive Director
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors



STAFF REPORT

This report provides an overview of the three main areas of responsibility for the foundation staff: programs, partnership and individual giving.

PROGRAMS

Dori Maynard Diversity Leadership Program

Board members will be introduced to the 2016 fellows at the Monday board meeting. Additionally, the fellows will be recognized at the banquet and at the donor reception. It is important for board members to take time at the reception to meet these fellows and to use the opportunity to encourage these members to get involved in leadership positions within the organization.

We received 8 applications, which is comparable to prior years. The fellows were chosen by a selection committee made up of 2015 fellows and two foundation board members.

This year, we have six fellows. They are:

- Andrew Seaman, Reuters
- Christiana Lilly, freelance journalist
- Jennifer Matthews, CNN
- Neha Negandhi, freelance journalist
- Alicia Nieves, WNEP-TV
- Richard Gaspar, Hillsborough Community College

Terry Harper Scholarships

Board members will be introduced to the 2016 scholarship recipients at the Monday board meeting. Additionally, the recipients will be recognized at the banquet and at the donor reception. This is a good opportunity to talk one-on-one with potential future SPJ leaders about opportunities within the organization.

We received 14 applications, which is comparable to prior years. The recipients were chosen by a selection committee of two SPJ board members and two foundation board members. Terry's widow, Lee Ann Harper, notifies the recipients each year.

This year, we have four recipients. They are:

- Brett Hall, WSTM-TV
- Robyn Sidersky, The Virginian-Pilot
- Kristin LaFratta, freelance journalist
- Caley Cook, University of Washington

Training Place

A snapshot of the Training Place program is below. Totals are by calendar year.

<i>On Demand Videos</i>	Views
2010 (social media and video)	1,311
2011 (FOI)	1,189
2012 (freelancing)	1,202
2013 (data viz)	1,106
2014 (branding, smartphone)	1,074
2015 (photo verification, investigative reporting)	1,003
2016 (Google Trends, Google Maps)	718 so far

<i>JournCamps</i>	Attendance
2012 (Phoenix, Chicago)	232
2013 (D.C., Minneapolis)	216
2014 (Nashville, San Diego, Miami)	171
2015 (Atlanta, NYC, Boston)	190
2016 (New Orleans, Denver)	170 so far

<i>Webinars</i>	Participants	Replays
2014 (4 webinars)	150	205
2015 (5 webinars)	295	262
2016 (6 webinars)	191	204

<i>2016 Google Tools Training</i>	# of Locations	Total Trained
SPJ (chapters, regionals, JournCamps, webinars)	14	289
Journalism organizations (chapters, regionals, conferences)	13	704
Newsrooms	12	355
Universities	2	135

In total, we have trained about 2,750 journalists so far this year through our Training Place and Google Tools program.

PARTNERSHIPS

The **Kiplinger Program** is returning again in fiscal year 2017 to partner on two JournCamps, specifically, the workshops in New York City and Columbus, Ohio.

Google News Lab partnership is growing and the News Lab is pleased with its progress so far.

This is likely because I spend a significant amount of time on this program. Google did agree to contract a part-timer to help with the workload, which is good for now. However, they are interested discussing

ways we may extend our reach to offer training to even more journalists. At some point, we may need to develop a plan for additional staffing just for this program.

INDIVIDUAL GIVING

Year-to-Year Figures

From August 1, 2015 to August 1, 2016, \$24,732 was contributed to the foundation. The average gift is \$75. For comparison purposes, \$24,734 was contributed during the same time frame the previous year. 65 of the 265 people, or 25%, who contributed to the foundation this year are new donors. We are not at 100% giving for either board.

We will continue our current fundraising efforts, but also have a new idea we are developing: A Day of Giving. The concept is simple: we will dedicate an entire day where we encourage individuals to give to SPJ and the SDX Foundation. This program has been done successfully by other non-profits. Once a concrete plan is developed, we will present it to leadership.

CONCLUSION

Our Diversity Fellows and Harper Scholarship programs are running along. We do have to work to get the word out about the programs each year. We will be sure to work with volunteers to ensure we are maximizing our marketing for EIJ17. Should applications for the programs remain flat next year, it may be time to take a closer look at these programs next year.

