Rest in peace, press release: A case study exploring how adopting an audience-first

editorial approach affects news production in a nontraditional newsroom

A Professional Project

presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

at the University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of the Degree

Master of Arts

by

VALERIE HELLINGHAUSEN

Randall Smith, Project Chair

Dr. Yong Volz, Committee Member & Methodologist

MAY 2019

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

They say that man plans, and God laughs. When it comes to research, I can say that the same is true. Nevertheless, there are so many people I want to thank who were there for me when plans failed and when I needed a laugh before I could muster the courage to begin again.

First, to my parents Holly and Doug Hellinghausen, thank you for your endless support. You have seen me chase every dream I've set my mind to and cheered me on the entire way. Your faith and love are a formidable source of strength and inspiration for me every day, in every endeavor. To my brother Garrett, my sister-in-law Maddie and my sister Kristina, thank you for being my constant motivators and for carrying the weight of life at times when our family needed it most.

To my loving grandparents, thank you for your constant encouragement and support throughout my education and in all areas of my life. The opportunities I've had would not have been possible without your generosity. With you, I have learned to study the world without fear, to find joy in hard work, to value the lessons and legacies families leave us, and most of all to know the joy of a good book and intellectual conversation. You have shown me how to lead my life with grace, forgiveness and love. I'm proud to say, in Grandmommy's words, that "I got the piece of paper!"

To the Mark Twain Gang, you have been my home away from home from the first day on Mizzou's campus to our (hopefully) annual reunions. Even though I may be known as Mama Val for taking care of everyone else, thank you for taking care of me when I needed you most.

To the incredibly talented staff at the Missourian, thank you for giving me a place to grow as a journalist and as a human. To Laura Johnston, Jeanne Abbott, Elizabeth Stephens and Elizabeth Brixey, thank you for believing in my abilities as a leader and for trusting my creative vision. To all of my fellow TAs, but especially Natalia, Ellen, Kyle and Tyler, thank you for your friendship and your many talents.

To Randy Smith and Yong Volz, thank you for seeing me through to the end. Although I may have been the captain of my own ship through this master's process, you helped me navigate every obstacle. Your expertise and empathy are unparalleled.

To Michael Stacy and Randy Smith at the Missouri Business Alert, thank you for entrusting me with being the first to take on this role as a University of Missouri branded journalism fellow. It has been an honor to represent the Missouri School of Journalism.

Finally, to everyone at the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation: You have shown me what uncommon kindness can do to change the world, and I am proud to have been part of serving that mission. Most of all, thank you Larry Jacob and Kim Wallace Carlson. You valued my voice and challenged me to take on any task with unending trust every step of the way. Without your leadership, this never would have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The way news becomes news has fascinated me since I became a reporter for my high school newspaper my sophomore year. So much so, that I made it a point to rise through the ranks from reporter to page editor finally to editor-in-chief not because I wanted the title, but because I wanted to make a better newspaper. And I believed that the final product would turn out better if there was clarity and consistency along the way from the time a story first got pitched to when it was finally set on a page.

In college, I followed a similar thread of curiosity in working for the Columbia Missourian. While I was required to work there as a news reporter and copy editor, I spent five semesters working as a teaching assistant on both the interactive copy desk and the print design desk. With every role I moved into, I worked to better understand how the newsroom functioned and how everyone played a part in getting the newspaper out each night. I found that this interest led me to become a better, more empathetic journalist, as it led me to try to better understand the responsibilities and frustrations of my colleagues, my superiors and the readers we all served. No matter where I worked, whether it be as a copy editor for *Newsday* or *The Dallas Morning News*, I quickly realized that many newsrooms faced the same challenges when it came to meeting deadlines with ever-shrinking staffs, readerships and budgets. And while many sought to find solutions to revive ailing news publications, many also told me the same two things: Print is dying, and you should get out while you can.

I never believed that print or journalism as a whole was dying. Rather, I saw that journalists were struggling to adapt their product when the places and processes that

produced it remained pretty much the same. As such, I spent two year in graduate school studying strategic communication in hopes that I would find new industries to apply the skills I had crafted as an undergraduate student studying print and digital news editing. In those two years, I not only broadened my skillset, but got a better grasp of the industry and the problems it faced not only where norms and practice were concerned, but where theory had tried to answer bigger questions about how journalism and other media were struggling, changing and growing as power changed hands, technology evolved and audiences lost or found interest.

In my final semester of graduate studies coursework, I found myself hanging on every word in a branded storytelling course taught by Jim Flink. I signed up with little knowledge of what branded storytelling or content marketing were. In the end, I trusted that Jim Flink and our guest lecturer, David Germano, were right when they explained that branded storytelling and content marketing were quickly becoming the future of advertising. Despite how new buzzwords like branded storytelling sound, I had learned that the method itself borrowed heavily from the skills and structures found in journalistic newsrooms. In short, brands were looking to find creative minds who could create added value around a business' existing product by telling stories, creating experiences and sharing information related to audiences who might someday buy a business' existing product. Several companies, like Red Bull and Under Armour, have successfully done this by creating content for video series, blogs and apps among other things.

When the course ended, I knew that I wanted to keep exploring the branded storytelling industry and try to find a job there once I finished my graduate studies. Sooner than I could finish my capstone, such an opportunity had found me. In June 2018,

I accepted what would later be extended to a yearlong position as the first branded storytelling fellow for a new program with the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, a nonprofit in Kansas City, Missouri, focused on funding entrepreneurship and education efforts. There, I would work across the Entrepreneurship and Public Affairs teams to develop content strategy and put my journalism skills to use writing and editing stories for the Public Affairs editorial team.

In Kansas City, I have had the opportunity to further explore what branded storytelling is, and how it affects the way news gets made in the philanthropy sphere. At the same time, I have learned how to adapt my skills as a journalist within a nontraditional newsroom that is also ever-evolving. Within the last year, the Public Affairs editorial team at the foundation has worked to adopt an "audience-first, story-focused" approach with the help of Atlantic 57, a creative consulting agency that works as another arm of *The Atlantic* magazine. The conversations and challenges adopting this new editorial approach have been a hugely enriching addition to my experience as a fellow. While I had no idea that I would be part of the team rethinking not only what stories we tell, but how we go about telling them and to whom, these major changes have shifted the structure and way we think about our work. Furthermore, it is these shifts that reignited my interest in the news production process and sparked the inspiration for the research I have conducted here in fulfillment of this professional project.

From talking with 11 of the members of the Public Affairs department, I was able to learn the challenges and opportunities for growth adopting this new approach has provided. As the foundation has shifted it its own philosophy toward working and talking with people instead of talking at them, it became necessary for what was once a

traditional corporate communications department to shift. This need for change also became readily apparent as local news providers faced severe financial constraints and cuts, as well as distrust among audiences that was further agitated by the political climate over the last five to 10 years. In talking with these public affairs practitioners, I learned how thinking about audiences and their motivations has affected the work these practitioners do, and what that might mean for others looking to take on ventures into branded storytelling, brand journalism or some other combination of buzzwords.

For Kauffman, adopting this approach has led the Public Affairs team to build new trust with more diverse audiences even as relationships in the research community — its former primary audience — adapt, falter or fall off altogether. From these new relationships, the Public Affairs team has a unique opportunity to position the foundation as a trusted source, valued voice and at times an ideological ally for its audiences in a handful of conversations. At the same time, constraints are felt both internally and externally as the Public Affairs applies this new approach to its wider foundation communications, attempts to gather data around these efforts and create content for previously untapped or under-utilized communications channels.

Although these challenges will require much work ahead, the fact is that the foundation is no stranger to storytelling. The foundation has a long legacy of sharing the stories of entrepreneurs, educators and great thinkers much like its founder, Ewing Marion Kauffman, who himself agreed to sit for hours of interviews about his life so that they could one day be shared. While other nonprofits and companies may be just beginning to tell stories or may have even more experience, I think there is much to be gained from these conversations and the efforts of the Kauffman Foundation's Public

Affairs team. And, as a fellow Public Affairs colleague at the foundation, I hope the department may find that reflecting on these conversations we had and what work is still to be done will be helpful in its continued journey exploring how to tell the story of the foundation.

CHAPTER TWO

Rest in peace, press release: A case study exploring how adopting an audience-first

editorial approach affects news production in a nontraditional newsroom

INTRODUCTION

At the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, a nonprofit in Kansas City, Missouri,

the Public Affairs editorial team produces a weekly newsletter called "Ideas at Work."

Each newsletter promotes both new and old stories resurfaced from the foundation's

blog: "Kauffman Currents." Every Thursday, this newsletter is emailed to a variety of

individuals interested in entrepreneurship, education and innovation. And each week, the

editorial team races to produce a new article or two to fill the newsletter with fresh

content. This news cycle has carried on week by week, month by month for a few years.

And it would have continued to do so until Shari, an executive assistant in Investments,

asked a simple question: Why?

Newsrooms often are chained to an endless news cycle, whether it requires filling

the pages of a daily newspaper, cutting video segments to fit an hourlong television news

block or updating a social media feed. No matter the medium, traditional journalism

newsrooms often find themselves bound to maintain a steady production pace to provide

consistency for their viewers and to ensure they regularly have a fully fleshed-out product

to sell, so to speak. In nontraditional newsrooms, where the news produced is not the

main business, this cycle can be more readily broken. At the Kauffman Foundation, the

editorial team has broken several routines in its news production process, deciding that

simply putting out a newsletter every Thursday because that is the norm is not necessarily

a good enough reason to do it.

Instead, over the past year the editorial team at the foundation has adopted a new approach to its work that concentrates on storytelling first. Everything else – whether it be timing or filling a hole in a newsletter – comes second to the quality of stories produced. This is not to say that traditional journalism newsrooms cannot produce quality work within a set schedule or space. However, without those constraints a nontraditional newsroom team is able to focus on storytelling without a production deadline hanging over its head. Instead, the editorial team faces new constraints with its new editorial approach. Instead of being concerned about making deadlines, the editorial team is primarily concerned with who the stories they tell serve, and whether those audiences are interested and engaged in the topics and conversations the newsroom reports on.

This case study explored, then, how adopting this audience-first approach affects the news production process in a nontraditional newsroom such as the one at the Kauffman Foundation. To do this, this case study used Tandoc and Vos' three facets of news production affected by audience feedback as a theoretical framework to guide the following research questions (2016):

- **RQ1:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected how public affairs practitioners think about audiences in their work?

- **RQ2:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected what public affairs practitioners decide to cover?

- **RQ3:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners place and/or distribute a story?

- **RQ4:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners evaluate a story's performance?

In this study, the researcher conducted interviews with a range of storytellers on the Public Affairs team who play different but direct editorial roles in this process at the Kauffman Foundation. From these conversations, this study has sought to answer some of these questions in order to gain a better understanding of how this process affects all aspects of the news production process and its team members. Additionally, these interviews delved into the perspectives of team members with experience spanning from less than two years to more than 20 years with the foundation. This range of experience provided insights into how this newsroom has adapted editorial approach and news production process within the past year, while still gleaning some understanding of how these changes relate to the newsroom's broader history and growth.

From these findings, this research provides insights into how restructuring one's editorial approach might affect the processes that govern the day-to-day working of a newsroom. These insights are especially valuable to practitioners and academics alike as the definition of newsroom and the structure itself is expanded beyond the realm of journalism and into nonprofits, corporate brands and other nontraditional spaces. Before we can explore these new expansions, however, the next section will look at how the view of the press as institution has been discussed in previous studies, and how that discussion is evolving as news production is further affected by the audiences that newsrooms serve.

LITERATURE REVIEW & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

One of the simplest ways to understand the purpose of studying news production is this: "What the news means depends on how the news gets made," (Sigal, 1973: p. 1). While other researchers like Lippmann historically have questioned the reality, we derive and craft within our minds based on the news we read (1922), others suggest that the reality is not so far outside the practitioners' own minds. Molotch and Lester wrote that the media do not reflect "a world out there," but rather a world influenced — if not created — by "the practices of those having the power to determine the experience of others," (1974: p. 206).

As such, to get a better understanding of our reality, we also have to look at how that reality gets made. To begin, we will explore and define media as an evolving institution which has processes that continue to shift as new technology and workflows are used to improve efficiency and work. Then, we will explore how the media institution's wall have lowered. Finally, we will review how incorporating audience feedback in the news production process has changed how we may continue to study it altogether.

Media as an evolving institution

Although not all scholars believe the media serves as a singular institution or Fourth Estate to democracy (Lippmann, 1922; Gans, 1998), for the purpose of this study, this research will understand the media to be an institution following the definitions outlined by Cook (1998) and Giddens (1979). Cook saw the media as a single institution with an established, organized system that had the influence and power to both reinforce the dominant ideologies and political structures, as well as serve as a guide for the

public's thoughts, actions and values (1998). Giddens, on the other hand, also believed that institutions like the media are evolutionary in nature (1979). As such, the practices an institution at one time considers to be traditional are often replaced by other practices, which in turn create new routines.

In the past and in our present, new technology and media channels have played a role in altering the media's "missions, routines and relationships with its audiences," (Robinson, 2017: p. 307). For example, as the internet and social media platforms have led to a more continuous news cycle, many newsrooms have adapted not just the news process but the "news engine," (Bro, Hansen & Andersson, 2016). In their 2016 study, Bro, Hansen & Andersson explored how the news production process at DR, the Danish Broadcasting Corporation, was affected after attempting to improve efficiency by eliminating unnecessary steps and wasted energy on the part of journalists. In the end, the study found that all of the 20 or more employees interviewed in the survey agreed that the "news engine" workflow has "significantly improved the utilization of resources" and "is capable of collecting substantially more content to each of the individual stories," (Bro, Hansen & Andersson, 2016: p. 1011).

