

MINUTES
Journalism Education Association Board Meeting
Nov. 9, 2007 • 8:30 a.m.
Philadelphia Marriott Downtown

THESE MINUTES ARE NOT CONSIDERED OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED AT THE NEXT BOARD MEETING.

CALL TO ORDER — Jack Kennedy, 8:30 a.m.

ROLL CALL — Susan Tantillo

Jack Kennedy, MJE, President and Executive/Finance Committee chair
Bob Bair, MJE, Vice President and New Adviser Outreach Committee chair
Susan Tantillo, MJE, Secretary and Awards Committee chair
Ann Visser, MJE, Past President/Convention Consultant
Bradley Wilson, CJE, C:JET editor and Technology Committee chair
Linda Puntney, MJE, JEA Executive Director
Connie Fulkerson, JEA Administrative Assistant
Mark Newton, MJE, Certification Commission chair
Lori Oglesbee, CJE, Development/Curriculum Commission chair and Publications Committee chair
Anita Marie Wertz, CJE, Junior High/Middle School Commission chair
Norma Kneese, MJE, Multicultural Commission chair and Outreach Academy Committee chair
John Bowen, MJE, Scholastic Press Rights Commission chair
Steve Matson, MJE, Region 1/Northwest Regional Director and Partnership/Endorsements Committee chair
Kathy Gaber, Region 2/Southwest Regional Director and Multimedia Exploration Committee chair
Gary Lindsay, MJE, Region 3/North Central Regional Director
Wayna Polk, Region 4/South Central Regional Director and Scholarship Committee chair
Brenda Gorsuch, Region 5/Southeast Regional Director and Administrator Outreach Committee chair
Betsy Pollard Rau, Region 6/Mid-Atlantic and Great Lakes Regional Director
Ron Bonadonna, CJE, Region 7/Northeast Regional Director and Membership Retention Committee chair
Joe Nations, Ad Hoc Board Member (left to attend Outreach Academy after roll call)
Linda Barrington, MJE, NCTE Liaison/Assembly Director and Mentoring Program Committee co-chair
Julie Dodd, MJE, Scholastic Press Association Directors Liaison, Nominations Committee chair, Mentoring Program Committee co-chair
Candace Perkins Bowen, MJE, JEA Listserv Liaison
Logan Aimone, MJE, NSPA Liaison
Albert R. Tims, Ph.D., NSPA Board President and Director, School of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Minnesota
Jane Blystone, MJE, Philadelphia Local Committee chair

APPROVAL OF MINUTES — Susan Tantillo

- Gorsuch moved and Visser seconded that the minutes from the summer board meeting at Kansas State University be approved as presented. Motion carried unanimously.
- Gorsuch moved and Visser seconded that the minutes from the Denver board meeting and general membership meeting be approved as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

LIGHTNING ROUNDS (Updates, Quick Reports) — 8 – 10 a.m

• Local Committee comments...Blystone

Blystone went on record thanking the JEA board and especially Executive Director Puntney for their support in bringing the convention to Philadelphia. She welcomed the board and noted this is the first convention with a two-day Outreach Academy. Wednesday focused on Philadelphia-area advisers and Thursday focuses on out-of-state advisers. Puntney commended Blystone and Linda Shockley of Dow Jones Newspaper Fund for their diligence in convention planning. She also reminded the board of the new mentor training program beginning today.

• Profit/Loss Statement, Denver...Puntney

Puntney reported JEA net income of \$155,833.02 from the Denver convention. She noted as of Oct. 19, 2007, JEA had received its entire share of the convention proceeds. Denver drew 3,367 delegates (3,092 paid).

• Quarterly Financial Statements...Puntney

Investments: JEA's total portfolio value as of Oct. 31, 2007, is \$824,372.30. This compares to \$631,152.72 on Oct. 31, 2006.

Quarterly Profit/Loss Statements: The 2007-08 (July 1-June 30) overall JEA budget is based on projected income of \$962,615 and projected expenses of \$1,115,988 with the difference to be made up, if necessary, from reserve funds. Puntney noted as of Oct. 31 income was \$259,213.35 and expenses were \$188,151.58 for a net income of \$71,061.77. The JEA Balance Sheet as of Nov. 6, 2007, shows total assets of \$1,291,093.41.

Kennedy noted JEA Bookstore sales are already at \$145,483.63, nearly half of the \$300,000 budgeted amount.

• Headquarters Report...Puntney

Puntney called attention to her report in the JEA Semi-Annual Report. She said her greatest concern is membership and pointed out the decline of 161 in voting members (teachers) since last fall. She said the board needs to discuss this at some point. Brainstorming of causes for decline in membership followed. Bonadonna will consult with his Membership Retention Committee and have a report for the board in Anaheim.
Membership Retention Committee: Bonadonna, chair; Gorsuch, Tantillo.

• **Convention Updates...Aimone, Visser, Puntney**

Registration for Philadelphia has exceeded expectations: 4,718 (4,352 paid) delegates are registered as of Nov. 7. Aimone expects a significant number of walk-ins based on phone inquiries this week.

Upcoming conventions include Anaheim, April 17-20, 2008, and St. Louis, Nov. 13-16, 2008. Representatives from JEA and NSPA visited Portland to consider it for the April 2010 convention. The Convention Center will be used for nearly all sessions with housing provided in the cluster of hotels surrounding the center.

Matson moved and Visser seconded that NSPA and JEA pursue signing a contract to host the spring 2010 convention in Portland. Motion carried unanimously.

A Texas venue is under consideration for fall 2010. Specifics will be proposed in Anaheim.

• **NSPA Update...Aimone**

Aimone introduced Tims. Aimone said NSPA continues to be stable and secure with auditor finding sound financial practices in place. NSPA has changed its fiscal year to coincide with JEA's fiscal year, July 1-June 30. NSPA has a policy in place for reserves. NSPA is committed to being a good partner with JEA. All money due JEA from the Denver convention is paid. NSPA delivered a pre-convention check from Philadelphia registration. Renegotiations are underway with College Media Advisers. The NSPA Board of Directors welcomed two new members – Laura Widmer and Alan Weintraut. No one has left the board in the last two years.