We continue to train a high volume of journalists through training place. And our partnership with the Google News Lab has helped lower the Foundation's cost to do so. For example, many of the trainers we use for our JournCamps are Google trainers – and therefore paid out of that bucket. This allows us to stretch our dollars further. The same is true when we use Google trainers to produce webinars and on-demand videos. Because the partnerships have developed after the budget has been passed it has allowed the Foundation to dip into its corpus less than expected at budget time.

On that note, we must work to find more partnerships. We don't want to put all of our eggs into one Google basket. This, of course, is easier said than done. We hope to meet with more potential funders in the coming year. These are the key to stretching the Foundation's resources.

On the fundraising front, Katie Hunt is completing her first year. We remained stagnant in terms of SDX Foundation individual giving. This is the same challenge we have had for several years now. However, we did see an increase in contributions to SPJ. Specifically, we raised more than \$5,000 for the First Amendment Forever Fund. We have also tried a new approach: asking a specific individual to support a specific effort. We plan to do more of this moving forward. Tying fundraising efforts to a specific campaign, no matter how small, has proven fruitful. Although the Foundation board tends to focus specifically on Foundation fundraising, Katie focuses on SPJ and SDX Foundation (as her employment costs are split). We view fundraising as holistic. If the money is coming in, SPJ/SDX Foundation is doing more good work.

I feel we are moving in the right direction. But we have a long way to go before I would say we are maximizing our potential. Primarily, we need more partners and an ever-improving individual giving program. That will be a focus for us in the coming year.

DATE: Sept. 19, 2016
FROM: Robert Leger, SDX Foundation President
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors



PASS-THROUGH CONTRIBUTIONS

The list below represents pass-through contributions that have occurred during the most recent 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:

- \$7,500 from Scripps Howard Foundation for EIJ16 (50/50 split with RTDNA)
- \$4,133 from Howard & Ursula Dubin Foundation for SPJ Recognition Packages
- \$5,000 from Tegna Foundation for EIJ16 (split w RTDNA and NAJA)
- \$10,000 from Gannett Foundation for EIJ16

DATE: Aug. 26, 2016
FROM: Hagit Limor, Chairwoman, Programming Committee
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors



PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE REPORT

From the Programming Committee: Hagit Limor, Rebecca Baker, Todd Gillman, Sue Kopen-Katcef, Kevin Smith, Lynn Walsh, Sonya Ross, Evelyn Hsu

Dear SDX Board members,

Attached you'll find the latest iteration of the idea this board has been discussing over the past two years, the position we nicknamed Dr. J. We're now calling it Journalist on Call. While we batted around many clever monikers, this describes best what we are trying to accomplish in a position where we feel we can make a real difference. No other journalism organization offers a resource with the holistic reach of what we are proposing.

We have two asks for the SDX board:

- Your sign-off on this position, allowing us to seek funding from larger foundations for a three-year pilot project.
- A decision on whether we will pledge any of our money. We believe any grant request will be more favorably received if we do.

Following this memo you'll find the basics of a grant application, a FAQ sheet and a proposed budget. A huge thank-you to President Robert Leger for the heavy lifting on the grant document and to Chris Vachon for all her help.

The Committee appreciates all your comments and input so we want to catch you up on all we've accomplished since and in response to questions raised at the April board meeting:

We sought input from leaders from RCFP, IRE and SPLC. We also talked to a staff person at the Education Writers Association (EWA), who serves in a role similar to our concept, for EWA members. Their comments are in the following grant application outline.

The grants committee funded travel for Mickey Osterreicher, the National Press Photographers Association's general counsel, to Cleveland and Philadelphia shortly before the Republican and Democratic conventions. We viewed this a test run for our Journalist on Call concept. The results of this are outlined in the following grant application outline.

Respectfully Submitted,

Hagit Limor
SDX Programming Committee Chair

JOURNALIST ON CALL OVERVIEW

Proposal Summary (400 characters):

Press rights are under siege. News staffs are shrinking. Editors are stretched further than ever managing digital transformation. Journalists have less time to navigate FOI and ethical issues. An outside coach would be invaluable — someone in their corner, a “go-to,” supporting and fighting for their rights. We seek funding for a three-year trial period to employ a coach and trainer in open records, journalists’ rights and ethics. The need for a Journalist on Call is huge.

Competencies:

What related skills and experiences will position you to succeed? (750 characters or less).

