

**FINAL REPORT OF THE NASW CONSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW AD HOC COMMITTEE
MAY 16, 2016**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The NASW Constitutional Review Ad Hoc Committee was asked to explore likely impacts and put forward recommendations regarding a proposed constitutional change that would extend eligibility to serve as an NASW officer to any regular member. During our investigation it became clear that the charge to this committee was perhaps too narrow, and that the petition to change the constitution likely reflects wider issues that should be considered in tandem with the question of whether to change the constitution to allow any member to be an officer of NASW.

The NASW membership is a heterogeneous group that includes a mix of journalists, public information officers (PIOs), and many science writers that do not identify as either. This diversity is critical to the issue at hand because a majority of responding members say they agree with the proposed change, but support for the measure varies widely among different subsets of members. The below analysis indicates that passing the proposed amendment may significantly alter the composition of NASW's membership, with staff journalists representing a likely fulcrum of that change. The current discourse also brings to the forefront profound divides and disconnects between segments of NASW's membership, though in spite of the challenges the majority of members say they find value in the mixed composition of the organization.

The issues underlying the proposed amendment point toward deeper questions of organizational identity about who NASW represents and what it aims to accomplish. These questions are unlikely to be satisfactorily addressed by changing the rules for officer eligibility. The committee recommends that the board should undertake more detailed inquiries that seek to get to the root of the discontent that gave rise to the proposed constitutional amendment and explore other changes within the organization that may address these grievances more effectively than changing eligibility for executive officer positions and without negatively impacting membership.

INTRODUCTION

Since its incorporation in 1955, the National Association of Science Writers' mission has been to "foster the dissemination of accurate information regarding science through all media normally devoted to informing the public." The society's purpose was always to support accurate and professional science writing. From its earliest days, the organization included journalists and other science writers, including public information officers for universities and government

agencies, book authors, educators, and others. Initially there were two classes of membership used to distinguish between journalist and non-journalist members.

Over time, the perceived inequity of these membership levels became the topic of frequent, and sometimes contentious, discussion at annual meetings and other forums. In 1998, after a great deal of thought and discussion, the organization adopted a compromise position. The membership voted to abolish membership classes and allow non-journalists to be full members, including eligibility to serve on the executive board, but not officers. The positions of President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer remained open only to journalists.

Currently, the NASW constitution requires that “a substantial majority of an officer’s science-writing activities shall be journalism. Officers may not write press releases or otherwise act on behalf of an institution or company to affect media coverage while they serve in office.” In October 2015, members of NASW petitioned the board to consider amending the constitution to allow any NASW regular member, including public information officers and others who primarily work outside of journalism, to be eligible to serve as an officer. This amendment, unless withdrawn by the submitter, must be voted on at the next annual meeting (Fall 2016).

NASW President Robin Henig formed the NASW Constitutional Review Ad Hoc Committee to study the likely outcomes of NASW adopting this constitutional change and put forward recommendations. The committee includes: Siri Carpenter (Freelance); Douglas Fox (Freelance); Robert Lee Hotz (*Wall Street Journal*); A’ndrea Messer (Penn State); Jill Sakai (University of Wisconsin–Madison); and Nidhi Subbaraman (*BuzzFeed News*).

The Ad Hoc Committee has collected a wide variety of quantitative and qualitative data on this issue, as described below. In this report, we present the results of our analyses and make recommendations to the board.

WHAT WE DID

Our first task was to seek feedback from NASW members about the proposed amendment. We did this by constructing a survey (see Appendix 3) with several goals. Among them:

- To determine with a high resolution the job positions and duties that NASW members have.
- To allow NASW members to express their agreement or disagreement with the proposed amendment itself and to share what effects its adoption would likely have on them.
- To establish what value members derive from being part of a group that includes writers of various stripes (including journalists, textbook authors, university public information officers, government press officers, and others).

The survey was hosted and distributed using the web-based tool Survey Monkey, and was made available for 21 days. Additionally, NASW members were invited to email the committee

at adhoc2016@nasw.org with more detailed or open-ended responses to the proposed amendment.

Committee members used analysis tools in Survey Monkey and Excel to analyze the data at a fine level.

Because there is substantial precedent to this proposal (most pertinently the decision in 1998 to establish a single category of membership but restrict officer positions to journalists) and because NASW lacks a formal history, we invited all contactable past presidents of NASW to share their views on the proposed change. They were also encouraged to share recollections of their time in office—including any instances in which they encountered relevant tensions between members with different kinds of job descriptions. Our goal was to trace the evolution of the organization, learn what its core values are, and understand the history of the issue at hand.

