

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS
APRIL 16, 2016
SHERATON, NEW ORLEANS

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

With President Paul Fletcher presiding, the meeting of the board of directors of the Society of Professional Journalists was called to order at 8:50 a.m. CT on Saturday, April 16 at the Sheraton New Orleans.

In addition to Fletcher, the following were present: President-Elect Lynn Walsh; Secretary Treasurer Rebecca Baker; Vice President of Campus Chapter Affairs Sue Kopen Katcef; At Large Directors Bill McCloskey and Alex Tarquinio; Campus Representatives Kate Hiller and Monica Dattage; Campus Adviser At Large Becky Tallent; Regional Directors Jane Primerano, Andy Schotz, Michael Koretzky, Patti Newberry Gallagher, Deborah Givens, Joe Radske, Eddy Gallagher, Tom Johnson, Matt Hall and Amanda Womac.

Staff members present for the meeting were Executive Director Joe Skeel and Membership Strategist Tara Puckey. Also present was Membership Committee Chairwoman Robyn Davis Sekula.

MEMBERSHIP STRATEGIC PLANNING

Fletcher reminded the board of his goal to address membership, which he first mentioned during his inauguration speech during EIJ15 in Orlando. That led to a January strategic planning meeting in Scottsdale, Az., when the SPJ Executive Committee met.

Eighteen people attended the January meeting, which included the executive committee, five staff members, the diversity and membership committee chairs, the SDX president and three other members representing different segments of SPJ membership.

Fletcher shared that this is the first time since 2006 that leadership is taking a deep look into membership. And, for the first time, the national board is taking ownership of membership. He categorized it as a “sea change,” because previously recruitment and retention was viewed as the responsibility of chapters.

Fletcher told the board that in Scottsdale, the group talked a lot about what SPJ does, and what it believes in. How can we use those things to attract people?

The group settled on two courses of action: Being the career resource for journalists throughout their “life cycle” and helping journalists and those who support our work to fight their own fight in areas of transparency, ethics, diversity, etc.

The board is now being asked to consider those courses of action, he said. If it supports the ideas, it will spend the morning in brainstorming sessions so that it may fine tune the action plans.

Lastly, he reiterated that whatever the board decided, and whatever work is done today, this is only a start. We can't solve all of SPJ's membership problems today, he said.

He then asked Davis Sekula to update the board on the strategic planning progress since January. Davis Sekula first shared with the board how she and the membership committee work. It develops its own yearly plan, then runs that by the president and staff. Primarily, the plan consists of tactics and objectives for the coming year.

In Scottsdale, she said, we wanted to approach membership from a much higher level. The organization primarily focuses on the day-to-day, she said.

“Instead of handling all of the tasks, we are stepping back and asking ‘what do we want to do? Who do we want to be?’”

She reiterated that there is not a single initiative that will fix the membership drain. But the first step is to ask “Is SPJ what we want it to be? Are we really serving our members? Are we improving journalism? Are we meeting our mission?”

“That's what we were going after in Scottsdale.”

Davis Sekula shared that the Scottsdale meeting started with a frank discussion and ended with two plans that answered the questions above.

Following that meeting, the work continued.

Davis Sekula, with the help of the membership committee and SPJ Past Presidents John Ensslin and Sonny Albarado, reached out members and conducted focus groups.

The goal was to get as much information as possible to help flesh out the plans.

She closed by stating that she was not in New Orleans to defend the plans developed in Scottsdale. It's up to the board to decide how it wishes to proceed. But she wanted to make sure leadership understood the process and how we arrived at the plans presented to the board.

Fletcher then asked SPJ Membership Strategist Puckey to share details of the plans.

Puckey shared that the two plans incorporate many things SPJ is already doing. But the Society must focus those efforts, while adding some new elements, to maximize efficiency and effectiveness.

She also shared that regardless if the board supports the plans, we have several improvements on the way in the areas of member communication. One example she gave was the development of an onboarding process for new members.

Puckey first addressed the “Fighters” plan.

She shared the concept of the SPJ supporter category, where SPJ would target those who support journalism and the work we do. This could include non-journalists or journalists that aren't interested in full membership.

By a show of hands, the board supported this concept – with details to be discussed later in the meeting.