Aimone reported concerns from NSPA board members and attorneys about the plan to donate \$1 from each convention registration fee to the Student Press Law Center. Their concern is not SPLC itself as demonstrated by NSPA's \$5,000 donation to SPLC and the plan to continue to "pass the hat" for SPLC donations at conventions. Their concern is the legality of the forced donation practice and whether NSPA needs to register in each state to accept donations for SPLC via convention registrations. One possible solution may be to have a check-off box on the registration form where delegates can specify \$1 of each registration fee be donated to SPLC. Research continues into this question. NSPA remains committed to all financial transactions being absolutely above board.

Aimone reported partnering with Ball State University for 2007-08 to produce a magazine called Blend. Its goal is to be a service to student members of NSPA with content aimed at them. It is being distributed to all NSPA members and is available during the convention at the BSU booth.

• **Mentoring Update...Dodd, Barrington, Nick Ferentinos (Mentor for California Scholastic Journalism Initiative and Outreach Consultant to the New Teacher Center, UC Santa Cruz.**

Dodd recapped the mentoring idea as an outgrowth of the SPA Roundtable discussion in Denver focusing on adviser turnover. Ten mentors from five states will undergo mentor training at this convention and Anaheim. These mentors are Nancy Becker and Sandy Jacoby from Wisconsin, Linda Drake and Mary Anne McCloud from Kansas, Georgia and Wayne Dunn from Ohio, Bill Flechtner and Carla Harris from Oregon, Katy Gray and Dianne Gum from Colorado.

Materials from the New Teacher Center at the University of California-Santa Cruz form the basis for the highly interactive program. The Mentor Program instructional team tailored these materials specifically to journalism. Barrington noted the team already sees where it can make improvements with the next group of 10 mentors from five new states, especially by shifting the training to a summer workshop at Kansas State instead of at conventions. The plan is for the JEA-trained mentors to expand the program within their states by training additional mentors.

Ferentinos thanked the JEA board for its support of the Mentor Program and reported on his involvement in the program along with Steve O'Donoghue. He urged the board to think about the growth of the program in terms of its being wise, useful and permanent. He said the New Teacher Center <newteachercenter.org> is a national leader in mentor training, selling its mentor package to school districts. He noted the center's previous work has been primarily generic but now it needs to be more content-focused. The center is already working on math and science as content-focused mentor areas.

Barrington moved and Kneese seconded that JEA pursue a partnership with the New Teacher Center to have access to training materials and the resources of the center and its personnel. Motion carried unanimously.

The Partnership and Endorsement Committee, chaired by Matson, will consider what questions need to be answered in pursuit of the partnership, especially including how much money JEA will be committing in excess of the \$30,000 per year over three years the board already agreed to in July 2007.

Endorsements and Partnership Committee: Matson, chair; Hall, Martinez, Puntney, Nations, C. Bowen, J. Bowen.

• **Write-off Concerns, Judging Responsibilities, Board Responsibilities...Patricia Turley, Write-off co-chair**

Board members recapped the summer discussion from the minutes: "The board brainstormed ideas about how to improve the judging process for Write-offs. Ideas included the following in no particular order: limiting the number of judges since more judges results in worse judging, requiring moderators to judge, holistic reading/scoring modeled after AP test scoring, individuals or a team of individuals committing to judging the same contest for a certain number of conventions, appointing table leaders who would lead judge calibration activities, requiring all judges to

attend the presentation portion of live contests and create a rubric, eat dinner with judging team (be sure to warn judges ahead of time), discontinue involvement of professional journalists as judges, pay judges, eliminate judge dinner, insist on more positive comments, publish representative winners on jea.org, eliminate judge comments on judge sheets, have a detailed training session in Philadelphia for moderator/judges, add weights to sections of the rubric.”

Turley noted pros and cons of the “super-judge” concept, including losing collegiality and creating an appearance of exclusivity. She also mentioned the importance of written feedback to students, regardless of flaws in the system. Turley and her co-chair, Cindy Bandow, intend to copy superior entries beginning with the Philadelphia contest to create a portfolio to share with contestants and judges. Lindsay suggested copying the judge comments also.

Oglesby reminded the board of her idea about stickers with frequently used strength and weakness comments. She also suggested distributing a list of comments to use and comments to avoid.

Puntney said the number of judges is not a financial issue but said each contest category needs a definite leader to expedite the judging process. She also suggested having a core of experienced judges to work with new judges. Matson suggested assigning at least two experienced judges to each of the core categories.

Kennedy said in his view the core contests — news, editorial, feature and sports — are the biggest problem because they are filled with less experienced judges.

Gorsuch said the entire on-the-spot contest philosophy is not educationally sound because it is not what we are asking our students to do in a realistic publication production situation.

Lindsay suggested quick training of judges during the judging process.

Rau described Michigan’s experience with mentoring judges.

Matson volunteered to draft a survey for judges to complete at the end of this convention’s judging to have concrete opinions about the process. Gaber suggested the survey results go to the Write-off Judge Committee for action in Anaheim.

Turley said she will organize the judge dinner in Philadelphia so judges eat together with others from their category, including their moderator. Discussion of judging can begin earlier. Her goal for Anaheim will be to have at least two experienced judges in each category.

Write-off Judge Committee: Gayda, chair; Kennedy, Tantillo, Matson, Barrington, Puntney.

Other Write-off Concerns...Turley

Turley expressed concern about lack of pre-convention help from local adults and students in Philadelphia. She said she hopes this is an unusual situation.

She reminded the board of the two pilot contests in Philadelphia: 46-Podcasting (carry-in) and 10-Newsmagazine Layout (carry-in).

• Press Rights Commission...J. Bowen

J. Bowen said the second annual commission meeting at Poynter in January 2008 will focus on new projects determined by the commission members, including additional podcasts.

Twenty-three entries in the one-time national contest co-sponsored by JEA and NSPA inspired by the “BONG HiTS 4 JESUS” ruling, resulted in first place in editorial writing and first place and one runner-up editorial cartooning. No award will be presented in the objective reporting package category due to questions about whether opinion content could be included in the package and whether copyrighted images were used without permission in some entries.

• QUICK REPORTS...various board members

Newton reminded board members of the requirement to work toward the next level of certification while serving on the board. This requirement applies to state directors also.

