AGENDA
THE SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
TIME: 9 A.M.    DATE: JAN. 18, 2014
NASHVILLE, TN.

1. Call to Order – Cuillier

2. Roll Call – Fletcher
   a. Cuillier  c. Fletcher  e. Meyers  g. Albarado

3. Approve Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
   a. June 22, 2013 (Page 1)
   b. January 15, 2014 (addendum to materials)

4. Approve Delegate Meeting Minutes

5. Report of the SPJ President – Cuillier (Page 12)

6. Report of the SDX Foundation President – Leger

7. SDX Foundation Grant Requests – Cuillier
   a. Zombie Stories (Page 16)

8. Old/New Business
   a. Ethics Code update – Cuillier
   b. Name change update – Cuillier (Page 17)
   c. Freelance Community update – Cuillier
   d. Auto Dues update – Skeel
   e. Website update – Neuts/O’Keefe
   f. Scripps Leadership analysis – Skeel (Page 26)
   g. Staff succession plan – Skeel (Page 36)
   h. Board member stipends proposal – Fletcher (Page 39)
   i. Membership update – Neuts/Skeel

EXECUTIVE SESSION

9. Nominations – Albarado

10. Strategy discussion: The Big Picture - where should SPJ be in 20 years?
    a. Advocacy/communications
    b. Organizational management
    c. Education/training

11. Adjournment
The Society of Professional Journalists

Executive Committee Meeting

Date: Jan. 18, 2014
Time: 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.
Room: Ryman Studio C
Location: Gaylord Opryland, Nashville, Tenn.

The Society of Professional Journalists works to improve and protect journalism. The organization is the nation's largest and most broad-based journalism organization, dedicated to encouraging the free practice of journalism and stimulating high standards of ethical behavior.

Founded in 1909 as Sigma Delta Chi, SPJ promotes the free flow of information vital to a well-informed citizenry, works to inspire and educate the next generation of journalists, and protects First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech and press.
MINUTES
MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
WASHINGTON, D.C.
JUNE 22, 2013

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
With President Sonny Albarado presiding, the Executive Committee of the Society of Professional Journalists was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

ROLL CALL
In addition to Albarado, the following were in attendance: President-Elect David Cuillier, Secretary-treasurer Dana Neuts, Immediate Past President John Ensslin, Vice President of Campus Chapter Affairs Neil Ralston and at-large members Bill McCloskey and Brian Eckert. Also in attendance were Executive Director Joe Skeel, Chapter Coordinator Tara Puckey, SDX Foundation President Robert Leger and guests Bob Becker, Sue Kopen Katcef, Paul Fletcher and Andy Schotz.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Upon proper motion and second by McCloskey and Neuts, respectively, the minutes from Jan. 19, 2013 and April 9, 2013 were approved.

SPJ PRESIDENT’S REPORT
Albarado reported that he went to San Antonio and the centennial Wells Key event in Wisconsin on June 1. He has been working with the national coalition regarding the Shield Law media coalition and hopes to see some action in the late Fall on the shield law.

SDX FOUNDATION PRESIDENT’S REPORT
Leger updated the group on the account balances, which were up $650k over the prior year, and shared that the handwriting campaign returned over $2,500. Also, Jerry Robert's donated a significant amount of stock to the Foundation.

INVESTMENT POLICY
The group discussed the need for an updated investment policy, now that there is money again to invest.

Upon proper motion and second by Ensslin and Eckert, respectively, an updated investment policy was adopted. (Appendix A)

INVESTMENT PROPOSAL
Skeel shared an investment proposal, put together by SPJ’s investment banker at PNC, which included a combination of a money market, low-risk mutual fund and laddered CDs. The committee discussed various investment options.
Upon proper motion and second by Neuts and Ralston, respectively, the committee voted to invest $400,000 in the low-risk mutual fund, $100,000 in CDs and $100,000 in the Money Market.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Chapter update – Puckey shared information about chapters and annual reports: She talked to each RD about every chapter in their area and created a list of chapters that are alive and dormant. She reported that she would have a mechanism in place to let members of each chapter know when the chapter is inactivated.

Chapter affiliations – Skeel shared the situation with chapter affiliations and how the web upgrade has affected the practice of affiliating members based on zip codes. Therefore, headquarters staff would no longer automatically affiliate members with chapters based on zip code. New members would only be affiliated with chapters if they decided to join.

SPJ Communications/branding – Neuts shared her report and asked that the Executive Committee consider the possibility of hiring a higher-level communications/branding person. The committee discussed the need of such a position and how it would be funded. Albarado agreed to develop a task force to look at the possibility of what a higher-level communications position might entail.

Education Committee Request – Ensslin moved to endorse Journalism Education Committee proposal to start the ball rolling on their study/project related to high school journalism. Dave asked for an additional explanation of request from Becky Tallent. He questioned if SPJ should get in the business of funding research.

**Upon proper motion and second by Ensslin and Ralston, respectively, the committee voted to ask the SPJ Board to recommend that SDX fund the project at the $1,800 level.**

Nominations process – Neuts shared her memo about the process while Ensslin shared his experience of recruiting members. He named three major criteria for his struggles in getting nominations: Apathy (people view it as a chore, not an opportunity). Getting journalists on board is challenging because of lack of employer support. SPJ own collegial atmosphere leads to people not wanting to run against others. Group discussed ways to engage future leaders.

Social Media guidelines – **Upon proper motion and second by McCloskey and Ensslin, respectively, the committee voted to recommend the full board adopt the social medial guidelines. (Appendix B)**

**AWARDS DISCUSSION**

Echolsman Award: **Upon proper motion and second by McCloskey and Ensslin, Mike Reilly is chosen.** The group asked that staff emphasize in the award language that it is based on the adviser role only.
Distinguished teaching in journalism: Executive Committee would like to thank the Journalism Education committee for vetting the candidates and make recommendations. **Upon proper motion and second by McCloskey and Ensslin, Foley is chosen.** The group asked if, moving forward, we can require that a CV be submitted as well?

Ethics in Journalism: **Upon proper motion and second by Cuillier and McCloskey David Boardman is chosen.** Neuts abstains.

Fellows of the Society: Brian will contact John Carroll. Send him an email to remind him to reach out and see if he can come. Group discussed whether to give out more than one award. **Upon proper motion and second by Cuillier and Ensslin, Martinez is chosen.**

First Amendment Award: **Upon proper motion and second by McCloskey and Ralston, the Human Rights Defense Center is chosen.**

First Amendment Award: **Upon proper motion and second by Ensslin and Neuts, the committee votes to merge SPJ’s First Amendment Award with the SDX Pulliam First Amendment Award.**

Sunshine award: **Upon proper motion and second by Ensslin and McCloskey, Rosenfeld, Donahue and Sunlight Foundation are chosen. Upon proper motion and second by McCloskey and Eckert, Donahue is chosen. Upon proper motion and second by Ralston and Cuillier, the Sunlight Foundation is chosen**

Historic Site in Journalism: **Upon proper motion and second by Cuillier and McCloskey, Washington Square is chosen.** The committee asked for future nominations from American Journalism Historians Association.

Julie Galvan Outstanding Graduate in Journalism: **Upon proper motion and second by Cuillier and Neuts, Trumbell is chosen.**

Howard Dubin award: **Upon proper motion and second by McCloskey and Ensslin, Patti Cross is chosen in the small chapter category. Upon proper motion and second by Eckert and Neuts, Andy Schotz is chosen in the large category. McCloskey abstains.**

**Upon proper motion and second, the committee entered executive session to discuss confidential awards.**

Regional Director of the Year: **Upon proper motion and second by Neuts and Ralston, Eckert is chosen.**

Wells Memorial Key: **Upon proper motion and second by Neuts and Ralston, David Carlson is chosen.**

Adjournments
Upon proper motion and second by Neuts and McCloskey, the committee adjourned at 3:45 p.m. on Saturday, June 22.
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
INVESTMENT POLICY

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

A. Standard of Care
   1) In managing the assets of the Society of Professional Journalists, the board of directors shall use the care, skill, prudence, and diligence under the circumstances as any reasonable person.