At the same time, almost half (45 percent) of those surveyed during the study felt the quality of their work had been reduced, and roughly one-third (37 percent) of survey respondents felt they had seen a decline in the quality of the news produced. (1012). Attempts to create more news and faster is certainly a change in news production that many newsrooms seek to make, even at the cost of journalists' sense of value in their work (Bro, Hansen & Andersson, 1016: p. 1006). However, it is obviously not the only change occurring in news production.

Looking beyond the media's walls

In discussing news production, Sigal wrote that "routine is closely linked to tradition in the sense that tradition underwrites the continuity of practice in the elapsing of time," (1973: p. 220). In traditional journalistic tradition, the news media's mission has been to keep a critical eye on those in power, tell stories that inform the public, lead discussions and provide truthful, trustworthy, accurate and interesting accounts of the day's events (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2014). With the inception and incorporation of the internet into the media, however, who plays a role in that mission is disrupting the routines that have long shaped the media's action as well as those who practice it.

While Cook may have pushed for seeing the media as a singular institution in 1998, in 2006 Cook began to rethink this position, partly because of the internet. In 2006, Cook wrote, "I argue here that we need to approach the news media with attention to the institutional walls surrounding them and the ways the newsmaking process includes actors on both sides of that wall," (p. 161). This provides a significant shift in thinking, as we have to consider that news production considers and also involves more than journalists, given the participatory and democratic nature of the internet. Where the media once held the institutional influence and power to create news and meaning as gatekeepers, now the readers that institution serves also hold the power to influence the media institution and even create news in some situations.

Audience feedback and news production

Audience feedback not only guides journalists as to "what to report and how to report it, but also tells news readers what to read, how to read, and how to respond to it," (Lee & Tandoc, 2017: p. 445). The sheer abundance and ease with which audience

feedback in the form of clicks, likes, shares, comments and other metrics can be gathered

has led to the creation of new tasks and entirely new roles devoted to monitoring the

activity and engagement of audiences online (Tandoc & Vos, 2016).

Several studies have already begun to show the influence audience feedback has

had over news coverage and decision-making. Tandoc found that stories with photos or

videos or other visual content tended to draw more engagement in the form of clicks,

motivating editors to ensure that articles had some visual content (2014). In the same

study, content that appeared to be more popular with viewers was more likely to be

shared by editors across social media platforms in order to drive more traffic to a news

publication's website. Additionally, topics that appear to be trending with lots of clicks,

likes, comments and other measures of engagement tend to be more likely to be covered

(Welbers, Van Atteveldt, Kleinnijenhuis, Schaper, & Ruigrok). But what is popular may

not always be what needs promoting, as scholars like Boczkowski have shown that

audiences tend to prefer to click on stories about celebrities or sports (2010). Other forms

of audience feedback have helped newsrooms to determine not only what information is

popular, but what information is sought, as search query data have been shown to

subsequently affect news coverage (Ragas, Tran & Martin, 2014).

While it may be comforting to some to know newsrooms are paying attention to

what information audiences seek, allowing audiences' desires to heavily influence news

coverage may drastically shift the foundation and focus of gatekeeping and agenda

setting theories (Chaffee & Metzger). In the same vein, focusing too much on giving

audiences the information they want instead of the information they need may put the

media's mission of informing the public and bringing communities together at risk

(Tandoc & Thomas, 2015).

Three facets of audience-influenced news production

Despite these fears, Tandoc and Vos have outlined three facets of news

production that have been affected by audience feedback: topic selection, story placement

and performance evaluation (2016). These three facets can help up to breakdown how

news production may be altered by the influence of audience feedback in a newsroom.

The first facet, topic selection, refers to the process of determining whether an event,

issue or piece of information will be reported," (Lee & Tandoc, 2017: p. 438).

Traditionally, scholars like Gans explained that topic selection was a process that

journalists often kept closed off from the public in attempts to maintain the authority and

autonomy of the media institution (1979). Now, audiences often help guide the story

selection process, as likes, shares and other measures of an audience's level of

engagement and interest in a topic may play into whether it is deemed newsworthy

enough for a journalist to cover.

The second facet, story placement, is the process of determining where a story is

placed within a publication (Lee & Tandoc, 2017). This may refer to where a story

appears on a publication's home page, or where and how often it is shared across other

media channels, like email newsletters, Facebook and Twitter. Finally, the third facet is

performance evaluation, or the process of determining how success is measured in a

journalist's day-to-day work. For some news media, clicks are king where pay-per-click

structures may lead to additional pay given to reporters who produce stories that exceed a

certain number of views or other levels of engagement (Fischer, 2014). In other cases,

time spent on page, shares on social media or other aggregated audience feedback on individual posts and stories may serve as measures of success.

Applying the three facets as a framework

While Tandoc and Vos derived these three facets from case studies conducted in three online newsrooms, the framework they have provided may have applications outside of traditional newsrooms. In order to better test this framework, these three facets were employed to guide this study exploring how adopting an audience-first editorial approach has affected news production in a nontraditional newsroom. With the editorial newsroom at the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City, Missouri, as a significant case, this study first questions how adopting a new editorial approach has affected how the newsroom thinks about audiences before exploring how that approach and consideration of audiences further affects the three facets Tandoc and Vos define. To do this, the study will focus on the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected how public affairs practitioners think about audiences in their work?

- **RQ2:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected what public affairs practitioners decide to cover?

- **RQ3:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners place and/or distribute a story?

- **RQ4:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners evaluate a story's performance?

The next section will further explain how in-depth interviews were conducted to explore these questions. Additionally, the following section will go over the participants

included in the case study as well as how data was gathered, analyzed and measured.
Finally, the next section discusses how data was validated and reflects on what challenges
the researcher encountered through the study's duration.

METHODOLOGY

Method

In this study, the research was conducted as a single, exploratory case. For the purpose of this study, cases were understood following the definition provided by Thomas:

"Case studies are analyses of persons, events, decisions, periods, projects, policies, institutions, or other systems that are studied holistically by one or more methods. The case that is the subject of the inquiry will be an instance of a class of phenomena that provides an analytical frame—an object—within which the study is conducted and which the case illuminates and explicates," (2011: p. 513)

Following this definition, the Kauffman Foundation's Public Affairs editorial team served as the study's case, with the editorial team's news production process as its object. The research questions outlined below followed the theoretical framework provided by the three facets of news production affected by audience feedback that Tandoc and Lee defined (2016). This framework helped to guide addressing the following questions about how adopting an audience-first, story-focused approach, has affected a nontraditional newsroom's news production:

- **RQ1:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected how public affairs practitioners think about audiences in their work?

- **RQ2:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected what public affairs practitioners decide to cover?

- **RQ3:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners place and/or distribute a story?

- **RQ4:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners evaluate a story's performance?

With this theory as its guide, the researcher had the opportunity to study real-life situations experienced by the editorial team that, as concrete and context-dependent experiences, were rich with nuance and detail, which Flyvbjerg highlights as a strength of case studies, (2013).

To best explore this nuance and detail, the research used in-depth interviews as its method for data collection. In-depth interviews offered the researcher the opportunity to capture individual experiences, which closely aligned with the aims of this study to better understand how adopting a new editorial approach has affected news production — which the interview subjects perform in their daily work. Additionally, because the researcher has already spent more than 8 months embedded with the interview subjects, the researcher had already established access and rapport with subjects, so as best to "study sideways" as both a coworker and researcher (Plesner, 2011: p. 471), instead of solely as an outsider in a position of authority to dominate or subordinate one's relationship to the subject.

With this in mind, this study assumed the conception of a romantic interview, as per Roulston's research (2010). The research proposed best fit the 'romantic' conception of an interview for a number of reasons. In this approach, it is understood that through developed rapport, the interviewer is able to access the interviewed subject's beliefs, experiences, opinions, attitudes or perspectives on a topic. As a coworker to the interview

subjects in this study and delineated in **Appendix C**, this rapport had already been established in one social setting and was often a strength when conducting interviews, as the discussions were more conversational in nature.

Subjects & Data

Data was collected and analyzed from transcripts made from audio-recorded interviews. These transcripts were created and formatted by the researchers. These interviews each lasted roughly an hour and were conducted with core members of the Kauffman Foundation's Public Affairs editorial team. These interview subjects included the 11 editorial team members outlined in **Appendix C**. The 11 interview subjects reflected a diversity of skills, roles, level of education and gender as well as race. Additionally, the 11 interview subjects have varying levels of experience in their professional career and have worked for the Kauffman Foundation for a range of time spanning from less than one year to more than 20 years among the subjects. This diversity of experience and background allowed for a wider range of perspectives with different nuances that enriched the data. These interview subjects were selected based on their diversity of experience and roles on the editorial team. In the end, the 11 interviews provided the researcher sufficient data in order to reach theoretical saturation, or a point where little to no new information is gleaned from additional interviews (Small, 2009; Yin, 2002).

Interview Procedure

In this study, the researcher conducted 11 hourlong in-depth interviews to reach theoretical saturation. The interviews followed a semi-structured interview guide, which can be found in **Appendix B**. While the research questions outlined within this study

provided guidance to the questions asked in the interviews, the semi-structured approach allowed for conversations to flow with more flexibility. Additionally, following a semi-structured format allowed interview subjects to explore other avenues of thought that were not always directly addressed in the researcher's questions. This allowed the researcher to ask follow-up questions that in turn clarified interview subject responses and to explore different viewpoints in more depth.

Measure

Once the interviews were completed and the conversations had been fully transcribed, the researcher analyzed the data collected following the protocol outlined by Dey (1993). When analyzing, the researcher started by conducting a vertical reading of the transcripts, which allowed the researcher to soak in the data. Then, the researcher conducted horizontal readings of each transcript and began coding the data that was most salient to the research questions posed. During this time, the researcher coded "like with like" (Dey, 1993: p. 95), or looked for patterns that emerge from the data. These patterns helped to create chunks of data organized by those data points that share a category (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

Once all of the data had been coded in this way, the researcher moved on to linking data together. Unlike the initial round of coding, this second round focused on how data interact, not on how they are like one another. This process of linking helped the researcher to make sense of the data in order to understand the relationships between data points (Dey, 1993). These connections in turn helped the researcher to infer meaning from the data, which is reflected on in the study's analysis portion found in **Chapter Three**. Returning to Tandoc and Vos' theoretical framework helped the researcher

explain and organize the findings from this analysis.

Validity

Following the romantic conception of interviewing best allowed the researcher to ensure validity in a number of ways (Roulston, 2011). As Roulston suggests, interviewers using the romantic conception of interview need to demonstrate the established rapport, often through a longevity of fieldwork. As a fellow with the Kauffman Foundation's Public Affairs department, the researcher had already worked with the interview subjects with for more than 8 months at the time of this proposal, thus creating an established rapport that will in all likelihood carry into the interview space. This, along with the proposed method of conducting 11 hourlong in-depth interviews demonstrated both longevity and rigor of work to improve the validity of this study.

Validity will be ensured upon the study's completion by making the transcripts and interview guide accessible and replicable for others. Additionally, the researcher was aware of the sensitive nature an interview and discussing one's work may pose for the subjects being interviewed. As such, the researcher took care to sequence and adjust the questioning pattern as needed to help establish greater rapport, comfort and conversation flow in the interviews.

Roulston also writes that the validity and quality in interviews following the romantic conception are often supported by triangulation of methods or data to improve validity. Because the research involved interviewing different people on the same team within a social setting, the Kauffman Foundation, the data included multiple viewpoints, which the researcher used to validate, clarify and support details from prior interviews as they were conducted in succession until saturation was met.

To further support the validity and credibility of the study, the researcher wrote weekly memos throughout the study. These were sent to the committee overseeing this study for the completion of graduate studies. In these memos, the researcher discussed what progress was being made in the study, as well as provided reflections on any biases or preconceived thoughts the researcher found to be influencing their thinking throughout the course of the study.

This reflexivity through weekly memos was also supported with low inference descriptors included from the interview transcripts throughout the study's analysis. By including direct responses from interview subjects, this allowed the researcher to show the progression from research question to participant response to the researcher's analysis. Additionally, these low inference descriptors provided direct, dense description throughout that supports and deepens the researcher's analysis.

Reflection & Challenges

Despite these validity checks, the researcher still anticipated there would be some challenges in conducting this study. First, the researcher anticipated that there would be some challenges to recruiting participants. While the researcher was not concerned about securing interviews, at first there was some tension around the study's potential for publication. As such, carefully writing an opening script and questions in the interview guide to create a conversational interview space, as well as clearly outlining the study's intentions in a consent form (see **Appendix C**) alleviated these concerns for study participants.

Secondly, the researcher's unique situation as both an employed fellow of the Kauffman Foundation and researcher for the University of Missouri could have

complicated the reflexivity shown in this study. As a fellow, the researcher had been

privy and engaged in prior conversations about changes in editorial approach that were

explored in this study. With this in mind, weekly logs helped the researcher to explore

what conflicting biases and preconceived thoughts came to mind during interviews and

analysis. That being said, the dual positions the researcher holds proved to be a strength,

as the case study had strong proximity to the researcher's local knowledge and

experience (Thomas, 2011).

CHAPTER THREE

How the Kauffman Foundation has stepped up its storytelling amid journalism's fake news fallout

If press releases are dead, print journalism is dying and distrust in media is festering, is brand journalism the solution? For this Kansas City nonprofit, an audience-first, story-focused editorial approach has provided a mix of opportunities and challenges to better inform and inspire audiences. The game-changer? A mind-shift from viewing audiences as a set of demographics to individuals with flexible motivations and interests that may waver in intensity based on the subject matter. In making this shift in its approach to storytelling, the Kauffman Foundation has carved out an opportunity for itself — and potentially other philanthropies — to become trusted sources of news and information that can balance meeting these audiences' needs and wants while still subtly elevating larger social missions where other traditional and journalistic news providers can't.