Matson called attention to the additional report from Idaho since the semi-annual report was first compiled. He also discussed the financial problems the Idaho adviser association faces.

Gaber suggested developing and publishing a model or models for beginning or reviving successful state organizations. Suggestions should include bonding the treasurer and conducting a regular audit. The audit might be done through a university to save money since a full audit may cost as much as \$5,000.

The board reinforced the suggestion that Regional Directors travel to each state in their region at least once in their two-year term. This could be to help a state revitalize its adviser organization or scholastic press association.

Due to a lack of reports in the semi-annual report from some State Directors, Matson suggested adding the submission of this report to the list of requirements to receive the \$300 stipend to attend a national convention.

Matson moved and Polk seconded that the requirements for a state director’s convention stipend include the timely submission of two semi-annual reports in the year in which that stipend is given. Motion carried 8-7. (This goes into effect with the Anaheim convention.)

Gaber volunteered to send her State Director questionnaire to Bair for sharing with all Regional Directors.

C. Bowen said we have passed the 900-mark on JEAHELP – 912 at her last official notification.

Gorsuch reported from the Administrative Outreach Committee that J-Ideas has formed a Principal's Coalition for the First Amendment. This is a national organization for high school principals and administrators who support a free press, practices and advocacy in public schools. It has produced materials for principals including a curriculum DVD available free from the JEA Bookstore.

Oglesbee said Howard Spanogle's project approved in Nashville likely will result in resources and downloadable materials rather than a book as originally proposed. Spanogle continues to work on the project. She also wants to move forward on a download site housed at jea.org. Oglesby suggested materials for this site be channeled through the Curriculum Commission and then forwarded to Wilson for posting to the site.

Kneese reminded the board that Teddi Johnson, former ad hoc board member, resigned during the summer. Kneese said she is looking for applicants to fill Johnson's position. Applications should include a biography and a letter of interest. She asked Regional Directors and State Directors to make potential candidates aware of the vacancy. Newton said when he had a similar vacancy on the Certification Commission, he sent a request for applicants to JEAHELP asking for a bio and a letter of interest.

Polk reported the new State Director in Louisiana is concerned about Baton Rouge's calls for help. The state is still dealing with the effects of Hurricane Katrina over two years ago. Many schools still do not have journalism programs or equipment.

Polk said she has already had at least 50 requests for information about the JOY competition for 2008.

Dodd reminded the board about the Scholastic Press Association Roundtable 9-11 a.m., Saturday, at each national convention. It is open to all State Directors as well as SPA Directors. She sends an e-newsletter following each convention. She offered to add State Directors to the e-newsletter list.

Dodd said Diana Hadley of Indiana and Dick Johns of Iowa are looking for the names of administrators in each state who receive Administrator of the Year awards.

Dodd reported Ken Paulson, editor of *USA Today*, visited the University of Florida recently to promote *USA Today's* Liberty Tree Initiative, a marketing program to sell the public on the benefits of the First Amendment. The project is one way *USA Today* is looking to increase involvement in education.

Bair has created a CD with materials for new advisers from C. Bowen and Oglesbee. Anyone can ask Bair for a copy of the CD.

• **Mission Statement of the Coalition for Responsible Student Expression...Matson**

Matson shared the mission statement with the board ([CLICK HERE](#)). The SPLC, Washington JEA, Washington Community College Journalism Association, J-Ideas and the Washington News Council have already endorsed it. The coalition seeks the endorsement of JEA and permission to use JEA's name and logo. In the interest of time, the board agreed to consider the request, even though it had not gone through the Partnership and Endorsements Committee.

Matson moved and Lindsay seconded that the JEA Board endorse the Mission Statement of the Coalition for Responsible Student Expression and thereby become a member of the Coalition. Motion carried unanimously.

• **Scholastic Press Rights Commission Motions...J. Bowen**

The following motions came from the Scholastic Press Right Commission and, therefore, do not require a second:

Motion 1: The JEA Scholastic Press Rights Commission moves that the JEA board of directors or its designee contact Jostens, publisher of "Jostens Taking Issue," and the publishers/author of Patricia Osborn's "School Newspaper Adviser's Survival Guide" and ask them to reconsider and/or revise these and other materials that contain statements about press law, policies and student responsibility that run counter to JEA policy or that misstate court decisions.

In the meantime, the Scholastic Press Rights Commission moves that JEA place a note in the bookstore next to these materials restating JEA's philosophy on legal issues involved. (An alternative to this would be to enclose our concerns with each copy of the book or guide sold.) (Copy of this statement at jea.org.)

Motion 2: If the publishers will not revise or reconsider the materials in question or will not indicate by the Anaheim convention that they intend to make changes in the next edition they publish, then the JEA Board should remove the publication(s) from the JEA Bookstore.

Discussion followed with updates based on contact from Jostens.

Matson moved and Gorsuch seconded to amend Motion 1 by striking paragraph 2. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion 1 as presented without paragraph 2 carried 12-2.

Gorsuch moved and Tantillo seconded to table Motion 2 until the board meeting in Anaheim. Motion to table carried 15-0.

J. Bowen moved and Newton seconded that the Scholastic Press Rights Commission requests JEA to provide a copy of the association's philosophy on legal issues with every bookstore purchase or shipment and to include that philosophy in the bookstore catalogue. Motion carried

unanimously.

Oglesbee moved and Newton seconded that we ask the Student Press Rights Commission to examine the legal information distributed by yearbook companies and open a dialog concerning potential ambiguous or erroneous statements and/or commend publishers for alignment with JEA's official position. Motion carried 11-3-1.

Lindsay moved and Matson seconded that it is the responsibility of the Student Press Rights Commission to review any objections raised by members relating to scholastic press rights and responsibilities in materials offered through the JEA Bookstore. If the commission finds significant problems, it is authorized to communicate these to the authors and suggest revisions to correct the issue. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Reimbursement of substitute pay for board members...Puntney

Puntney said current practice is to reimburse schools or districts, as necessary, up to \$100 per day for two days for JEA board members to attend two JEA national conventions per school year. Discussion followed about whether this is sufficient to cover the expenses of the schools or districts.