B. Asset Management
   1) The board shall have the authority to obtain the services of professional asset managers and to dismiss same as necessary.

C. Diversification
   1) The board shall supervise the diversification of the assets of the funds, plans and program. This will be done to minimize the risk of large losses unless circumstances make it clearly prudent not to diversify.

D. Restrictions
   1) Fixed income securities may be purchased where issued or guaranteed by the United States Treasury, government sponsored enterprises, or corporate bonds rated by Moody’s or Standard and Poor’s. International Securities may also be purchased. Convertible securities will be considered as equity securities. An average Standard and Poor’s credit rating of “AA,” or the equivalent should be maintained. Commercial paper should be rated P-1 by Moody’s Investor Service, Inc., A-1 Standard and Poor’s, or F-1 by Fitch’s and certificates of deposit or banker’s acceptances of the one hundred (100) largest commercial banks in the United States, or deposit or banker’s acceptance (in appropriate amounts) are fully insured by an agency of the Federal Government.

   2) No direct investments shall be made in commodities, commodity contracts, futures, future contracts, oil/gas, mineral leases, mineral rights, or royalty contracts.

   3) No direct transactions in short sales, options, puts, calls, straddles and/or spreads shall be used. Covered call options strategies on equities can be pursued on a limited basis. Real Estate Investment Trusts (REIT) are permitted on a limited basis.

   4) No investment shall knowingly be made in which any officer or director of the SPJ board of directors has a known significant financial interest.
5) SPJ may invest in mutual funds which are quoted by the National Association of Securities Dealers.

6) SPJ retains the right to remove any stock or bond from the portfolio if it feels that the issuing body or company sells products or services not in harmony with the Society’s goals.

II. INVESTMENT OBJECTIVES

Recognizing the need to manage day-to-day operations; fiduciary responsibility to our members; and desire for a prudent guide for the present and future direction of our assets, our investment priorities shall be:

A. Liquidity
   1) To maintain sufficient liquidity to provide for all anticipated withdrawals or transfers and to invest in issues with sufficient marketability to provide for unexpected withdrawals.

B. Stability
   1) To maintain a high level of stability and security in the Society by minimizing risk and volatility insofar as possible within the rate of return objectives.

C. Steady income from interest and dividends
   1) Earned interest and dividends may be re-invested or used for day-to-day operations.

D. Preservation of Capital
   1) To preserve the capital investment of the Society only after ensuring the previous three objectives are being met.

III. INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT POLICY

1) To achieve the Society’s investment objectives, we will place tight parameters on investment decisions and advisors. These would include a low to moderate risk tolerance in every portion of the portfolio. We wish to avoid large swings in portfolio value and will not accept short-term fluctuation to try to achieve a higher return.

2) The Society’s executive director shall review account balances monthly and suggest investment changes to the board of directors when appropriate.

3) The executive director will share investment performance with the board of directors at the time quarterly financials are issued.
At the Society of Professional Journalists Board meeting on April 20, board members’ questions and concerns about proposed social media guidelines prompted me to withdraw the proposal for further editing and presentation of revised guidelines at a later date.

Here is the revised proposal.

SOCIAL MEDIA GUIDELINES
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS

PREAMBLE
The Society strongly encourages its leaders and members to regularly use social media to communicate, not only among themselves, but with the broader journalism community.

These guidelines are intended to help SPJ leaders and members follow accepted best practices as they use social media in carrying out the Society's missions. Source material for these guidelines came from governmental agencies, nonprofits and some of the nation's largest businesses.

THE SHORT VERSION
These guidelines can be summed up in three words: Use common sense.

DISCLOSURE
Always disclose your position with SPJ or clearly indicate your role.

GUIDELINES
FOR SPJ LEADERS AND COMMITTEES
- Remember: only SPJ's national president, or the president's designee, can speak on behalf of the organization.
- Don't blindside your leaders.
- Do not disclose private or proprietary information.
- Encourage discussion about SPJ and journalism in general.
- “Live tweeting” of open board meetings and convention business is allowed.
MINUTES
MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
AUGUST 24, 2013
ANAHEIM, CA

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
With President Sonny Albarado presiding, the meeting of the house of delegates of the Society of Professional Journalists was called to order at 2:03 p.m. on Saturday, August 24, 2013, at the Anaheim Marriott, in conjunction with the Society’s annual convention at the Excellence in Journalism conference.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT
Immediate Past President John Ensslin announced the following list of candidates:
- President-elect: Dana Neuts
- Secretary-treasurer: Paul Fletcher
- Vice President, Campus Chapter Affairs: Sue Kopen Kateef
- At-large director: Bill McCloskey
- Campus adviser at-large: Rebecca Tallent
- Student Representative: Michael Auslen, Lindsey Cook, Michael Periatt, Casey Voyles

Upon proper motion and second from Lauren Bartlett, Los Angeles Pro Chapter, and Georgiana Vines, East Tennessee Pro Chapter, the house of delegates accepted the nominations.

Ensslin explained voting procedures for One Member, One Vote. The candidates for office in attendance then addressed the delegates. Lindsey Cook, Michael Periatt and Casey Voyles were not present to speak.

SUBMISSION OF RESOLUTIONS
Albarado gave instructions to submit proposed resolutions to Resolutions Committee Chairman Mac McKerral.

CHAPTER OF THE YEAR AWARDS
Albarado presented the Chapter of the Year Awards and congratulated winning chapters.

Small Chapter of the Year – Virginia Pro
Large Chapter of the Year – New York Deadline Club

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business to come before the house of delegates, Ensslin declared the meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m. on Saturday, August 24, 2013.
MINUTES
MEETING OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
AUGUST 26, 2013
ANAHEIM, CALI.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER
With President Sonny Albarado presiding, the meeting of the house of delegates of the Society of Professional Journalists was called to order at 3:33 p.m. on Monday, August 26, 2013, at the Anaheim Marriott, in conjunction with the Society’s annual convention at the Excellence in Journalism conference.

YEAR IN REVIEW
Albarado gave a brief year in review of initiatives completed in the past year, including the fight for a federal Shield Law, support for the NPPA, adopting new guidelines and policies for the Society.

RULES OF THE CONVENTION
Bylaws Committee Chairman Robert Becker read the rules of the convention and voting procedures for delegates.

CONVENTION RESOLUTIONS
Resolutions Committee Chairman Gordon “Mac” McKerral introduced the 9 resolutions for delegates’ consideration.

Upon proper motion and second by Lauren Bartlett, Los Angeles Pro Chapter, and David Sheets, St. Louis Pro Chapter, respectively, the house of delegates agreed to approve all resolutions as a block with the exception of 5, 6 and 9.

Steve Geimann read resolution 1, thanking Albarado for his service.

RESOLUTION 5 – Renaming SPJ the “Society for Professional Journalism”
Bill McCloskey made a motion to speak to the issue for only 15 minutes. The motion was seconded by Lauren Bartlett, Los Angeles Pro Chapter.

A voice vote was taken and was close. McKerral urged delegates to move forward with discussion.

Hazel Becker, D.C. Pro Chapter, opposed the resolution because of her belief that the Society continues to do things for journalists – training, advocating and the Code of Ethics. Eric Francis, Arkansas Pro Chapter, supported the resolution, saying that supporting the act of journalism does not change our mission and can foster an outreach to those who support journalism but may not be journalists in the traditional sense.
Terri Carnicelli, Valley of the Sun Pro Chapter, made a motion to strike the first “Whereas” because it seems to provide a negative connotation. Monica Guzman, Western Washington Pro, seconded.

A card vote was taken and the motion passed. The first “Whereas” was removed from the resolution.

There was debate among leaders about removing the second “Whereas,” and McKerral spoke with the group about remaining on point with the big picture.