By Valerie Hellinghausen

In 2018, Larry Jacob asked an audacious question:

What if the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation were its own media company?

As vice president of Public Affairs for the Kansas City-based nonprofit, Jacob is used to asking tough questions as a leader, whether in the world of philanthropy or the political sphere.

"[I] ask an audacious question not with the idea that we're actually going to do that, but what can we learn from asking that type of question," said Jacob. "That's just the way that I approach the work, because if you don't, then you're doing the same stuff."

For the foundation, doing more of the same wasn't going to cut it. In the last decade, changes in the news media and philosophy at the foundation had come to a head. So, in 2018, the Public Affairs team worked with Atlantic 57, a media consulting agency borne out of The Atlantic magazine, to revamp the foundation's approach to storytelling. From this work, the foundation has carved out a unique place for itself as a branded journalism newsroom that aims to inform and inspire its audiences.

Branded journalism is still a relatively new concept, but the media industry at large has been looking to better understand and reach audiences for years. Brand like Red Bull have been leading the way with content marketing that encourages audiences not to buy an energy drink but to see themselves and their lifestyles in the stories a brand tells. At the same time, newsrooms like The New York Times are looking to bake design thinking into an entire story's experience from the code up in order to create meaning and better connect with an audience's interests and motivations.

While the goal to change the way stories are told to better reach audiences might be the same for many in the media industry, the Kauffman Foundation's experience serves as a

unique example in how audience-first, brand-focused editorial storytelling can both challenge and create new opportunities for other nonprofits and businesses to increase engagement and potentially affect social change.

A 'perfect storm' of changes

Three years ago, when Jacob started at the foundation, he recognized there was a "perfect storm" brewing that would alter the course of the Public Affairs department. For one, local media had been severely cut in Kansas City and across the country, said Jacob. As a result, the foundation couldn't solidly rely on external media sources to get out the foundation's message.

In additions to changes in the media climate, the foundation had begun to move away from its primary focus on research. Kauffman recognized that in order to fulfill its founder's mission, it had to build relationships with others outside the foundation's walls in order to make social change. In short, the foundation had to work and talk with people — not talk at them.

"The mission of the foundation in the simplest of terms is: You're born. You get tools throughout life. You take or make a job. You give back to society," explains Jacob. "To effectively do that for more people —especially those that had been historically marginalized due to race, gender, location— and to fulfill Mr. Kauffman's legacy of overcoming all of that doesn't happen with money. It just can't. There's not enough money to do that."

While neither money nor media coverage could fulfill this mission, it also became apparent that the current structure of the Public Affairs team couldn't support its new philosophy either.

Prior to 2018, the Public Affairs team formula was consistent with others seen in typical corporate communications says Director of Editorial Keith Mays. The foundation would create a new program, release new research or host an event, and it would issue a news release alongside some kind of media relations effort.

"It was an ivory tower situation where it was like, 'Here's this important thing. Drop it out of the ivory tower. You're welcome'," said Mays.

"There was value to that certainly for a specific audience," added Jacob. "But to tell the foundation's story, it wasn't really giving the full picture of what we were trying to accomplish."

Telling the story of the foundation

In order to fulfill its mission, the foundation knew it needed to build stronger partnerships with its grantees and other audiences who could be motivated to take action.

"We didn't have the money or the expertise to make the kind of social change that we wanted," said Mays. "If we keep everyone at arm's length, a step removed, and kind of

do everything through the media, then we wouldn't necessarily be making the kind of authentic connections that we needed in order to do the kind of work that we want to do."

In order to build these authentic connections, the foundation needed to better understand its audiences. And amid faltering trust and financial stability in traditional media, the foundation and other nonprofits had an opportunity to become a trusted source of information, said Matt Pozel, senior multimedia writer and producer in Public Affairs.

"I don't want to be too much of a curmudgeon, but I think you can make the argument that whatever the traditional media was they completely missed the boat," said Pozel. "If they had known what their audience wanted, if they knew what the messages were, then they wouldn't be in the situation that they are today."

"It is so discouraging to see how just flat out to have leaders that have no regard for the truth. What's real or what's not real. What's authentic. So, in some ways I feel like it's more of our responsibility to fill that void because there are segments of society that are working against that," said Pozel.

To fill this void and learn how to more effectively tell stories than traditional media had in the past, the Public Affairs team hired consultants from Atlantic 57 to help craft a new editorial strategy and processes. Over the course of 2018, this work led to forming what the team calls an "audience-first, story-focused" approach.

Under this approach, Atlantic 57 helped the Public Affairs team define a set of audience typologies that are based on people's motivations and interests, rather than demographic information like age, gender, location or race. These typologies are meant to keep audience at the forefront of all editorial planning and communication.

"What we're trying to do at a higher level and sort of an uncommon level that we talk about is to think about audiences more broadly by their larger beliefs, their world beliefs," said Mays.

"People outside this building aren't necessarily going to be interested in us patting ourselves on the back. That's not an effective way to get our information out there or get our priorities out there," said Mays. "However, people out there as all people are interested in a good story."

For Editorial Manager Julie Scheidegger, a good story has to go beyond interesting people, and that's where typologies come in. If Kauffman knows what motivates its audiences, it can create content that can motivate people to take action to further the foundation's mission.

"We need people to be motivated to do something by our content," said Scheidegger. "Whether that's follow us on Twitter, it's a like and a share or a follow — something really, really small — all the way up to 'I went to this event.' … There's so many different levels, but we need our content to motivate people."

Rethinking the traditional news beat

While audience comes as a first priority in content creation under this approach, keeping a sharp focus on what stories the foundation is telling and why is also important. Through the work with Atlantic 57, Kauffman developed a number of coverage areas it has continued to narrow down. The coverage areas serve as an umbrella over what ideas and conversations the foundation wants to create content about. These areas, ideally, should align with the interests and motivations seen in the typologies Atlantic 57 helped Kauffman identify.

"The coverage areas basically keep front-of-mind what are some of the core values, said Chris Newton, digital marketing specialist at the foundation. "It gives us that lens and perspective to start there when we're thinking about a new story idea."

In this sense, the coverage areas Kauffman has adopted are different from traditional news beats, which tend to be more focused on an area of subject matter that stakeholders feel audiences need to be informed about.

With this shift in thinking, the foundation has gotten away from reporting the "what" of a story and instead has pushed itself to focus on the "why." Prior to 2018, event coverage and stories talking about what the foundation had accomplished would've garnered a write-up without question. Now, the foundation looks to see how an event or other topic is of use or interest to the audience, and what that action that might motivate an audience to take.

"It's difficult because again we're not journalism. We can't just kind of follow the trends of the day. And we have to kind of shoehorn what the foundation cares about and what message it's trying to get across," said Miles Sandler, the foundation's director of engagement in education.

"On the flip side, I think a foundation has a really unique role in this kind of communication space and editorial space because there's a social mission," said Sandler. "We consistently have to have this drumbeat of values that we're trying to communicate because we are trying to shift behaviors."

This unique role provides the foundation a mix of freedom and newfound constraints in what it decides to cover. Unlike a newspaper or other media outlet, the foundation isn't concerned with being objective or unbiased and providing full coverage of an issue or event. However, that doesn't necessarily make storytelling any easier.

"Since we don't have to do that, we are freed to give it our own angle and that Kauffman lens," said Scheidegger. "We can go farther beyond that, and it's harder. That's the problem. It's so much easier just to say, 'OK. Well, we did individual school grants, so let's put out a thing that says we put out individual school grants. This is how much we gave. This is the schools that received it. OK, great job, guys. Done'."

"But that's not going to do anything," said Scheidegger "That's not going to motivate anything more then maybe a transactional audience member. We can't just say we gave them money to go and do all these really boring things. Show the result — that's what we have to do, and it's much harder."

In 2018, Scheidegger found that one key way to show the result while avoiding being self-congratulatory is to highlight other voices beyond Kauffman's. When Scheidegger looked to craft a story around MORTAR, one of the foundation's grantees that is Cincinnati-based and looking to catalyze entrepreneurial growth, she let MORTAR speak for itself.

"It was really, really important to me with that video, especially with our increasing work with diversity, equity and inclusion, to make sure that that video was done through the correct lens with the correct voice," said Julie.

So, Scheidegger went to Managing Partner and Creative Director Allen Woods at MORTAR. When she asked Woods who could best tell the story of MORTAR's impact, his response was immediate: Chanel Scales. Scales, a graduate of the MORTAR program, was living in Atlanta when [MORTAR reached out to its graduates with an opportunity to open a retail shop in Cincinnati's thriving Over the Rhine neighborhood](#).

"I just kind of trusted that Allen knew what he was doing, what he was talking about," said Scheidegger.

And she was right to. Scales' voice and her journey to opening her own fashion retail store, Own Lane Shoetique, wound up being a natural fit for the story. Later that spring, MORTAR wound up playing the video of Chanel's story as it welcomed its 18th and 19th new cohort of participants.

"That was the intangible that we can't necessarily measure," said Scheidegger. "I was looking through the stories and looking at all their pictures and stuff, and there I saw Chanel's video playing to this huge crowd of new MORTAR folks. And that to me said more than anything else. Because I was like, 'Oh my god. We did it.' We created a video that sounded like them. That was their voice. It wasn't Kauffman from on high. We still said all the things we wanted to say. We still created the story, the narrative we needed people to hear, but we did it in Chanel's voice and with MORTAR's voice."

For Scheidegger, the story was a powerful lesson in how new diverse voices can tell their own story with facets of Kauffman's mission still shining through.

"We don't always need to be the voice. We can empower and uplift and amplify the voices of the people we serve in their communities and let them speak clearly about what they're dealing with," said Scheidegger.

To do this requires maintaining a delicate balance, however. The foundation has to constantly weigh satisfying audiences' interests and motivations with communicating larger foundational goals and messages around strengthening economies through entrepreneurship and education. If the latter comes off too strong, there's the potential for audiences to see content as pure spin, instead of informative and inspirational storytelling. There's also concerns around what telling grantees stories will implicate about continued financial support from the foundation. But when done right, however, the potential impact can be powerful, making this difficult work even more worthwhile, says Sandler.

"We're trying to shift perspectives. We're trying to provide the opportunity for people to see what else they can do around these social issues," said Sandler. "That to me is kind of the higher calling. We always need to keep that at the forefront, and then help connect that to things that are going to get eyeballs on it."

In maintaining the tenuous balance between connecting the foundation's mission and an audience's motivations, Scheidegger believes that's how the foundation can further establish a trusting relationship with audiences who are interested in making social change, too.

"People now want to feel like not only can they trust us and believe us, but that they know people here, said Scheidegger. "That really is something that we can do that other places can't is build that trust in a real way. To really have people trust us not only because we're an authority in the space, but because we are humans who are trying to within this weird philanthropic role with billions of dollars behind us try to work with people to move the needle."

One way Kauffman has successfully found to work with people was in its Inclusion Open for 2019. Instead of making a request for papers (RFP) through email, newsletter or some media relations effort, Kauffman welcomed its applicants in. Through Facebook Live, the foundation hosted an open forum to discuss the RFP and answer questions from people across the country that were tuning in.

"It spoke the language of the people that we're trying to reach," said Kayla Smalley, digital content coordinator. "It wasn't like us being like gatekeepers to the money. We really wanted to level with people."

In the end, the Facebook Live video converted views into hundreds of applicants for the RFP, said Smalley. Being able to anticipate those conversions, however, isn't as simple.

"That's a metric that you find out later," said Smalley. "But in the moment, I thought it was interesting to take a look at the amount of viewers throughout the duration of the video. Because if it's irrelevant to a bunch of people, they're going to click in, watch for a couple seconds, and click back out because it's not what they expected. But we had a very steady, consistent viewership throughout the entirety of the Facebook Live. So, that gave me confidence to say, 'We are talking to the right people'."

While the live-streamed video converted into applicants, it also has translated into more trust for the Public Affairs team. In turn, that trust has become stronger bedrock for building a news beat and relationship with sources, says Scheidegger.

"I'm getting to the point —especially with the Inclusion Open folks because I've been able to do so much with Chris and Natalie [that] I can DM or call quite a few people in their portfolio and be like, 'Hey, what's happening in Tennessee?' You know, 'what's up in Chattanooga today?' And really work the beat in terms of starting to be able to tell real stories and not just these superficial or drop-in kind of stories," said Scheidegger.

Defining and measuring success

Overall, just how much Kauffman is moving the needle is still difficult to track. While the new editorial approach provided useful frameworks like the typologies and coverage areas that have seen pockets of success, these aren't easy to execute on or replicate.

"The typologies have helped us get aligned in vocabulary and general understandings," said Newton, but there's still more that the Public Affairs team needs to drill into in order to make the typologies more useful when it comes to gathering data and learning about audiences.

"For example, on paid advertising targeting and social channels, it's not like you can go to Facebook and say, 'Hey. Give me anyone who is a futurist'," said Newton. "There's not really that data segment in Facebook that can be targeted. If someone has an interest of futurist on their Facebook account, we could target them, but it's not that widely used is what we've found. So, those typologies have not been actionable for us."

That being said, the Public Affairs team has seen success since adopting its audience-first, story-focused editorial approach. However, the foundation defines this success differently.

According to Mays, editorial success can be broken down into a dichotomy of success based on traditional engagement or on outcomes and actions taken.

In the first category, the foundation is looking for interactions audience members have with content online. This could come in the form of sharing or "liking" a story or leaving a comment on it. In a broader sense, engagement could also simply look at how many people have viewed a story or watched a video.

Newton cites a [Facebook post the foundation made during the NFL playoffs](#) in January as an example of success in terms of traditional engagement.