Puckey then shared the concept of a SDX Foundation initiative, tentatively called “Dr. J.” This would be a staff position that could serve as a one-stop-shop for individuals needing help in understanding their rights, working through ethical situations, etc. Although this person couldn't possibly answer all of the questions, it would serve as a “traffic cop” and direct people to the answers.

By a show of hands, the board supported this concept – with details to be discussed during the SDX Foundation meeting the following day.

Puckey said if all goes according to plan, the “Fighter plan” could be unveiled during EIJ16 – as many of the pieces are already in existence.

She shared that the “Lifers plan” would likely be unveiled at EIJ17.

Upon proper motion by Gallagher and second by Baker, the board voted to move forward with the Fighter and Lifer plans.

Baker moved to go into executive session in order to discuss strategies for the two plans. Kopen Katcef seconded.

Discussion ensued about the need to go into executive session. Baker shared that leadership may be discussing proprietary measures, and confidentiality is important.

Fletcher shared that although SPJ strives to operate in the most transparent manner – just as we expect governments to do – SPJ is not a government entity. And this is one of the few times he supports going into executive session. He also said it is impractical to live stream group work.

After much discussion, the motion to go into executive session was withdrawn.

Puckey then explained how the group work would work, tackling the Fighters plan first.

The board worked in groups for about three hours, coming back together to discuss progress over lunch.

At this time, questions about the Dr. J position arose. SDX Foundation president Robert Leger and Vice President Irwin Gratz answered questions from the SPJ board.

Kopen Katcef moved that SPJ support the concept of the Dr. J position. Baker seconded.

Koretzky asked to amend the motion, stating that the position should be for one year, giving the Foundation time to evaluate it. Kopen Katcef denied the request for the friendly amendment.

McCloskey moved to table the motion. Koretzky seconded. The motion to table failed by an 11-6 vote.

Upon proper motion by Kopen Katcef and second by Baker, the board voted to approve the concept of the Dr. J position. Koretzky and McCloskey voted no.

Discussion continued about ideas to attract and retain members through lunch.

SELECTION OF FELLOWS

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and second by Baker, the board voted to enter executive session at 2:10 p.m. for the purpose of selecting Fellows of the Society.

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and second by Schotz, the board voted to exit executive session at 2:21 p.m.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Fletcher made a few remarks about his report, noting information about the continued roll-out of the updated Code of Ethics, updated information about FOIA reform and #FixFOIABY50, SPJ's visit to the White House and Lynn Walsh's presentation at SXSW. He also noted that Sonny Albarado, the Resolutions Chair, will start requesting resolutions from chapters much earlier this year to address concerns from the previous year.

At the request of McCloskey, Puckey explained that the board chipped in and purchased Hilde Lysiak a four year student membership. Fletcher and Walsh recorded a welcome video that will be shared and Davis Sekula is writing a blog post to welcome her.

MINUTES

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and second by Baker, the board voted to approve meeting minutes from Sept. 18, 2015; Sept. 21, 2015; Oct. 27, 2015; Nov. 16, 2015; Dec. 22, 2015; Feb. 15, 2016. Primerano abstained from voting on Sept. 18, 21 and Oct. 27 as she was not a board member at the time. Hiller and Dattage abstained from voting on the Sept. 18 minutes for the same reason.

FISCAL YEAR 2017 BUDGET

Baker gave an update on the budget for FY17, noting that it is one of the most aggressive budgets that we've seen in recent years. Skeel provided an overview of the budget to the board and explained that revenue from association management and membership are two key points within the budget. Expenses were reduced in staff raises and training, among other things.

Koretzky asked questions about projected revenue for association management and if additional staffing would be required to attain the expected amount. Skeel explained that Lisa Susemichel was hired to help with many of the association management tasks and spoke about the length of contracts.

Johnson inquired about association management competition and what other choices associations have when it comes to management. Skeel talked briefly about the different types of management choices: associations with their own staff, traditional association management firms that aren't industry specific and what the Society offers, which is a mix of both. He noted that it is sometimes a challenge to not be able to offer the organizations an executive director role or manage their fundraising.

Newberry Gallagher asked about membership revenue specifically and if there was a specific number of members tied to the revenue predictions. Skeel explained that it is aggressive in that we haven't budgeted a 3 percent decline as we have in prior years.

Baker called the question.

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and second by Tallent, the board voted to approve the FY17 budget.

CHAPTER ACTION

Puckey informed the board of three campus chapters seeking approval of their charters: Samford University, University of Chicago and Samford University.

