Greater Than the Sum:

Creating Collaborative and Connected Public Media in America

Craig Aaron
Candace Clement
Josh Stearns

Free Press
August 2012

freepress
www.freepress.net

Contents:

ABOUT FREE PRESS

Free Press is building a powerful nationwide movement to change media and technology policies, promote the public interest and strengthen democracy. Free Press advocates for universal and affordable Internet access, diverse media ownership, vibrant public media and quality journalism. Information about Free Press campaigns can be found at www.freepress.net.

The authors wish to thank Jessica Clark and Tom Glaisyer of the New America Foundation for their insights and feedback on this paper.

This research was supported by a grant from the Open Society Foundations.

Part One: Introduction

On a warm September afternoon, hundreds of volunteers armed with soldering irons, hammers, saws, cameras and microphones worked their way through a three-story building in downtown Hudson, N.Y. Together they worked tirelessly to build a new community resource: a full-power, noncommercial radio station. When WGXC-FM flipped the switch, it began broadcasting at 3,300 watts, reaching a potential audience of nearly 80,000 people. The station is programmed entirely by volunteers.

Thousands of miles south, the *Texas Tribune*, a nonprofit online news project, enters its third year of existence. The organization reports on public policy, politics and government, in addition to hosting local in-person events to promote "civic engagement and discourse on … matters of statewide concern." The organization has received national attention for its reporting projects and unique approach to filling the gap in state political reporting.

In Michigan, a new generation of journalists and community watchdogs is being trained at the Grand Rapids Community Media Center. The center provides community access television, manages a Low Power FM radio station, stages a community theater and runs a vibrant local news website. In addition, it provides website design and technology consultation to local nonprofits.

In Boston, one of the pioneers of modern public broadcasting is building new connections. WGBH launched the WGBH Lab to engage new voices and spark creative video projects for screens of all sizes. At the same time, the station is experimenting with longtime programs like *Frontline*, rethinking documentary journalism for the digital age.

Armed with cellphones to stream live coverage of breaking events, citizen journalists with The UpTake are reshaping media coverage in Minnesota with their motto: "Will journalism be done by you or to you?" The UpTake was the only journalism organization in the state to provide gavel-to-gavel coverage of the contentious 2008 Senate vote recount. Its footage has been featured on major websites and mainstream cable news programs.

Each of these organizations serve different, albeit intersecting, audiences. Their membership varies. They represent different constituencies. But together, these organizations make up the greater fabric of public media in the United States today. It's a diverse and innovative network of online and offline outlets, professionals and ordinary people, who are serving communities and re-envisioning public service media.

When most people think of public media, they picture NPR and PBS. In reality, America's public and noncommercial media sector has long encompassed more than just those national brands and is growing more diverse and multifaceted every year. To understand the whole picture, we have to view public media as a network of noncommercial and nonprofit institutions that share a similar mission: serving diverse, local communities by providing alternatives and filling the notable gaps left by commercial media.

In many ways, noncommercial media in the U.S. is in the midst of a renaissance. People who might never have considered a nonprofit business model before — like longtime journalists and new social entrepreneurs — are launching vibrant, nonprofit startups across the country. High-profile reports, blogs and articles are singing the praises of noncommercial news. Longtime community television and radio stations are redefining themselves as community media centers. And funders are investing extraordinary resources in these projects. All of this comes in addition to a vast coast-to-coast network of nearly 1,300 local public broadcasting stations, and the broad community of independent producers, membership organizations and others that provide support and training to public and community media.

However, the long-term sustainability of this renaissance is threatened by structural policy issues that narrowly define public media and limit their funding. Public broadcasting is an essential institution in our nation. But it has been more than 40 years since the introduction of the Public Broadcasting Act, and technology, culture, society and the media have changed dramatically since then. It is time to rethink and reimagine public media, and to reinvest in this critical infrastructure in ways that will support public media's diversity and fulfill the varied needs of local communities.

As Free Press wrote in its 2010 report, *New Public Media: A Plan for Action*:

> Creating a public media system that reflects the public it serves is about more than ensuring diverse staff and programming. The very nature of digital media enables a much broader community to coalesce around information and ideas. Bringing public media into the digital age will require the enabling of new individuals, outlets and organizations to collaborate with stations and qualify for financial support. It means abandoning the scarcity mindset that permeates the current system and moving toward one of abundance.
>
> By embracing digital media — and the changes that come with a shift from one-way broadcast communication to many-to-many digital communication — a more diverse media system could emerge that brings in new participants and stakeholders and expands the definition of the individuals, entities and organizations that comprise public media.

The time to expand funding for and expand our definition of public media has come. There is simply not enough money in ads, underwriting, donations and philanthropy to support the kind of media our communities need. We have a unique moment where America's entrepreneurial spirit has spurred the growth of nonprofit news organizations and community media centers. We must seize this opportunity. The seeds of a new era of localism have been planted, but we lack the structures that would support the diverse array of new public media ventures that are sprouting up.

While dozens of inspiring local news projects have started to address the gaps left by commercial media, many are struggling to sustain their work. The philanthropic community, whose attention to these new community news projects has been critical during this transitional period, will not support this work forever. Neither can it compensate for the 30,000 journalism jobs that have been cut in the past few years. At the same time, community media centers are facing dramatic funding cuts due to changes in local and state franchising laws, and community radio stations are still fighting to fund their operations or jumping through hoops at the Federal Communications Commission to get on the air.

Expanding the public media sector is one way to meet the nation's information needs, but there are obstacles to tackle first. The system as it exists today is underfunded, improperly insulated from partisan politics and narrowly defined and executed. Compared to other nations, U.S. spending on public media is literally pocket change — 80 times less than the amount spent in the highest-funded European nations. And since that funding is determined through the annual appropriations process, it remains at the mercy of the political whims of Washington. While public broadcasters reach nearly every household in the country, too few are innovating and expanding the ways in which they serve local communities or create opportunities for local people to participate in media making.

In the long term, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) needs to be reinvented as a "Corporation for Public Media," and a trust fund should be created to shield public media funding from funding threats. Given the current political and economic climate, such ideas might seem far-fetched. And inside the public broadcasting system, these ideas will likely be seen as controversial or even impossible when so much energy is spent defending the little funding that currently exists. However, we believe we must think beyond the present political moment to articulate what could and should be done.[1] Now, more than ever, we need a vision we can begin working toward — and that vision should help unite public and community media, not leave them more divided.