Michael Fitzgerald, New England Pro Chapter, called the question. The motion passed.

Debate ended and Resolution 5 failed.

**RESOLUTION 6 - PAOs**
Carolyn Carlson, Kennesaw State University Chapter, made a motion to pass, seconded by Georgiana Vines, Eastern Tennessee Pro Chapter.

Lauren Bartlett, Los Angeles Pro Chapter, made a friendly amendment that the final “be it further resolved” be struck from the resolution. A proper second was given by Bill McCloskey, D. C. Pro Chapter, and the friendly amendment was accepted by Carlson and Vines, respectively.

McCloskey, D.C. Pro Chapter, spoke to delegates, saying “passing this will not change the scenario” and that he objects against seeking special privileges for journalists instead of all citizens. He urged delegates to vote against it.

A card vote was taken. Resolution 6 failed.

**RESOLUTION 9 – Defining “journalist”**
Eric Francis, Arkansas Pro Chapter moved that Resolution 9 be approved and was seconded by Hazel Becker, D.C. Pro Chapter.

There was no discussion and the Resolutions Committee gave a brief description on the background of the resolution.

A vote was taken and Resolution 9 was passed by the house of delegates.

**ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION – RESOLUTION 5**
Michael Fitzgerald, New England Pro Chapter, made a motion for additional discussion about Resolution 5. A proper second was given by Mary Kenney, Indiana University Chapter.

Monica Guzman, Western Washington Pro Chapter, encouraged delegates to be educated about the process and urged them to continue discussion on the topic. Mark Scarp, Valley of the Sun Pro Chapter, suggested that the discussion be brought before the national
board at their meeting on August 27, 2013 for a recommendation to bring the topic forward as a bylaws amendment. Patti Newberry, Miami University Chapter, asked that the board have specific discussions regarding logistical information and the impact at a chapter level.

Lauren Bartlett, Los Angeles Pro Chapter, made a friendly amendment that the issue simply be a discussion item with the board on the following day. Eric Francis, Arkansas Pro Chapter, seconded and the friendly amendment was accepted. The motion passed.

**ELECTION RESULTS**
President Albarado announced the results of the board elections:

Election Results:
President Elect: Dana Neuts
Secretary Treasurer: Paul Fletcher
Vice President, Campus Chapter Affairs: Sue Kopen Katcef
Campus Adviser At-Large: Rebecca Tallent
Director At-Large: Bill McCloskey
Campus Representatives (2): Lindsey Cook, Michael Periatt
Region 2: Andy Schotz
Region 3: Michael Koretzky
Region 6: Joe Radske
Region 10: Pia Hallenberg
Region 11: Elizabeth Smith
Region 12: Tony Hernandez

**SWEARING IN NEW OFFICERS:**
Newly elected officers and board members were sworn in by President Albarado.

**CIRCLE OF EXCELLENCE AWARDS:**
Albarado presented the Circle of Excellence Awards to large and small chapters.

**ADJOURNMENT:**
Upon proper motion and second Lauren Bartlett, Los Angeles Pro Chapter, and Steve Geimann, D.C. Pro Chapter, the house of delegates voted to adjourn the meeting at 4:40 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:   Jan. 18, 2014
FROM:   Dave Cuillier
SUBJ:   SPJ President’s Report
FOR:    SPJ Executive Committee

The year is moving swiftly, and we’ve made some excellent advances as an organization on a variety of fronts. This memo will outline some of the activities coming up, which are exciting to me, and I hope to members. No doubt I will have missed some important efforts undertaken by staff and volunteers, so I apologize in advance for any unintentional oversights.

Advocacy
We continue to fight on behalf of journalists, and I am proud to be part of this organization for that reason alone. Secretary-Treasurer Paul Fletcher took an active role in working on shield law issues – both the Hosey case in Illinois and the federal shield law campaign (great senator-contact blitz this past fall). We are waiting for the shield law legislation to emerge before going all out on another congressional call campaign. The website is updated and we are ready to move. In addition, we continue to write letters of support for journalists in need, as well as provide LDF funds, testimony, and other forms of support. Some examples include:

- Helping journalism students at Otterbein University in Ohio fight for police records at private universities, which we hope will lead to legislative change.
- Assisting a college newspaper adviser in Oregon who faces problems with university administrators.
- Speaking out at a state hearing in Connecticut over access to autopsy photos and other records.
- Writing a joint op-ed piece for the New York Times with the National Press Club about excessive PIO controls.
- Quoted by Fox and other media over the Colorado Jana Winter shield law case.

Advocacy, along with ethics, diversity and training, is one of our most powerful strengths and it is something I strongly feel we need to build upon. One goal of mine is to create a stable advocacy fund to increase our reach and effectiveness for generations to come. I’m talking with Joe about possibilities and I would like to talk more with the Executive Committee and propose some options this spring.

Communities
The Freelance Committee has morphed into a Freelance Community and will announce the ability for members to sign up as soon as the website is ready in February or March. Michael Fitzgerald is planning to submit an application to the full board in April for formal recognition as a
community. By late spring we will have numerous activities available for freelance community members. Other committees are still considering shifting to communities (e.g., Journalism Education, Digital, Generation J). I feel this is a positive move toward enhancing professional development and networking opportunities (e.g., jobs!) for our members.

Training and Development
The organization continues to conduct excellent training and development for members who take advantage of it. I think this is one of our strengths. The Scripps sessions appear to be a huge success—we’ll hear more from Joe at the meeting. We continue to do excellent on-site newsroom training, which has become incredibly cool—check out the offerings packed with multimedia, social media and other topical skills, at http://www.spj.org/newsroomtraining.asp. And the conferences are still valuable. Increased training opportunities through SDX (e.g., the photojournalism workshops and For Journalism) are crucial to the survival of SPJ and quality journalism, and we will continue to build on that through new collaborations with other organizations.

Membership
Membership continues to decline slowly, which is of concern to me. Vice President Dana Neuts has taken the lead on membership, initiating efforts to recognize members, attract new ones, and retain existing members. Joe has hired a student to call people whose memberships lapsed, and other activities are under way that they can expound upon in their reports. I feel that the key to membership is providing services that people feel are valuable, such as effective training, resources, and networking opportunities (e.g., communities). Continuing to focus on training, building resources, advocacy, and ethics, is crucial. Then the second step is getting the word out through more effective communications. This is something we could initiate immediately with potential positive effects on membership.

Communications
I think we are all in agreement that SPJ could communicate better to the public, its members and more important, prospective members. This is not a dig on staff or volunteers. Ellen, as well as previous interns, has done a good job. Dana Neuts, Michael Koretzky, and others have been working to improve the website. We’ve tried committees in various forms to improve communications but we don’t quite make it to where we want to be. Staff are busy. Volunteers have their own jobs to focus on. The structure just doesn’t facilitate momentum. This is not a people issue; it’s a systemic issue, and it’s something we must address. From my perspective, if you want a job done right you have to pay a professional. I don’t want a citizen surgeon taking out my gall bladder. I don’t want an amateur engineer designing the overpass near my house. We expect professionalism out of journalists, and I think we expect the same for our communications. Therefore, I have asked Joe to figure out how SPJ might be able to hire a full-time skilled communications director to tackle the priorities we have identified:

- Speaking out quickly on breaking journalism news
- Improving the website and social media channels
- Expanding communication with members and prospective members
- Educating the public about the crucial role of journalism in society
- Advocating for journalism, including effecting legislative change in states and Congress

Dana Neuts proposed this last fall and I think it’s time we hire a professional, along with continuing the intern position and creating an advocacy fund for lobbying efforts. I will bring this up in the
Executive Committee and when we have figured out the financing, discuss this with the full board as well, perhaps via email. Any decent organization has a skilled communications professional on board – we should be no different. I see no reason why we couldn’t start advertising for the right person in February or March.