Supervision of this position will be by SDX Foundation associate director Chris Vachon, who has 12 years experience producing educational programming, developing collaborative relationships in the journalism community and supervising a self-starting, highly motivated staff. Vachon and other staffers have their pulse on journalism training needs.

Additionally, SPJ has a diverse membership of 7,000 digital, broadcast, print and free-lance journalists, as well as college journalism instructors and professors. Publicity about the opportunity to get coaching and advice from this new position will reach journalists serving many audiences and who run into a wide variety of daily challenges doing good journalism.

Opportunity:

Summarize the project. Explain the overall challenge, the approach being taken, and why that will work.

Shortly before the Republican and Democratic conventions, the Sigma Delta Chi Foundation underwrote visits by Mickey Osterreicher to Cleveland and Philadelphia. Osterreicher, the National Press Photographers Association’s general counsel, conducted training sessions for more than 600 police officers and held evening sessions with area journalists. He emphasized the right to photograph and record in public and covered recent case law, including prohibitions on police seizing images or ordering them deleted.

Osterreicher's training fostered a better understanding of civic rights and police responsibilities. Photographers don’t want to become part of the story; they just want to take great photographs. Osterreicher’s work made it easier for them to do that.

The officer in charge of police training in Cleveland wrote to Osterreicher: “Because of you, I believe the CDP will be better prepared to provide a safe environment for citizens to exercise their Constitutional rights.”

This, in microcosm, is what we see the Journalist on Call doing on a larger scale: being a resource to journalists even before they need help, and when they do, available on a moment’s notice.

No resource like this exists. The closest we found is Emily Richmond, public editor for the Education Writers Association. Her core duty is working one-on-one with EWA members, helping them navigate school bureaucracy and understand their rights, among other duties. She estimates she works with 150 to 200 education reporters a year, from rookies to veterans.

But if you're not an education writer, where do you turn? No journalism organization provides real-time assistance on ethics, FOI and journalist's rights, as well as coaching. That's why we see a need for a Journalist on Call. Journalism is best learned and produced in the real world, with an experienced guide helping you find the way. With digital tools, that guide doesn't have to be at your side. He or she can be hundreds of miles away.

This is what we envision the Journalist on Call doing:

Hotline

This person's primary responsibility would be to provide quick and timely replies to inquiries regarding ethical dilemmas, FOI questions and journalists' rights — from any journalist, not just SPJ members. (SPJ hosts an ethics hotlines now, which receives 400 touches per year. The volunteers who manage the hotline offer excellent advice, but because they are volunteers timely responses can be challenging.)

The Journalist on Call would have the knowledge necessary to answer most questions, and would know about other resources available. He or she would not dispense legal advice, but would have a great relationship with the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press and other legal hotlines, such as those associated with NAJA, ONA or the First Amendment Coalition. (The Reporters Committee's Greg Leslie has already told us he would join a call in progress when legal advice is needed.)

Mobile App and Mobile Responsive Website

Methods to reach the Journalist on Call would be mobile-friendly through an app and/or a mobile responsive website. The key to success will be to include features that instantly assist journalists. In this digital age, the means to reach the Journalist on Call would have to be tech savvy.

SWAT Team/J-Team Approach

The person would be an on-site resource at locations where problems are anticipated or occurring. Like Osterreicher before the conventions, this person could provide training to stave off conflicts. When a big story was underway, the Journalist on Call would be available to talk reporters and editors newsroom leaders through ethical and FOI issues. If time pressures made travel impractical, the trainer would be available by phone, email, Skype and/or webinars. In addition, he or she would aggregate all applicable resources on a digital platform, saving journalists the time of finding them.

Training:

The Journalist on Call would develop and implement educational curriculum on journalists' rights, open records and journalism ethics. He or she would deliver the information online and in person through SPJ/SDX Foundation's various channels, including SPJ's traveling workshops, newsroom training, SPJ.org, webinars, journalism conferences and chapter programming.

Who could possibly do all this? It is an expansive job description that can come fully into focus only by putting someone into the job with enough time to explore what works, what doesn't and what best serves the needs of journalistic excellence in a digital age. As such, we envision the person to be someone who has been in the trenches, fighting open records battles, dealing with day-to-day journalism ethics issues and defending freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The person has guided a staff, thus worked with reporters. He or she will be adept at new technology and capable of applying it effectively. A persistent self-motivator who can work with minimal oversight, the person will be able to manage multiple projects and follow each carefully from inception to completion.