With additional funding and fixes to public media's governance and structures, we can build a new public media system that will finally be capable of living up to its initial mandate of creating a "great network for knowledge" that can "help us see America whole, in all its diversity."[2]

How might a newly expanded public media system concretely impact the news and information needs of local communities? What might it look like to have a fully funded, well-supported and unified nonprofit media sector? Imagine:

---

[1] Read more in *New Public Media: A Plan for Action*, Free Press, 2010, and *Public Media's Moment*, Free Press, 2009.

[2] "Public Television: A Program for Action," Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, January 1967.

- A newly mandated Corporation for Public Media with adequate funding to support the 1,300 longtime public broadcasters and innovative local media projects
- Ten thousand new journalists employed to cover local news in communities across the U.S.[3]
- A network of 1,000 thriving online nonprofit journalism organizations invested in both daily beat reporting and long-term investigative journalism
- Thousands of new Low Power FM radio stations in communities across the U.S.
- Hundreds of new community media centers formed as partnerships among local public access channels, public broadcasters, libraries, computing centers and community radio organizations
- High-speed broadband connections among community anchor institutions. These networks would serve as a virtual backbone for libraries, public broadcasters, public schools, colleges and universities, community media organizations and other applicable nonprofits.
- Quality content that is freely accessible on and across all available platforms, including broadcast, Web and mobile devices
- A range of new platforms for community conversation, civic engagement and democratic dialogue between the public, civic leaders, media makers and policymakers

These are big ideas and will require difficult policy changes and cultural shifts. Some of these reforms will face formidable opposition, both inside Congress and from within the public broadcasting community. However, we must move the debate about public broadcasting beyond "how much will get cut this year?" to a vision of where we could be 10 years from now.

Part Two: New Opportunities and the Need for Reform

While the Carnegie Commission is most often credited with sparking the legislative momentum that eventually led to the passage of the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act, that effort was rooted in an intellectual and organizing campaign that lasted more than 10 years and drew on numerous organizations, foundations, scholars and practitioners.

We are again at a moment of profound debate, inquiry and imagination regarding the future of public media in the U.S. The recent policy battles over federal and state funding for public broadcasting have cast a spotlight on this debate and highlighted its contentious nature. In addition, an array of recent reports, conferences and federal inquiries have focused on public media as a core component of our nation's information infrastructure.

There is broad consensus that noncommercial media have a role to play in addressing our country's civic and democratic challenges:

- In its "Public Media 2.0" report, the Center for Social Media at American University says "Multiplatform, participatory and digital public media 2.0 will be an essential feature of truly democratic public life from here on in. And it'll be media both for and by the public."
- Similarly, in their report on "The Reconstruction of American Journalism," Len Downie and Michael Schudson argue that public broadcasting has the potential to provide "significant local news reporting in every community."
- The nonpartisan Knight Commission recommended that the federal government "increase support for public service media aimed at meeting community information needs" and argued that "public broadcasters in the United States have demonstrated their capacity to deliver high-quality, fair, and credible news and information programming free of government interference."[4]

[3] If taxpayer funding for public media rose to a mere $5 per capita, funding these 10,000 new journalists would require only one third of the total amount of new funding.

[4] Jessica Clark and Patricia Aufderheide, "Public Media 2.0," The Center for Social Media, American University. February 2009; Len Downie and Michael Schudson, "The Reconstruction of American Journalism," Columbia University, October 2009; The Knight Commission, "Informed Communities," The Knight Foundation, September 2009.

Public media's structure, a complex web of stations and national organizations stretching across the country, is both its greatest strength and its greatest weakness. With local stations in hundreds of communities, it is poised to help meet new challenges in local news and information. However, there is also widespread agreement that while the current public broadcasting system has done a lot with a little, as it is currently structured it cannot meet the new challenges we face.

- From the "Public Media 2.0" report: "If we're going to have media for a vibrant democratic culture, we have to plan for it, try it out, show people that it matters and build new constituencies to invest in it. … If public media 2.0 looks less highly stratified and culturally balkanized than the public media of today, it will be because of conscious investment and government policy choices."

- Downie and Schudson agree that to meet its full potential, the CPB needs reform. "The CPB should declare that local news reporting is a top priority for public broadcasting and change its allocation of resources accordingly," they write.

- The Knight Commission called on public broadcasters and public media advocates to "move quickly toward a broader vision of public service media, one that is more local, more inclusive, and more interactive."

Public media's promise is equaled only by its challenges, and expanding our definition of what qualifies as public media can help us meet those challenges. If we look across the entire noncommercial media sector in the U.S., we see many of the kinds of innovations and community connections the reports above describe. We shouldn't ask public media to reinvent the wheel, but we should support those organizations that are already innovating, serving diverse communities and meeting new kinds of information needs. And we should create opportunities for those lessons to inform the entire noncommercial sector. But right now, overly rigid funding guidelines and traditional definitions inscribed in both culture and law preclude this kind of development.

Policymakers are starting to understand this problem. In its National Broadband Plan, the Federal Communications Commission called for expanding the CPB so it could provide additional funding for broadband-based distribution of content.[5] Two years later, Steve Waldman, the author of the agency's "Information Needs of Communities" report, echoed and expanded on this recommendation:

> Public broadcasters need to continue to play an important role on the media landscape. They have done superb work in many areas, and this would be precisely the wrong time to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. But the system can be improved so that public TV and radio would be more likely to produce local programming and digital innovation. … Local communities would benefit if the CPB had more flexibility to award money to multimedia innovators, whether their original platforms were TV or radio or something else. … CPB should have more leeway to fund nonprofit media that do not hold an over-the-air TV or radio license.[6]

Rethinking Public Media, Barbara Cochran's paper for the Knight Foundation, put it this way:

> The Public Broadcasting Act should be overhauled to reflect the reality of digital media, and funds should be redirected from outmoded broadcasting infrastructure and duplication of service to building digital capacity. Congress should authorize new funds to enable public media to participate in broadband buildout.[7]

Even the most recent round of political attacks and the resurgence of the culture-war mentality in Washington illustrate the need to redefine public media. It is incumbent on us to build on the foundation of what is already working while reimagining a more robust, expansive and interconnected noncommercial media sector in America.

---

[5] The Federal Communications Commission,"The National Broadband Plan," Broadband.gov. See Chapter 15: Civic Engagement.

[6] Steve Waldman, *The Information Needs of Communities*, The Federal Communications Commission, page 356, May 2011. http://transition.fcc.gov/osp/inc-report/The_Information_Needs_of_Communities.pdf

[7] Barbara Cochran, "Rethinking Public Media: More Local, More Inclusive, More Interactive," The Knight Foundation, December 2010.