Oglesbee moved and Newton seconded that each board member's school or district be reimbursed actual expenses up to \$200 per day for substitute pay to attend conventions — not to exceed three days per convention — beginning with the spring 2008 convention. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion to adjourn at 2:10 p.m. by Wilson.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Hathaway Tantillo, MJE
JEA Secretary

NEXT MEETING: April 17, 2008, Anaheim (Calif.) Marriott, 8:30 a.m.

AGENDA
Journalism Education Association General Membership Meeting
Nov. 9, 2007 • 8 a.m.
Philadelphia Marriott Downtown

CALL TO ORDER — Jack Kennedy, 8:07 a.m.

ROLL CALL — Susan Tantillo

In attendance were:

Jack Kennedy, MJE, President and Executive/Finance Committee chair
Bob Bair, MJE, Vice President and New Adviser Outreach Committee chair
Susan Tantillo, MJE, Secretary and Awards Committee chair
Ann Visser, MJE, Past President/Convention Consultant
Bradley Wilson, CJE, C:JET editor and Technology Committee chair
Linda Puntney, MJE, JEA Executive Director
Connie Fulkerson, JEA Administrative Assistant
Mark Newton, MJE, Certification Commission chair
Lori Oglesbee, CJE, Development/Curriculum Commission chair and Publications Committee chair
Anita Marie Wertz, CJE, Junior High/Middle School Commission chair
Norma Kneese, MJE, Multicultural Commission chair and Outreach Academy Committee chair
John Bowen, MJE, Scholastic Press Rights Commission chair
Steve Matson, MJE, Region 1/Northwest Regional Director and Partnership/Endorsements Committee chair
Kathy Gaber, Region 2/Southwest Regional Director and Multimedia Exploration Committee chair
Gary Lindsay, MJE, Region 3/North Central Regional Director
Wayna Polk, Region 4/South Central Regional Director and Scholarship Committee chair
Brenda Gorsuch, Region 5/Southeast Regional Director and Administrator Outreach Committee chair
Betsy Pollard Rau, Region 6/Mid-Atlantic and Great Lakes Regional Director
Ron Bonadonna, CJE, Region 7/Northeast Regional Director and Membership Retention Committee chair
Joe Nations, Ad Hoc Board Member
Linda Barrington, MJE, NCTE Liaison/Assembly Director and Mentoring Program Committee co-chair
Julie Dodd, MJE, Scholastic Press Association Directors Liaison, Nominations Committee chair, Mentoring Program Committee co-chair
Candace Perkins Bowen, MJE, JEA Listserv Liaison

• Summary of Board Action...Tantillo

Tantillo summarized highlights of the summer and Philadelphia JEA board meetings:

- The board approved a formal JEA Mentoring Program beginning with five states with two mentors from each state. Training for these 10 mentors began at this convention and continues in Anaheim. Julie Dodd and Linda Barrington are co-chairs for the program.
- Because Kevin Kneisley resigned his Broadcast Liaison board position following the Denver convention, the board decided to change the

position to a committee chair with the intent to explore multimedia options. Katny Gaber, Region 2 Director, from Colorado is the Multimedia Exploration Committee chair.

- The board drafted a response to the “BONG HiTS 4 JESUS” decision and sent a press release to the media.
- At both summer and Philadelphia board meetings members brainstormed ways to improve Write-off judging procedures and quality of feedback. Brainstorming will continue.
- The board voted unanimously to join SPLC, Washington JEA, Washington Community College Journalism Association, J-Ideas and Washington News Council in supporting the Mission Statement of the Washington Coalition for Responsible Student Expression. The coalition favors passage of legislation that supports student journalists’ First Amendment rights. ([CLICK HERE](#))

• **Mission Statement...Matson**

Matson said the Washington group will be honored for other states to take and use the Washington Coalition’s statement to spearhead legislative efforts or to remind audiences of the importance of student freedom of expression.

• **Conventions, Headquarters, Financial reports...Puntney**

Puntney reported JEA net income of \$155,833.02 from the Denver convention. She noted as of Oct. 19, 2007, JEA had received its entire share of the convention proceeds. Denver drew 3,367 delegates (3,092 paid).

Investments: JEA’s total portfolio value as of Oct. 31, 2007, is \$824,372.30. This compares to \$631,152.72 on Oct. 31, 2006. She noted that in 1989-90 the goal for JEA’s investments was \$100,000.

Quarterly Profit/Loss Statements: The 2007-08 (July 1-June 30) overall JEA budget is based on projected income of \$962,615 and projected expenses of \$1,115,988 with the difference to be made up, if necessary, from reserve funds. Puntney noted as of Oct. 31 income was \$259,213.35 and expenses were \$188,151.58 for a net income of \$71,061.77. The JEA Balance Sheet as of Nov. 6, 2007, shows total assets of \$1,291,093.41.

Puntney called attention to her report in the JEA Semi-Annual Report. She said her greatest concern is membership and pointed out the decline of 161 in voting members (teachers) since last fall. She reminded members that affiliate organizations, such as scholastic press associations, receive a rebate of \$5 for each JEA member paid through their group.

Future conventions:

Anaheim – April 17-20, 2008

St. Louis – Nov. 13-16, 2008, “Gateway to the Best”

Phoenix – April 16-19, 2009

Washington, D.C. – Nov. 12-15, 2009

• **Curriculum Commission...Oglesbee**

Oglesbee assured members she responds to every JEAHELP request for curriculum although she does so directly to the individual to reduce the “me too” requests. She is working on a way to post downloadable resources to jea.org. Oglesbee said Howard Spanogle’s project approved in Nashville likely will result in resources and downloadable materials rather than a book as originally proposed. Spanogle continues to work on the project.

Members having curriculum to contribute to others or those looking for specific curriculum for themselves should contact Oglesbee.

• **Student Press Rights Commission...J. Bowen**

J. Bowen said the second annual commission meeting at Poynter in January 2008 will focus on new projects determined by the commission members, including additional podcasts. Members with requests for materials or ideas for projects should contact him.

• **Multicultural Commission...Kneese**

Kneese recognized the Outreach Academy participants present and commended Linda Shockley of Dow Jones Newspaper Fund for her involvement in expanding the program to two days for the first time. Wednesday focused on Philadelphia-area advisers and Thursday focused on out-of-state advisers.