In short, the ideal candidate to be our first Journalist on Call has a fire in the belly about the issues, gets jazzed when there is a battle to be fought and quickly rolls up his or her sleeves to protect the First Amendment.

We'll make sure journalists know of this new resource in a widespread marketing effort. After all, it would do no good if the position exists but no one knows about it.

SPJ is fortunate to have a two-person communications team, which will be tasked with getting the word out about the position and the available resources. Additionally, SPJ subscribes to Meltwater Press, a web-based media contact database of 300,000 journalists. We will use this and social media to publicize the position. The person we hire will also spread the word by making contacts with other journalism organizations.

Collaboration with key stakeholders is important to make this resource valuable. No one person can answer every possible question, nor is there a need to reinvent wheels that already exist. That's why we've reached out to other journalism organizations for their input and to see how this person would fit with what they already offer.

Bruce Brown of the Reporters Committee sees a great need for someone who can offer timely ethics advice and serve as a coach. It would be incredibly beneficial, he says, for someone to be available to brainstorm with journalists and serve as an encourager and cheerleader. This would be especially helpful to journalists who don't work in a newsroom.

Mark Horvit of IRE suggested that SPJ/SDX Foundation would likely be more effective than other organizations in launching this position because of our reach. Journalists don't need this resource until they're in a pickle, so they're more likely to know about it if a broad-based organization is promoting it.

Horvit also noted that many journalists just don't have the time to fight for information.

This is exacerbated if they don't know where to turn for help. They might be more willing to stand up for their rights if they know someone is readily available to offer advice and connect them to resources they may not know about, such as the NFOIC Litigation Fund or SPJ's Legal Defense Fund.

Strategy:

How does the strategy fit Knight's strategy?

"In Defense of the First Amendment" found that editors believe the journalism industry is less able to pursue First Amendment legal cases than it was a decade ago, largely because of economic pressure. Even before this poll was taken, Knight recognized the need to buttress protection of the First Amendment by funding a number of non-profit law projects.

While our proposal does not involve lawyers or courtrooms, it addresses a weakness created by the same economic pressures. The best argument for a vibrant First Amendment is excellent journalism. Great journalism is more likely when reporters have weighed all the ethical considerations or had support in pursuing FOI requests. When editors are stretched, our person would be available to fill the vacuum. Communities would be better informed; the First Amendment would stand on more solid ground.

Paraphrasing the key questions Eric Newton raised in his April 21 Knight Foundation blog:

Should great journalism depend on whether businesses have the money to produce it? Should we have less excellence in journalism because the digital age has upended the media's business model?

The answers are clear, but how do we ensure great journalism? Our proposal is designed to encourage great work by providing the coaching, support and training that have become more rare in financially stretched newsrooms.

Leadership:

Why is your organization's leadership team positioned to succeed with this effort?

The SDX Foundation produces all SPJ-branded educational programming except for the Excellence in Journalism national convention. This includes traveling workshops, Google tools training, webinars and online tutorials. The leadership team constantly modifies content and curriculum to keep pace with the needs of reporters and editors.

The SDX Foundation is positioned to succeed because of the vast amount of education and training it already offers, and also because staff and volunteer leadership buy into the concept of a Journalist on Call. The idea bubbled up from senior staff and volunteer leaders. The board of directors has worked on the concept for two years to be sure it is the right fit for SPJ/SDX Foundation, and to be sure there is a need in the journalism community.

Activities:

What are the key project activities? Provide a timetable and describe the role of any partners.

Phase 1

Once funding is secured, we will widely advertise the job opening. We would reach out to all our partner journalism associations, newsroom contacts and education contacts. The advertisement of the position alone will generate awareness of the Journalist on Call.

Phase 2

Development of infrastructure to allow the person to be able to respond easily and quickly to inquiries.

Phase 3

Once a start date is determined, marketing efforts would go full speed ahead.

Phase 4

Once the person begins working, he or she would begin developing training programs and would supplement marketing effort by contacting newsrooms and journalism organizations to let them know he or she is on board. Key stakeholders that in particular would play a partner role would be the Reporters Committee, IRE, ethnic-based journalism associations and the state FOI coalitions.