**Name Change Task Force – and new Under 30 Task Force**
John Ensslin and the 10-member Name Change Task Force did an incredible job airing out the name change idea, as directed by me, the board, and ultimately, the delegates. His extensive report is included in this packet, so I won’t go into details. Ultimately, they found little support for the change, particularly among long-time members, which was to be expected. However, the discussion did inspire the task force to continue figuring out how to better engage and retain younger members. As a result, John and a new group, including many young members, will figure out how to better serve journalists under 30, in coordination with the Generation J Committee and the Membership Committee. They will brainstorm, survey young members, conduct Studio SPJ sessions, hold live chats, put on focus groups, and deliver a final report to the Executive Committee in time for its summer meeting, with potential action items to be considered by the full board in Nashville. This dovetails nicely with SPJ’s efforts to identify what it wants to be, how it can remain essential to journalists, and how it can respond quickly in a changing media world. I figured from the get-go, when the delegates discussed the name change idea at the convention in Anaheim, that members would resist, and for good reason. But I am glad the process has sparked enthusiasm toward taking concrete steps toward improving the organization and service to members. That was the whole idea, in my thinking.

**Code of Ethics Update**
Kevin Smith and the Ethics Committee have been hashing out ideas for updating the code and soliciting feedback from members. Last month Kevin broke the committee into subgroups to tackle different sections. They have until the first of February to produce their respective sections with proposed revisions. They will hash out the revisions and provide a proposal by the end of March, to present to the full board at the April meeting. They will continue to solicit input from members online and at regional conferences, then the full board can consider changes at the Nashville convention.

**Committee Updates**
Our volunteer committee members continue do to great work furthering the cause. Individual committees may provide their own reports for the packet, but I will provide some summaries of their activities.

- **Awards and Honors**
  The committee is following up on the final changes for the MoE awards, and this coming year will review the categories for the SDX awards. Mark Lodato will continue as vice chair as Andrew Seaman chairs the committee. The committee is pleased with Chad’s work in handling the awards. Things appear to be running smoothly with awards.

- **Digital Media**
  This committee has struggled for several years to stay active, and chair Gil Asakawa stepped down last month. This committee was indeed tenuous from the start this year and I am grateful for Gil’s service over the years. Moving forward, I’m going to recommend
formation next year of a Digital Media Community. This will require active volunteers who have a passion for technology, social media, and digital news delivery.

- **Diversity**
  The Diversity Committee is gathering information for a diversity sensitivity/terminology page. The members also are looking at focusing on helping minority journalists break into management. They are working on a proposal. Sandra Gonzalez is doing a great job as chair and they have passionate members.

- **Ethics**
  The focus of the Ethics Committee has been on updating the code (see above).

- **Freedom of Information**
  Carolyn Carlson continues to work on the PIO issue, completing her third survey, this one looking at Education Writers Association members’ perceptions toward government PR officials. The committee has weighed various causes that might warrant an instant Black Hole Award. We’ve had good contenders.

- **Freelance**
  The main focus has been on shifting to a community, but in the meantime this active group continues to work on resources of use to freelancers. Michael Fitzgerald has been great at leading the committee.

- **Generation J**
  This committee has a lot of great ideas, including a TipTuesday program on Twitter. I anticipate they will be busy working with John Ensslin’s Under 30 Task Force, and I think this group would be a good community, eventually. Chair Victoria Reitano stepped down to co-chair because of some busy times in her life, and Claudia Amezcua stepped up.

- **International Journalism**
  The committee has come up with very good ideas, including recruiting international journalists, translating SPJ resources into Spanish, and examining other social media tools to communicate. Some good ideas – I am hopeful will be acted on by year’s end.

- **Journalism Education**
  The main focus of this committee has been on a high school journalism project, due to finish by July. They plan to distribute a survey this month of high school advisers to find out how much censorship is going on in comparison to studies from the 1970s and 1990s.
ZOMBIE MONEY PLEA

To: SPJ executive committee and SDX board
From: Michael Koretzky, Region 3 director
Re: grant request for Zombie Stories

The weekend before Halloween, SPJ took over a grassy knoll on the banks of the Mississippi River in New Orleans. We invited 20 zombies to teach interviewing skills to 70-75 students. (It was hard to get an accurate count because it was dark and they kept moving.)

Instead of boring you with a recap, here are some links that explains the whole thing, each requiring only a minute to peruse...

- Zombie Stories preview
- Dave Cuillier as a zombie
- Zombie Stories results

We want to take Zombie Stories on the road, much like we do with the First Amendment Free Food Festival. That program has been held at more than 50 college campuses since SPJ debuted it in 2006, and one SPJ chapter even made national news on FOX and Friends. SPJ still assists today with these festivals, providing logistics and even T-shirts for the “goon squads.”

If you spend $3,000 on Zombie Stories, here’s what you’ll get...

- **240 T-shirts for $1,800.** I use a Christian T-shirt manufacturer in California, the cheapest I could find nationwide. I’m his only Jewish customer. But business is business.
- **12 micro-grants of $100 per school.** This defrays the cost of zombie makeup and mixing the fake blood, which is comprised of corn syrup, vegetable oil, and red dye.
- **A dozen Zombie Stories around the country.** We already have enthusiastic interest from three SPJ college chapters (including the one advised by board member Kym Fox), plus a community college (Lorain) and a private four-year school (Stetson) without chapters.

As with First Amendment Free Food Festival, costs of mailing the shirts will be paid by SPJ Florida, while step-by-step advice and troubleshooting will be provided by Region 3.

If you have any questions, holler. Thanks again for your past support of our crazy projects. Our goal is to teach journalism in creative ways, inspiring both students and the public. In this case, we settled on zombies.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: Jan. 7, 2014
FROM: John Ensslin, Name Change Task Force chairman
SUBJ: SPJ name change
FOR: SPJ Executive Committee

SPJ needs to take substantial and meaningful steps toward making our society more relevant to a new generation of journalists. And we need to do it now.

That’s the consensus of the 10-member task force that has spent the last three months studying the SPJ name change issue.

Back in September, SPJ President Dave Cuillier appointed us to a task force to delve into the issue first raised during our national convention of changing our name to “The Society for Professional Journalism.”

Our goal was to air that debate, sound out opinion from a wide range of the membership and study the possible financial costs associated with a name change, which totaled about $20,000 for the national organization.

That phase of our work is completed. Attached you will find some of the report’s more enlightening components, which include:

- Summaries of some focus groups held with members around the country;
- Results of a survey emailed to all SPJ members; and
- Member comments on the topic.

As you will see, our inquiry into the name change question quickly led us into a set of larger issues concerning SPI’s future. Those questions include:

- How can we make SPJ more relevant to the next generation of journalists who are coming of age during a rapidly evolving digital era of journalism;
- What do we need to do to stem the steady loss of members that SPJ has experienced over the last five years;
- Are we primarily an organization that seeks to advocate for journalism in general or are we primarily serving the needs of the journalists who belong to our society.

It also quickly became apparent as we sought out opinion from our members that the majority felt they had not heard a convincing case for changing our name.

The majority of those surveyed indicated an opposition to the name change, but we note that the vast majority of those who participated in our focus groups represented members 30 and older. Thus the very group that we are aiming to reach was the least represented.
Members of the task force also were divided on the name change issue. Several of us also felt the name should reflect the mission of the society – and that changing the name without changing the mission was putting the proverbial cart before the horse.

Others felt a name change was an important first step toward making SPJ more relevant to younger journalists.

We also discovered that we are in substantial agreement that SPJ needs to address some of the larger issues raised by our inquiry.

So rather than waste time and effort plodding through the motions of whether a name change should stand or fall, the committee decided we needed to re-invent and take on a new task.

And that would be to draft a set of recommendations on ways in which the society can make itself more relevant to the next generation of journalists – just as we have from time to time, throughout our long history.

To accomplish this task, the committee (none of whose members are younger than 40 years old) realized that we would need to turn to a younger group of professional and student journalists for advice on what SPJ ought to do.