• **Mentoring Program...Dodd/Barrington**

The co-chairs explained JEA’s new Mentoring Program beginning with this convention. Dodd explained the idea as an outgrowth of the SPA Roundtable discussion in Denver focusing on adviser turnover. At the summer board meeting, the board allocated \$30,000 per year for the next three years to fund the program. Co-chairs are seeking additional funding from outside sources.

Ten mentors from five states began training at this convention and will continue in Anaheim. These mentors are Nancy Becker and Sandy Jacoby from Wisconsin, Linda Drake and Mary Anne McCloud from Kansas, Georgia and Wayne Dunn from Ohio, Bill Flechtner and Carla Harris from Oregon, Katy Gray and Dianne Gum from Colorado. They are wearing special mentor ribbons.

The next mentor group -- five new states with two mentors each -- will receive training in the summer of 2008. More information is available at a 9 a.m. session today or by contacting Dodd or Barrington.

• **Scholastic Press...Dodd**

Dodd reminded members of the Scholastic Press Association Roundtable at each national JEA convention from 9 to 10:50 a.m. Saturday. The

group will discuss additional initiatives, networking with principals and rebuilding struggling or defunct SPAs.

• **Emerging Technology...Gaber**

Gaber asked members interested in exploring broadcast, podcast, DVD and other forms of student media and their relationship to JEA to contact her.

• **State Directors...Bair**

Bair reminded State Directors of their meeting following this one at 9 a.m.

Polk moved and Visser seconded that the organization go on record to commend the Philadelphia local committee for the great job it has done in organizing for the fall 2007 convention. Motion carried unanimously.

• **Bookstore...Fulkerson**

Fulkerson called attention to Adviser Hospitality and the JEA Bookstore located in Franklin Hall 1. She also noted Meet the Authors events throughout the convention. Locations are on page 43 of the convention program.

• **Announcement**

Marie Parsons, interim director of the Alabama Scholastic Press Association at the University of Alabama, announced the university is looking for a Scholastic Media Director to begin Aug. 1, 2008.

Motion to adjourn at 8:40 a.m. by Barrington, seconded by Visser.

The next meeting will be at 8 a.m. April 18, 2008 at the Anaheim Marriott, Anaheim, Calif.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Hathaway Tantillo, MJE
JEA Secretary

[BOARD MEETING](#) | [GENERAL MEMBERSHIP](#) | [ATTACHMENTS](#)

ATTACHMENTS

Mission Statement

The Washington Coalition for Responsible Student Expression believes that student journalists should strive for accuracy, fairness and balance in order to achieve and maintain credibility and to bring to the public, as Walter Lippman said, "a view of reality upon which the citizen can act."

Student journalists also must be responsible to the laws that govern the press – such as libel, invasion of privacy, copyright infringement and obscenity – and should strive to maintain the highest standards of journalistic ethics. Also, their work must not materially and substantially disrupt the school day.

At the same time, student journalists should be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know, and they should be accountable to their readers, listeners, or viewers.

A free student press reflects the intellectual health of a vibrant, dynamic school. It helps create a respect for diversity, provides a voice for students, and establishes a link between students and school officials.

To ensure a strong, healthy student press in Washington State, this coalition of concerned organizations and individuals favors the passage of legislation that supports the First Amendment rights of student journalists.

As of Nov. 7, 2007, this statement is endorsed by
Student Press Law Center
Washington JEA
Washington Community College Journalism Association
J-Ideas
Washington News Council

Comments about *Jostens Taking Issue*:

Page 2:

Under the section on Tinker:

"School administrators do not have to wait until a disturbance or disruption actually occurs to take action. If administrators have good reason to believe that a particular expression is going to cause disruption or disorder..." (goes on to cite an example)...

Jostens explanation is overly broad and does not follow the strictness of the Tinker standard. Even the example is overly broad as simple

reporting on a topic might not lead to disruption. Disorder is not the same as disruption.

“Advocates of student press rights argued that giving the administrators the right to define what was ‘disruptive’ was too restrictive. The bottom line is the decision itself, and 18 years of court decisions defined the terminology much more clearly than is done here.

Under the section on prior restraint:

Whole paragraph:

Ignores the total misuse of review without legitimate pedagogical concern. Generalizes the negative aspects of scholastic media into almost requiring prior review; does nothing to show the lack of any educational value of prior review. Fails to even mention the value of student decision-making. Seems to be written only from the admin point of view.

Under the section on prior restraint:

“Proponents of student press rights *claim* that prior restraint denies First Amendment rights to student journalists.”

Makes it sound like Jostens doubts those claims; provides no legal support either way

“While acknowledging that school administrators have the right to exercise *some* control over student publications, they argue that punishment of irresponsible journalism should take place after publication”

The issue is not some control but under what precise conditions. This also ignores the whole question of what is “irresponsible journalism” since much prior review and restraint comes over topics having nothing to do with anything irresponsible.

“Establishing a policy of prior review and restraint encourages journalists to avoid controversy.”

It does far more than that; it also does not teach students administrators have the final say and allows them to learn in a supportive atmosphere.

XXXXXX: “As a result of Supreme Court decisions and changing public views, student journalists have increased restrictions on their First Amendment rights.”

—Public views, huh?

• “Until 1988, the Tinker standard defined student press rights.”

—For some schools, it still does.

• The discussion of prior review and prior restraint does little in the way of suggesting ways to work around those options.

• “Principals and school boards sometime claim the right to prior review of student publications.”

—Not put into context of Tinker or Hazelwood or open forums.

• “Establishing a policy of prior review and restraint encouraged journalists to avoid controversy.”

• —Lots of writing like this. Is this what we want to advocate?

Page 3:

Controversy over Prior Restraint:

It is not clear in this section that Hazelwood did not overturn Tinker but instead laid a separate railroad track of court viewpoint.

Starting in the seventh graph, “The Court stated that things like,” ... overstated the decision and the quote is used out of context. It should also be clear here that admin removal has to be viewpoint neutral, although Hazelwood itself did not coin the phrase. “Unsuitable” as used in the Jostens wording is too broad and not correct.