"Here's an example of success. It's not as much editorial, but we made a post about Ewing Kauffman. There was a picture of Ewing Kauffman with the owner of the Kansas City Chiefs when they were breaking ground for the sports complex that now the Chiefs and the [Kansas City] Royals play at," said Newton. "That was our single, that post was the most liked post, the most reached and engaged. Basically, every metric when it comes to Facebook was far and away the best that we've ever done on Facebook in a given day or on a single post since the Facebook account has been created, what, 10 years ago."

According to Newton, that one Facebook post probably saw more reach than all of Kauffman's blog posts in early 2019 and the same engagement as five or six blog posts combined on [Kauffman Currents](#). While the timing may have seemed to most like an obvious opportunity to share about part of the foundation's legacy in Kansas City, the fact that it was done in a stand-alone post on Facebook represents a shift for the foundation. Ten years ago, the Kauffman Foundation might have ignored posting about football altogether, as it would have been considered irrelevant to their work and audience in the research world. And even three years ago, when the editorial function of Public Affairs was just taking shape, the strategy might have been to write an article and

share it everywhere without considering the uniqueness of each distribution channel or the different audiences engaging there.

For Pozel, who originally suggested sharing the photo and its history on social media, the post was an opportunity to highlight Ewing Kauffman's legacy as one for the people.

"I think nostalgia is a pretty powerful thing," said Pozel. "I don't want to always look back to Ewing Kauffman. I want people to feel like they're a part of that. And I think when you look at that Facebook post about the breaking ground, when you read the comments people did take it to where what it meant to them."

For Newton, finding a way to mix speaking to audience's interests and feelings while still offering up timely content could continue to reshape what success looks like in Kauffman's content. The key to that, however, will be ensuring that the foundation's targeting is highly specific when the audience isn't as passionate or broad as, say, football fans during playoff season.

"That kind of success could be the new normal," said Newton. "But that's not going to happen unless we continue to improve the way we target. Improve our content and our messaging, so that the people who are most likely to engage and react to something are the ones actually being targeted by it in the posts."

The second category, success is based more on the social outcomes of the story. This is looking at what actions or results can be tied back to the content that was created. These correlations are often difficult to make and difficult to track. As such, some members of the Public Affairs team have taken to calling them "the intangibles."

"What we found in creating this framework was that when it comes to measuring editorial and just measuring content, we kind of have to stop at just the engagement level if we're wanting to drill down," explained Newton.

The challenge in being able to draw lines between a story and an audience member's action is twofold. For one, it requires strategic thinking from the outset about what specific action the audience is expected to take. The second piece is ensuring that there is the technological capability to track the action.

"It's almost as if for every story or every time we pitch an idea or we're like 'this is in the hopper,' we should identify as a team, 'OK, what are maybe one or two actions that if someone reads this and they walk away, what is the one or two things we really wish they would do next? What's their next step as a reader?' It could be interesting because it might do things to help people get to trigger that action," said Newton.

"But we don't do that because we don't have to. Because we're not like a for-profit business that needs revenue in order to keep the lights on," he added.

Nevertheless, the foundation still sees this success in its work. In December 2018, Kauffman reported on [how an organization has adapted and scaled literacy education in Kansas City](#) to reach more individuals and families.

"I don't think it's done that great, but we know that it reached at least one right person," said Mays, who reported on the story. "It led to that program, Literacy KC, being adopted by one of the large corporations in town as their charity of choice for the upcoming year. And it's going to make a huge difference to that nonprofit. We know that they learned about Literacy KC on our website."

"The great takeaway from that one was then Literacy KC got a huge amount of money from a local corporation. And now that's going to further their work. It was because of that video," added Scheidegger. "That's huge, and it's not how many retweets did it get. But that's a real thing."

For Mays, this story helped shift the way he and the Public Affairs team at large understand success and view the influence their storytelling can have.

"It's a totally different kind of impact, said Mays. "I hadn't really thought in those terms until it happened about how important it is to those people in organizations that we choose to feature. What a difference that can make that's not necessarily about mass numbers, but it's about reaching the right people."

With the right targeting technology and consistent efforts to motivate and provide the opportunity for audiences to take specific, concrete actions, nonprofits like the Kauffman Foundation might be better able to effect the social change they hope to see in the world.

How to keep moving forward

After a year of solidifying the approach in theory, Jacob and the rest of the Public Affairs department have to decide how to move forward with what they have learned from their attempts to answer the question of whether the foundation could be its own media company. While it is not entirely its own media company today, the shift in editorial approach has put storytelling and what audiences are motivated by at the forefront of what they do, rather than solely highlighting the foundation's programs and initiatives.

"We have a relatively short fuse on proof that this approach works," said Jacob. "We're not going to do this for 10 years if it's not working, which is where the measurement comes in and why we have to show there's benefit back to the foundation."

Other philanthropies and nonprofits may face similar timelines to prove an audience-first editorial approach will add value to a company's work. Based on conversations with Public Affairs team members, these three areas are of key importance to focus on in order to take new thinking and frameworks about audiences to a place where there is actionable, measurable success.

1) More consistent, agnostic channel usage

Under the audience-first, story-focused editorial approach, audiences are the top priority, and then the nature and focus of a story is meant to ultimately guide which communication channels are used. However, existing preferences for some channels, like a company's owned website and email newsletters, may still prevail over other channels.

At Kauffman, this struggle is seen when it comes to valuing social media channels like LinkedIn and Instagram as equally important storytelling platforms to established blogs and communication streams.

"I think that there's still a bias towards (Kauffman) Currents, towards using a website channel with a long-form story," said Kim Wallace Carlson, director of engagement in entrepreneurship at the foundation.

With that being said, Wallace Carlson adds that the thinking around channels has started to shift. Social media is more prioritized, but there still are times where channels are seen as just a means of distribution — not an opportunity to host content unique to a platform and the audiences that may already exist there.

"There is still room to grow in thinking about how you do unique channel-based storytelling or channel-based campaigns," explained Wallace Carlson. "I still think that we are using some channels such as Twitter or Facebook purely as distribution. We haven't totally leveraged those channels for channel-specific content that only lives on Facebook or only lives on Instagram or only lives on Twitter. But I think it feels like we're warming up to it, but it's just a matter of figuring out how to do that and how to build in the time to do that and really think about it. Versus creating once and publishing everywhere."

Time is key to consider, too, in that the audiences need consistency in channel usage.

"From a communications strategy standpoint, I really don't like it when we use platforms sporadically," explains Lauren Aleshire, senior content marketing specialist in Public Affairs.

"I think it's ineffective when we use Instagram for one day and then don't use Instagram again for another month. Anyhow, I think we have to take both of those things into consideration. You know, making sure we're communicating in some kind of ongoing basis or some kind of regular, scheduled cadence so that we can engage our readers no matter what platform it is."

2) Better information collecting and sharing

While the Public Affairs' team has started to define and work toward measuring its successes under this new approach, the next step comes in how — and whether — to communicate and tie that success to a company's larger work as a whole.

Aleshire cites this as one of the main difficulties Kauffman faces in navigating how the editorial approach aligns with the rest of the foundation's work.

"We're doing this work. We're telling the stories. Everyone agrees it's valuable work," said Aleshire. "But how is it then specifically tying back to strategies? Frankly, even tying back to dashboards and the way that we communicate with people and our numbers."

Without this clarity, Aleshire says there is a disconnect between the Public Affairs team and other programmatic departments in understanding the how editorial work at the foundation can further its larger mission.

"When I've written editorial work, there hasn't been the expectation that it has an impact on the immediate goals of the program," said Aleshire. "It's kind of an added bonus. It's great to be telling that story. It's great to be raising awareness of it. People are excited about the spotlight, but as far as increasing the immediate metrics? It honestly hasn't been part of the conversation and I think that's probably where the disconnect is existing."

Jacob says this disconnect isn't unusual in this line of work, however. Nonprofits have a unique difficulty in that, while there are certain business objectives, at the end of the day there isn't a product to sell. And while programmatically a philanthropy may want to see hard numbers on progress toward its mission, it takes time to draw those connections.

"We have real people that I can point to to show that. But we don't have enough of them, so we're hamstrung when we want to activate," said Jacob. "If you want a vibrant economy, you need a lot more people, especially those that have been pushed aside, to get better skill sets through education. Better opportunities to start businesses. Better networks. Those are the types of things that we need a lot more people to champion. And that's what we're trying to create overall. And that's a shift away from a communications internal agency to a public affairs approach that's more focused on the strategy."

And Jacob is right. The Public Affairs team set a goal of increasing overall audience engagement by 20 percent in 2019. To do this, the foundation will need to see increases in things like views and clicks on content as well as new followers or subscribers to newsletters.

So far, page views have been up consistently compared with monthly numbers from the 2018. In March 2019, the foundation had 11,735 page-views — that's up 28 percent from February 2018 and up 7 percent from March 2018. Overall, social engagement, social followers, and email subscribers and clicks were down from the previous month, which saw spikes in most of these areas following the release of several research initiatives as well as events like the State of Entrepreneurship and Inclusion Open.

All of that is to say that the foundation is seeing growth and learning from these new examples of where the editorial approach has been applied, but the numbers aren't exactly conclusive.

Still, collecting this data and making sure its shared among departments is key to building knowledge and better understanding of the value of this new editorial approach. Processes might change, but people change much slower, said Sandler. Knowing this, she realized that she can start to shift her own colleagues on the Education team to begin understanding the editorial function and decision-making in Public Affairs more readily if she's providing examples of where there has been success.

"I realize that I wasn't showing any analytics to the Education team. So, I'm expecting them to go on this ride with me of using other channels when I'm not actually showing them like, 'Well, this is actually how much more eyeballs and how much more engagement we got putting this thing on social versus putting it on our Currents piece'," said Sandler.

"So, you have to show them the evidence for them to start to sway their opinion," Sandler said. "And I just realized that feedback loop, I wasn't providing it on the Education team. ...I can't just say, 'Hey guys! Facebook is the place to be at for your Education content.' I have to show them why am I making that decision? How is that actually going to help them programmatically?"

Showing this information will become simpler as the Public Affairs team continues to work on aligning its digital properties and platforms with a new customer relationship management (CRM) system in 2019.

"Not being able to track with where our different audiences are engaging with us at, it makes it harder to tell a full picture," said Aleshire. "We can speculate who we think our people are on Facebook based on demographic information and based on Facebook's targeting, but without also seeing the way that they interact with our other materials, we're just speculating."

3) Educating and shifting the mindset of the foundation as a whole

Beyond refining technological capabilities and functions, refocusing overarching strategy has been further complicated as once-traditional internal communication roles have been expanded and redefined to better align with the new editorial approach. At the Kauffman Foundation, Public Affairs serves more roles than just as an editorial newsroom, explained Mays. Nevertheless, Mays says a pivot in editorial approach can provide an opportunity to rethink how much effort should be put toward a company's corporate communications role over editorial roles and other methods of communicating in order to meet larger strategic objectives.

"We're still an organization that's generating ideas and content. I don't want to downplay the fact that we kind of have a traditional corporate communications role, certainly the department does. And that we need to let the world know about what the foundation is doing," said Mays. "But it's sort of, from an editorial sense, part of what we're about. It's not all of what we're about."

One way this balance of traditional communications and editorial storytelling was demonstrated was in the Public Affairs' approach to a video created to present to the foundation's board, said Senior Video Producer Matt Long.

"We could've done — and we were going down the road of producing a piece — where all these people talk about how great 1 Million Cups is," said Long. "But they wanted to hear from direct whether it was an organizer and how its impacted their community, or it was an entrepreneur and how having presented 1 Million Cups has impacted their company directly."

In the video, individual stories of were presented to show the range of impact the national program has had in educating, engaging and supporting entrepreneurs since its inception in 2012. As a result, Long says the video illustrated how editorial storytelling can make the programmatic work of the foundation more genuine and relatable to audiences.

"People can see themselves in the problems that an entrepreneur is facing might be similar to the problems a colleague is facing," said Long. "You're still trying to get your angle in there about the value of 1 Million Cups but through a very real person that other entrepreneurs can identify with."

With that being said, Long believes there's still value in producing content in a more traditional way, where a video might focus more on explaining a concept or what a new program is about. And there's no doubt that the foundation will still need to produce that content from time to time. But now, examples like the 1 Million Cups board video can show others in the foundation how storytelling can be another effective method of communicating their work with those inside and outside of the foundation.

Nonetheless, whether editorial takes up part or the whole of what Public Affairs does at Kauffman, for now Public Affairs has to combat that confusion and close disconnects with other departments, according to Wallace Carlson.

"We have to do all of it," says Wallace Carlson. "But right now, we're leaning in one way, and it's causing some confusion and tension around our program teams."

Wallace Carlson says the solution here will be thinking more about how the Public Affairs team and departments like it can better serve as a strategic partner to its other program areas — even in an editorial capacity.

"I think we have a lot of opportunity for more collaboration between departments to really understand what the needs are, and if and how storytelling can help," said Wallace Carlson. "So, what are the needs from a total cross-foundation perspective? What are the needs from program perspective? What are the needs from individual leadership perspectives?"

Alleviating this confusion and tension will take time and more conversations with different stakeholders, says Jacob. Where 2018 was spent building the new editorial approach at the foundation, Jacob says in 2019 the Public Affairs department will concentrate on showing how the new approach to storytelling can help them to serve the larger foundation's mission.

"It's going to be messy if you're trying to retrofit this into any organization that has any legacy whatsoever," he said. "There's going to be overlap for a while. There's going to be a ton of ambiguity. People are going to freak out for a while. You've got to keep them together long enough so they can get through that and keep them talking enough so that they can get through that and hopefully get to the other side of it."

Upholding a legacy

Despite these internal growing pains from the editorial shift, the fact remains that storytelling is something that — alongside programmatic efforts in education and entrepreneurship — the foundation has been doing for decades.

After working at the foundation for 25 years, Long says while storytelling might not be the foundation's lifeblood, it definitely is in its blood.