Mind you we are not talking about re-examining the mission of SPJ or starting from scratch. Rather, our goal is to develop a list of specific, practical and achievable tasks that SPJ can undertake to make it more relevant to young journalists who are the future of our society.

President Cuillier has given us the OK to re-chart our direction. So beginning in January, we will do so. Our goal will be to present a set of recommendations in time for the next meeting of the SPJ national board in April.

We look forward to reporting back to you at that time.

The Future of SPJ Task Force (formerly known as the “name change” committee.)
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NAME CHANGE TASK FORCE
FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY

Members of the SPJ name change task force conducted several focus groups during October and
November in Utah, New York, New Jersey and Maryland.

The purpose of the focus groups was to elicit a greater level of response than our email survey and
delve into some of the reasons behind members’ opinions on the name change issue.

Sue Kopen Katcef conducted both a focus group and an online survey of SPJ student members at
the University of Maryland. (see attached survey results.) About a dozen students responded to
the survey.

Of the four focus groups we conducted it is notable that this student group, while hardly
unanimous, was the most receptive to the concepts behind the name change.

This is evident in some of the comments student members provided to the survey with statements
such as:

“I think the change promotes a better connection between current journalists and students to
make the profession the best it can be.”

And this from another student:

“If this is a change that the society feels will benefit the group I am in full support.”

However, other students were just as skeptical as many of the professional members, with
comments such as this:

“I think ‘journalists’ makes it feel more like a community, whereas ‘journalism’ detaches the
human element.”

And this ironic comment:

“It is a bad idea. In fact, I am one of those few people who wish that it was still the fraternity
Sigma Delta Chi.”

Sue also included some interesting comments from the live focus group she conducted. Here are
a few things they had to say:

“Makes me thing they're trying to cater more to students.”

“(Sounds like it's) focusing on the FIELD rather than the people.”
“Like RTDNA...may be aimed at broadening the membership base to include those without journalism in their job title.”

“Concerned about the costs of making the switch (especially as it would affect local chapters.)”

“Change in the name might make it clearer for other (outside journalism) to understand what SPJ is all about.”

“Change in name might help with including newer jobs in digital journalism--not necessarily writing & reporting--like coding--and might help attract more from the digital realm.”

The other three focus groups involved only professional members, many of whom were officers of local chapters.

In Salt Lake City, Don Meyers quizzed members of the Utah Headliners. He reported back, “The general consensus of the group is that the change is unnecessary. “

“The thinking is that we are better off keeping our name and using our efforts on more pressing issues,” he added.

I found a similar reaction during a board retreat of the SPJ New Jersey chapter. Two board members had attended the national convention in Anaheim as delegates where they heard the brief debate.

They felt, as did the others, that they had not heard a convincing argument for a name change. It is worth noting the group included no one under the age of 40.

Carl Corry did a focus group with board members of the Press Club of Long Island. Carl reported that:

“Some were skeptical that a name change in itself would invite more members and wanted to know more about how the change would affect the membership and chapter structures.

“Some were concerned that it would invite non-journalists to participate in decision-making, while others were concerned about the financial costs to the organization.

“Alternatively, some said any name change would require a robust marketing push and haven't been impressed with SPJ's efforts as it is, so they are not confident that we would be able to pull it off.

“A few people said they supported the concept, but needed to see an actual game plan for how it would be done.”

Carl also noted that of the 10 people in the group, one was under 30 and another had just turned 30.
NAME CHANGE TASK FORCE
MEMBER COMMENTS

Here are some comments on the name change issue submitted by members in response to our web page or the email survey:

“Hearing that SPJ is considering changing its name to Society for Professional Journalism, my initial thought is, "Why?" Although I'm rarely short on rationalizations or ideas (admittedly, often out-of the box), I cannot come up with any compelling answers to why. But I can think of several answers to the equally important question, "Why not?" Starting with, "Unnecessary."

-Steven FitzGerald, former Cleveland Pro chapter president, member since 1995.

“I took the name change survey. Sorry to say this is the first I have heard about this ‘movement’? The methodology of this whole name change effort is goofy. I suggest the Society first have an open conversation about the needs behind all this emesis regarding name changing. SPJ needs to remain the society of professionals, whatever the name might.”

-John J. Dill, professional member, Spokane Valley, WA.

“The present name implies that the organisation is purposed at improving the craft of journalism by assisting its practitioners—the professional journalists. To change the last name to ‘journalism' presents the public with a perception that we are a nebulous group with an ill-defined purpose that has been loosed from the moorings of its higher mission.

“The bias of the group’s management for a name change was revealed in one of the survey questions when the choices for what the name change would accomplish all included lofty goals. One option that forecasts the likely outcome of the name change was likely purposefully omitted—that the name change would achieve nothing, which is precisely what changing the name will do.

“The name change will accomplish nothing.

“Thank you for listening.”

Father Michael Carl, Priest/Journalist, Wakefield, MA.

“I've followed with curious skepticism the issue of changing the name of our organization. It certainly is proper for members to raise issues they think important to the life of SPJ as is the case here. But frankly, I can't see any compelling reason to take any more time than necessary to dispose of this suggestion and get on about our business. Every organization reinvents itself in small or large ways over time, but changing the name won't begin to deal with perceived or real problems within the Society. Continued dedication to the goals of the society in turbulent media times is what's needed, not a new name.

“Background: I was initiated as a student at the University of Michigan in 1954 and have maintained my membership since as a newspaper and magazine journalist and professor of
journalism. I have served the Society as Region 3 director, SPJ chapter adviser at two universities (Bowling Green and U of Georgia) and vice president for campus chapter affairs.”

-Wally Eberhard, Journalism professor emeritus, University of Georgia

“Just cast my vote for "no" on the name change. ‘Professional Journalists’ says it all.”
-Gail Daly, freelance writer, Georgia

Here also are comments solicited by Task Force member Andy Schotz who emailed several chapter presidents for their opinions:

There are times for change when things are drastically out-of-date.
There are times for change if the organization needs to stay on top of emerging trends.
There are times for change if the chapter's mission is furthered due to a new branding
This is not one of those times.
In the Cincinnati SPJ Pro Chapter many board members agree that now is neither the time nor the place for a name change.
Here's a sampling what some of them said...

- "We are an organization of individuals and this change into a mass just isn't necessary and smacks too much of judy and andy sayin, "Hey kids! Let's do a show."

- I'm not buying the rationale that has been offered by SPJ voices for changing the organization's name.

We are all journalists in SPJ -- radio, television, print, on-line and free lancers. The current title covers everyone very nicely.

-Tom McKee, Cincinnati Pro Chapter President

I am against the name change. This was originally presented as a rebranding effort. To me, changing the name of SPJ doesn't do anything to build membership or better connect with our existing members. The current name reflects our support for people who work in journalism. Changing the name makes it sound like we're supporting their work products. Isn't our goal to support good journalism and the people who produce it?

I've read the post on why SPJ should change its name. I just don't see how a name change will increase membership or suddenly make us any better at lobbying for shield laws.

-Alice Walton, SPJ/LA President

I personally have no opinion. However, I decided to ask some of the other members in our region their thoughts.
Here are two responses I received:

I think the name should stay the same. We are a group of journalists. I know the definition of a journalist has been debated but I think the definition of "professional journalism" is even more difficult to define and would just muddy the water more. - Laurie J. Williams

Honestly? I don't care, and quite frankly think there are far more important things the organization could be tackling. This strikes me as a waste of effort and energy that could be better spent elsewhere, and symbolic of the way too much of SPJ's attention is focused inward on things the board cares about instead of on rank and file members and their needs. - Michelle Dupler

Submitted by Veronica Craker, President, William O. Douglas Pro chapter

I have to say I'm torn. I was in Anaheim when the motion was introduced and heard the discussion. While I'm in complete agreement that our name should sound more inclusive for all types of media practitioners, I don't know that a name change is going to have that effect. Either changing it or not will require serious marketing to increase membership and/or not alienate our existing membership.