XXXXXX:

• “According to Hazelwood, administrators have the right to review materials in school-sponsored forums before publication and can remove materials they consider to be unsuitable. Essentially, this decision defined the administrator as the publisher and gave him the power of prior restraint.”

• —Ugh. What about established open forums? Are administrators really publishers?

Page 4:

Prior restraint on Yearbook Content:

In the last graph in that section Jostens refers to an Indiana situation where the adviser was removed after refusing “to allow the school’s athletic department to control the yearbook’s coverage of the football team. The school superintendent overturned her decision and gave the athletic staff editorial control.”

The implication of this statement is that the administrator action were acceptable or at least did not violate Hazelwood. Our question is what is their “legitimate pedagogical concern” for so doing and what were the outcomes. Each of the examples ought to show the legality or any challenge of the admin decisions.

Reaction to Hazelwood:

The first graph speaks of “Hazelwood does not require school administrators to censor student publications, (sic) it only gives them the right to do so.

The graph does not mention the conditions and that those rights are limited.

First graph: “In response, (to Hazelwood) many journalism teachers and the Journalism Education Association are calling on student journalists to adhere to the highest standard of journalism.”

I am not sure JEA made any use limited statement. As an organization JEA made statements far more precise and direct about censorship, prior review and prior restraint.

Last sentence, last paragraph:

The implication is that administrators have the obligation and right to *allow* students "a broader range of topics." The First Amendment not only allows that but protects it.

XXXXXX:

- Under "Prior Restraint on Yearbook Content" a handful of scenarios are described where administrators cut content, many of the situations our commission would fight against. The writing presents these scenarios as just the way it is and restraint is OK.

Page 7:

Invasion of privacy: Should read unwarranted invasion of privacy

Fraser explanation does not talk about the impact of a captive audience

XXXXXX:

- "If the material is controversial, it is probably best to get the minor's parent to sign a release form." (p. 7) Law of the Student Press states that an informed minor can give consent. I worry that once you start getting signed consent, you run the risk of needing it to justify all quotes.

Page 8:

First graph continued from previous page: Parental consent is very broad and vague here, at the least. In the Hazelwood case the problem was with the lack of parental quotes for balance not the fact there was no consent. In a news situation no consent is needed if the can be considered to be cognizant of her/his surroundings and what s/he is speaking of.

Just what is the Right of Publicity? What court cases apply here? Isn't this called misappropriation?

Private: Journalists may reveal info from those sources IF they get the info from the sources. Using documents, unless public records, can be problematic at least.

Photographs as Libel: Much more explanation and use of citations needed for anti-bullying and anti-harassment. Neither of these situations should be lumped with libel; parents of special ed students do not have the right of prior review (they can opt out of being pictured when students is in a special edu identifiable situation)

Last graph in the Photographs as libel section: So the Univ. of Colorado Dean acted legally? Student objections prior to removal do not necessarily make the removal legal. The implication is it was legal.

XXXXXX:

It actually says this? Good grief. Of course parents don't have any such right. The yearbook staff needs to exercise caution when covering special ed students/programs to make sure they are accurate in their descriptions of the programs and participants, but there is no legal right of parental prior review.

It ticks you off that they throw this stuff out there without citing any authority. Perhaps what they are thinking of -- and just screwed up on -- is that b/c some high-school aged special ed students wouldn't have the legal capacity to consent to an invasion of their privacy (e.g., a discussion of their medical/mental health), publication staff would need to contact the students' parents/guardians for such permission. Of course, the parents could refuse such permission (or demand that they be allowed to read the story before giving such permission) and the publication couldn't safely publish the story without it -- but that's not prior review as that term is generally understood.

XXXXXX:

- Lots of mentions of school "anti-bullying" and "anti-harassment" policies, without much backbone. We would agree they are not good things (bullying and harassing), but how do they fit in with newsworthiness?

XXXXXX:

- "Making sure that all interested parties sign consent form is one way to avoid intrusion policies." (p. 8)

Page 8 also describes the censorship of the University of Colorado yearbook because of the inclusion of a picture of student wearing a t-shirt printed with an obscene statement. This case of censorship is listed under the publication's Photographs as Libel section. While the printing of this picture might border some obscenity standards, the student was obviously wearing the t-shirt in public. I don't think this fits under libel.

Page 9:

The obscenity section is incomplete. Did Hazelwood say vulgar speech could be censored? In all cases? Fraser does not mention his case was in front of a captive audience.

Last sentence in the left column at the bottom of the page is not correct. It must meet all three parts of the Miller test, which was not mentioned.

That graph assumes that administrators will know what is to be printed before it is public. How does one define good taste? Who defines it? Is it a legal term?

Threats of violence: what case defines "true threats?" Is it something other than Tinker? Has the case mentioned in this graph now undergone review?

Potential liability: Where are the statistics to show "the number of libel and invasion of privacy suits brought against students publications has grown?" True, or a scare tactic designed to appeal to administrators? The SPLC says no student they are aware of has ever lost a libel case? More precise figures would help with validity.

"In the post-Hazelwood era, student journalists need to use their best judgment and maintain journalistic standards to avoid *needless* controversy. Libel suits and obscenity charges tend to confirm school officials' distrust of uncensored student publications."

While this sounds good, it is contradictory. If students maintain professional standards they would not need prior review or restraint. If they are reviewed or restrained, they are not legally responsible for the content. Further, to not be a scare tactic, the authors ought to support the statements with cases and citations.

Page 17

Printer's Right of Censure: JEA has significant issues with the concept of printer's right to censure. If this happens, the school assumes liability and responsibility. Private printers have gone far beyond restraining copyright violations. In addition to reading the contract carefully, JEA would urge you do not agree to this.

XXXXXX:

* page 17: "Some schools use printers inside the school or connected with the school to print the school newspapers. In such cases, the printer's right to exercise prior restraint is governed by the Hazelwood decision."

Whether or not a printer has the right to interfere with content is probably up to some other school official (principal, superintendent), but assuming the higher-ups have permitted the printer to exercise such authority -- or at least haven't objected -- I don't think student journalists could legally object simply b/c the censor is the school printer.

However, whether or not Hazelwood governs would, as with any administrative censorship, depend on whether or not the school was a "Hazelwood paper" or a "forum paper." The school printer would legally be subject to the same restrictions as any other school official.