Upon proper motion by Gallagher and second by Walsh, the board voted to approve Samford University, University of Chicago and Utah Valley University for chapter charters.

Tarquinio asked about procedures and policies about forming satellite chapters. Puckey explained that while there are procedures to do so, she generally encourages chapters to form independently so they are eligible for delegates and can govern themselves.

SUPPORTER MEMBERSHIP

Walsh took a few minutes to explain the work of the Supporter Membership task force and summarized each component of the membership. She noted cost, benefits and differences between this type of membership and current members. Walsh explained the two options the task force explored: redefine current Associates with this new membership category or create a new tier of membership.

Baker pointed out that our current Associate category isn't clear as to what it is and suggested that the membership be called SPJ Supporters. She also suggested moving current Associates into the SPJ Supporters category, essentially replacing the current category. Tarquinio expressed concern that the new Associate category may disenfranchise some members and also cannibalizing our other membership categories.

McCloskey pointed out that the Associate category is not described as a membership level within the bylaws. He believes that this type of membership is essentially a donor category and asked how this membership category impacted the Household Membership. Womac indicated that she

supports the idea, but inquired if this would be a tiered donation amount. Skeel addressed some of the staff tasks that would be associated with this type of membership.

Walsh made a motion that the idea of a supporter membership be a \$20 membership that would redefine the current Associate “pocket,” and striking the removal of Household Memberships, essentially option one. The motion was seconded by Kopen Katcef.

Baker offered a friendly amendment to change the price to \$25 because it may fall in line with our other prices. Kopen Katcef said that she prefers to keep it at \$20 and Koretzky agreed. Baker withdrew the amendment.

Robert Leger said that the bylaws note an Associate is someone who isn’t eligible for membership within the Society. A general consensus indicated that the bylaws committee would need to clean up information about the membership categories. Irwin Gratz indicated that it might require the bylaws committee to bring forth changes that would allow this change to take place.

Discussion continued about cost, the type of membership that this group would represent and overall goals of the membership.

Baker called the question.

Upon proper motion by Walsh and second by Kopen Katcef, the board approved Option 1 listed in the Supporter Membership memorandum (Appendix A). Schotz and Tarquinio opposed; McCloskey abstained.

OPT-OUT MEMBERSHIP RECRUITMENT PRACTICES

Puckey explained that members used to be automatically affiliated with a chapter based on zip code and how the process has changed since then. She asked the board for guidance about if chapters should be allowed to send e-mails to SPJ members in their area, requiring them to opt-out of chapter membership.

Baker supports the idea for chapters that are the only chapter in their state and do not charge dues. Koretzky gave background on the actions of Florida Pro, which conducted an opt-out campaign, and shared information about their goals of engagement and retention. Hall asked for a few points of information: how many members were gained, if there is information about who opened email. Schotz expressed his concern for any opt-out communication.

Schotz made a motion that SPJ national and local shall not do any opt-out marketing. It was seconded by Baker.

Walsh noted that she is uncomfortable with such a hard line as technology changes. Hiller said that she accidentally opens emails all the time, so she isn’t sure that people are actually reading the emails. Baker withdrew her second and there were no other seconds.

Schotz's motion – SPJ national and local shall not do any opt-out marketing – fails for lack of a second.

Ultimately, the board agreed to give the following guidance to staff: Chapters cannot utilize the opt-out method to add members to their ranks, but they are able to contact unaffiliated members in their area and encourage them to join. Requests should be forwarded or directed to headquarters.

MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATION

Fletcher provided an executive summary about the work of the Unaffiliated Members Task Force. He noted that roughly 41 percent of members don't have representation at the convention because they are not affiliated with a chapter. The Executive Committee recommends that the full board adopt the overall regional delegate process, but recommended that the Bylaws Committee proposed language be used.

On another matter, Fletcher spoke about a proposal that delegates can put forward a binding resolution to the membership. Since this is currently allowed, but not publicized, the Executive Committee decided to not offer a recommendation to the full board either way.

Schotz made a motion to recommend the adoption of an at-large delegate system to the convention delegates. Baker voiced a second.

Hall pointed out his support of the proposal. Walsh made it clear that she was not in agreement with the committee for several reasons: She would like everyone to have a voice, she is worried that this will create more work on staff and she believes that one member, one vote is the best option. Schotz voiced agreement with Walsh, but expressed his concern with technology for conducting real-time debate during the convention business meeting and the ability to implement one member, one vote.