That said I lean toward keeping it as it is and focusing the discussion on other, more productive, efforts to bring members through the door.

-Tammy Merrett-Murry, STL SPJ Pro Chapter President

I haven't been paying close attention at all to the pros/cons of this whole thing--and I have to admit that I don't even know the genesis of the push to change the name.

But my two cents? No on the name change. "Society of Professional Journalists" says to me just that: A group of journalists watching out for one another and for the profession. "Society for Professional Journalism" seems like the sort of thing that PR and marketing folks can infiltrate. I know that sounds pretty silly. And "infiltrate" is the wrong word. But at a time when our profession is getting hammered by PR and marketing campaigns, PIOs and all sorts of other folks who get paid for a living to spin a tale, I'm all for journalists sticking together to build a better future for the profession.

Plus, our chapter doesn't need to spend a bunch of time and money revamping all our promotional materials, etc.

-Laura Paskus, President, Rio Grande Pro chapter
A survey of the membership of the Society of Professional Journalists found overwhelming opposition to the idea of changing the organization's name.

By a more than 2 to 1 ratio, respondents to the email survey said they did not favor changing SPJ's name to "The Society for Professional Journalism."

Most of the comments left by some of the respondents were emphatically opposed to the name change.

"I think it is a BAD IDEA and a waste of time and resources to change the name," one respondent wrote. "SPJ should DO the things it wants to create the image it wants to project. A name change is window dressing. PLEASE DO NOT WASTE RESOURCES ON THIS."

Another wrote, "A name change would introduce confusion, improve nothing and blur the brand."

The survey also found a strong sense of identification with the society's brand and mission.

When they think of SPJ, 74 percent thought of our ethics work, nearly 70 percent thought of First Amendment advocacy and nearly 66 percent thought of "excellence."

More than 77 percent felt the SPJ brand is strong or somewhat strong, while slightly more than 5 percent considered it somewhat weak or very weak.

Nearly 89 percent thought SPJ has done fairly well or exceptionally well at living up to its mission of perpetuating a free press.

A similar majority of 88 percent strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that SPJ should help define "professional journalism."

The survey, commissioned by a task force studying the name change issue, was conducted via Survey Monkey between Dec. 3-15.

A total 837 members - or nearly 11 percent of the membership - responded to the poll. The respondents tended to be older members than is reflected in the overall demographics of the society.

More than 35 percent of the respondents described themselves as members for more than 20 years while just over 13 percent said they were members for less than one year.
Professional members who make up about 53 percent of the total membership accounted for 63 percent of the respondents. Students, who make up nearly 24 percent of the membership accounted for nearly 13 percent of the respondents.

For a complete report of the survey results, go to:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=1iKR_2fMG_2bIaq5kuM9O3YHGkIDShjaS1ZJ2wbm71_2by0eo_3d
MEMORANDUM

DATE: Dec. 6, 2013
FROM: Tara Puckey, Chapter Coordinator
SUBJ: Evaluation of Ted Scripps Leadership Institute
FOR: SPJ Executive Committee

Although the board asked for measurable data from the current Ted Scripps Leadership Institute format, it is difficult to provide anything but anecdotal information because of the short period of time for the new format.

That said, the educational content of the program has remained largely unchanged. We have added two thirty-minute rapid fire sessions about the nuts and bolts of SPJ and useful web tools. We now allow attendees to select the roundtable discussions that are most valuable to them instead of forcing them to attend all the sessions. We adjusted the Friday night ice-breaker event to our location and made minor changes to time because of the number of participants.

But, we consider these changes to be minor and therefore are confident in saying the content of the program remains the same as it did prior to the road show. Because of this, it is possible to use past programs to gauge the overall success of the Scripps Leadership program.

We recently surveyed 56 random participants from the Scripps Leadership Institutes in 2000, 2001, 2003, 2005 and 2007 and received 20 responses. Participants were asked about their experience and how the Institute has helped them since they attended the program. Overall, the response was positive – 100 percent felt that the Ted Scripps Leadership Institute helped develop skills and provided information that was valuable to them in their leadership role. I have included the results from the survey at the end of this report.

Speaking specifically of the new road show, we surveyed participants at the end of each program around the country and their responses reaffirmed the value of the program. They said things like:

“This was an inspiring conference!”

“I thought this was a well-designed weekend. I learned plenty, but more importantly I now know where to go when all those things I don’t know inevitably pop up.”

“Of all the SPJ programs I have attended over the years, this is probably the most valuable conference I have participated in.”

Through time, the program content and evaluations have remained the same, except we saw significant benefits in other areas with the new road show.
BENEFITS

- **Training more leaders.**
  - We trained 83 leaders at four locations around the country. Previous programs trained between 40 and 50 leaders. In 2012, for example, we trained 43.

- **Regional connections and programs.**
  - Leaders are able to connect with people in their area, giving them additional connections that feel “close,” allowing them to discuss regional and local journalism issues and promoting joint programming between chapters.

- **Connections with SPJ HQ staff**
  - As the Chapter Coordinator, a more intimate group gives me time to connect personally with each chapter leader. They now have someone at HQ they know personally and can come to me with questions or concerns about chapter issues. It also gives them a sense of personal responsibility when I ask for things like chapter reports and financial documents.

A NEW GROUP OF PARTICIPANTS

Previously, the program was open only to current or incoming chapter presidents. This year, we extended invitations to entire boards, encouraging chapters to send two to three leaders. This way, the Institute would serve as a board retreat of sorts, allow more leaders to be exposed to the information and ensure that the things learned would make their way back to the chapter.

Moving forward, we would like to extend the reach, inviting members interested in leadership, whether or not they are involved in chapter leadership. This addresses two philosophies:

- We sometimes see that boards remain stagnant, with the same members leading for 10-20 years. This can be because small groups of leaders can be intimidating to those who are new to the chapter, or because the group is isolated and not reaching out to identify other potential leaders. By reaching out through the Institute, we force leadership growth from the bottom up.

- Members who have great leadership potential may not be involved with a chapter. That doesn’t mean they can’t be incredible leaders, whether it is to a small, unofficial group of members in a local area (who can’t or don’t want to go through charter paperwork and chapter administration) or on a national level. By inviting these people to participate, we are training leaders throughout the organization that may even create new leadership roles.

STRENGTHENING CHAPTERS?

Since the beginning, one of the primary purposes of the program was to strengthen SPJs chapters. Unfortunately, there is little evidence to suggest that this is occurring. On the whole, SPJ’s chapters are not significantly better off today than they were 10 years ago. Some would argue they are worse.

Of course, it’s impossible to know if SPJ’s chapter structure would be worse if the Scripps Leadership Institute didn’t exist.

Regardless, we think it’s a moot point. Although the original mission may have been to make better chapter leaders (and better chapters by extension), the program has evolved into much more than that.
Simply put, this program is about training future leaders.

This training may manifest itself in a chapter role. But it could also be a committee role or a national board role. Ideally, it’s all three. But it may also manifest itself in the newsroom or classroom. The bottom line is that by training SPJ members to be leaders, we are training people that believe in our mission to become leaders in their own worlds – and in the journalism industry.

Therefore, the Scripps Leadership Institute should not be viewed solely as a “chapter” function. It has much more potential.

SUMMARY
The Ted Scripps Leadership Institute has been training leaders for years and continues to do so successfully in the new format. The program may not have had a direct impact on significantly improving SPJ’s chapters (on the whole), but we hope the new format improves our chances by reaching more chapter members. Even if it doesn’t, the program has value far beyond the chapter concept. Moving around the country allows us to train more leaders, make more local connections and continue providing a program that gives people “warm fuzzies” about the organization.

As one person in the survey said, “The best thing I got out of it was that SPJ after that felt like a family.”
# Ted Scripps Leadership Institute Survey

## 1. Are you still a member of SPJ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question: 20
- skipped question: 0

## 2. Since the institute, what leadership roles have you fulfilled? Please include leadership roles not specific to your chapter as well.