Part Three: Beyond Access, Toward Accessibility

We need a definition of public media that better suits today's world. In his "open letter to the FCC," Steve Coll, the president of the New America Foundation, captured the predicament. He wrote: "We badly require new policies and new thinking in Washington because the media policy regime we have inherited is out of date and inadequate for the times in which we live."[8]

We can start by considering the concepts of access and accessibility. Accessibility has long defined public media. Like public parks, public media have long been understood as a set-aside, reserved for everyone to access and enjoy. The national resource metaphor is fitting, as the FCC carved out spectrum and frequencies for public media and protected it for noncommercial use.

Early fights for educational and noncommercial media focused on this access to the public airwaves. The cost of media production was prohibitive, and access to transmission and distribution technologies was largely unavailable. The need to give people access to high-quality and diverse arts, education and journalism content in this context inspired the efforts to secure frequencies for noncommercial radio, to pass the Public Broadcasting Act, and to create public access, educational and governmental cable channels. Furthermore, public media programming was subsidized to ensure that everyone could watch or listen to it at no cost. Indeed, one of the founding mandates of public broadcasting was to "make public telecommunications services available to all citizens of the United States."[9]

Access is vital but goes only so far. Simply providing access does not fulfill the potential of today's media, nor does it adequately meet the needs of today's communities. Accessibility refers to an individual or community's ability to participate in the creation of media. Accessibility emphasizes giving people access to the tools and skills to make media, letting the community in to participate and contribute, and being accountable to local citizens. This is the model of community access TV and Low Power FM radio, as well as other media and technology literacy, training and empowerment organizations.

Public media must expand opportunities for interaction and engagement, not just consumption. In his book *Mediactive*, longtime journalist and technologist Dan Gillmor writes, "In a participatory culture none of us is fully literate unless we are creating, not just consuming."[10] Renee Hobbs' paper on media literacy for the Knight Commission echoes this theme: "Today full participation in contemporary culture requires not just consuming messages, but also creating and sharing them." [11] Shifting to a model that embodies Hobbs and Gillmor's vision will require learning lessons from public broadcasting, community media, citizen journalism and online news organizations. Each brings critical experience and skills to bear on these questions.

However, all of these organizations face critical policy challenges right now. Across the country phone and cable companies have launched effective campaigns to undermine and revise the laws that mandate their support for community access and public access, educational and governmental (PEG) television. At the same time, funding for federal programs like the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) has been slashed from the federal budget, putting dozens of new community radio stations in jeopardy and undercutting traditional public media stations' ability to maintain their equipment and facilities.

Additionally, since 2008 there has been a spike in applications for 501(c)3 nonprofit status from journalism organizations. The uptick has raised red flags at the IRS, which is delaying approval for many groups. This IRS delay is not just slowing the growth of a vital new journalism sector; it also threatens to undermine noncommercial news writ large and potentially endanger longstanding nonprofit journalism organizations.

For too long, access and accessibility have been seen as two separate missions, served by distinct stakeholders in noncommercial media. Public policy has to account for the shifting needs of communities and the shifting demands of democracy. Both traditional public broadcasting and nonprofit community media models have a lot to offer and much to learn from each other, and there are some organizations excelling in both areas. We need a more unified policy platform for noncommercial media to ward off these kinds of piecemeal attacks on individual funding streams.

---

8 Steve Coll, "Reboot," *Columbia Journalism Review*, October 2010.

9 Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. http://www.cpb.org/aboutpb/act/

10 Dan Gillmor, *Mediactive*, November 2011. www.mediactive.com.

11 Renee Hobbs, "Digital Media Literacy: A Plan for Action," The Knight Foundation, November 2010.

Part Four: Defining a New Public Media

Public media in America face an interesting dilemma. On the one hand, the public declares year after year that funding for public radio and television is the best use of taxpayer dollars, second only to national defense.[12] It is widely considered an indispensable resource for children's programming. Where other media entities have cut back on their coverage of the arts and science beats, public media continue to nurture them. While public trust in the press has plummeted, trust in public media has increased.

On the other hand, public media are perceived by many as elitist, liberal and interested in catering only to a niche audience that skews old, educated, wealthy and white. Indeed, an internal NPR study found that public radio could expand its audience exponentially if it worked "to break down perceptions that its programs are elitist and stuffy." Researchers pointed specifically to issues of accessibility as a key factor in this perception. Listeners often reported that they couldn't relate to content or the presentation of that content. "When encountering public radio, news consumers from various demographic groups share a common problem: They feel excluded."[13]

Echoes of this report are evident in a study of public television conducted by the media watch group Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR). The study found the flagship public affairs shows on PBS lack diverse sources and viewpoints and don't live up to their mission of providing an alternative to commercial media.[14] While audiences under age 8 and over age 60 may be satisfied with what airs on PBS, the rest are turning to commercial media for much of their entertainment programming.

It is precisely because public media's potential is so great that we must be honest about where it is falling short. Public broadcasters should recognize that while they have succeeded on many fronts, too many have failed to engage locally in the same way that community media organizations do. Similarly, community media organizations should recognize that by partnering with public broadcasters, they could gain access to resources and support that would help elevate their work and distribute it to new audiences. Both sectors could be doing more to serve and empower diverse communities across the country.

With a better understanding of what encompasses public media, we could imagine a new era of collaborative media making that engages people at the local level via a coalition of noncommercial organizations. However, as Free Press has noted previously, bridging the gap between public broadcasters and community media on a broad scale will not be easy. In the 2010 Free Press report *New Public Media: A Plan for Action*, the authors write: "Despite the similarities in mission and objectives, these communities tend to occupy separate camps, each critiquing the other for its shortcomings instead of viewing their complementary strengths as assets in a larger effort to inform communities and boost civic engagement."

Changes in technology, the economy and the needs of communities make it increasingly important for community and public media stakeholders to come together and find common ground in their concern for the health of local media. (For one concrete example of what a local media collaboration of this sort might look like, see our profile of the St. Paul Neighborhood Network in Appendix 2.)