Upon proper motion by Schotz and second by Baker, the board voted to recommend that the delegates approve the at-large delegate system with language suggested by the Bylaws Committee indicating that the board determines procedures. (Appendix B) Walsh, Johnson and Koretzky voted no.

Regarding binding resolutions, McCloskey suggested that we ensure it is well publicized that delegates can send things to the full membership for a binding vote, noting that it should be in the delegate handbook and announced at the closing business meeting. Schotz expressed his concern that this might fall through the cracks and encouraged the group to add this to the bylaws.

Primerano called the question.

Upon proper motion by McCloskey and second by Tarquinio, the board voted that staff be directed to add language to the Parliamentary Script, Resolution Script and the Delegate Handbook, making it clear that any resolution can be referred to the full membership for an electronic referendum. Schotz voted no.

ACEJMC APPOINTMENTS

Fletcher briefly discussed the ACEJMC appointment policy following the recommendation of the Executive Committee to adopt. In essence, the appointment policy is similar to that of the appointment of a new Regional Director.

Baker called the question.

Upon proper motion by Tallent and second by Hiller, the board voted to approve the AEJMC appointment policy (APPENDIX C).

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Fletcher briefly spoke about Neuts' nominations report, followed by a summary of SDX Foundation business provided by Leger. The board discussed the SDX Foundation Dr. J initiative and the recent Stephen Glass donation to the SDX Foundation.

Fletcher informed the board of the latest Legal Defense Fund case. The Lens, a nonprofit based in New Orleans, was seeking a digital database of all public purchases and is now in a legal battle with the city over their request. The LDF Committee recently approved \$5,000 for The Lens, but the committee would like to ask the board for an additional \$5,000.

Baker made a motion that the board approve an additional \$5,000 LDF funds to The Lens and a second was made by Kopen Katcef. Koretzky made a friendly amendment that the board approve an additional \$5,000, making funds total \$10,000. Both Baker and Kopen Katcef accepted.

Upon proper motion by Baker and second by Kopen Katcef, the board voted to approve an additional \$5,000 in LDF funds to The Lens.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon proper motion by Hiller and second by Gallagher the meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m. Saturday, April 16, 2016.

APPENDIX A

DATE: March 30, 2016
FROM: Lynn Walsh
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors



SUPPORTER MEMBERSHIP

Idea:

There are people out there, non-journalists, fighting or paying attention to issues, we at SPJ, care about and pride ourselves on fighting for. SPJ, as is highlighted in our strategic plan, should be reaching out to these people and engaging with them, to raise awareness, connect with them and be a support and resource for them. These issues primarily include: access to public information, freedom of the press, journalism ethics and protecting the First Amendment.

Benefits:

- Allow SPJ to fight and bring awareness to these issues for journalists and the public.
- Help SPJ advocate for these issues with larger support, more members.
- May help restore media credibility for all journalists.
- Bring SPJ's name into the spotlight and into the public eye as a fighter for public information, available to all, not just journalists, and freedom of the press and First Amendment issues.

How it would work:

People would pay \$20 to become "Associate Members" (Or another name decided on by the board) to support the mission of SPJ. These would be people who are committing a monetary donation to SPJ (\$20) to say "we support efforts to protect the First Amendment, freedom of press and the public's access to information."

What they would get:

- Separate newsletter in their inbox, highlighting SPJ's work and what is going on in the field of public access to information, First Amendment, journalism ethics, etc.
- SPJ Member rate for EIJ conference
- Able to join SPJ communities
- MEMBER GIFT (MARKETING TOOL)
- Educational Training/Events organized by staff or volunteers: Public Records Day, etc.

What they would NOT get:

- Access to the SPJ membership list.
- Access to what is behind the SPJ member payroll.
- Not a voting member.

- Discount on award submissions
- Cannot run for national or local offices.
- Digital Quill/Quill

Launching:

A strategy would need to be developed and maintained to launch/maintain:

- We think this membership level should be advertised and marketed separately than how we market to working journalists. This means it may need its own web page that has duplicate material on it or just is displayed differently.
- We may consider a campaign or slogan to help launch this: something along the lines of “If the press didn’t tell you who would?” We may run ads again on TV through the ad council.
- To help recruit them do we have splash pages “pop up” on the SPJ page (ethics, FOIA, etc.) telling people about this membership, asking them to join/donate?
- May initially reach out to former and current associate members?
- HQ staff responsible for newsletter, possibly the FOIA/legal intern in the summer?