"It's part of our DNA," says Long. In fact, it's become ingrained in the routine he and Matt Pozel have created when they sit down to interview people for stories.

"I think we come from a history organizationally of telling stories," says Long. "Matt [Pozel] sits down with people. I've heard this hundreds of times. His stall as I'm getting a microphone ready, or setting a light, part of his stall tactic is to say, 'Thanks for sitting down with us. We're the Kauffman Foundation. As you know, video is one of the ways we tell stories.' He doesn't know that they know that, but that's what he always tells them. He tells them, 'this is one of the ways we tell stories.' And we do."

For Pozel, who came to the foundation 20 years ago as a writer, storytelling wasn't always done through video or an editorial lens, but storytelling always had purpose.

"I feel like from the first time I discovered I had an ability to write something and reach people was like a magic moment," said Pozel. "But then it was also that moment to be cognizant of I can influence people. I can play off of people's emotions. I can create something that is legitimate or illegitimate, and I need to be careful about how I apply that."

Over the past few decades, the foundation has told stories differently whether it be in writing or video, to explain and highlight programmatic areas or to inform and inspire audiences under this new approach.

"Marion Labs had a studio where they produced. They had their big corporate stuff that they produced pieces for, but they also had an in-house studio where they would produce marketing pieces and pieces for their associates. And that's how some of this started," said Long.

Explaining program initiatives and providing more marketing-style videos is a still an important function of Public Affairs. However, now there's more opportunity to weigh which approach — whether it be informative, promotional, editorial or something else entirely — will help guide creating content that will be most effective in resonating with audiences and sharing the foundation's mission.

"We're still telling the stories, we're just doing it a different way now," said Long. "There's a lot more intentionality to who we're thinking about, who we're going to produce these pieces for. But in some respects, I feel like we could probably rationalize any approach."

For now, the foundation is still working through the challenges of infusing branded journalism into the work the Public Affairs team does both for its audiences and other

associates at the foundation. No matter how stories are told or how successful the new "audience-first, story-focused" editorial approach is, Long is confident the foundation won't stop telling stories.

"We're all storytellers. I mean everybody on this staff is some form of a storyteller," said Long. "I mean that's what they love to do. But why organizationally? You know, why did Ewing Kauffman sit down before he passed away and commit to 6 or 7 hours of telling stories about his life? He was convinced to do it by Bob Barrett at the time. But Bob Barrett was the communications director of the Kauffman Foundation at the time and knew there'd be enough value in hearing these stories of Mr. Kauffman's life."

"It just feels like we have a visual history," Long said. "I just feel like I've been able to be part of that legacy through telling stories through video. So, however we do it, that's just what we do."

APPENDIX A: REFERENCES

Boczkowski, P. J., & Mitchelstein, E. (2012). How Users Take Advantage of Different Forms of Interactivity on Online News Sites: Clicking, E-Mailing, and Commenting. *Human Communication Research*, *38*(1), 1–22. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2011.01418.x

Bro, P., Hansen, K. R., & Andersson, R. (2016). Improving Productivity in the Newsroom? *Journalism Practice*, *10*(8), 1005–1018. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/17512786.2015.1090883

Chaffee, S. H., & Metzger, M. J. (2001). The End of Mass Communication? *Mass Communication & Society*, *4*(4), 365–379. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1207/S15327825MCS0404pass:[_]3

Cook, T. E. (1998). *Governing with the news: the news media as a political institution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b5790448&site=eds-live&scope=site

Cook, T. E. (2006). The News Media as a Political Institution: Looking Backward and Looking Forward. *Political Communication*, *23*(2), 159–171. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/10584600600629711

Fischer, M. C. (2014). The pay-per-visit debate: Is chasing viral traffic hurting journalism? *American Journalism Review*. http://ajr.org/2014/03/27/pay-per-visitdebate-chasing-viral-traffic-hurting-journalism

Flyvbjerg, B. (2013). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363

Gans, H. J. (1979). *Deciding what's news: a study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b1119985&site=eds-live&scope=site

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b1129329&site=eds-live&scope=site

Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2014). *The elements of journalism: what newspeople should know and the public should expect*. New York: Three Rivers Press, [2014]. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b10438513&site=eds-live&scope=site

Lee, E., & Tandoc, E. C. (2017). When News Meets the Audience: How Audience Feedback Online Affects News Production and Consumption. *Human Communication Research, 43*(4), 436–449. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12123

Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, [©1922]. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b1432384&site=eds-live&scope=site

Molotch, H. & Lester, M. (1974). News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents, and Scandals. *American Sociological Review, 39*(1), 101. http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.2094279&site=eds-live&scope=site

Plesner, U. (2011). "Studying Sideways: Displacing the Problem of Power in Research Interviews with Sociologists and Journalists," *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(2011): 471-482.

Ragas, M. W., Tran, H. L., & Martin, J. A. (2014). Media-induced or search-driven? A study of online agenda-setting effects during the BP oil disaster. *Journalism Studies*, *15*(1), 48–63. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/1461670X.2013.793509

Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, *10*(2), 199–228. https://doiorg.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1177/1468794109356739

Robinson, S. (2007). "Someone's Gotta Be in Control Here." *Journalism Practice*, *1*(3), 305–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512780701504856

Sigal, L. V. (1973). *Reporters and officials: the organization and politics of newsmaking*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b1689248&site=eds-live&scope=site

Small, M. L. (2009). "How many cases do I need?" On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research. *Ethnography*, *10*(1), 5. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.24047975&site=eds-live&scope=site

Tandoc, E. C. (2014). Journalism is twerking? How web analytics is changing the process of gatekeeping. *New Media and Society*, *16*(4), 559–575. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1177/1461444814530541

Tandoc, E. C., & Thomas, R. J. (2015). The Ethics of Web Analytics: Implications of using audience metrics in news construction. *Digital Journalism*, *3*(2), 243–258. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/21670811.2014.909122

Tandoc, E. C., & Vos, T.P. (2016). The Journalist is Marketing the News: Social media in the gatekeeping process. *Journalism Practice*, *10*(8), 950–966. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/17512786.2015.1087811

Thomas, G. (2011). A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse, and structure. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*(6), 511–521. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1177/1077800411409884

Welbers, K., Van Atteveldt, W., Kleinnijenhuis, J., Schaper, J., & Ruigrok, N. (2016). News selection criteria in the digital age: Professional norms versus online audience metrics. *Journalism*, *17*(8), 1037–1053. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1177/1464884915595474

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods*. Los Angeles: SAGE, [2014]. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b9740874&site=eds-live&scope=site

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW GUIDE

General questions
- What's your name, and how long have you been working for the Kauffman Foundation?
- Tell me a little bit about what kind of work you do here — either for the editorial team or another department you may serve in tandem with Public Affairs.

Background questions
- Can you give me an overview of the new editorial approach the Kauffman Foundation is adopting on your team?
    - How long has this change been worked on/talked about?
    - What do you feel are the primary goals of this change?

- **RQ1:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected how you think about audiences in your work?

    - **A)** What kinds of audiences or people does Kauffman look to engage with its content? Are these audiences different than those you engaged with before the change in editorial approach?

    - **B)** Can you give me a sense of how actively you are thinking about the people you are creating content for? Maybe give me an example of when audiences were or were not considered at some point in your work.

- **RQ2:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected what you decide to cover?
    - **A)** What kinds of topics is Kauffman interested in covering under this new approach? Are these different than before the change?

    - **B)** Under this new approach, who can pitch stories? Can you describe that process and how it has maybe changed?

    - **C)** Under this new approach, how do you decide what ultimately will get covered?

- **RQ3:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way you use different channels to tell stories?

    - **A)** Since adopting a new editorial approach that concentrates on stories, when does story placement across channels come into play in the editorial process? *E.g. The beginning, once a story is in production, after a story is written*

    - **B)** In this new approach, are some channels where stories are placed or shared more valued than others? Which? Why or why not?

- **RQ4:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way you evaluate a story's performance?

    o **A)** Can you give me three words to describe what a successful story is under the new editorial approach? *Explain these choices.*

    o **B)** What sorts of measurements or responses are you looking for in what you would consider a successful story? Have these measurements changed or are they emphasized differently than before?

Wrap-up

- The Kauffman Foundation isn't a for-profit business. Editorial stories aren't the product we're selling. We're in the business of giving money away. With that being said, why make this change in editorial approach if we don't have to?

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW LIST

Larry Jacob
Vice President of Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Keith Mays
Director of Editorial in Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Julie Scheidegger
Editorial Manager in Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Matt Pozel
Senior Multimedia Writer & Producer in
Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Matt Long
Senior Video Producer in Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Kim Wallace Carlson
Director of Engagement -
Entrepreneurship in Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Miles Sandler
Director of Engagement – Education in
Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Lauren Aleshire
Senior Content Marketing Specialist in
Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Chris Newton
Digital Marketing Specialist in Public
Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Katey Stoetzel
Content Marketing Coordinator in Public
Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Kayla Smalley
Digital Content Coordinator in Public
Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

APPENDIX D: CONSENT FORM

*Rest in peace, press release: A case study exploring how adopting a
audience-first editorial approach affects news production in a nontraditional newsroom*

Consent Form

I volunteer to participate in a research project conducted by Valerie Hellinghausen and overseen by the research director, Randall Smith, from the Missouri School of Journalism at the University of Missouri.

1. What is the aim of the study?
This study aims to provide insights into how restructuring one's editorial approach might affect the processes that govern the day-to-day working of a newsroom. These insights may prove especially valuable to practitioners and academics alike as the definition of newsroom and the structure itself is expanded beyond the realm of journalism and into nonprofits, corporate brands and other nontraditional spaces. In the end, these findings may help fill a gap in literature exploring how adopting a new editorial approach may affect news production, especially in light of the influence of audience feedback.

 As a participant, I understand that this study is also being conducted for the completion of the researcher's professional project for the completion of a master's degree and may be submitted for publication.

2. What will be involved in participating?
My role involves participating in an audio-recorded interview. The interview will last between 30 and 60 minutes. During the interview, participants will be asked to respond to several questions relating to the study.

3. Will I be compensated for my participation?
I recognize that the researchers value my time, but I will not be monetarily compensated for my participation in the study. At no time during the study or its publication will I profit from my participation.

4. Who will know what I say?
Audio recordings and transcripts of the interviews will be made. Only the researcher and the research director will have access to the recording. Additionally, I recognize that the researcher will destroy the audio recording according to Institutional Review Board protocol. *Despite these protections, if I don't want to be recorded, I will not participate in the study.*

5. What are my rights as a participant?
I understand that my participation in this study is *voluntary*. If, however, I feel uncomfortable in any way during the interview, I maintain the right to decline to answer any question or to withdraw my participation in the study at any time, for any reason without penalty. If I have any questions regarding the research, they will be answered fully at any point in the study.

6. If I want more information about the study, whom can I contact?
This study has been reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Research Protections Program and Institutional Review Board at the University of Missouri. The board can be contacted through the Office of Research, Graduate Studies and Economic Development on campus, by phone at (573) 882-3181 or by email at irb@missouri.edu. Randall Smith, the research director, can be contacted by phone at (573) 882-9738 or by email at smithrandall@missouri.edu. Valerie Hellinghausen, the primary researcher, may be contacted by phone at (281) 840-8416 or by email at vhellinghausen@kauffman.org.

_____	_____
Printed respondent name	Respondent signature, date
_____	_____
Printed researcher name	Researcher signature, date

APPENDIX E: SUPERVISOR EVALUATION

EWING MARION
KAUFFMAN
FOUNDATION

April 7, 2019

Kim Wallace Carlson
4801 Rockhill Rd.
Kansas City, MO 64110
kcarlson@kauffman.org

Dear Missouri School of Journalism Graduate Committee:

With talents in both journalistic storytelling and strategic communications, Valerie Hellinghausen has proven herself to be an invaluable member of the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation's Public Affairs team.

Valerie joined the team as a Fellow mere weeks before the Foundation's second annual "ESHIP Summit," a convening of more than 600 entrepreneurial ecosystem builders from around the world. During our first briefing, Valerie asked detailed questions about our intent for the Summit, the expectations of the attendees and our measures of success. She gracefully navigated vague assignments to produce stories that supported our overall communications objectives.

Her work on the ESHIP Summit – with a short ramp-up period and minimal direction – set her up to take on a year full of new and reimagined projects that would demand her creativity, strategic thinking and leadership.

Of note, Valerie was instrumental to the success of the 2019 State of Entrepreneurship. After 10 years in Washington, D.C., the yearly event came home to Kansas City, and Valerie stepped up to execute a multi-channel communications strategy. This included writing and organizing national and local email communications; crafting website copy and content updates; and most importantly, managing a live SMS and social campaign that was critical to the event's success. She showed savvy not only in multi-channel communications, but also in negotiation with teammates on a high-stakes project that relied heavily on cross-team integration.

During Valerie's past year on my team, I have been impressed with her growth as a confident yet humble leader – especially on projects with no set precedent. She is more comfortable in ambiguous situations, using her skills as a journalist and respected team member to get more information. She speaks up, asks questions and seeks feedback with ease.

I deeply appreciate Valerie's focus on better understanding the "why" and "to what end" of our projects so she may better unleash her creative, strategic thinking to arrive at the "what" and the "how" to achieve results.

Valerie is a standout strategic communications professional. If a spot opened up on my team, she'd be the first person I'd call and invite to apply.

Warmest Regards,

Kim Wallace Carlson
Director of Engagement – Entrepreneurship
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

APPENDIX F: SELF-EVALUATION

When I accepted the position for the new University of Missouri branded storytelling fellowship with the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, there was so much I didn't know. I knew next to nothing about Kansas City. I didn't knew even less about what specifically I would be doing. Working in philanthropy — and strategic communications in general — was entirely new to me. Sure, I'd studied the various facets of the industry for two years, but I hadn't gained much experience applying my skills as a storyteller and strategic communicator outside of a classroom.