The committee also queried groups beyond NASW. We contacted about 15 prominent publications and asked if their editorial ethics policies would pose a conflict of interest for members who wrote for those outlets as staff or freelance writers, if the proposed NASW constitutional amendment is passed. This list included print and digital publications, newspapers and magazines, and broadcast outlets.

We also emailed board members or presidents of other journalist groups that share members with NASW and are frequent collaborators. We asked if NASW adopting the proposed amendment would alter their organizations' existing relationship with NASW or prevent them from collaborating with NASW on events that would benefit the groups' mutual members.

Finally, we sought to understand if the proposed amendment could result in NASW being disqualified from receiving funding from the Authors Coalition of America, a key funder of this organization. In particular, our goal was to determine if and to what extent a potential departure of members—journalists or public information officers—would affect NASW's eligibility to receive funds from this source.

OUR FINDINGS

Survey results

We sent 2,670 invitations on March 1, 2016, to all NASW members (including those who had not yet renewed for 2016), with reminders on March 17 and March 21 to those who had not yet responded.

- 1,738 people opened the invitation; of those, 828 clicked through.
- 718 people started the survey, and 658 people completed it. The overall response rate was 24.6%.

NASW membership and meeting attendance

- About 70% of people who responded to the survey have been members of NASW for at least five years; about 33% have been members for at least 15 years.
- About 61% of respondents have attended at least one ScienceWriters meeting in the last five years; 21% have attended at least three meetings.
 - This overall attendance rate represents a larger proportion of people who have attended at least three meetings than was reported in the latest full NASW membership survey (13%) and suggests that respondents to this survey represent a subpopulation of NASW with higher levels of engagement.

Self-identification

718 people answered the question “Which label or labels would you use to identify yourself?” Response options were limited to “Journalist,” “Public information officer or other media relations professional [PIO],” and “Other.” Respondents could select as many options as they wanted.

- 416 people (58%) label themselves as journalists.
 - Of these, 278 (67%) label themselves *only* as journalists.
 - 61 (16%) also self-identify as PIOs.
 - 138 (33%) also label themselves as PIOs, “Other,” or both.
- 120 people (17%) label themselves *only* as PIOs.
- 155 people (22%) label themselves *only* as “Other.”

The fact that such a large number of NASW members label themselves as “Other” indicates that many members do not think of themselves as either journalists or PIOs. How *do* they label themselves? The most common identities people supplied in the open-ended field accompanying the “Other” option were “writer” and “science writer.” Other frequently used labels included: author, blogger, consultant, educator, scientist, outreach, editor, medical writer, freelance, retired curriculum/educational writer, communicator, feature or non-news writer, contract writer, student, and technical writer.

Job duties

In addition to asking respondents to indicate what label or labels they use to identify themselves, the survey asked them to indicate what kinds of work their job duties include. A subset of the response options included:

- Writing/editing text or producing multimedia materials in a journalistic role for print, online, or broadcast media outlets
- Writing/editing for university/alumni or scientific society magazines
- Writing/editing for industry-funded trade magazines
- Writing/editing/producing publicly available news articles, blog posts, or multimedia materials for an institution such as universities, research institutes or centers, scientific societies, nonprofit organizations, museums, government agencies, advocacy organizations, or companies
- Writing non-public materials for an institution (such as annual reports, updates to donors, grants, internal reports)
- Acting on behalf of an institution to affect media coverage of that institution (e.g., writing/editing press releases, pitching stories to media, serving as a media liaison or doing media training of scientists, or disseminating public information following a newsworthy event on behalf of an institution)

Of journalists (n=416):

- 50% write/edit for an institution such as a university, research institute or center, scientific society, nonprofit organization, museum, government agency, advocacy organization, or company.
- 31% work for university, alum, or society magazines.
- 50% work on publicly available news stories or other materials for institutions
- 11% work on behalf of an institution to promote or affect coverage.
- 20% write materials within pharma/medical/other scientific arena such as journal papers, CME, meeting abstracts or posters, product materials, etc.

Of PIOs (n=212):

- 37% write/edit in a journalistic role for print, online, or broadcast media outlets.

Freelance versus staff

The survey asked people whether they are primarily freelance, staff, or both.