Why would someone join?

They want to continue to see journalism that creates change in communities, starts difficult conversations, uncovers information and informs the public. They get to say, “I support that,” and hopefully one day, “I was part of a fight for open records” at the state and federal level.

Name:

- Option 1: Change the current membership format, where these new members would be considered Associate Members and we eliminate the Household Membership level. Here is what the membership levels would look like:
 - Professional: You spend more than half your time working as a journalist or j-educator.
 - Retired: You're retired and 62 or older.
 - Lifetime: Enjoy a lifetime membership in SPJ. Local chapter dues not included
 - Student: High school, undergraduate and graduate students.
 - Post-Graduate: Those who have graduated from college or graduate school within the past three years.
 - Associate: You support efforts to protect the First Amendment, freedom of press and the public’s access to information.
- Option 2: Create a new tier of membership and name it something like:
 - Friends of SPJ, Friends of Journalism, Friends of the Press, Journalism Supporters, SPJ Supporters

Task Force Members:

- Patti Newberry
- Sue Kopen
- Brett Hall
- Eddy Gallagher
- Michael Koretzky
- Lynn Walsh
- Jason Parsley

Questions for Supporters Task Force to answer:

- Why \$20? Is there any particular reason that amount was chosen? Does that effectively cover costs?
 - According to information from Joe: Hard cost per member is \$21.59, without Quill drops to \$8.89, with digital Quill it is \$14.27.
- What will we be expected to give them?
 - Separate newsletter in their inbox, highlighting SPJ's work and what is going on in the field of public access to information, First Amendment, journalism ethics, etc.
 - SPJ Member rate for EIJ conference
 - Able to join SPJ communities
 - MEMBER GIFT (MARKETING TOOL)
 - Educational Training/Events: Public Records Day, FOIA tour, etc.
- What will professional journalist members get that these folks will not?
 - Everything behind the SPJ paywall on the website (eCampus, Webinars, Members Directory Lists, Freelance Directory, Award candidates feedback, Freelance Community board, Freelancer Guide, Convention Recap Audio)
 - Access to the SPJ membership list.
 - Voting member.
 - Discount on award submissions
 - Ability to run for national/local offices.
- How will chapters handle these members? Or will they?
 - They will not directly but are free to indirectly.
- Why will someone who is not a journalist want to do this? (Need a good statement that compels people to join)
 - These issues primarily include: access to public information, freedom of the press, journalism ethics and protecting the First Amendment
- How will we market this new membership type?
- What costs are associated with this?
- New brochures, etc. Anything else?
- How will we handle this on the web site?

- Who are good targets for this type of membership? General public, local activists, attorneys.
- What should we call these new types of members?
- Why not call them Associate members? Supporters?
- Do we have any goal for how many of these types of members we'd like to have?
- No, but definitely should re-evaluate if it is working after several years.
- In Scottsdale there was mention of SPJ website metrics showing that people frequented a very targeted bunch on pages (sometimes in a certain order) on the website. I'd suggest we dig into those metrics some more and see if that traffic is stable over time or based on reactions to news events, etc? Can more be learned about this behavior? How many people do this? If these people are our potential "supporters" I'd like to know the numbers a little more. And, assuming we move forward with the "supporter" membership - we should make certain that these well-trafficked pages have a clear call to action to become a "supporter" of SPJ.
- Data from HQ:
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9ymCBKwFz6ldUhfBEQtclEza1J3d3BwUjM1c0lJbmZlRm5n/view?usp=sharing>
- One process gap we might want to target with the "supporter" membership is the ease of signing up. I'd love to see SPJ be able to utilize Amazon Payments or PayPal to quickly, easily, (and maybe with one-click) allow people to donate or give to the cause. I think the harder a process we make this, the more we leave on the table.
- Lynn's note: I would love to see this too and think it would be an important function possibility for us to easily maintain and keep these types of members. HQ says this is already possible.