At a 2011 NPR board meeting, Sue Schardt, the executive director of the Association of Independents in Radio, spoke to the challenge and the opportunity of this current moment:

> One choice, at this transformational moment, is to say, "We are satisfied with what we are doing. We — in radio — are providing 11 percent of America with an extraordinary service." If this is our choice, we need to carefully consider whether we warrant public funding and, if so, what the rationale would be.
>
> I believe we need to say, in this moment, "You're right. We are not satisfied, either. Now that we have achieved this huge success over a 30-year incubation period, we now are poised to commit ourselves to translate and bring what we have to everyone in America. Within the next five years, seven years — we set the timetable. We are absolutely committed to serving — truly — and speaking in the voices — truly — of 80 percent or 90 percent of the public."

---

12 "PBS is #1 in Public Trust," PBS. http://www.pbs.org/about/news/archive/2012/pbs-most-trusted/

13 Karen Everhart, "Study Sees Growth if NPR Loosens Up, Sounds Less Elite," *Current*. http://www.current.org/audience/aud1017npr-opportunities.shtml

14 "Taking the Public Out of Public TV," Fair.org. http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=4178

> We need to come to terms with a much higher sense of purpose, and reach for it. In this time when so many people across this nation are lost, are struggling, cannot make their mortgage payments or feed their children, we can bring inspiration. We can bring hope. We know how to do this. […] Let us energize them, let's energize the politicians and make it our mission to reach all of America — truly. That is what our task is, that is our opportunity, and it is what is going to define the next 40 years of this institution. This is what is at stake. It is not to hold on to our 11 or 12 percent.[15]

We envision a future for public media that embraces this challenge by expanding the universe of nonprofit and noncommercial media. We envision a time in which our communities will be woven together by a network of diverse noncommercial projects that educate, inspire and engage people in civic life through art and media. This future is one in which public media are so much more than *Sesame Street*, Garrison Keillor and endless on-air fund drives.

We envision at least six key categories of organizations that would be included within this newly expanded public media sector:

- Public broadcasters: This group includes NPR stations, PBS stations and noncommercial satellite broadcasters like Link TV or Free Speech TV.

- Community media: These include noncommercial radio stations owned by local nonprofits such as community groups, churches or schools, as well as PEG television channels and the emerging nonprofit Web-based journalism projects.

- Independent producers: This includes filmmakers and producers in film, radio, print and digital multimedia such as the Independent Television Service (ITVS) and Association of Independents in Radio (AIR).

- Independent noncommercial publications and websites: This group includes journalism organizations and publications like *Colorlines*, *Mother Jones*, the *Christian Science Monitor*, *ProPublica* and *Orion Magazine*. Information media: This includes websites that aggregate and curate information and public data and interactive applications that are designed to inform and educate, such as civic engagement platforms like SeeClickFix or Localocracy.

- Capacity-building organizations: These organizations provide much-needed expertise, resources and analysis for the public media system. Examples include: the National Federation of Community Broadcasters, the National Center for Media Engagement, the Investigative News Network, Public Media Corps and the Minority Media Consortia.

Each type of organization brings vital and complementary skills, expertise and infrastructure into the public media world. This vision of the future would take a concept like the CPB's Local Journalism Centers to another level. Partnerships across this larger noncommercial media system would bring together a broad range of services to enable participating organizations to assess and address their communities' information needs collectively.

Part Five: Building a New Public Media Network

In this networked age, our public media system can no longer be about one-way communication. It must help build interconnection between platforms and people.

Ellen Goodman and Anne Chen offer a framework for rethinking public media, which can also serve as a jumping-off point to restructuring public media policy. Goodman and Chen argue that public media is locked into 20th-century technology and infrastructure in the face of a 21st-century digital media world. In response, they propose "a layered model of public media that maps onto the realities and capabilities of digital networks."[16]

---

[15] Sue Schardt, "To Serve All the Public?" *Current*. http://www.current.org/audience/aud1105schardt

[16] Ellen Goodman and Anne Chen, "Modeling Policy for New Public Media Networks," *Harvard Journal of Law and Technology*, vol. 24, no. 1, page 111, fall 2010.

While public media policy has traditionally been structured around specific platforms — specifically radio and television stations — Goodman and Chen call for a "functions"-based approach. They outline four core functions of a networked public media: infrastructure, creation, curation and connection. Goodman and Chen acknowledge that there is both an "expanding array of public service media genres" and an "expanding array of public service media practitioners." They offer two big-picture policy recommendations:

- The need to shift from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to a new "Corporation for Public Service Media"
- The need to create interconnectedness across the system

By restructuring our public media policy framework around infrastructure, creation, curation and connection, we open up space for new organizations and foster new connections between media makers and communities. In what follows, we build on Goodman and Chen's recommendations to examine more deeply the policies and politics such a transition would demand.

a. Infrastructure

A primary goal of the Public Broadcasting Act was the creation of broadcasting facilities that could reach every corner of the nation. The Act itself put as much emphasis on the development of this network of stations as it did on the creation of programming.[17] Public broadcasting has had great success in the last 40 years in creating a national network of interconnected stations that reaches almost all of the country's households. But as the media landscape shifts, the time has come to build a network for the 21st century.

Broadband connections are now the most important means by which public media institutions can connect to each other. Stations and independent producers rely on the Internet to produce, promote and distribute their content. Public broadcasting station websites are heavily trafficked, and mobile applications, like the Public Radio Player by PRX, are used by more than 4 million people to access public media content from hundreds of stations and producers.

Still, the nation's broadband infrastructure is lagging, with nearly 30 percent of the U.S. stuck on the wrong side of the digital divide.[18] Without the ability to connect to online content and resources, individuals, institutions and communities are missing out on the full potential of public and community media.

Goodman and Chen argue that this infrastructure piece is vital not only to helping push forward with a new era of digital public media, but also for broadening what counts as public media:

> What is needed is an explicit recognition in policy that the public service media infrastructure layer can and should involve many entities contributing transmission capacity and interconnecting with each other. These entities need have nothing to do with the creation of public service media content or the other functions in the public service media network.[19]

New policies and funding that support and connect public media and community anchor institutions (hospitals, libraries, community colleges, museums, municipal enterprises and other nonprofit institutions that are rooted in local communities) will bolster the ability for stations, independent producers and other organizations to fulfill their public service missions. There is also a need to fold other infrastructure projects under the jurisdiction of a newly mandated Corporation for Public Media.

The now-defunded Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP) was designed to help build and strengthen the physical infrastructure of public broadcasting. With the loss of that funding, we need new investment to help develop the next generation of public service communications infrastructure. In place of PTFP, we should establish a new fund within a Corporation for Public Media that goes beyond building stations to building networks.

---

[17] 47 U.S.C. § 396 (g)(1)(B).