That being said, I trusted this fellowship could be a springboard into new areas of my career. And I was right. In the last year, the confidence I have in my skills has grown with every new challenge that's been thrown my way. Through various projects I've led, stories I've told and conversations I've been a part of, the thing I've learned most about myself is that I work well when the rules are undefined and precedents aren't set.

I'm not afraid to be the first to ask a question. This was especially true when, in the first few weeks of my fellowship, I was asked to interview mayors and entrepreneurial leaders during the second ESHIP Summit. Though the days were long, I was energized by the opportunity to dust off my reporting skills and the makers, the doers and the dreamers that the Kauffman Foundation has built a community with.

I also learned to share my ideas and value those of others, even when we worked in incredibly different roles or had vastly different levels of professional experience. In the past year, the Public Affairs team welcomed me into numerous conversations not just about everyday tasks but about how the department should function as a whole. I had the opportunity to engage with conversations and ultimately conduct research reviewing how the Public Affairs' editorial approach has shifted to being audience-first and story-focused with the guidance of Atlantic 57, a consulting agency that works in tandem with *the Atlantic magazine*. It's this work that has further shaped how I view the future of the industry I work in, as well as consider the possibilities for media's influence as a whole. Even more so, it's these conversations that inspired the work I have done here in fulfillment of my master's degree, and so that other fellows may someday have the opportunity to do the same.

Most importantly, my time at the Kauffman Foundation and my work on my professional project have allowed my leadership skills to shine. When my boss, Kim Wallace Carlson, was unable to attend the 10th State of Entrepreneurship, she trusted me to see the event through in her place. This trust came from months of experience working with me and mentoring me on how to always look for ways to communicate clearly and inspire audiences to act and work with us to fulfill the foundation's larger mission. After leading the content research, creation and multiplatform distribution strategy for the event, I knew I had earned both Kim's trust in my abilities as well as a stronger sense of confidence in myself as a strategic communicator.

With that, I am proud to know the work I've done here has furthered my own career and set a high bar for the students who will continue this fellowship in years to come. It has been my greatest honor to work with a team of such dedicated and caring professionals at Kauffman, and I know that I have done my job to my best ability because of the way I feel trusted, welcomed and valued walking into any meeting, project or conversation at the foundation.

APPENDIX G: WEEKLY LOGS

Week 1: Jan. 20-27

This has been a short week after returning from a long holiday weekend. Most of my time this week will be spent finishing meetings with several of our program officers. In these meetings, I have been discussing with team members from different program areas about who they would like to invite to our upcoming State of Entrepreneurship address. In addition to building a list of people to invite, I have been brainstorming with different program officers about different actions individuals can take to support entrepreneurship. The idea is to build a "digital checklist" of sorts to share with those that attend the event or join our Livestream. This is the first time we may be able to use this content to continue engaging and promoting specific actions throughout the course of the year.

In addition to these meetings, I have been crafting our messaging to send to 1 Million Cups Kansas City. We want to invite them to join us for the event, but also would appreciate their help in promoting the event at 1 Million Cups meetings. We hope there will be some crossover between the two events on Feb. 27.

Week 2: Jan. 28-Feb. 2

I have been finishing up my meetings related to the State of Entrepreneurship digital checklist and event list. So far, I have gotten a lot of good feedback, but we have encountered a lot of confusion as to who this event is marketed toward. We have a pretty broad, aspirational audience we would like to reach, so that complicates things a bit. In years past, it seems Kauffman has been pretty limited in who is invited to the event when it's been held in Washington D.C., keeping these more policy-related as a result.

Outside of my meetings, I have been drafting the copy for several save-the-date and reminder emails that will help promote the event. We have been dividing some of our communication between two audiences: those who can attend the event in person and those who will be attending the event via Livestream. Working with Chris Newton on this has really taught me to think more critically about how we engage people digitally, and how we ought to be treating our online audiences.

Week 3: Feb. 3-9

The past two weeks I've really been focused on State of Entrepreneurship (SOE). Kim has me handling most of the copy needs for this event, as well as some of the strategic content going into it. We sent out our initial save the date today, so some of my handiwork may have already hit your inboxes. If not, more details will be coming soon, and I'm happy to share any info I can. We're looking forward to seeing you there.

Outside of SOE, I'm still getting our project with Technical.ly off the ground. I have my second call with them this afternoon to go over some of the parameters of our project. I'll be working with some of our Evaluation team at Kauffman as we move closer to

developing survey questions. For now, we're just trying to finalize what information we want to gather about the publications we research and include in our landscape of small-business-focused publications in all 50 states.

Other than that, I've been scouting some initial info for a couple editorial pieces as we work through some changes to our editorial meeting formats. I should be of more help as a reporter as things calm down with SOE.

Week 4: Feb. 10-16

This week was cut a bit short for me with me leaving for Houston on Friday for a family funeral. Before then, I was mostly focused on handling a few last-minute copy needs for the State of Entrepreneurship. I have been finalizing the copy for our program as well as putting the finishing touches on some reminder emails.

I have also been working closely with our Evaluation team this week to get our questionnaire language refined for my work with Technical.ly. I have a call scheduled with the team at Technical.ly to go over these questions to ensure we will be getting the answers we need to make this census useful for Kim in the future. We are hopeful that by talking with several of these small business-focused publications that we will get some insight into those entrepreneurial communities as well as what information needs readers might have. I am working with our Evaluation team as well as some of our team members at Global Strategy Group to make sure our survey language and question formatting is in line with other surveys we have put out in the past.

Week 5: Feb. 17-23

We are buttoning up some of the final pieces of our content for the State of Entrepreneurship. I have been writing our copy and drafting some layout ideas for the digital checklist we will be creating and distributing to our event attendees. Additionally, I have been working with Julie and Chris from the editorial team on the flow for our digital activation work with Phone2Action.

Outside of the fellowship, I have started several conversations with my thesis advisor and Kim to discuss the potential of switching from a thesis to a professional project for my master's capstone. Originally, I had completed a thesis proposal before accepting this fellowship last summer. Since then, it's been very difficult to find a consistent, concentrated block of time to work on my thesis research. I feel strongly that this fellowship has given me a ton of opportunities to grow in all areas of my education and professional work. It's not usually possible for a student to change course at this point in the semester, but I feel confident that if I can find a topic related to my work it will be possible to finish on time.

Week 6: Feb. 24-March 2

The State of Entrepreneurship was held this Wednesday, and that is where most of my week was spent both before, during and after the event. We were still working out a couple kinks in our digital activation flow on Phone2Action into Tuesday afternoon. I also had to take over for Kim on Tuesday after she needed to go into the hospital after injuring herself while exercising. The event itself went off without too much of a hitch despite some ice that caused 1 Million Cups to cancel their event for the week. The turnout was still good, though, and it seemed like our event was energizing for those that could come. We also saw some of the best online engagement we have ever had for this event, so that will be exciting to dig into in some retrospective meetings next week.

Outside of work, I have been working to gather and fill out all the necessary paperwork to switch from a thesis to a professional project. This week, I was also able to finalize my new committee and make my advisor switch. Dr. Volz was on board with staying on my committee, and I think that the idea I have proposed will prove useful to both the Kauffman Foundation and other industry leaders in nontraditional newsrooms. Also, I think it will provide a good example for future fellows in Kansas City. That being said, I have also spent some time this week reaching out to a former classmate of mine who I think may be a good fit to take over the fellowship after my time here ends this May.

Week 7: March 3-9

After the State of Entrepreneurship (SOE), Kim asked me to lead a retrospective meeting to discuss what ongoing outreach we want to plan for following the event. We captured roughly 600+ new email addresses at the event. For the remainder of my fellowship, I will likely continue to plan and lead the content strategy on how to best communicate with these audiences with new SOE-related content as well as folding in other content the Kauffman team is working on.

In the same vein, I've been leading the revamp of the digital checklist I created for SOE. We originally created a document with significant statistics from Kauffman research and actions people can take to support entrepreneurs. In April, our policy department will be taking a group of entrepreneur support organizations and entrepreneurs to Washington D.C. Jason Wiens, who is leading this event, asked if I could help tweak the content from the SOE checklist to fit a policy-related audience. I've finished the copy updates and layout drafting for this and should be getting it finalized next week.

Additionally, I have been setting up and conducting some initial interviews for a story I'm writing about the diversity gap in the STEM pipeline. I'll be reaching out to several Kansas City area grantees and organizations to understand how they're working to solve this problem.

On Wednesday, I also checked in with the team at Technical.ly to go over progress updates on our project to find more entrepreneur-focused news publications in all 50 states. We have finished our initial research and should have completed our first round of interviews this week.

For the rest of the week and weekend, I will continue drafting materials for my professional project proposal. I spent some time earlier this week outlining my timeline, which I have attached here, and I feel confident about the scope of the work. I also managed to get all of my paperwork sent in to the Office of Graduate Studies, and I have Kim caught up on what will be needed on her end. Kim is also confirming with Larry that I will be able to use our contractor to help with transcribing interviews. It doesn't sound like this should be an issue, and it will save me a lot of time going forward.

Week 8: March 10-16

This was a relatively focused week for me while the majority of my team was away for the South by Southwest conference in Austin, Texas. I have primarily been working on writing an editorial piece for Kauffman Currents looking at improving diversity in the STEM pipeline for women and girls. I held a couple interviews with different nonprofit organizations that the Kauffman Foundation has provided grants for me for this piece. My editors will be reviewing my draft next week once I add in a new perspective from an interview I had Friday. These conversations have been especially intriguing, and it's been refreshing to see my interview skills sharpening after it's been a few years since I was reporting regularly.

Aside from reporting, I have been drafting our strategy for ongoing communication following our State of Entrepreneurship event. I will be spearheading the next few email sends as we look to engage this audience with other Kauffman events as well as more content we're creating related to the event. This process has really helped me to correct some of the tendencies our Entrepreneurship team has when it comes to talking a big talk when we discuss what event follow-up we will do. Often times, these tasks get set aside as new events and initiatives take priority. I have learned to keep people accountable and to step up as a leader on these projects when my colleagues have other pressing items come up.

As far as my professional project is concerned, I spoke with Kim Wallace and she let me know that I will not be able to use our transcription contractor because of some budgeting protocol. I'll spend some time this weekend researching other alternatives. Knowing that I may need to adjust my timeline to allow for me to transcribe these myself, I sat down to schedule all of my interviews. So far, all of my colleagues appear to be on board with meeting with me. I will be conducting roughly 5 out of my 12 interviews next week, and then 5 more the following week with the last 2 finishing up around April 1. Initially, I had thought I'd need a third full week to conduct these, but it seems like there is enough availability in my schedule and my colleagues to complete these a bit ahead of schedule. I think that should give me some time to work on transcribing the last few as needed. That being said, I will be spending some time this weekend refining my interview questions with the intention of having them ready for feedback come Monday morning.

Week 9: March 17-23

This week, I wrapped up some initial interviews for my STEM piece. We've gotten a clearer frame on this and are looking at exploring how and whether the current education opportunities in STEM are preparing us for a more diverse workforce. I'll continue working on this piece over the next week or so conducting a few follow-up interviews and working with our editorial managers to discuss any additional content around it.

I've also been drafting an on-going communications plan that will help us to continue communicating with the audience we built around State of Entrepreneurship this year. I worked on fleshing out a second draft this week. Once we have it in a sharable state, I will be bringing together all the stakeholders in that plan to discuss our first round of priority sends. So far, it looks like we'll be prioritizing some messaging around Hill Day, a project Jason Wiens is overseeing in our policy division.

Outside of my fellowship work, I have been conducting interviews for my professional project. So far, the conversations have been really engaging. Each person I have interviewed has offered some differing perspectives on how this approach has affected our work. A few responses have really stood out to me, and I'm noticing some trends. I've managed to conduct 5 this week and get two fully transcribed. I plan to get the remaining 3 transcribed this weekend. Next week, I plan to conduct 3-5 more as I await some confirmations.

Week 10: March 24-30

This week has been a little all over the place at the foundation. I was participating in a number of team development meetings. Several of these meetings spawned conversations related to the work I'm doing in my professional project. It was intriguing to see what common threads were brought up and further developed in these group discussions. In what little time I've had between meetings, most of my time has been spent working on developing the digital aspects of an advertising campaign we are running with POLITICO. I spent some time learning and building out a campaign on an application called Phone 2 Action, which we've used for other events in similar capacities. I will be keeping an eye on what engagement we see with this tool in the coming weeks.

As for my professional project, I am getting close to finishing up my interviews. I have one to conduct today and one to conduct Monday. The conversations are becoming more and more repetitive, which has me feeling confident I'm close to meeting theoretical saturation. I had one colleague decline my request to be interviewed because of scheduling issues, but I feel confident with the 11 other interviews I should have plenty of data to dig into. My plan is to finish transcribing this week's interviews this weekend, and hopefully begin coding next week.

That being said, after my interview with Larry Jacob, the vice president of Public Affairs at the foundation, he expressed some concern and desire to have some oversight over what gets submitted for publication. I spoke with my supervisor, Kim Wallace Carlson, about the possibility of including the opportunity for Larry and/or her to conduct a member check of relevant portions of my writing to provide feedback on. She expressed

that if I can build in the time for their review, it would probably ease some of these concerns. I have a few examples from my courses with Dr. Volz that I can review this weekend and potentially model my own protocol after.

Week 11: March 31-April 6

This week has been a little different with what's going on with my family. I took some time off from my work at the Kauffman Foundation after working all day Monday. On Monday I made sure that everything was set for our POLITICO as campaign and that Phone 2 Action was working for an upcoming text-in campaign. I also attended several of our weekly editorial meetings to discuss progress on an editorial piece I've been working on covering the STEM pipeline.