	Number of responses	Freelance	Staff	Staff + freelance
Journalists	416	62%	22%	16%
PIOs	212	20%	59%	21%
Other	275	64%	24%	15%

* Note: categories are not mutually exclusive.

- The overall breakdown of freelance versus staff in our sample was similar to that in the latest NASW membership survey.

Opinions about the proposed constitutional change

- Of 658 people who answered a question asking their opinion about changing the constitution to allow any regular member, including non-journalists, to serve as an officer, a majority agree or strongly agree with the proposed change. But support for the measure varies widely among different subsets of members.

	Number of responses	Disagree or strongly disagree	Agree or strongly agree	No opinion
All respondents	658	31	56	13
<i>By self-label:</i>				
Journalists **	381	42	43	15
non-PIO journalists	320	48	38	14
- freelance		50	35	15
- staff		44	42	14
PIOs **	201	11	79	10
Non-journalists **	277	14	74	12
<i>By freelance vs staff:</i>				
Freelance	332	38	43	19
Staff	222	23	64	13
Staff + regular freelance	104	25	65	10

* Note: categories are not mutually exclusive.

** Note: Throughout this report, the labels “journalist” and “PIO” reflect members’ self-identification in response to this question. “Non-journalists” include all respondents who self-identified as only PIO, only “Other,” or PIO and “Other.”

Effect on membership numbers

- 54 people (of 658 complete respondents, or about 8%) say they are likely or extremely likely to leave NASW if the proposed constitutional change is made.
 - 48 of these 54 people self-identify as journalists.
 - 13% of journalists and 2% of non-journalists indicate they are likely or extremely likely to leave if the proposed change is made.
- 25 people (4%) say they are likely or extremely likely to leave if the change is *not* made.

- 20 of these people are PIOs and 4 are journalists. One identifies as “Other.”

Effects on engagement and volunteerism

The survey asked people how the proposed constitutional change would likely affect their experiences in NASW or the science writing profession.

- Overall, more people report expected positive effects than negative effects if the proposed amendment passes.

	Expect positive effect	Expect negative effect
Likelihood of attending ScienceWriters meetings	18%	15%
Interest in serving NASW through committees or other work	26%	19%
Ability to advance career or develop skills	21%	9%
Sense of engagement in community	34%	18%
Belief that work is valued	36%	14%

- Here again, response distributions are notably different for journalists and non-journalists.
 - In general, more journalists expect negative impacts of the change and more non-journalists expect positive impacts of the change.
 - The largest reported effect is a positive impact on non-journalists’ beliefs that their work and viewpoints are valued. This is also one of the largest reported differences between journalists and non-journalists.

	Journalists		Non-Journalists	
	+ effect	- effect	+ effect	- effect
Likelihood of attending ScienceWriters meetings	10	22	30	5
Interest in serving NASW through committees or other work	14	28	43	6
Belief that work is valued	19	21	59	4

- The number of people who say that might leave NASW (n=54, or 8%) is considerably smaller than those who say they would respond negatively in other

- ways, such as being less likely to attend ScienceWriters meetings (n=95, or 15%) or to work on NASW committees (n=122, or 19%).
- The people who fall into at least one of these three negatively-responding groups (leave NASW; less likely to attend meetings; less likely to serve on committees) skew heavily toward journalists (combined staff/freelance). For example, 107 of 122 people less likely to participate in committees (the largest negatively responding group) are journalists. In sum, 31% of journalists say they will have one or more of these three responses if the proposed change is made, versus 6% of non-journalists.
 - The rate of negative reaction is highest among non-PIO *staff* journalists (n=118).
 - 24% of these staff journalists say they are likely to leave NASW if the proposed change is made.
 - 31% say they are less likely to attend meetings.
 - 42% say they are less likely to serve on committees.
 - 46% indicated at least one of the above.
- People who predict they will experience negative effects if the proposed change is adopted represent a highly engaged subset of the membership, as measured by the number of ScienceWriters meetings attended in the last five years (as we describe below, letters from former NASW presidents underscore this trend):
 - Among people who say they would be less likely to take part in committees (n=122), 39% have attended three or more of the last five meetings, compared to 21% of all respondents.
 - Among people who say they might leave NASW (n=54), 44% attended three or more of the last five meetings.
 - 59% (n=658) of people say that they find it either very valuable or extremely valuable to be part of an organization whose membership is a mixture of journalists and non-journalists. An additional 25% say the mixture is moderately valuable.
 - Breaking this down by self-label, the mixture is called very or extremely valuable by 43% of journalists and 81% of non-journalists.