Phase 5

Ongoing outreach by the Journalist on Call. Begin taking enquiries and helping reporters produce excellent journalism.

Outcomes:

What are the expected outcomes?

The addition of the Journalist on Call will change the landscape of options for reporters, news directors and editors in small and large outlets, for freelancers, and for the increasing number of one-man-band multimedia journalists who run across ethical dilemmas but have no one to ask for solid advice.

While several organizations handle legal questions, no one is available to handle quickly the more common array of daily issues journalists confront. SPJ's excellent Ethics Committee is comprised of volunteers who cannot act as swiftly as would a professional expert always on call. The addition of this position will lead to more informed decision-making and ethical reporting and more public records access. It would provide a resource during big breaking-news events. It could allow for the building of a searchable site/database of resources that allow reporters to plan ahead before initiating interviews and other coverage.

The result is better journalism.

Specifically, outcomes will be measured by the number of journalists served and more by the number of success stories that result from a journalist leaning on the Journalist on Call.

We believe strongly in the need to support this position for three years to allow the person hired the time to develop a job description into a known quantity. In many ways this is our field of dreams: we must build it to see if journalists will come. Our experience tells us there is a void and a great need for this position.

Assessment:

What will be learned from this work? What specific indicators will be tracked?

The ultimate measure of this position is whether journalists turn to it. We will closely track the number of calls we receive, expecting to see growth over three years. Other indicators include how many events the Journalist on Call parachutes into, how many people he or she trains in person and online. In addition to tracking the raw numbers, we will follow up with callers to determine whether the advice was helpful and how their story or situation turned out.

We expect the position to assume a life of its own by acquiring a reputation. Once the position establishes itself, the SDX Foundation will be prepared to fully fund it going forward.

JOURNALIST ON CALL BUDGET

Salary **\$70,000**

Based on the expectations of knowledge and work, \$70,000 seems in the middle. If the position is just a clearinghouse (but we think we want it to be more), then it can be less - \$40,000-\$50,000. But if the person is expected to have a bit of cache and credibility - maybe already known to some extent, then it might be closer to \$90,000-\$100,000. It's like hiring a Knight chair or a big professor of practice from the industry to bring prestige to a program. The problem with hiring big names, however, is they sometimes don't work hard and can be prima donnas. Someone in the middle would probably be best - hungry who can make a name for himself or herself.

Health Care Benefits **\$10,000**

Based on someone in the 40-60 year old range.

401K **\$4,200**

6% of the salary.

Travel **\$20,000**

This person would travel to newsrooms; to conferences; to cities where journalists need assistance with issues related to rights and access.

Marketing **\$10,000**

The first year, and maybe subsequent years, money should be spent on getting the word out about the position. Besides social media, other promotional avenues could include booths at conferences, digital and print ads, etc.

Technology **\$12,000**

Cell phone and landline; computer (not an annual expense); database seat license; technology maintenance; mobile app development.

Other Employment Costs **\$10,000**

Payroll taxes; payroll service; workman's compensation; employee education; office supplies; utilities.

TOTAL **\$136,200**

DATE: Sept. 19, 2016
FROM: Sonny Albarado, Nominations Committee Chairman
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors



NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Nominations Committee (Sonny Albarado, Patti Newberry and Sonya Ross) contacted board members and officers whose terms conclude Sept. 19:

President Robert Leger
Vice-President Irwin Gratz
Secretary Hagit Limor
Treasurer Howard Dubin

Board members: Dave Carlson, Al Cross, Steve Geimann, Howard Dubin, Russ Pulliam and Dave Aeikens.

Of those, Cross, Geimann and Aeikens said they would not seek reelection to the board. All others indicated their desire to seek reelection as officers or to the board.

Separately, former SPJ President Dana Neuts, whose SPJ appointment to SDX expires Sept. 19, said she did not want to be considered for an elected seat on the SDX board.

No one on the SDX board informed the committee of any intent to run for one of the officer posts.

The committee considered seeking new board nominees who would be representative of a younger demographic or digital news fields, but decided this year to stand pat because of discussions related to the size of the board and the possibility of reducing it.

Not filling the vacancies left by the three who chose to leave the board and the seat frequently offered to former SPJ presidents will effectively reduce the board's size by four, but still fulfill the bylaws requirement that non-SPJ board members form the majority of the SDX Foundation board.