- answered question: 20
- skipped question: 0

## 3. Do you feel that the Ted Scripps Leadership Institute helped develop skills and provided information that was valuable to you in your chapter leadership role?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- answered question: 19
- skipped question: 1
4. On a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being incredibly helpful, how helpful was the institute to you in leading your chapter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not helpful at all</th>
<th>Helped, but not as much as I had hoped</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Incredibly helpful</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Rating Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>10.0% (2)</td>
<td>20.0% (4)</td>
<td><strong>70.0% (14)</strong></td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 20
Skipped question: 0

5. Please list skills, information and/or policies learned at Scripps that your chapter has adopted or applied:

Response Count: 18

Answered question: 18
Skipped question: 2

6. Looking back, what were some of the most beneficial parts of the Ted Scripps Leadership Institute? Are you glad you attended? Does your experience motivate you to stay involved with SPJ? Please provide some feedback about your experience overall.

Response Count: 17

Answered question: 17
Skipped question: 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership roles</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>President of chapter Regional director vice president of chapter</td>
<td>Dec 10, 2013 6:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Indiana University Chapter president</td>
<td>Dec 9, 2013 5:44 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student chapter president. Pro chapter president. Programming committee chair. Contest chair and co-chair.</td>
<td>Dec 9, 2013 11:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Membership chair, president-elect</td>
<td>Dec 8, 2013 1:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management in work.</td>
<td>Dec 8, 2013 12:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chapter president, campus chapter adviser, newsletter editor, board member and co-organizer of many programs</td>
<td>Dec 7, 2013 11:02 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N.C. Society of Professional Journalists president</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 9:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>treasurer of my chapter</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 3:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>President, Greater Los Angeles Chapter.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 2:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Since the institute, I have graduated from Northwestern State University and started off in the field of community news journalism. I am now in a PR/Marketing capacity, and I looking to continue in freelance journalism.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 1:55 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>President of our chapter, Editor of C. U.’s newspaper</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 11:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Past-president of student chapter</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 11:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>News editor of the college newspaper, spj sdsu president</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 10:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Leadership roles in Toastmasters and formerly local SpJ chapter</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 10:20 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Exec VP and President of my local chapter</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 10:14 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Chapter president</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 10:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>President of JMU SPJ, Student Advisor of JMU SPJ, Teaching Assistant for Broadcast Journalism Class</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I've spoken at SPJ national conferences, regional conferences and served as president of my chapter.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 9:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>President officer and the Student Government officers.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 8:59 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5. Please list skills, information and/or policies learned at Scripps that your chapter has adopted or applied:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tracking and building membership Better programming ideas Networking with other SPJers from around country to help create ideas and synergies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creating/reviewing bylaws, programming ideas, fundraising ideas, tax status information, how to use tools on SPJ.org like member rosters and members not renewing reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Delegating, organizing, project management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fundraising and recruitment ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The continued training of our chapter presidents, before they take up this role, has led to consistency and innovation in our policies and programs. Things we tried in the past few years as a direct result of Scripps training: a photography contest, inviting national trainers to come here to deliver programs, membership initiatives such as calling those who have not renewed to find out why, etc. But many of the benefits reside in other things, such as knowing whom to contact at headquarters when you have a problem or need help for some other reason, knowing how to use the leaders' portion of the national website, and knowing other SPJ leaders from across the country who can be contacted for advice and support, understanding people's leadership styles and how a variety of different ones can work well together, understanding the important role and place of students in the overall SPJ organization, etc. Not to mention knowing how to do duck-pin bowling!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>- How to work with different personalities - Contacts at SPJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Very helpful in membership recruitment during down time for part of the industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The leadership institute helped me enhance my development skill and group decision making skills both in journalism and in corporate America.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The things I learned about requiting and retention have be intergrated into our chapter. This has helped keep the chapter alive and with a potential for growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To be honest, my participation in Scripps was several years ago (as was my presidency/board involvement) so I'm a bit fuzzy on the details on how exactly I applied what I learned at Scripps. What I can tell you is that Scripps definitely motivated to go back and work on several aspects of the chapter with my board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fundraising, socials, keeping organized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>How to lead the organization....events, membership, awards and programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Programming ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Free Food Fest, other innovative programs (Diversity program, membership recruiting techniques, resume review)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I got a lot out of it! It helped me get to know SPJ better and understand my own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Please list skills, information and/or policies learned at Scripps that your chapter has adopted or applied:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strengths and weaknesses and how to use them to the benefit of my chapter and in my professional work as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Have a set plan. Fundraising ideas. an executive board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. Looking back, what were some of the most beneficial parts of the Ted Scripps Leadership Institute? Are you glad you attended? Does your experience motivate you to stay involved with SPJ? Please provide some feedback about your experience overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes glad I attended. I encourage anyone that can go to go. It helped me identify strengths and weaknesses as I moved on in SPJ leadership.</td>
<td>Dec 10, 2013 6:19 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The leadership style assessment was extremely helpful. Networking with other chapter leaders was also great -- we all struggle with the same issues and are not alone. I am so glad I attended. We try and send someone every year. Scripps is absolutely fantastic and a great opportunity to learn more about SPJ and network with fellow leader/members.</td>
<td>Dec 9, 2013 11:40 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Loved it. I am inspired by other leaders. I love learning from them. I also enjoy learning about different leadership styles and how I can more effectively work with others. Tech tools were a great bonus!</td>
<td>Dec 8, 2013 1:23 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am very glad I attended, I learned a lot about my leadership styles and how others work as well. This is a wonderful program I am very thankful to be a part of. Sadly my local chapters were very tough to work with and I have since stopped my membership with SPJ. The difference between some of the other chapters and the national chapter made me realize the good you are doing, and that some of the chapters are behind though.</td>
<td>Dec 8, 2013 12:16 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I listed some of the other valuable things in the previous response: in case that's not easy for you to capture, here's a repeat: knowing whom to contact at headquarters when you have a problem or need help for some other reason, knowing how to use the leaders’ portion of the national website, and knowing other SPJ leaders from across the country who can be contacted for advice and support, understanding people's leadership styles and how a variety of different ones can work well together, understanding the important role and place of students in the overall SPJ organization, etc. Not to mention knowing how to do duck-pin bowling! I am very glad I attended, and also very glad that OTHER leaders attended. The experience does motivate everyone who attends to stay involved, I am sure -- we have so many past presidents involved in our current board and organization, it's amazing. We just did a photo at the Holiday Party and I think nine past presidents were there. And I would have made it ten, but I was really sick and couldn't go. We love SPJ, and the Scripps Leadership training, followed by regular association with those people at national and regional conferences, make the experience really special.</td>
<td>Dec 7, 2013 11:02 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The best thing I got out of it was that SPJ after that felt like a family.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 9:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I enjoyed meeting with colleagues and sharing experiences. I am glad that I attended. It motivated me to stay involved with SPJ for several years. I am now in the PR field and so SPJ has less relevance for me.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 3:38 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I'm very grateful I attended. Apart from honing leadership skills, it better acquainted me with “the players” in SPJ, nationally and in local chapters. I’m retired from journalism, except for a part-time teaching job, but I maintain my affiliation and interest in SPJ</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 2:25 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes, I am very glad I attended. I build some lasting relationships and made some awesome contacts. I also glad to enhance my skills and just be apart of an awesome network for SPJ. I wish that there was another continuation or alumni</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 1:55 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. Looking back, what were some of the most beneficial parts of the Ted Scripps Leadership Institute? Are you glad you attended? Does your experience motivate you to stay involved with SPJ? Please provide some feedback about your experience overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My experiences from the Ted Scripps Leadership Institute have formed life long bonds and friendships. The base of support and knowledge that was built there can help anyone to want to continue on in journalism as well as to help it grow.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 11:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am glad I had the opportunity to attend the institute. It was great bonding with my fellow SPJ leaders and it really gave me a broader scope of what SPJ does both nationally and locally. It also gave me a lot of useful skills that I can applied outside SPJ as well. I currently am not involved in SPJ leadership, however, I remain a firm supporter of the institute and believe that anyone who is interested in serving as an SPJ leader should participate.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 11:28 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>It was very motivating but my chapter just wasn't that excited about SPJ in general and it was hard for me to try to inspire that in them myself. I left my chapter in good hands though and now that I'm no longer in the journalism field I wish them and you all well!</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 11:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Meeting presidents from other chapters was the most beneficial to me. Now we always bounce ideas off of each other, even if we live in other states.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 10:56 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Meeting others from other chapters was great.....exchanging ideas and experiences was extremely helpful. Suggest training in fiscal responsibility and financial record keeping be added to the institute program.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 10:14 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Meeting leaders from SPJ chapters across the nation, collaborating about goals, learning from successes of other chapters</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes, I'm definitely glad I went. The Saturday morning presentation in which we took the personality test was the single most helpful thing to me. I really learned a lot about myself. I remember only the speaker's first name, Jeff, but he was really great. I also felt like I learned a lot about SPJ in general and all of the various benefits available for chapter leaders. The networking was beneficial as well.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 9:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am very glad I attended. I look forward to EIJ more now to catch up and to learn new techniques. I learn more about myself and also about ways to help the chapter.</td>
<td>Dec 6, 2013 8:59 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: Oct. 29, 2013
FROM: Joe Skeel, Executive Director
SUBJ: SPJ Succession Model
FOR: SPJ Executive Committee