[18] "Exploring the Digital Nation: Computer and Internet Use at Home," NTIA, November 2011. http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/exploring_the_digital_nation_computer_and_internet_use_at_home_11092011.pdf

[19] Goodman and Chen, page 136.

This funding would help support concrete infrastructure as well as platforms like the Public Radio Exchange and the Public Media Platform, a unified API for noncommercial media. We need to develop this new digital backbone quickly and help prepare stations to leverage these tools. In addition, we must address digital public media more meaningfully in policy debates on such topics as the National Broadband Plan, spectrum auctions, reform of the Universal Service Fund and the establishment of strong Net Neutrality protections.

b. Content Creation

Infrastructure is nothing without content. There is no need to build the roads if we don't have the cars. Even in this age of Twitter and Facebook, of user-generated content and crowd-sourcing, the founding congressional mandate for public media remains relevant. Specifically, Congress declared:

> It furthers the general welfare to encourage public telecommunications services which will be responsive to the interests of people both in particular localities and throughout the United States, which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence, and which will constitute a source of alternative telecommunications services for all the citizens of the Nation.[20]

As in the founding days of public broadcasting, the need for quality journalism, arts programming and educational content is acute. But such content should thrive across platforms. The challenge is to reimagine public media in ways that help it meet that "expression of diversity" while understanding that diversity must include a range of topics, types and modes of production.

This isn't the first time groups have called for such a shift. In the late 1980s, independent producers organized a campaign that would eventually lead to the establishment of the Independent Television Service (ITVS) as a new funding stream within the CPB. Producers argued that PBS was not doing enough to provide space for independent voices, was not covering vital social issues and was not fully serving diverse communities. In short, they argued that public media was not meeting its mandate or its full potential, and, in the process, they began to expand the policy definition of what constitutes public media, creating a new fund for independent producers.
We are at a similar moment now. Public broadcasters are launching admirable efforts like the Local Journalism Centers, Project Argo and Localore to adapt to the new media and information environment. But the growing information needs of communities and commercial media's declining investment in newsrooms are outpacing what public broadcasters can do alone. We need to continue to fund traditional public broadcasting and encourage its transition from a one-way broadcast model to a multi-directional, multi-platform, networked model.

At the same time, we should also fund new kinds of content from trustworthy noncommercial journalism, arts and educational organizations that are expanding the definition of public service media. A study of the winners of the Chicago Community Trust's Local Reporting Awards found that "non-traditional providers bring quality and dimension to community news," and that these other news and information sources provided "diverse voices and nuanced perspectives." The report's authors suggested that "partnerships of professionals and non-traditional information providers hold promise for local community news."[21]

When the CPB was established, a key focus was the development of programming "that involves creative risks and that addresses the needs of unserved and underserved audiences, particularly children and minorities." We have to understand that in the digital age, "programming" refers to both the content on our screens and the code within our applications and websites.

[20] 47 U.S.C. § 396(a)(5)

[21] Michele McLellan, "Non-Traditional Providers Bring Quality and Dimension to Community News," Knight Digital Media Center, June 2012. http://www.knightdigitalmediacenter.org/leadership_blog/comments/20120619_non-traditional_actors_bring_quality_and_dimension_to_community_ne/

The snapshots at the start of this paper offer a few examples of what new public media content might look like. There are others:

- Community media centers are combining locally produced public affairs programming with live community conversations and in-depth media and digital literacy projects. (See Cambridge Community TV in Massachusetts.)

- Nonprofit journalism websites are organizing crowd-sourced citizen reporting efforts and helping communities keep watch over how local governments spend stimulus dollars. (See *ProPublica*.)

- Web platforms give communities concrete tools to better engage their local government through journalism, civic engagement and dialogue. (SeeClickFix and Localocracy.)

- Multilingual blogs launched through partnerships between journalism schools and local nonprofits report on key issues of community concern in the language of those communities. (See Alhambra Source.)

- Programs send AmeriCorps volunteers into information anchor institutions (schools, libraries, public media organizations) to develop digital infrastructure and engagement and expand service to the community. (See the Public Media Corps and the Transmission Project's Digital Arts Service Corps.)

These are not just different business models designed to create the same content or outcomes in communities. These organizations share a mission to reconstruct the public square in America both online and offline but approach that mission in diverse ways. Public broadcasting has embraced innovation in many ways, but there is still a long way to go. And we should not assume that innovation must come from within the system. As new models emerge, we need policies and systems that can recognize their value as public media and help ensure their survival.

c. Curation

The pace and speed of media creation, distribution and consumption requires better aggregation and curation of public media content. Such an approach will add context and help communities use the information therein. With their strong national organizations, network of local stations and rich archival content, public media are well suited to help aggregate, organize and contextualize the flood of information we face. Public media are also well positioned to connect communities across the nation through relevant information, conversation and stories.

There are a few good examples of this work going on right now:

- The American Archive, CPB's project with the Library of Congress, is an ambitious effort to locate, digitize and store all of public media's content from the last 40 years.

- Public Radio Exchange and others have built an online marketplace of data-rich searchable programming for independent public media producers.

- Economy Story was a collaboration that collected all the reporting public media did on the economic crisis into one central Web portal.

- Project Argo and the Local Journalism Centers are both efforts to foster multiplatform news at the local level that can be curated and distributed nationally.

Outside of traditional public broadcasting, *Mother Jones* has been creating in-depth "explainer" pages for topics like the Arab Spring and the Fukushima nuclear crisis. The Center for Investigative Reporting is working with the Investigative News Network to launch a YouTube channel that curates the best investigative video journalism from across the Web. And *ProPublica* launched "Muckreads" to curate watchdog reporting.

As the tools of content creation are increasingly democratized, and as more and more government data becomes available, we'll need a new era of projects that help connect content and add meaningful context to the vast flow of information. At many local community media stations and hyper-local journalism startups, content production is lively, but delivery and cataloging are lacking due to financial and systemic constraints. New support specifically earmarked for projects that help facilitate online development and pay for editorial staff is a necessary component of funding reforms that would help broaden the range of organizations and content within public media.

d. Connection

"Community engagement" has become a buzzword within journalism as newsrooms have realized that their survival depends on having a community of people who are deeply invested in their product. Public broadcasters realized this long ago and are ahead of the curve in thinking about how to interact with their audiences. However, the new media environment and the public's information demands force us to expand beyond traditional notions of community engagement. Public and community media need tools, training and technical assistance to assess their impact and meet their mission of connecting and serving local communities.