This is what I recommended to President Leger:

As SDX and SPJ begin considering their structure going forward, it might be a good idea to use this opportunity to slightly reduce the size of the board by not filling these slots.

I don't think this prevents the SDX board from later choosing an outstanding candidate who is younger or ticks some other diversity checkbox.

Plus, other current board members may decide to step down or not seek re-election, providing another chance for the officers and board to further diversify SDX.

DATE: Sept. 19, 2016
FROM: Robert Leger, SDX Foundation President
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors



THINKING STRATEGICALLY

The SDX Foundation is a different organization than it was three years ago. We've changed our focus from a foundation that wrote checks to support others' work to one that delivers our own programming. Our transition to this point has centered on logistics: budgeting, revamping committees, figuring out new processes.

Now that we have a better idea of how to operate in this new skin, it's time to get strategic. A few weeks ago, I asked you to consider a set of questions for discussion at this meeting. Ultimately, what those questions ask is:

Why does the SDX Foundation exist? What do we want to accomplish?

In our former iteration, there was little need to ask such questions. In our new structure, it's imperative that we address them. We have more options, yet our resources remain finite. Where can they do the most good? We need to determine where we're going and how we'll get there.

After I circulated my questions, Dave Carlson suggested I had left something off the list. Our top priority, he said, should be building the corpus. That leads back to the key question: Why? For what purpose should we build the corpus? What do we hope to accomplish?

That's where we'll begin the discussion. We likely won't finish it in one day; this might stretch over several meetings.

Our conversation today will inform a plan of work for the next year and influence budget choices next spring. Once we agree on our priorities, committees will be given assignments. The board will need some of your time between now and April.

One of my goals is to fully activate the Development Committee, which we have underutilized for too long. Our staff professionals can submit grant requests, make pitches or close a deal. Board members can open doors for them or identify non-traditional funding sources. Volunteers?

The Questions

- Rank discretionary programs from most to least important?
- Should we pay for new ideas by shifting discretionary spending, raising new money, seeking grants, or a combination?
- Is the programming committee the best way to generate new ideas?
- Should we stop making grants to free money for SDX programming?
- Should we make changes in Quill to reduce expenses?
- Should we change how we seek donations?
- Should we change our name to make the connection with SPJ more clear?
- What views and voices do we need on our board?
- Does the current size and structure of the board allow us to operate strategically and effectively fulfill our mission?

What you said

To prime our conversation, I'll share highlights of the responses to my note of a few weeks ago. Seventeen members ranked our discretionary programs, with every program being ranked a top priority by at least one member. Here are the averages, with 1 being top priority.

Training place	1.6
EIJ (support for SPJ)	2.3
Diversity Leadership Program	2.8
Grants	4.1
Quill	4.3

Highlights from your comments:

Training programs

Sonny Albarado: Are our training offerings unique or sufficiently different from the handful of others offered by the likes of APME, IRE, Poynter, et al that we compete in the marketplace?

Kevin Smith: Journ camps ... are getting more expensive and the attendance seems to be falling off depending on the host city. It might be time to rethink these, but we should continue them. I'm not sure how successful the webinars are in terms of viewership.

Bill Ketter: Does someone have any metrics on the effectiveness of JournCamp and Diversity Leadership Program? Certainly diversity training is a needed and noble pursuit in a profession that has struggled to reach racial and gender representation that matches societal changes. ASNE has taken this on as a priority for 20 years and the needle hasn't moved much, unfortunately.

Sonya Ross: There is a training area where SPJ can be unique and distinct, and serve a crying need in the industry: race & ethnicity coverage. Race coverage is fraught with challenges, from the best way to devote newsroom resources, to applying appropriate sensitivity, choosing language that does not offend, or addressing diversity concerns within the newsroom. The stakes around mistakes are high, which makes many media outlets a bit reluctant even though they want to do a better job in this area.

Diversity Leadership Training program

Sonny Albarado: How can we make Diversity Leadership Program more productive? Not just in terms of putting leaders on SPJ/SDX's ladder, but making it meaningful for any minority journalist. Should we partner with NABJ/NAHJ/NAJA, etc. to expand the leadership opportunities? Just trying to think creatively.