Page 20

Second graph, statement on admin responsibility is good and should be stressed earlier and more. They are responsible if they prior review/restrain.

However, giving the adviser "more control" only increases the state's (school's) responsibility. Only if students make final content decisions are they responsible.

A "well-written policy" does more than establish limits. It enforces freedoms and learning and a whole lot more.

Editorial policy: "You will decide who is responsible for its content and what types of material you will exclude" presupposes admin control and decision. It is also unclear as to who the "who" refers to.

The second graph in this section is misleading. The statement about Hazelwood's powers is very broad and incorrect.

Establish editorial control: "If the staff and adviser are given the right to choose the content, who will be responsible for any lawsuits and legal fees that might result?" Raises the scare tactic of lawsuits again; few have occurred. Legal precedent is quite clear.

The next graph is even more problematic: how can you legally divide editorial responsibility and have any chance of being a forum? It is this theme and tone throughout that suggests little acceptance or understanding of the importance of the forum.

The bullet points lack any legal and ethical pros and cons. There is no "just staff" making decisions option, thus precluding the forum for student expression option. (continued to page 21)

Page 21

Prohibit Illegal Material: "material likely to cause a substantial disruption" is not an accurate definition.

To avoid future controversy, the staff, adviser and administration should come to an agreement over what constitutes a substantial disruption. Settle any disputes over the legality of publishing certain materials by talking to an attorney."

Tinker clearly defines "substantial and material disruption" and should not be modified with other wording. JEA would agree with contacting an attorney, but would call for that attorney to be one expert in communication law, and not be affiliated with the school system.

Outline Individual Responsibilities: To whom would the student journalist agree to submit materials like that? Does the statement mean publish? Who would call for him or her to rewrite?

Does liaison mean control or advise? Decide or play devil's advocate?

Establish an Open Forum:

Is "forum for ideas" the same as forum for student expression?

is forum for ideas the same as forum for student expression:

“You should claim the right to edit letters for brevity and accuracy and to remove prohibited content” This would, to us, negate the forum concept and make the editors into censors. It also refers to prohibited content, without defining it.

How can anti-bullying and-harassment policies affect one’s ability to publish letters to the editor?

XXXXXX:

Other parts of the policy chapter seem to take prior review for granted, and that seems counter to JEA policy. Such phrases as "Adviser duties need to be defined clearly. Does your adviser or the student editor have editorial control over the newspaper or yearbook?" Good grief! Also the open forum section on pg 21 includes a section on what you can edit in letters. Some experts would say returning letters with issues to the writer keeps the forum OPEN instead of giving control to students to edit letters. (That’s in another part farther back, too.)

Page 22

Having school officials, adviser and students confer about death policies again pre-supposes the publication is not a forum for student expression. “If the administration agrees that you should do a story.....” pre-supposes prior review.

XXXXXX:

Again in the death policy, the book assumes the administrator will have the final say.

Advertising policy: last graph on page 22: “in poor taste”...what does this mean? Who decides? Is it a legal term? JEA’s policy on this is quite precise.

XXXXXX:

- “Before such an issue arises, the newspaper staff, the adviser and the school administration must clearly define whether the school newspaper can cover such a topic.”
- This is the common writing style. Seems to take away responsibility from editors.

“If your administration agrees that you should do a story on the death of a student or staff member, you still must decide whether you can do the story in a professional, thoughtful manner that will not cause pain to friends and family.”

- —Again, very poorly described. “If your administration agrees...”

Page 23

Responsible Student Journalism: Policies generally do not determine what story you can cover and how you will cover them.

One should always involve students in the development of policies for publication.

Trust does not mean subservience.

Questions: First bullet point: the policies listed as models run directly counter to the forum for student expression concept that JEA has adopted as a working model. They run counter to our educational philosophy.

Page 24

The Guidelines, while not restrictive, seem to endorse a non-student forum slant; be aimed in favor of administrators.

Page 25

Points negate the forum for student expression concept:

- “The adviser may veto the decision, but the Board may overrule with a unanimous vote.
- “Despite the court ruling in Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier, administrators rely on the adviser and staff to make all content decisions.”
- Edit board reserves the right to edit all letters...
- How can student staff have final say if they allow “constructive criticism of any part of the paper before publication?”
- The newspaper’s purpose in the second right-hand graph is limiting and hardly inclusive of professional standards.
- Last graph on the page “No material, opinionated or otherwise, will be printed which is libelous, *irresponsible*, advocates an illegal activity or which the Editor-in-chief, Editorial Board, and/or adviser deems in poor taste” contradicts earlier legal guidelines and makes the publication a non forum for student expression.

Page 27

Explain the logic of the last sentence of the third graph.

Define poor taste, irresponsible? Only use legally definable terms.

XXXXXX (general comments)

I have reviewed the publication titled Jostens Taking Issue A Student Guide to Publication Law which is produced by Jostens, Inc.

While the majority of the facts pertaining to student press law seem to be accurate, the overall tone of the publication is worrisome to me.

The publication seems to convey that administrative censorship is the reality and that the best student publications can do is write in ways that

will avoid being questioned. All of the examples and explanations of press law seem to leave out any suggestion of open forum. In the only mention of public forum (p. 21), the publication does not offer establishment of the student publication as an open forum as a viable defense for prior restraint.

Additionally, multiple times the publication mentions "Anti-Bullying Bills" that regulate student speech that may be considered harassment or teasing (p. 4, p.21). I haven't heard anywhere before this that these bills should be taken into consideration when establishing editorial policy.

Many examples of censorship are outlined throughout the publication, but none are accompanied by an explanation as to whether that censorship was justified by law. The overall feeling is that administrators can and will censor, so learn to play nice and keep your head low, and you won't get into any trouble with your publication.

Also, the idea of permission and consent is a recurring theme.

Other explanations of prior restraint and administrative censorship seem bent toward allowing it.

"If administrators have good reason to believe that a particular expression is going to cause a disruption - for example, a previous article on the same topic causing a student walkout - they can stop the expression from occurring." (p. 2)

"Hazelwood does not require school administrators to censor student publications, it only gives them the right to do so." (p. 4)

"The administration needs to decide how much editorial control it wishes to exercise." (p. 21)

Patricia Osborn's "School Newspaper Adviser's Survival Guide"

XXXXX:

I did not find any glaring mistakes in the document you sent me but I do have some problems with it. It constantly uses the word censor and censorship and gives that authority to administrators even though it does give the limitations of that censorship.