The more engaged a public media institution is with the community it serves, the better that institution will be at fulfilling its mission. Community engagement takes resources plus smart strategy and outreach efforts. As public media moves away from the "hub-and-spoke" model of broadcasting stations to a more decentralized and nodal network, projects like these will be critical. Building long-term relationships between public media institutions and their communities is hard work and takes time, but it is essential if public media are to transition from merely providing information to becoming civic institutions. Such an effort will improve the service to the local community and help ensure the survival and support of noncommercial media.

Community building and community engagement can take many forms. Here are a few success stories:

- In 2011, as Chicago prepared to elect a new mayor for the first time in many years, Chicago Public Media put out a call to local residents for the issues they thought the new mayor should know about, address or at least consider as he took office. They worked with a network of nonprofit partners to surface powerful stories and gave local voices primetime spots on the radio and in video on the Web.

- KETC in St. Louis featured profiles of local community members to put a face on the mortgage crisis and developed an in-depth series of partnerships with local organizations to "connect people at risk of foreclosure to the resources they need."

- The National Black Programming Consortia created the Public Media Corps to train a team of community leaders to encourage broadband adoption in Washington, D.C. high schools, public broadcasting stations and other community anchor institutions like hospitals and libraries.

The acquisition of the nonprofit crowd-funding journalism platform Spot.Us by American Public Media signals how closely connected traditional public media and new noncommercial media makers can be. However, we cannot expect, nor should we desire, that every exciting nonprofit media organization should have to be subsumed by a public radio or TV station to access federal support.

Traditionally these efforts have received support from a patchwork of disparate sources including the CPB; agencies like the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Department of Education; and a range of foundations and corporate underwriters. While this kind of piecemeal approach may work for stations and organizations with strong and sizable development and events staff, for most organizations this is a challenge.

New funding would go to projects that enable the public to better connect to public media. Beyond supporting specific projects, this funding would also support important training. It would allow organizations to get technical assistance from the National Center for Media Engagement, which helps stations better locate, understand and respond to community needs. It would also allow stations to work with organizations like the Public Media Corps, which focuses on connecting people of color, low-income communities and seniors to broadband and public media services.

Part Six: Testing Ideas, Moving Ahead

Among leading democracies, the United States is unique in that so much of its media is commercial. And thus far, much of that media has not served the public well.

At the same time, we face unprecedented challenges across the noncommercial media sector: threats in Congress targeting NPR and PBS, state budget cuts pinching local stations, rising postal rates and broadband costs squeezing print and online news organizations, and more. Only by understanding the shared stakes we all have in the future of noncommercial media will we be able to come together to fight back against these challenges and envision a better future.

Enacting any of the proposals outlined in this paper will require reforms at just about every level: in Congress, at the FCC and within the CPB. We suggest increased collaboration with the NEA and NEH and recognize that additional research is needed on how inter-agency collaboration might work. Additionally, expanded coordination across all the government agencies that are loosely connected to public media (e.g., the National Science Foundation, the FCC, the Department of Education, etc.) is needed.

The framework we have outlined here is only a guide, and there is still a lot of work ahead to discuss, debate and deepen these ideas. Within these broad categories is incredible nuance regarding how new funding guidelines and eligibility requirements would be operationalized.

Important factors that could help reshape how we think about what is eligible for federal funding include:

- How does a project promote and deepen community engagement?
- What local information does a project provide?
- What civic needs does a project meet?
- What kind of capacity exists for communities/organizations to support and sustain a project?
- Are there reasons to pursue public funding instead of private money?
- Does the project or organization create content with and for diverse communities?
- Does the project or organization have a life beyond the node (station/organization) and serve the network at large?
- Will the project or organization expand the diversity of viewpoints in public media?

This is only a partial list. Other categories and questions should be included in a rubric that is more inclusive and forward-looking. That is a discussion that should engage communities and media makers both inside and outside the system. A series of interviews and convenings with stakeholders would help determine the degree of support for these concepts across the traditional public broadcasting community and with community and independent media institutions. That process, in and of itself, would be an opportunity to educate lawmakers and the public about the role and variety of public service media in the U.S.

In the end, these proposals are not only about expanding and diversifying the public media system, but also about expanding the public media community. Public media makers of all stripes will be best served by working together across platforms, focusing on new functions and not old structures to meet our democracy's needs. Creating space and developing support for new public service-oriented media and journalism organizations will also expand the stakeholders and build a new coalition of support for noncommercial media.

After all, this is as much about public media's success as its survival. There is no sign that political attacks on public media will subside in the near term. But by expanding our public media networks and aligning with our neighbors we can stand up to those attacks — and thrive.

* * *

Appendix One: Public Media Funding Today

Part One: Current Funding Structures and Guidelines — Who Funds What, Where, When and How

To achieve an expanded vision for public media we'll need to address and revise both federal legislation and the internal policies at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. To better identify what changes are needed, it's important to understand the complex network of current funding streams and the complicated eligibility requirements that undergird and define the public broadcasting system.

The Communications Act governs the funding of public broadcasting, and CPB serves as the "steward of the government's investment in public broadcasting." Acting as the fiscal agent for the yearly appropriations from Congress, CPB distributes funding to national organizations like NPR and PBS as well as to more than a thousand local stations. The majority of the funding for stations comes in the form of community service grants that support station operations and programming.

In addition to directly funding programs, CPB also provides support for the National Minority Consortia groups (which include the Center for Asian American Media, the National Black Programming Consortium, Native American Public Telecommunications, Pacific Islanders in Communications and Latino Public Broadcasting). Many of these organizations fund programming that is relevant to their communities, but they also provide training and support for public media makers.

Public broadcasters also receive taxpayer dollars through other federal sources. Until recently, a key source of that support was the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program (PTFP), funding for which was eliminated during the 2011 budget debates. PTFP was a matching-grant program administered by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), a federal agency within the Department of Commerce. The program allowed existing broadcasters and would-be broadcasters to apply for matching funds (planning grants) to support the planning of new broadcast stations or capital funds for the construction of new facilities and the maintenance of existing ones (construction grants). PTFP funding was available to public broadcasting stations, state and local governments, native tribes and nonprofit organizations.

Before PTFP's defunding, its grant programs were the only substantial capital funding to public media organizations. The program funded a wide variety of broadcast projects both inside and outside the domain of traditional NPR and PBS stations.