General Notes from Scottsdale Membership meeting:

- Cost: Finding ways to optimize cost structure. We don't know what the "supporter" membership might cost at this point - but one thing I would suggest is to not provide new content solely for this tier. I would think for this price point - they just would get Digital Quill, discount on EIJ, and little else. I would not make a separate newsletter for them as this would be developing new workload.
- Somewhat related to metrics - do we have an idea of how big this "supporter" universe realistically might be? If so, can we set some goals to help provide metrics on success and impact? Knowing if we're expecting 100 supporters or 1000 supporters helps tailor how much energy and effort SPJ will expend
- Assuming our "supporter" tier are generally non-journalists - it might be easier to rally them around an event or product rather than an ongoing concept like the "First Amendment" or "press freedom." I might brainstorm some way that we can tie this "supporter" tier to events that seem to resonate with the non-journalist crowd.

- I'm a big advocate for giving "supporters" something tangible for their contribution - like a t-shirt or laptop sticker. Done properly, these become their own social advertising campaign for the project through shared photographs.
- In general, I think the nice part about this "supporter" idea is that it's a focus on a real, achievable issue and potential solution. Success in this area requires some more clarity on what we want to change and how we can demonstrate we've achieved that. As consumer behavior continues to move away from annual dues and memberships, we need to help SPJ evolve its approach - through rapid iteration and experimentation!

APPENDIX B

DATE: April 12, 2016
FROM: Paul Fletcher, President
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors



41-Percent Representation

Board Colleagues:

The Executive Committee held a Zoom conference on Monday, April, 11, to review the proposals from the Membership Representation Task Force, chaired by Alex Tarquinio, and the recommendations of the By-Laws Committee, chaired by Bob Becker.

Both groups have put in a great deal of work to hammer out a proposal designed to solve the 41 Percent Problem – the fact that 41 percent of our members do not belong to a chapter and therefore have no say in the governance of SPJ at our annual convention.

I appreciate and thank them for their work in vetting the issues and in working out differences.

There are two proposed by-laws amendments on the table.

AT-LARGE DELEGATES. The good news is that there now is general consensus on a proposed solution – adoption of a system creating at-large delegates in each region who would represent those in the region who are not chapter members.

The task force and the committee were in disagreement on the level of detail of the procedures to be included in the by-laws amendment.

The positions and arguments are detailed in the attached memos.

The Executive Committee recommends to the board that the board recommend to the convention that SPJ adopt the change creating the regional at-large delegate system, with the simple statement that the board will establish a procedure for their selection (essentially the recommendation of the by-laws committee).

Should the convention pass this amendment, the Executive Committee recommends to the board that in establishing a procedure, it should adopt the proposal from the task force on selection of the at-large delegates (taken from their proposed amendment language).

REFERENDUMS. A second proposal from the task force would amend the by-laws to provide an explicit statement that the SPJ convention can send any resolution to a membership-wide binding referendum.

The by-laws committee opposed this idea, stating that the procedure already exists and that adding it to the by-laws was unnecessary.

The executive committee expressed support for the idea of making sure delegates be made aware of this option, either in delegate training or in a statement from the resolutions chair at the outset of convention.

With the referendum option apparently already in place and these options available, the executive committee did not take a position on this by-laws change, referring it on to the board for consideration.

APPENDIX C

DATE: April 5, 2016
FROM: Lynn Walsh, President-Elect
FOR: SPJ Board of Directors



ACEJMC SELECTION POLICY

Note: The SPJ Executive Committee voted in January to recommend that the Board of Directors adopt the following policy for selecting future representatives of the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications.

Colleagues,

This memo will provide additional information about the SPJ seat on the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC).

Steve Geimann held this seat for 19 years but with his transfer to London, he relinquished his position.

The Orlando convention passed a resolution requiring SPJ's continued active involvement in ACEJMC and our continued support of a rep, including payment of the annual membership fee and the rep's travel expenses to council meetings.

Sonny Albarado was appointed in late 2015. This was done by appointment by SPJ President Paul Fletcher and approved by the board.

I would like to amend the established formal system for selecting the SPJ ACEJMC rep. and I propose the following:

1. The SPJ position on the ACEJMC is a position that interested SPJ members apply to be considered for. The applicants are considered by the full board and subject to board ratification.
2. The SPJ rep will serve for a term of three years.
3. The SPJ rep should be a working journalist.
4. The SPJ rep will submit reports to the board, detailing his/her activity, for the spring and fall board meeting packets.
5. SPJ will pay the annual membership fee and the rep's travel expenses to council meetings.