Other findings

- We find it is extremely unlikely that the proposed change, if adopted, will negatively affect NASW's Authors Coalition funding. The number of people who would have to leave NASW for it to lose eligibility (on the basis of the "published author" count) vastly outnumbers the proportion of members who indicated they would do so if the amendment were passed.
- We find it unlikely that the proposed change, if adopted, would affect NASW's relationship with other journalistic organizations. Inquiries with the responsible parties at the Council for the Advancement of Science Writing, the World Federation of Science Journalists, and the Society of Environmental Journalists indicate that NASW's relationships with these organizations would be unaffected if the amendment is passed.
- Although we queried only a sample of the many journalistic outlets where NASW members publish, the belief that large numbers of journalists would be forced to leave NASW in order to continue their journalistic work seems likely to be unfounded. A survey of editorial and ethics guidelines at 12 publications in which NASW members frequently publish (538, *The Boston Globe*, *Buzzfeed*, *National Geographic*, *The New Yorker*,

NOVA, NPR, The New York Times, Scientific American, Slate, Vox, and Wired), reveals that none of these organizations has a policy, formal or informal, that would clearly prevent NASW members from working for or contributing to those publications if the proposed amendment is adopted; most have no policy that even remotely addresses this issue, and none has a policy that clearly indicates journalists could not continue working for those outlets if NASW adopted the proposed constitutional change.

Letters from past NASW presidents

A dozen former presidents of NASW, dating back to 1970, responded to the committee's request for comment on the proposed constitutional amendment (see Appendix 1 for the full text of these letters). As former officers, they collectively represent 96 years of volunteer service to the organization.

- Generally, the former presidents, who were all freelance or staff journalists when they served as officers, saw the restriction on officers issue more in terms of conflicts of interest, to avoid the influence of special interest, rather than as a prohibition aimed at a single professional category. They all saw the professional diversity of NASW as one of its core strengths, but noted that the effort to balance different professional values was by its nature bound to leave all groups in some measure unsatisfied. That said, they said that journalistic values have been the guiding principles of the organization since its inception, overriding otherwise irreconcilable professional differences.
- In summary, eight former presidents are opposed to the proposed amendment; two are in favor; and two have no opinion or are ambivalent about it. Four former presidents said they would resign their NASW membership if the constitutional change is adopted.

Letters from science writers

We received 39 letters, 38 from members and one from a non-member.

- The largest category of letters from members (14) expressed no clear preference for change or no change; some expressed not having strong feelings; others expressed uncertainty or ambivalence. The numbers of letter-writers who expressed support for and opposition to the proposed change were even, at 12 each.
- Most letters were thoughtful and direct. Some reflected inaccurate understandings of the question before the membership.
- Some letters suggested that the organization should be NASJ [National Association of Science Journalists] rather than NASW. There appears to be uneven understanding that the organization was originally formed to include all science writers.
- Letter-writers had varying, and sometimes inaccurate, perceptions of what PIOs do, what freelance writers/editors do and what constitutes journalism.
- Some letters suggested potential alternatives to the proposed amendment, such as allowing "not more than two officers (not including the President's seat) to be PIOs on the Executive Board" or having three Presidents, "representing each member group (staff journalists, PIOs, and freelancers) ... [with] important decisions made by a majority vote 2-1 among them."

- Two major themes run through many of the letters: the changing nature of science journalism/writing, and the problems of conflict of interest.
-

KEY INSIGHTS

The data this committee collected, particularly the survey responses, warrant further analysis. However, a number of key observations and interpretations can already be offered; these are listed below.

NASW is an organization composed of members engaged in a diverse range of science writing activities.

- Although much of the discussion surrounding the proposed amendment has focused on journalists and PIOs, 22% of members do not identify as belonging to either of these categories.
- Many NASW members perform multiple types of work, often including a mixture of journalistic and non-journalistic activities.
- NASW includes science writers with a very broad range of professional interests and needs.

The proposed change is unlikely to cause problems for NASW or its members due to ethics codes of other organizations and media outlets.

- NASW's ability to derive funding support from the Authors Coalition will not be impacted.
- Journalist members' ability to work for high-profile media outlets will not be impacted.
- NASW's formal relationships with other organizations, such as those underlying the 2017 World Conference meeting, will not be impacted.