For example, it funded construction of new LPFM or noncommercial educational radio stations, NPR stations' conversion to digital signals, and updates to studio equipment for PEG facilities. The construction grant provided up to 75 percent funding for capital projects; the grantee had to raise the remaining money as matching funds. The equipment necessary to broadcast on radio or television is extremely costly, and in most cases full local funding for this equipment is difficult to secure.

PTFP planning grants were similarly unique. They were one of the only sources of funding communities could use to assess the feasibility of new public media projects. Like CPB funding, PTFP funds were linked to the budget and appropriations battles and were under constant threat. Despite its legacy of helping public broadcasting reach almost 100 percent of the U.S. — and despite the ongoing needs of both new and current stations — PTFP has been lost for the foreseeable future.

This shift has come at a critical moment. In 2007, the FCC closed what is likely the last major opportunity for full-power, noncommercial stations to be licensed. Many of those new community broadcasters were counting on PTFP funds to build out their stations. We will need to develop a new version of the PFTP program for the digital age so that we can expand the range of media outlets served and ensure that we don't squander these important new full-power licenses.

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) are two other key federal funding streams for public broadcasting. The NEA provides funding for radio and television arts programs intended for national broadcast. Grants administered through the "Arts on Radio and Television" program generally range from $10,000 to $200,000. The NEH offers two grants that support media projects in the humanities. The first, a development grant, enables media producers to collaborate with scholars to develop content

and prepare programs for production. The second, a production grant, supports the preparation of a program for distribution. The NEH funds radio, television and digital technology projects through the "America's Media Makers" grant. And the Department of Education's "Ready to Learn" program supports the development of early educational programming for preschool and early elementary-age children and their families. All of these programs came under attack in the most recent round of budget battles, illustrating the tenuous nature of public broadcasting funding as it is currently structured.

A more robust future for public media will require better collaboration and communication among government agencies. The current piecemeal approach leaves too much room for error, overlap or gaps in what is funded, and it doesn't leverage our combined federal resources. Facilitating the evolution of the CPB into a broader Corporation for Public Media would allow funding to be centralized. Funding could then be managed to avoid duplication and better confront the threat of dangerous program cuts.

Part Two: Funding Criteria and Eligibility

a. Legislative Guidelines

Outdated policy frameworks have limited CPB's ability to support a greater diversity of people, platforms and projects outside the realm of traditional public broadcasters.

The Communications Act outlines five specific elements that stations must have in place to qualify for CPB funding:

1. Open meetings
2. Financial disclosures
3. Community advisory boards
4. Equal employment opportunity compliance
5. Donor list and political activities requirements[22]

The CPB requires that all station-grant recipients certify continued compliance with these requirements. While the CPB does not provide legal counsel on these five elements, it has issued interpretations of each requirement to help guide stations.

These requirements are designed to make public broadcasters more transparent and accountable to local communities. However, the effectiveness and enforceability of many of these measures are questionable. Many stations are not in compliance with at least one of the Communications Act's requirements.[23]

The two biggest areas of noncompliance concern the open meeting requirement and the community advisory board requirement. It's worth noting that community engagement and accessibility happen to be areas in which community media and online journalism organizations have developed significant expertise. As public broadcasting adapts to a media age based on interactivity and seeks to broaden its base to rally more support for its work, these issues are critical to address.

CPB-funded stations must also comply with a series of other requirements. Stations with five or more employees are required to file statistical reports with the CPB that list all job openings and the race and gender of each employee. Stations are also required to meet financial disclosure requirements by providing public access to annual audits filed with the CPB, and when applying for grants, they must provide additional financial data.[24] Finally, to remain eligible for CPB funding, stations are prohibited from engaging in the rental, exchange or sale of station membership or donor lists to political candidates, political parties or political committees.[25]

---

[22] 47 U.S.C. § 396(k)

[23] See Office of the Inspector General reports: http://www.cpb.org/oig/reports/

[24] 47 U.S.C. § 396(k)(5).

[25] 47 U.S.C. § 396(12).

b. Corporation for Public Broadcasting Guidelines

Once a station has met the minimum requirements for funding as set forth in the Communications Act, it must also meet a series of internal criteria to receive CPB Community Service Grants. Community Service Grants (CSGs) represent the primary grant program within the CPB and account for much of the money that supports stations. CSGs provide public television and radio stations the opportunity to secure funding for operations and programming. Though eligibility requirements between radio and television differ slightly, the basic requirements for each are the same.

First, an applicant must be licensed with the FCC as a noncommercial radio or television broadcaster. For radio, only full-power noncommercial educational stations are eligible for funding. This leaves out Low Power FM radio stations, which are under 100 watts and have a broadcast radius of approximately three to ten miles, making them inherently local and rooted in communities. Stations that are managed and operated by and for students are also ineligible, meaning that most college radio stations are excluded from the sphere of public media. Stations that provide "in-service training programming to licensee employees or representatives" and stations licensed to political organizations are also ineligible for CSGs.[26] Additional hurdles exist for newcomers since the CSG program can admit only a limited number of new applicants each year.

The substantial majority of programming broadcast on these radio stations must also be CPB-qualified programming, which means it must serve demonstrated community needs of an educational, informational and cultural nature. Programming cannot be devoted to promoting the principles of a particular political or religious philosophy or be designed for in-school or professional in-service audiences. Stations must also air at least 18 consecutive daily hours of programming 365 days a year.

Requirements for local programming are vague at best: "The grantee originates a significant, locally originated program service designed to educate and serve its community of license."[27] Minimum requirements for station facilities (stations must be "sufficient, professionally equipped on-air and production facilities") are equally vague. Radio stations also must meet certain criteria for the number of full-time employees; requirements vary depending on the population density of each station's broadcast-coverage area. When a station is the only one in a given region it is eligible for more funding than stations that overlap with others. Stations serving minority audiences are also eligible for additional funding, provided they meet specific requirements.

CSG requirements also have minimum criteria for Non-Federal Financial Support (NFFS) and Audience Service Criteria (ASC). These also vary depending on population density. NFFS refers to a minimum amount of funds that a station must raise outside of support that comes from CSGs. The ASC requirements are based on a complex combination of Arbitron listenership data and financial support from the community (defined as foundations and nonprofits, businesses, memberships and other station-fundraising activities). Stations that fail to meet the ASC have their CSGs reduced over a period of four years before they are removed from the program altogether by year five.