Bill McCloskey: I note with disappointment that it has led to very little increase in diversity -- if any -- on SDX or SPJ boards. This program needs stronger emphasis, re-evaluation and if necessary written of as a failed effort. I prefer that it be reinvigorated.

Grants

Bill Ketter: Grants to outside organizations can be critical to accessing research and expertise that can endear the foundation and SPJ to the broader journalism community. But there needs to be greater scrutiny of the need and value of the applicant projects. I'd also suggest improved branding of approved

projects, and monitoring of their development. We may also want to adopt specific targets or topics for grants.

Hagit Limor: Other than the editorial writing grant, I feel that the smaller grants we provide to outside groups and individuals don't provide a significant enough impact that would outweigh the potential for us to make a bigger play otherwise.

Sonny Albarado: I'd hate to abandon grants to others completely, but we definitely can't be a primary source of funding. Plus, our needs should come first. And, maybe, circumstances will force us to stop making them.

Kevin Smith: This is already such a small piece of the pie. I think it should remain but clearly not a priority. Others do good work and we should assist when we can.

Funding ideas/raising money

Bill Ketter: The foundation needs to develop a strategic approach to coming up with ideas that will appeal to funders, be they individual angels or foundations. And the ideas have to be aimed at a purpose that serves the public welfare in a new way. Our message has to be clearly different and better than the competition or we won't get beyond a polite rejection. Identifying non-traditional journalism funders who believe in the value of journalism is also important.

Hagit Limor: We have to have skin in the game and not just depend on outside sources of funding. This is a foundation supporting best practices in journalism. At some point, I think we can on rare occasions dig into the corpus for something that could pay off and hopefully generate publicity or goodwill that may lead to outside funding in the future.

Developing ideas:

Dana Neuts: Relying on the programming committee limits our ability to be creative and it limits the ability for the full board to participate. Since we have a broad cross-section of board members, or should have, I think we should open this up to more people.

Sonny Albarado: The programming committee would be my preferred way of generating new ideas. The committee should proactively seek ideas from others.

Lynn Walsh: I think the program committee is a good form to generate new ideas.

Board size/makeup

Dana Neuts: More diversity in terms of age, background, ethnicity, etc. The same voices remain on the board, and I think that hurts SDX. I think a limited board, maybe of 15 people, could be more effective and a revisiting of committees. Our leadership structure, and selection, is very workable and we've got great people in place.

Lynn Walsh: I think we need more diversity when it comes to age, background on the board (more web, nontraditional journalists representatives)

Bill Ketter: The board is too large, and has too many non-participating members. I'd suggest we create an advisory board of well-known journalists to get the effect of their support for what we do. Then

reduce the size of the foundation board to focus on specific qualities or expertise essential to function nimbly and effectively.

Hagit Limor: We need more representation from employees of websites that seem to be where most people are getting their news these days. However, many may not be traditional to our culture. We could use representation from technology companies interested in information dissemination. We probably need much more youth, much as it pains me to say. ... Clearly, we need more minority representation as well.

Quill

Eight replies suggested making Quill online only or killing it outright. One person said he reads it cover to cover. The publications committee is polling attendees at EIJ to get an idea of how much members value the magazine in its current form. Focus groups will follow.

Our name

The question received little comment. One or two saw a need to change it to more directly indicate our association with SPJ. One or two others saw no need.

DATE: Aug. 26, 2016
FROM: Fred Brown, Chairman, Quill/Publications Committee
FOR: SDX Foundation Board of Directors



QUILL/PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

The Quill Committee met by teleconference on August 25. Four of our six members were able to participate, as well as SDX President Robert Leger and Scott Leadingham, whose duties include Quill. It was our second meeting-by-phone since the last national convention, and we continued our discussion of three major topics:

1. The future of Quill
2. The much-delayed SPJ history book
3. A fifth edition of the SDX/SPJ ethics book

We spent most of the half-hour talking about **Quill**. We had previously discussed converting the magazine to online only, but there was, and still is, considerable sentiment for continuing a print version. While SPJ-specific content easily could be online only, a print magazine would continue to provide a tangible presence in the marketplace. As executive director Joe Skeel put it in an email he sent before the meeting, "As you know, I believe there is strong value in having a piece that is delivered to people – specifically newsrooms, journalism departments, etc. etc. Printed marketing is making a comeback as more people get inundated with e-mail. As the former Quill editor, I am admittedly biased."