The wide range of positive and negative responses to the proposed change reflect a profound lack of consensus among members about who we are as an organization.

- Are we a journalistic organization? Should we be? Are we "pretending" to be? Would allowing non-journalists to serve as officers mean we are not a journalistic organization? What constitutes a journalist? What constitutes a PIO? We observed great disagreement on all these questions.
- The rhetoric pervading discussion about the proposed constitutional change and our identity as an organization has been hurtful to many members and has likely damaged many people's relationships with the organization and with other members.

Despite the lack of consensus on NASW's identity, a large majority of its members find the organization's mixed membership at least moderately valuable.

- And more than half find it very or extremely valuable.

The proposed constitutional change is an issue that matters a great deal to some, but not all, members of NASW.

- 38 members emailed the committee with their thoughts on the proposed amendment, expressing strong opinions for and against it in roughly equal numbers.

- About 25% of members responded to our survey; it is possible that feelings on the proposed change are less intense among the the 75% who did not respond.

Based on survey results, 8% of membership might leave NASW if the change is adopted (n=54); 4% might leave if the change is not adopted (n=25).

- The vast majority of those who would leave if the change is adopted self-identify as journalists.
- The majority of those expecting to leave if the change is not adopted self-identify as non-journalists.

A majority of non-journalist respondents support the proposed change, and anticipate a greater level of engagement with NASW if it is passed.

- 74% of non-journalists, including 79% of PIOs, support the change.
- Among those who indicate that the change would affect their experiences, a large majority indicate greater likelihood to attend ScienceWriters meetings and higher interest in serving NASW.
- For 59% of non-journalists, the proposed change would increase their sense of being valued members of NASW.

A plurality of journalists opposes the proposed change (48% against, 38% for); opposition is greater among freelance journalists than in staff journalists.

- Among freelance journalists (n=202), 50% were opposed and 35% in favor.
- Among staff journalists (n=118), 44% were opposed and 42% in favor.

A sizeable percentage of journalists say they would likely react negatively to the proposed change, by: (a) leaving NASW, (b) being less likely to attend ScienceWriters meetings, or (c) being less interested in working on committees. The negative responses are more common for staff than freelance journalists.

- Among freelance journalists, 32% anticipate doing at least one of these three things.
- Among staff journalists, 46% anticipate doing at least one of these things.
- Based on letters received, the greater negative responses of staff relative to freelance journalists may reflect several factors:
 - Staff journalists may have more traditional opinions on matters such as conflict of interest.
 - Staff journalists may feel freer to act on their beliefs and disengage from NASW, given their greater perceived income or career security.
 - Freelance journalists may feel more dependent on NASW and its meetings as opportunities for networking, connection with editors/publications, and professional development.
 - Freelance journalists working in a climate of shrinking pay may be more pragmatic in their immediate reactions to the proposed change, feeling that they cannot survive on journalism alone.

Passing the proposed amendment might significantly alter the composition of NASW's membership, with staff journalists representing the likely fulcrum of that change.

- Staff journalists may play a disproportionately large role in engaging other NASW members. Among respondents in our survey, they attend meetings more frequently than non-journalists (1.7 vs 1.2 meetings attended in the last five years, on average). Many freelance journalists attend ScienceWriters meetings to network with staff writers/editors or to see them in pitch events and other sessions.
- A dropoff in membership or participation by staff journalists could, over time, lead to a secondary dropoff in freelance journalist membership, meeting attendance, or committee participation.
- NASW is an organization of many smaller networks and communities, which are individually susceptible to change; as highly-valued individuals leave NASW or forego meetings or committees, others in their network may follow.
- Secondary departures would be motivated by a lower perceived value of NASW membership or the ScienceWriters meeting, a factor especially important for freelancers who must pay their own way to meetings and consider whether \$1,000 of travel expenses might be better spent attending another meeting.
- Journalists who forgo NASW meetings or membership can opt to attend other meetings such as AAAS, AGU, AHCJ, or SEJ, which also offer networking opportunities. These meetings can be viewed as competition that could facilitate a potential exodus of journalists from NASW.
- This dynamic could pull away journalists who had no initial opposition to the proposed constitution change, but who are following others as they leave.
- This dynamic could also hinder NASW from attracting new journalist members.