Once a station receives its CSG, it is free to spend it on any of the following seven categories:

1. Programming, production and services
2. Broadcasting, transmission and distribution
3. Program information and promotion
4. Fundraising and membership development
5. Underwriting and grant solicitation
6. Management and general operations
7. Purchase, rehabilitation or improvement of capital assets

CPB mandates that 26 percent of the CSG be spent on national program production and acquisition. These are membership fees to NPR and other groups like Public Radio International, American Public Media and Pacifica Program Service.

[26] Corporation for Public Broadcasting FY2011 Radio Community Service Grant General Provisions & Eligibility Criteria.

[27] Ibid

For television, CSG criteria account for the broadcast range of stations and discount grants for overlapping signals. Incentive grants are available for stations providing non-duplicative programming in multi-provider markets. TV stations must meet criteria for broadcasting schedules, employment requirements and minimum NFFS and use the grants for the same purposes as radio stations. However, television stations do not have to meet ASC requirements.

There is room for reform within the CSG process itself. While some admirable incentives and priorities are written into the policy, the high barrier to entry, the emphasis on NFFS, and the limited benchmarks for measuring actual audience service pose barriers to engaging a broader public media community. In addition, by limiting CPB funds to stations with existing broadcast licenses, these policies exclude a broad array of digital and print projects that otherwise embody all the essential elements of public media.

By law, the CSG program has to undergo periodic reviews. However, addressing the broader legislative issues regarding funding structures at CPB may necessitate a longer process and would require amending or reauthorizing the Communications Act to distribute the funds more broadly. In addition, it may be necessary to develop new funding mechanisms outside the "one-size-fits-all" CSG program.

Once funds are no longer tethered exclusively to broadcasting stations, the possibilities for a diverse multi-platform world-class public media system come into clearer focus. However, even without these barriers there is still a need to define a new framework for public media funding to guide the Corporation for Public Media into the future. That is no simple task.

Appendix Two: Community/Public Media Collaboration, an excerpt from *New Public Media: A Plan for Action*

The next generation of public broadcasting stations will bring together students, journalists, community media producers, local businesses and other people and organizations in pursuit of information. They will serve as a community hub — a space for training and for the production and distribution of news, information and programming on numerous platforms (radio, television, print, Web, mobile, etc.). This is part and parcel of the vision of a new public media system that is fully funded, more responsive to communities, networked and participatory. But fulfilling this role requires reimagining the mission of local stations.

Expanding and adapting to the changing media landscape also means that traditional public broadcasters will need to engage and collaborate with the broad, diverse and innovative world of individuals, organizations and institutions creating noncommercial media with a public service mission. Community and Low Power FM radio stations are owned and operated by local nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit journalism startups are springing up around the country. We need to start thinking of these outlets as public media, too.

Consider what public broadcasters might learn from the experience of local public access television centers, some of the only remaining media institutions that open their doors to members of the community. Colin Rhinesmith, community media and technology manager for Cambridge Community Television in Massachusetts, explains that community media — and public access television centers in particular — "have worked with communities to provide ways for citizens to engage in civic life and strengthen their communities through media for over 30 years."[28]

Collaboration between public service media organizations can create mutually beneficial results. Minnesota's St. Paul Neighborhood Network (SPNN) has a decade-long partnership with two local public broadcasters. Pioneer Public Television, a rural broadcaster, uses SPNN's production facilities in St. Paul and co-produces a weekly call-in program, *Your Legislators*, during the state's legislative sessions.

Programming focused on state government is scarce in today's media landscape, with many newspapers shuttering statehouse bureaus or cutting back on reporting.[29] Pioneer Public Television pays a production fee to SPNN and SPNN in turn distributes the programming to cable subscribers in its network and to others in the metropolitan area. Mike Wassenaar of SPNN explains:

> This is an example of the complementary relationship that could be possible between television stations, which do not have production capacity but have distribution capacity, and community television centers, which have production capacity. Pioneer gathers sponsorship dollars for the production and pays our facility a fee for service. Both entities benefit from the relationship.[30]

SPNN also partners with Twin Cities Public Television (TPT) in a "distribution" and "community training" collaboration. TPT has distributed SPNN programming on its network since the mid-1990s. The shows have been mostly cultural or ethnic programs, which Wassenaar says serve the missions of both SPNN and TPT and have helped extend their content's reach and impact. And as TPT has begun working to increase its locally produced content, it has partnered with many producers who have been trained at SPNN. "TPT needs to ensure technical quality of its programming and relies upon our ability to train community members," Wassenaar explains. "In a similar fashion, we have been an outreach partner for them to get programming from refugee and immigrant communities with whom they do not have a relationship."

---

[28] Colin Rhinesmith, "It's Time for Public Media Makers to Collaborate," NewPublicMedia.org, April 8, 2010.

[29] Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism, *State of the News Media 2010*.

[30] Candace Clement, interview with Mike Wassenaar, April 16, 2010.

These collaborations serve the interests of both public broadcasters and community access centers. There are, however, some significant drawbacks. Wassenaar says:

> In all these situations, either where we are producing content for the public broadcaster or we are training community members who produce content at our facilities for the public broadcaster, no producers gets paid. The broadcaster is doing a distribution agreement in which they say it should be enough for producers that they are getting distribution. This creates an unsustainable situation, especially for community producers in ethnic groups who are non-professionals or semi-professionals. Many of these people have other jobs, and doing this work for the good of their ethnic communities and for the community as a whole, and donate their time and resources and do private fundraising for their productions.[31]

Wassenaar says fair payment for public media makers is important, and volunteer work can go only so far:

> Remuneration for the worth this programming brings to the broadcaster should happen somehow, especially if the goal of diversifying production communities is taken seriously. And in just about all cases, these producers do not travel in the PBS/ITVS production community circles, and do not have the resources to tap into these existing funding streams. Micro-grant mechanisms, even the ability for us to distribute $1,500–$5,000 to producers for this kind of work, would do wonders for their production capacity.[32]

If public media organizations are committed to diversifying their content and their staff, they will need to ensure that funds are available to the individuals and organizations that help them to reach these goals.

[31] Candace Clement, interview with Mike Wassenaar, April 16, 2010.

[32] Ibid.

freepress
www.freepress.net

Free Press is a nonpartisan organization building a nationwide movement for media that serve the public interest. Free Press advocates for universal and affordable Internet access, diverse media ownership, vibrant public media and quality journalism. For more information, visit www.freepress.net.

Massachusetts Office
40 Main St., Suite 301
Florence, MA 01062
877.888.1533

Washington Office
1025 Connecticut Ave. NW
Suite 1110
Washington, D.C. 20036
202.265.1490