Joe also had a suggestion: "What if Quill is still a printed magazine, but is smaller (in physical size). What if we remove the toolbox pieces – and put those on SPJ.org – and make Quill more of a "journalism issues" focus with a training component. For example, a story could be about how the media has covered the political campaign – coupled with tips, resources, etc., to covering the election. Basically, we strip away the SPJ insider baseball and one-page toolboxes, but keep the more in-depth stuff. It would be the meaty stuff that people would sit down with."

Scott noted that SPJ has partnered with the Columbia Journalism Review, which now publishes a print version only twice a year. American Journalism Review a year ago decided to go online only, but found that was unsustainable. Scott also noted that he had yet to get an inquiry about why there had not been a July/August online Quill. It was a bit of an experiment, he said, to see if people would notice.

The committee decided that a good next step in determining Quill's future direction would be to circulate printed questionnaires at the regional meetings during EIJ asking folks if they read Quill online, in print or both; what they read (probably with a list of topics and features to choose from); what else they'd like to see in Quill, or what they could do without; and, finally, if they'd like to participate in follow-up discussions on Quill's future such as a focus group. The questionnaires also should be available at other locations during the convention, but they could be given special emphasis during the regional meetings.

History book: The committee decided to try to push back the content deadline to the end of the year. The number of unfinished elements remaining to bring the project to completion appears to be more manageable than I expected. I apologize for not getting more accomplished in the four months since I

got that to-do list. The biggest problem may be getting 1,000-word summaries from former presidents reminiscing about what happened during their terms. There were only seven in hand, and there should be around 30 to make this part of the book work.

Ethics book: The other major project is finishing a fifth edition of the ethics book. I have been whittling away at this and pledge to get it done, as well, by the end of the year. There are a number of new, student-written case studies I can use for the book, and a consulting job I've been working on for the past couple of years has produced (among a whole bunch of other stuff) a marvelous resource of dozens of media-related codes of ethics.



DATE: July 14, 2016

TO: Robert Leger, president
SDX Board of Directors

FROM: Mac McKerral, chair
SDX Grants Committee

RE: SDX First Amendment Award

CC: Chris Vachon, SPJ
associate executive director

Abbi Martzall, SPJ
awards coordinator

Robert:

A committee consisting of me, Sonny Albarado, Russ Pulliam and Sara Gregory reviewed the nominations for the 2016 Sigma Delta Chi First Amendment Awards and met via conference call on July 12. The committee was deadlocked on two nominations, both involving compelling reporting that resulted in significant findings, and change in public policy and private sector business operations.

The nominees were:

- Todd Wallack, the Boston Globe: Wallack did extensive reporting on the deficiencies in the Massachusetts Open Records laws, which led to a overhaul of the law, a significant benefit to the people of the state. The committee stated this work “remarkably led to significant public policy change” and demonstrated the significant change that can be achieved by dogged reporting.
- Ellen Gabler in her extensive “Hidden Errors” series for the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel revealed that laboratories throughout the United States did not follow basic policies and procedures designed to ensure the accuracy of test results. Her series (54 pages in PDF format) also uncovered a secret system used to hide mistakes from the public, which allowed medical laboratories to cut costs at the expense of patients. The committee noted the difficulty faced by Gabler when dealing with the private sector and the workarounds she used to get information not publicly available. As one committee member noted, the reporting involved “real people facing real harm.”

Therefore, it is the committee's recommendation that the award be split (\$5,000 each) between these two nominees.

The committee recognizes that this would involve additional costs. As per Abbi Martzall, the additional costs are attached to a dual award in this way: an additional crystal award, \$750; and participant travel, \$1,130 for the recipient to attend EIJ Conference (\$400 flight/\$500 hotel/\$80 banquet ticket/\$150 miscellaneous.)

We hope the foundation can find the wherewithal to handle the additional cost.

On another matter, the number of nominees dropped this year to eight (one was considered not legitimate). This is a significant drop from the past several years in which nominees totaled 12-15. Abbi will be looking into more ways we can get the word out, including notifying leaders in CONJO and other organizations.

As I have stated in the past, reading the excellent reporting work and tremendous service done in the vein of First Amendment and public access protection is humbling and inspiring. I consider this award among the most important SPJ/SDX bestows.