While it is easy to view the proposed change as positively impacting non-journalists versus negatively impacting journalists, it is important to view this within the larger ecosystem of NASW: the presence of journalists in NASW makes membership and meeting attendance more valuable for many PIO members, since it provides opportunities for cross-networking.

- Maintaining membership diversity is beneficial to members of all professional categories, as reflected in the survey.

Taken together, the surveys and letters suggest that NASW is currently experiencing at least two divides within its membership: (1) journalist vs non-journalist, which has received most attention in the current debate, and (2) staff vs freelance, which is equally important and also impacts the debate.

- The latter divide reflects a perceived disconnect with staff journalists and freelance journalists, with the freelancers feeling pinched by limited income, long-term career instability, industry changes leading to worsening contracts, rights, and pay practices (e.g., delayed payments or kill fees), and a worsening power imbalance with the publications they work for.
- Implicit in this perceived divide is a feeling that, at a time when journalism is suffering, NASW should be stepping in to strengthen it and influence its future evolution on behalf of freelancers who have little other sense of collective voice.

- Within this context, some freelance journalists are likely to see the proposed constitutional change as NASW taking a step away from advocating for journalism at a time when journalism most needs it, and taking a step away from looking after the needs of freelancers.
- It is unclear whether such a staff versus freelance divide exists among non-journalists, suggesting again that this divide may well stem from ongoing changes specifically within the news media industry.

In the context of these two divides, several major themes emerged from letters sent by NASW members to the Ad Hoc committee; these themes illustrate the divides and disconnects between segments of NASW's membership.

- Journalists cited concern about conflict of interest (COI), or perceived COI in NASW's leaders if the change is passed.
- Non-journalists pointed out the increasingly blurred lines between journalism, advocacy, and PIO work, citing this as reason why NASW should adapt to the times, enact the proposed change, and make its upper leadership more inclusive.
- Journalists (especially freelance) cited some of these same changes in the industry as reasons why NASW needed to avoid the proposed change, in order to bolster journalism in turbulent times.

Former NASW presidents are generally opposed to the change, although opinions vary.

- Eight former NASW presidents expressed opposition to the proposed amendment.
 - Two are in favor.
 - Two have no opinion or are ambivalent.
 - Four former presidents said they would resign their NASW membership if the constitutional change was adopted.
-

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The board should recognize that the issues underlying the proposed amendment point toward a deeper question of organizational identity that is unlikely to be satisfactorily addressed by merely changing the rules for officer eligibility. The board should consider: Is NASW a journalistic organization? Should it be? What does that mean?
 - The opinions and likely actions of those members who are most active in the organization should be considered in any decision.
 - The board should share the full text of this report (minus Appendix 2, which contains quotations from confidential member communications), with the full membership in order to provide members with important information that could guide their vote on the proposed constitutional change.
 - When the proposed amendment is put to a vote during the member meeting at ScienceWriters 2016, we recommend that NASW make the vote available online as well, to allow members who are not present at the meeting to participate.
 - The board should undertake more detailed inquiries that seek to get to the root of the discontent among PIOs and other non-journalists that gave rise to the proposed constitutional amendment. These questions would probably best be addressed not through broad surveys, but through a series of in-depth, candid interviews with members about their experiences in the organization. It is likely that other changes within the organization, such as allocation of more professional-development resources to non-journalist activities, or expansion of awards into categories beyond journalism, may address these grievances more effectively than changing eligibility for executive officer positions—and without risking the departure of key members.
 - In light of the above, the board should consider whether the proposed constitutional change represents the wrong answer to the wrong question. Given that NASW is required to put the proposed change up for a membership vote within a fixed timeframe, the board should consider making additional options available for voting at the same time (for example at ScienceWriters 2016)—options that might more directly address grievances without negatively impacting membership.
 - The board should make resources available to do more detailed analyses of some facets of this committee's survey that the committee was not able to fully examine, due to limitations of time and volunteer labor. For example, the survey contains data, so far unexamined, about the types and relative amounts of science writing work NASW members engage in; with our data, it is possible to study this question in fine detail, breaking results down by job title, job duties, staff versus freelance, length of membership, and more. The board should take further advantage of this rich dataset, perhaps with the aid of a statistician.
 - The board should consider analyzing data from new members that have joined the organization in recent years, in order to identify any trends in NASW's acquisition of new members. If warranted by that analysis, the board should assess what currently limits NASW's ability to attract or retain new journalist members.
-