For example, on page 54, second paragraph, "In those states or school districts that have not legislated otherwise, administrators have the right to prior review and the power to censor the student paper on the grounds given in the Hazelwood decision of 1988."

On page 56, second section, second sentence, "Avoid claiming that school officials don't deserve that right, under Hazelwood, they do."

On page 59 under Where You Fit as an Adviser, "With the newspaper as a public forum, it may seem that a safety valve is taken away from the adviser."

The description of the process for becoming a public forum by practice seems to me the system of establishing a public forum policy although not one that has passed to the hands of administrators.

Is "Death by Cheeseburger" free for advisers from the Freedom Forum? This says it is on page 55.

On page 63 in the section of Facing the Consequences it uses the bestiality story as the basis for its discussion of advisers facing the possible loss of their jobs. If this is the Val Schroeder case in Washington, Val did not lose her job although she has not been allowed to teach journalism. She settled out of court for an unspecified sum. Certainly, there are better examples with less sensational stories and advisers who did lose their jobs.

It uses the bestiality story again in its discussion of polls in the next section.

On page 62 Successful approaches for advising without begging or threats (some title!!) #3 speaks about the dangers of getting beat up if you criticize athletes.

The discussion of Outside and inside pressure groups on page 66 is particularly disturbing and almost suggests the paper should be a newsletter or, at least, presents and doesn't clearly refute that idea. "In some views, the school paper should be like a corporate tool, dedicated to printing positive news about school management and showing the school's best fact to public view. Except for the content, the school paper often fits comfortably into the newsletter slot; published for a clearly related circle of readers and generally supported materially if not sponsored by the management. How then can the staff of a high school paper dare to turn upon those who sponsor or support it?"

Later on that page: "Avoid pitting yourself against both colleagues and administrators on the grounds of students; 'rights.' It is not only Hazelwood that makes this position hard to defend. For it is also true of a school-sponsored publication that the school provides the space, possibly supports the paper financially and pays the adviser's salary. Without this recognition, there can be no paper."

This whole section is very questionable in its approach.

In summary, this needs updating to give info on copyright and the internet and needs to be less oriented to pleasing the administration.

XXXXX:

I have reviewed the section concerning student press law in the book titled School Newspaper Adviser's Survival Guide by Patricia Osborn, which I purchased from the JEA bookstore.

I am concerned about several statements found between pages 54-56 in this text regarding student press rights that seem contrary to JEA's official position on censorship of student publications.

Please review these statements so that you might respond to these concerns.

p. 54

"Strangely enough, the Hazelwood decision, allowing school officials the ability to censor school newspapers in order to "set high standards for the student speech that is disseminated under its auspices," came at a time when the professional media were relaxing their strictures under the influence of tabloid exposes and cutthroat competition.

"In those states or school districts that have not legislated otherwise, administrators have the right of prior review and the power to censor the student press on the grounds given in the Supreme Court's Hazelwood decision of 1988."

"The decision provides wide latitude for administrators desiring to censor student newspapers."

p. 56

"With a censored press, there is no use asking: How will our story on the accused teacher contribute to our readers' understanding? Is it our responsibility, not our right, to cover it? Nor is there any point in asking: Why is this album the best choice for this issue? Because the concern is whether it can get by the censor."

In my opinion, these statements send advisers and students the message that censorship is inevitable and that there is really nothing to be done by student or adviser when a principal chooses to censor. These statements also clearly oppose the JEA board position statement in the Student Press Rights Position, page 3, posted on our Scholastic Press Rights web page.

XXXXXX:

School Newspaper Adviser's Survival Guide (1998)

Pg 54, third paragraph: "In those states or school districts that have not legislated otherwise, administrators have the right to prior review and the power to censor the student paper on the grounds given in the Supreme Court's Hazelwood decision of 1988."

Fifth paragraph: "The decision provided wide latitude for administrators desiring to censor school papers."

But the mention of publications that are, by policy or PRACTICE, forums of student expression is buried at the end of the section and not explained to show how this could protect a publication. Eventually, there's more on pg 59. Also, where is any mention of administrators being viewpoint neutral? Again, in the activities, Part II begins, "In granting school officials the right of censorship, the Supreme Court...."

Pg 58, definition of obscenity: "articles or language considered filthy and offensive as judged by community standards regarding sexual conduct...."

Finally, on pg 59, she has a longer explanation of public forum and of viewpoint neutrality. So....as long as the adviser reads to the END of the section, it's OK.

Restatement of JEA principles

Prior review is a weapon in the arsenal of censorship, and the Journalism Education Association opposes its use in America's schools

- JEA believes students should make final decisions of content for all student media.
- JEA believes prior review has no educational value and inhibits open dialogue and exchange of ideas.
- JEA believes prior review negates the educational value of a trained, professionally active adviser and teacher working with students in a counseling, educational environment. Prior review simply makes the teacher an accessory, as if what is taught really does not matter.
- JEA believes prior review, as well as restraint, gives school officials, who are the government, the power to decide in advance what people will read or know. Such officials are potential newsmakers and their involvement with the newsmaking process can interfere with the public's right to know.
- JEA believes prior review establishes the possibility of viewpoint discrimination which destroys a free marketplace of ideas where a community can be fully informed and undermines all pretext of responsible journalism.
- JEA believes prior review leads toward self-censorship, the most chilling and pervasive form of censorship in schools. Fear like this will eliminate any chance of critical thinking and the development of active, inquiring citizenship.
- JEA believes learning must be a dynamic process, one in which an adviser helps students but does not make decisions for them.
- JEA believes advisers should trust students as they carry out their responsibilities of accurate, complete and thorough journalism without administrative interference.
- JEA believes student journalists must be accorded the same freedoms and responsibilities as their commercial counterparts and that these students must be provided with accurate information on their rights and responsibilities.
- JEA believes censorship or unwarranted administrative interference with the journalistic process is the last resort of an educational system failing its present and future citizens.