After Monday, I spent my week finishing my last few transcripts. I read over some examples of member check methods that I may adopt for my own protocol as well as some notes I had from Dr. Volz's courses on coding and linking. I started coding during the later portion of this week. I've done my initial codes on two transcripts. I hope to complete at least two more this weekend.

My family is hanging in through a tough week. We hope we'll be able to get my dad home either tomorrow or Sunday afternoon. He's stable as far as his nutrition and pain management go. For now, we'll be figuring out our next steps as we get hospice care set up. I anticipate I'll be in Houston until at least next Wednesday, but I'll keep everyone updated.

Week 12: April 7-13

This week was still odd for me, as I was out of the office dealing with a family health emergency in Houston. I will return to Kansas City and to work on Sunday. I spoke with my supervisor today to go over the projects I still have on my plate and to discuss priorities going into the final six weeks of my fellowship with the Kauffman Foundation.

Outside of work, I have been slowly making progress on coding my documents. At this point, I have 5 out of the 11 coded. Now that things are settling down a bit more in Houston, I anticipate I'll be able to make some headway this weekend. I plan to finish up coding next week with hopes of starting to outline by the following weekend. I know we're getting down to the last few weeks, but I feel confident that I can finish my work to graduate in May.

Week 13: April 14-20

At the foundation this week, I was primarily getting back up to speed after being out for two weeks. My primary focus for the week was on moving forward our communications plan that will be following up with an audience list we built after the State of Entrepreneurship 2019 event. I spent some time this week updating the copy for an email we'll be sending out asking audience members to complete a survey to support our policy

work. In addition to updating that copy, I met with Kim and my coworker Katey to discuss our next priority sends so that I can begin writing and building those emails next week while Kim is away.

Aside from that work, I was focused heavily on working with the team at Technical.ly to prepare our first report out of the landscape analysis work I've been doing with them. On Wednesday, we met with Kim to go over the current list of news publications they've researched. We also discussed the findings and interviews they've made so far and went over what updates we'd like to see before the final report is finished. I will be overseeing the last leg of this work while Kim is away, and it should be my primary concern for the next few weeks. I'll be fielding several additional calls and keeping a close eye on what interview data comes in to ensure this project is up to par with what Kim is expecting.

For my project, I spent the majority of this week finishing up the last of the coding I needed to do on my interview transcripts. Once I finished those, I spent a lot of time reading through and linking together like items and drafting an outline. In the end, I wound up writing my first draft of the professional portion of the project. It's been interesting to see how this process is so closely related to how I've done other work combing through interviews for Kauffman. I'm feeling confident about the draft and what issues it covers. I think I did a decent job of reporting what I learned, but I'm not sure if the purpose/value of the paper comes out as clearly as it needs to, especially if this is intended for publication. That being said, I think the interviews really tell the story here, and there was so much data that one area of the interview guide — story placement — was only lightly touched on. Data in the other areas was more prominent, and definitely of greater concern to highlight, but I didn't expect to use so little of that area in my project.

Week 14: April 21-27
This week, I have continued my professional work on an on-going communications strategy following up with audiences we built through the State of Entrepreneurship event in February. I've been managing some updates to one send with an electronic survey as well as drafting copy for several new sends we will be distributing in the coming weeks. I have been trying to write as much content as I can to help ensure we can maintain a regular distribution schedule with this audience. Next week, I will continue writing and making edits to these while Kim, my supervisor, is away. Outside of that work, I have spent Thursday and most of Friday in a seminar on micro-documentary storytelling with several Kauffman associates as well as other communicators working with philanthropies. It has been a comprehensive learning opportunity to think about how videos can assist in telling the foundation's story, and how I as a strategic thinker can help guide that process.

For my professional project, I have primarily been focused on making rounds of edits to my professional analysis portion. I have received feedback from my colleagues at Kauffman as well as Randy thus far. I'll have a couple updates and preparation work to make this weekend, as well as any edits I receive from you prior to my defense. Other than that, I am feeling good about where things are and I feel like I have formatting/paperwork all under control for Monday.

APPENDIX H: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – LAUREN ALESHIRE

Valerie: Go ahead and tell me your name and how long you've been working for the Kauffman Foundation.

00:05 Lauren: My name is Lauren Aleshire, and I've been working at the Kauffman Foundation for about a year and a half.

00:10 V: OK. Cool. So, tell me a little bit about what kind of work you do here either for Public Affairs or across other departments you might serve.

00:18 L: So, I work on the Public Affairs team in service of Entrepreneurship. I spent my first several months here working specifically on FastTrac and 1 Million Cups stories and telling the stories of those programs. The effects that they have in the communities, the stories of the entrepreneurs affected by them and the impact that implementing a program like that can have. I've started working on other stories and other program communications work within the Entrepreneurship team since then, but similar things. Looking to communicate the stories of different programs, different events, different initiatives that we move forward with still in service of entrepreneurship.

01:10 V: Gotcha. Yeah, you probably have one of the closer programmatic focuses out of everyone, so that's interesting.

01:18 V: That being said, can you give me an overview of your participation in the Atlantic 57 work? Kind of when did you get involved and what were you participating in?

01:28 L: I guess I participated in the group activities and then the read-outs. As far as kind of the structure of the work and the collection of the data, I was not part of that. I was from a RACI standpoint, I was an informed.

V: Gotcha.

01:52 V: And through that work, how would you define what this new editorial approach is that we're adopting?

02:03 L: I have gone back and forth with Keith on it a couple times. I think that ultimately we're looking to change the intent of our work to be focused on elevating the content pillars and the communications points that we want to relay to a larger audience, as opposed to starting with our programmatic work and strategies and then trying to find a story that aligns with that.

02:30 V: Mhmm. Can you talk a little bit more about what you mean by content pillars and what goes into that?

02:35 L: Sure. I can't say all of the content pillars off the top of my head, but ultimately there's a handful of topics that the foundation has decided aligns well with the programmatic and the strategy work that they're doing. So, these content pillars are a way of elevating stories to a level that makes them apply to the strategy, and also helps them be a little bit more tangible and understandable within the communities of the people that we're hoping to help.

03:16 V: OK. So yeah, just trying to move closer to serving that audience rather than focusing so much on what programs here Kauffman is doing, what Kauffman itself is doing.

03:26 L: That's exactly right. Even with entrepreneurship, that word and kind of the programs around it can be evasive to people. And so, the more that we think about entrepreneurship as supporting small business owners and supporting the communities that we live in — given that some of those people are entrepreneurs — then if we bring that conversation down to that level, it's a lot more understandable and a lot more applicable to the larger audience that we're hoping to get on board with the work that we're doing.

04:01 V: Gotcha. Cool. So, in kind of thinking about audiences, I do want to spend some time in talking about how adopting this new editorial approach has maybe affected the way that you think about audiences in your work, whether that's more so or in a different way.

04:19 L: Let me think on that for a second.

04:27 L: I think that the focus on audience, honestly, is really helpful for the Public Affairs team, whether it's at an editorial level or it's at a communication level, or it's at a program level. It helps us do a better job of taking what we're trying to communicate and applying it to the person that matters: our end user.

04:55 L: You can think about some things that we work on, like 1 Million Cups for example. And think about the way that that affects different audiences in different ways. So, if we are using that lens when we're telling our story, we're able to better effectively communicate with those people and communicate in a way that resonates with them more wholly.

05:18 V: Right. Right. And part of that shift has also been the typologies. What's your general understanding of the typologies and how that's meant to influence the way we do our work?

05:31 L: OK. I can't answer that question. I don't have a good enough understanding of how the typologies and the audiences are different. I guess one of them is kind of demographic and one of them is psychographic, in which I would think that both of those should be applying to our work. But what the end state is and how they want that to be, I'm not the right person to ask that question.

05:55 V: Sure. You said that one is more demographic, and one is more psychographic. Which would you say is more of the other?

06:05 L: I guess I would say that an audience. I guess I can talk about the definitions around them and how I feel like that's understood. But audience is more straightforward. It's more demographic. It's more we're looking at millennials. We're looking at baby boomers. We're looking at men who are over 40\. The typologies is not necessarily applying that demographic information but looking at the intent behind users and readers and your constituencies and using that to drive the way that you communicate with them, as opposed to demographic information.

V: Mhmm. Gotcha.

06:46 V: Yeah. I know there is that split. That was something that my committee initially asked me about. They said, 'Is Kauffman trying to get more people of color in the mix? Is Kauffman trying to get more women in the mix?' I said, 'I don't know if that's really an intention under this editorial approach.' I said, 'It would be nice. I don't think it's something we wouldn't want,' but I said, 'I don't think that's a primary goal.'

07:07 L: No. Honestly. It goes back to more effectively communicating with the people that we're working with. I know that, too, we've talked a lot about in this work, Kauffman's tie to research. What a researcher looks like and the way that you would communicate with them is very different than you would talk to a direct entrepreneur, for example. And so, the more we can refine that and use it to drive our work, the better we are.

07:42 L: I think about it with like USASBE, for example. We went to USASBE this year, and it's primarily a research audience. It's generally people in academia who are professors, who run entrepreneurship programs at their schools, who have been working in entrepreneurship for many years. Lots of them had touched the foundation before, had applied for research, had applied for grants, and some of them had offered our NEL programs before or programs for new entrepreneurs like FastTrac and 1 Million Cups. So, someone was offering them in their community. But as far as the way you would converse with that audience around what we're doing and our programs, it would be very different than how you would talk to someone who is working even at a small business center who was working with our programs or offering our programs. That distinction, I think, lies in many different areas in our work.

08:49 V: Yeah. Yeah that's one audience that I think has shifted a lot. As our research program has changed so much here, it really is an interesting group. People have indicated there was a time where we've really lost some of that audience, so it's interesting to see us building things back up in some ways and refining and better connecting with some groups than others.

09:16 V: That being said, through effectively communicating with one audience or another, are there certain values or messages we're trying to really focus on now under this approach? I know we say we want to tell the foundation's story, but I don't know if we have specific ways or things we want to focus on within that.

09:41 L: Kind of the content pillars, which again I don't have those five off the top of my head. From the squid burger, those content pillars are kind of where we're starting. I don't think the answer is our strategies, because honestly those are not communicated really effectively outside of this building. And then after that I'd just say Mr. Kauffman. Mr. Kauffman's legacy and the work around Mr. Kauffman and being uncommon and doing the work to affect people positively, locally through education and entrepreneurship. And so, some of our talking points around education and entrepreneurship and Mr. Kauffman's goals for the foundation.

10:34 V: So basically, trying to communicate around how to take his legacy and inspire or motivate more action around that.

10:40 L: That's exactly right.

10:42 L: I think that when you get into the strategy work, we're getting too specific. And so, more we're talking about how our work informs his legacy and fulfills his legacy.

10:58 V: Yeah. That's where the content pillars, coverage areas, however you want to say it. Those are still very broad, so I think it'll be interesting to see how we expand that out as we go, but I don't know that we're there yet.

L: Yeah.

11:09 L: Well, think about even community. Community is a great one because it applies to both our education work and our entrepreneurship work. But then you kind of also think about tying that then to what we hope the bigger impact of our work is, and that's almost like a further of a stretch we haven't quite made it to yet.

11:27 V: Yeah. Yeah. Well, I think that will take some time and the support of bringing in program officers and things into that. And kind of saying, here's our new editorial approach and here's how you play a role in that. And here's the goal of that. I think once we have everyone on board, it'll be easier to make that happen. But that's just something we haven't rolled out yet. But that's one thing.

11:53 V: I'm curious, from your perspective — you've been here a year and a half — how actively you feel our team is thinking about audiences. And if that's maybe been more emphasized or not so much.

12:06 L: The audiences or the typologies or either?

12:10 V: I would just say audiences in general. Typologies might play a role in how people think about that. They might not.

12:17 L: Honestly, that's one area we have a lot of work to do on. It's in everyone's mind, but because we don't have a solid CRM system yet, it's very hard for us to know the way in which people interface with our different programs and our different work in different strategies. Even people who don't directly interact with our programs but the way they interact with us online between our different programs and between our work, we don't have a way of tracking that. We're struggling I think. And I think everyone would agree with it, which is why we're doing the CRM project. But I think that we're lacking because we can't draw those lines and connect people and then try to tie them back to a typology or to a higher-level learning that they're hoping to achieve.

13:10 V: Yeah. It's like we have the framework, but we haven't built out the legs for it yet. We don't necessarily know what goes into each of those.

13:18 L: That's exactly right. I think about it too even the education thing when I first started, Miles said something about the TEACH program. So, I signed up for the TEACH program, and I interact with a lot of the content because I'm interested in it. I think it's a cool thing in Kansas City. So, you think like what that email series is doing really is not tracked against me and the way that I interact with other entrepreneurship content, "Ideas at Work" content. So, there's a connection that has to be made there. Until we can do that, it's just a partial story.

13:50 V: Yeah. I think that's where a lot of Larry's goal for this year is to bring all of those digital platforms and things together and into alignment so that we can enrich that.

14:04 V: I kind of want to shift to talking a little bit about our news production process here at the foundation and understanding how adopting a new editorial approach has affected what we ultimately decide to cover. Whether that falls under a content pillar, whether that's just a shift in generally what we decide cover whether that's events or something else entirely.

14:29 L: Sorry. So, how is the new process changed the approach?

14:33 L: I honestly feel like it's made a big change in it. And the reason is because we're looking for the 'why' right now and we're looking for the story, as opposed to maybe a more traditional content marketing approach where we have the answer and then we back into it with an angle. I think that even in our weekly meetings, and we've gone through a lot with the evolution with our weekly, monthly, quarterly meetings. But even the way the conversation in those goes, from starting with our work and then trying to tell a story or having a story or having a connection or something that needs to be told. And then if it fits back to our work, great. And if not, that's maybe OK, too. I feel like it's definitely changed. You can kind of even feel it in the way we converse about what story ideas are shared or what we're sharing.