Leaders of the Society asked during my annual evaluation that I share my succession plan for staff. What follows is the model that began taking shape shortly after I was hired as Executive Director.

About two years ago, after a year or so of evaluation, I began the process of reorganizing SPJ staff responsibilities. I did this for two reasons:

1. To put individuals in positions to maximize strengths.
2. To create more “traditional” positions that can easily be filled.

Before being hired as Executive Director, SPJ’s staff structure was a hodgepodge. Many of us had responsibilities that crossed departments. This is not uncommon in the non-profit world. People who are valued/skilled are given more responsibilities. Sometimes those responsibilities aren’t related. However, when that person leaves, it’s very difficult to find another individual that possesses that same expertise in all areas.

For example, at one time I was responsible for Quill magazine, membership and communications. If I had left, it would have been challenging to find someone with experience in magazine publishing, communications and membership management. I was not the only staffer who worked across departments.

Furthermore, there weren’t people on staff that could fill in for me on short notice. Cross training was existent, but not encompassing.

Although not many essential staffers departed since I joined in 2005, Terry may have been forced to reorganize all staff responsibilities every time someone managing multiple areas left.

I set out to eliminate this as much as possible, while still putting people in the best possible position to succeed.

Today, after the reorganization, SPJ is in a better position to move forward should a staff member leave. We now have one individual assigned to the following departments:

- Foundation
- Membership
Of these 11, I consider eight to be “straight fills.” Meaning, should the current employee leave, I could advertise for a replacement and quickly get a qualified individual to fill the spot. Of course, regardless of the position, there is a learning curve when it comes to SPJ’s unique culture, programs and services. This is not meant to demean the great staff we have now. As you know, their dedication to SPJ is not easily replaced. However, planning an event, managing a database, updating a website, keeping the books, etc., are skills that are readily available in the marketplace.

The three positions that will be more difficult to fill are Education, Foundation and Chapter/Volunteer Management. These positions require intimate knowledge of SPJ’s culture and/or journalism as a whole. These positions must be filled by people that have connections in SPJ and/or journalism. Finding them would likely take more time.

Fortunately, we are prepared to handle staff vacancies with the people we have on hand. This would give me ample time to find the right candidate.

We do this by cross training staff. Currently, there are at least two people that possess basic skills necessary to keep each department afloat. This allows us to get by in the short-term. For example: Chris filled in for Heather when she was on maternity leave. Heather is filling in for Linda while she recovers from surgery. Linda could cover for Tara on chapter issues. Tara covers for Ellen while she is on vacation. I can cover for Chad and Sarah should they leave or need to be away for a stretch. The list goes on.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Because of our reorganization and cross training, the executive director’s position is now the least important when it comes to the day-to-day operations of SPJ. My role now is to think big picture, support/guide volunteer leaders, develop partnerships, oversee the budget, provide feedback/support for staff, etc.

Should I leave at a planned time, SPJ could continue to operate – business as usual – for a decent amount of time. This would give the board of directors time to find a suitable replacement.

During that time, Chris would be more than capable at filling my role in leading staff, ensuring checks were signed, bills were paid and finances were monitored. I have also begun to expose Tara to some aspects of my job. This would give Chris a qualified helper should she need to
lighten the burden. Of course, there are others she could lean on for specific tasks – including volunteers. This, however, would take everyone away from their main priorities.

In summary, this succession model is designed to keep SPJ on course should a staff vacancy occur. When we lose a staff member, filling that void does slow us down and redirect some of our attention. Therefore, it’s critical to fill any holes with all deliberate speed.

The Society can only be most effective with an entire crew.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: Jan. 8, 2014
FROM: Paul Fletcher, Secretary-Treasurer
RE: Stipends for SPJ officers and board members
TO: SPJ Executive Committee

At the SPJ board meeting in Anaheim, you asked Joe Skeel and me to review the current system of stipends for SPJ officers and board members and to make recommendations for changing or updating the current stipend scheme.

Here is a quick review of the current amounts available per year, by position:

- President $10,000
- President-Elect $4,000
- Secretary-Treasurer $3,000
- Past President $2,500
- VP, Campus Chapter Affairs $4,000
- Campus Reps (2) $2,500
- Regional/At Large director Exec. C’tee (2) $2,000
- Regional director $1,000
- At Large Directors $1,000

The total amount budgeted per year under this system is $46,500.

In 2012-13, nine of the 23 people eligible for stipends used the full amount available; there was a total pool of $11,377.62 remaining after all expense reports had been submitted.

Five people (one officer and four RDs) requested relief for amounts over their stipends (total: $2,760.57), which SPJ was able to pay from the pool of unpaid stipend money.

This ad hoc approach worked well – this time. And given the fact that 14 of the 23 officers and directors who had stipend money available did not use the complete amount, it would be easy to say that we should

However, Joe and I noted that the stipend amount for officers has not been changed since [2005] and the other stipends were last reviewed and raised in [2009]. We also observed that some of the expectations and needs for the various posts may have changed during those years as well.

Also, some RDs may have regional funds on which they can draw for some expenses. Some officers or directors may have employers willing to foot part of the bill. Our analysis does not take either of those factors into account, since they are specific to individuals and make fashioning a policy difficult.
And it is not really possible to factor geography or number of chapters in a given region into account, either.

We propose an update to the stipend amounts as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President-Elect</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP, Campus Chapter Affairs</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Reps (2)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional/At Large on Exec. C’tee (2)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional director</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large director</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The annual total would be $51,500, or only $5,000 more than is currently budgeted.

Reasons for the adjustments:

- The Secretary-Treasurer likely is traveling as much as the President-Elect, including attendance at regional conventions.
- Travel costs have gone up in the past five years.
- The original stipend for VP of Campus Chapter Affairs anticipated the need for “parachute” visits to troubled campus chapters, a task not really handled by the VP any more.
- The Campus Reps are traveling to two meetings – the spring session and convention.
- All RDs would get an additional $500.

The goal of these proposed changes is to take current circumstances and reality into account.

The proposal gives each RD and at-large director ample money to spend on his/her travel, regardless of geography or the existence of a regional fund or the number of chapters in a region. With planning and careful budgeting, each RD should have the funds necessary to accomplish what is needed for his/her region without seeking additional money at the end of the year.

I look forward to hearing your thoughts.