15:33 V: Yeah. I've been really encouraged to see that meeting shift toward talking about what we're seeing in the world and what people are paying attention to. I think that's brought a new dynamic to things. Like what's important to us as consumers is also getting factored in.

15:50 V: And it's interesting to see we kind of move away from letting our calendar dictate entirely what's going to be coming up.

15:56 L: Yep. That's exactly right. I think that we've been less calendar-focused. 'Let's focus on this day or focus on this event,' as opposed to 'what's a conversation that's happening that we can be part of?'

16:13 V: And that's an interesting shift in how we look at and define relevance on our team because it's not just timely it's also engagement-based.

16:20 L: Yeah. That's exactly right.

16:23 L: And I think that that honestly will help the foundation overall as we work to have a bigger impact. People are interested in hearing what we have to say about different things and taking a stance on a topic. I actually think we know that from our A57 work. The more that we can evaluate what's going on and find areas where it makes sense to have an opinion or take a stance about things, it will better engage people.

16:56 V: With that shift in our editorial meetings, has there been any shift in how stories are planned or even pitched at these meetings?

17:10 L: I guess the conversation at the meetings is different because we're focusing on what's going on, what's the story that we need to be part of, or what's the story that we need to tell. But as far as the pitching and planning process, we've refined it a little bit, particularly with the use of Teamwork and the separation of work. But it generally flows the same way. That kind of is all similar.

V: Gotcha.

17:42 V: Yeah. It's interesting because I think we've built out a couple tools, but I haven't really felt a difference in that. I would just say that the one shift that I've seen — and you can agree or disagree with this — I don't see Kim and Miles always at that meeting. They're not the ones defining the agenda as much.

L: That's true. Yeah that's true.

18:03 L: I guess when I started we really went through the calendar at the meeting and said, 'OK. This is event is happening here. This is happening here. Victor is speaking here. These things are happening in this order.' And that was all driven by Kim and Miles, so if they weren't there, there wasn't even a conversation to have. Now we all have that marching order and are able to look for those areas of opportunity.

18:29 V: Yeah. So that conversation is just much richer. There's more people with a voice.

L: Yeah. Absolutely.

18:38 V: Yeah I know some people had told me about that. I guess I've been in at such an odd time in all of this that it's hard to know historically what's been and what's not been.

L: Mhmm.

18:48 V: I think another one of the big conversations that's been changing is just how we talk about and use channels. Do you feel that adopting this new editorial approach has maybe broadened the way we think about channels or changed it in any way?

19:14 L: Hopefully it has broadened it. Hopefully we're working toward broadening it, but I don't know that it really has yet. I think that's more of an internal bandwidth issue that we're working to alleviate. I still think it's been hard for people to think outside of our website, our newsletter, our social channels in a traditional video-feature format.

19:46 L: That being said, I know it's in everybody's mind to get away from that. It's just been a pull to make it happen.

19:53 V: Yeah. I think even within that there's still some tension. I still hear, 'We'll just put that on Facebook. We'll just put this on Twitter.' Do you feel like there's a hierarchy within that still?

20:08 L: Yeah, absolutely. There absolutely is. Of course, starting first with our website and then newsletters and then social channels. But I think that for whatever reason, social channels have become the red-headed stepchild. Like, 'Meh. We'll just put it there because there's nowhere else to put it.' I think that does a disservice to our channels, does a disservice to our readers. There's a better way to handle that stuff.

20:35 L: I also. From a communications strategy standpoint, I really don't like it when we use platforms sporadically. I think it's ineffective when we use Instagram for one day and then don't use Instagram again for another month. Anyhow, I think we have to take both of those things into consideration. You know, making sure we're communicating in some kind of ongoing basis or some kind of regular, scheduled cadence so that we can engage our readers no matter what platform it is.

21:09 V: Yeah. I think that's a really great point. I think that's something that maybe didn't come up specifically in the quarterly meeting conversation, but I think around building trust and talking about having conversations. You can't do that if you are in and out of the water so much.

L: Yes.

21:29 V: I would agree. I think there's a lot of work to do in getting there, but I don't know if people have a good sense of when to consider channel in this new structure.

21:46 L: I think it's a secondary conversation at this point. Ultimately, the focus of the group is trying to focus on the story and focus on creating high quality content that aligns with what our audiences want to hear. The channel conversation has still kind of been secondary. It still potentially needs more work because hopefully that would be worked into the initial pitch process. We're not quite there yet.

22:18 V: Yeah. I mean, ideally, that would start to at least form in some way. And it goes back to audience, too. I've asked kind of pointedly, do we mean audience first? Do we mean story first? And then, is channel second?

L: Yes. Yes.

22:34 V: What's the order here? But I think until we have a better idea of who our audiences are, where they are, what they want, what they're interested in, it's hard to know where all that takes place.

22:47 L: Yeah. Honestly, I think this is a technology limitation at this point, too, as we had kind of talked about with CRM. Not being able to track with where our different audiences are engaging with us at, it makes it harder to tell a full picture. We can speculate who we think our people are on Facebook based on demographic information and based on Facebook's targeting, but without also seeing the way that they interact with our other materials, we're just speculating.

23:19 V: Yeah. With that, too, it's hard because it's not only having the technological capability but having the time to consistently follow this.

L: Yeah. Absolutely.

23:31 V: You know. I see the work that Chris does. It's hard for one person to take that on and really be able to dive deep on testing and on gathering that data and then making sense of it.

L: Yeah. It's a huge undertaking.

23:49 L: And you think about...Let's say we were at the point where we have Salesforce implemented across the foundation and all of our data is being pulled into there and we're tracking how people are interacting with our different materials, websites they're visiting, when they're engaging with us, when they're subscribing or when they're clicking. And have a bit of a funnel set up. Still then, we have to be able to apply that information to then a differentiated strategy. And then that differentiated strategy is something that has to be built out and continually managed, which is not something that we're doing right now.

24:27 V: Yeah. Well, and you know that's where we kind of have this new editorial approach that works as a nice umbrella framework for some thinking, but that's one strategy element. That's not going through and taking a treatment for each channel, each audience. It's totally different.

24:45 L: Because even if thought. I know we've kind of talked about segmenting "Ideas at Work" based on the typologies and categorizing the different Currents pieces and grouping them by typology and then communicating with people in that way. Which, I think we all think is a great idea. Then, if we were really going to do a service to that audience, we would look at how that audience or typology is engaging with us and then make the solution that we're serving to them or the content that we're giving to them match the way in which we want them to engage with us. And is that social posts? Is it a daily email? Is it a weekly email? You know, what is that? And then, it might differ vastly between the different groups.

25:26 V: And that's where I also don't think we have a good inventory of what. If we're applying these typologies now to our audiences that are already established as well as thinking about what audiences we would like to include in that, I think we do a lot of content especially for the practitioner, but it's not within the Public Affairs bundle, necessarily. Public Affairs/editorial. I think a lot about the FastTrac Must-Reads and what we do with 1 Million Cups, and all of the content that's there being very practitioner-helpful. But, it's not like Kauffman Currents is going and writing how-to articles. It's different information.

26:06 L: Yeah. It's almost like we could be aggregating the different information that's published around the foundation to be shared with the different typologies. You think about even what Jason's doing with the typology work and then what FastTrac and Must Reads and even the Market Gaps RFP. Those are all things that wouldn't necessarily be new content that could be aggregated and shared with a practitioner, who would probably find that like very valuable information.

26:33 V: And that's where I think there's some folks who really want more role clarity as to what they do in editorial, what they do for Public Affairs, and that's where the saying that 'editorial is everything' has some people just stumped. 'So, like this thing that I have to create for FastTrac could also be considered editorial?'

26:56 L: It's definitely a new approach. It does have people a little bit confused about how to be working with us and how to be doing their work.

27:06 V: Yeah. But it makes sense. I write content for Jason every now and then. I've written and edited things for you for FastTrac. It's kind of true. I think it's just we don't yet understand that we could be aggregating that content. We could be pulling it all in and tying it together. So, really seeing us take on that full-on editorial newsroom role, I think that's a little alarming for some people.

27:38 L: I agree. I think we have to better define the way in which we interact with programs and the way that intersects with editorial work and or doesn't intersect at all. They could be two very different strategies and frankly they are kind of two different strategies. But I think we have to better communicate that internally because right now it seems like everyone is trying to smash them together.

28:18 V: Yeah. I think there is a want for consistency and continuity and for things to all work together thinking that then there won't be as much tension. Then there won't be as much confusion. But I think in some ways trying to force something to fit is harder.

28:35 L: What do you think about the back and forth that Kim and Julie were having the other day?

28:43 V: I think it's interesting. I think I agree with what Larry left off saying, which is just kind of like, 'Is this not happening? Because I see it happening?' I mean I see us fulfilling program needs, and so that's where I think that we were arguing about the same thing. And saying it just in different ways. I think all of it falls under Public Affairs. I think all of it could potentially have an editorial approach taken to it.

29:16 V: But I just think when we start to divide ourselves out to 'I'm on the editorial team. I'm on this.' Like no. We're on the Public Affairs team. That's our department. There shouldn't be total subsets of us because we could all potentially add into that. So, when I think about Public Affairs as this wider umbrella, underneath that falls the potential for advertising and marketing or content marketing and brand journalism and storytelling of all kinds. And then also media relations, public relations. So, we can all serve those functions. So, I started diagramming that out in my notes because it's like this conversation that's happening. I don't understand where the problem is because we do both of these things. They all fall under a department that we already have in existence. So, I didn't really understand what the tension was.

30:05 L: I didn't really get what they were working towards either. Unless Julie was saying that we needed to approach our other work in a better slash different manner was the only thing that I could get out of it. I think frankly that Kim would agree with that, but sometimes we don't have an initial high-level conversation about what we really want to be doing with this and what we want to be impacting. And so, without that, it's hard to let that affect each of the tactics and strategies that we use to move toward the objective. Whether it's editorial whether it's communications or postcards or direct mail or social or whatever it is we're doing.

30:53 V: Whatever it is yeah. I mean...and that's where I guess I felt like there were maybe other tensions being projected onto that conversation. I don't think it was really that conversation that was that confusing. It was just everything that goes into both of their roles.

L: Yeah.

31:09 V: And the constraint around having to share people that serve both roles. But I mean, it was a confusing point for a lot of people. But I don't think that those things have to contradict one another. Ideally in the work that we're doing, if we had program officers working more closely with us and helping define some of the work that we do, we might be able to reach more agreement on saying, 'No, this is a role where storytelling could be better. Maybe we don't need to do all those traditional media requests that you have.'

31:48 V: Like, 'Maybe we don't need to get this event invite created for you or maybe we don't need to write the Currents piece about this event. We can do something else. We can do something more effective.' We can have a little bit more creativity there rather than saying, 'My program officer needs this' without fully understanding what all we're capable of or what all we could do that would be better.

32:13 L: I agree with that. I agree with all of that. And I think that's honestly just exactly where the tension lies. Looking at a higher-level approach to things and looking at fulfilling the tactic immediately in front of you and then trying to find a way to merge those two. I think even people who might define themselves as only on the editorial team that were in the conversations that we had would agree that without the intersect of our programs and our other work, our policies, whatever it is, that they will also not be as effective in their ability to make change, which is what we all agree we want to be doing.

33:17 V: Yeah. We definitely need one another. We definitely need our program officers, and we look to them to help us set our agendas well and to bring in those audiences that they've already themselves cultivated. There's definitely a dependency on both. I just think that was a conversation that just built in so many frustrations. It wasn't effective and I don't think we really ever got to the heart of whatever the issue that was there. And maybe they did after that meeting, but I think that that brings in part of the conversation around how do we get the program officers involved in this? Do we? Is our strategy totally separate? And if it is, how do we work that out with the foundation? How do we still help keep each other accountable toward this larger mission?

L: Mhmm.

34:11 V: But I don't think that. I mean theoretically I don't think this new editorial approach should come into conflict with what we're trying to do programmatically. I think it's a really good fit.

34:24 L: I agree. I agree with that and I tend to take it back. I've worked at foundations before and I've done a lot of nonprofit work before coming here, but generally public charities where you're still trying to move people to action and you still have a bottom line. You still have objectives you're trying to complete. I think that sometimes we forget that a business objective should be driving what we're doing. So, if we don't have agreement on a business objective, then it's hard to determine the strategies and the ways in which we communicate whatever it is we're trying to determine. Because we then can't evaluate what's the most effective way to do this unknown thing. And so, I think that sometimes we forget that conversation here.

V: Yeah.

35:26 L: I think that. I don't know if that was at the root of what Julie and Kim were talking about, but I think that clarity around that could help resolve it.

35:34 V: Well and that did kind of come up in the conversation when Larry said, 'Can everyone take your flashcard again and write down what you think we're in the business of doing.'

L: That's right.

35:43 V: It's key to understand that because, yes, I agree. That should be what's driving what you're doing in a communications sense, in a programmatic sense. That is kind of the difficult point of this editorial work that we're doing. I mean, we're in the business of giving money away. Editorial might be creating additional value around those efforts, but it's really difficult for me to understand why are we making this change if we don't have to. From a journalism sense, there's not those revenue pressures to make these changes. So, how everyone understands what the purpose of our work is different at this point.

36:31 L: That's an interesting point. And really great. And I don't know the answer to it. Has anybody ever really said that?

36:38 V: Chris actually brought it up and said, 'You know, no one is making us make this change. Why are we doing it?' Not to say that we don't believe in it. But just why does storytelling matter? Why do this as a foundation?

36:52 L: When did he say that? In that meeting?

36:52 V: No, no, no. In an interview that I had with him.

L: Oh, interesting.

V: Yeah.

36:59 L: Yeah. Because I think that we as communicators and as nonprofit professionals know that this is a better way in which to work. But why are we choosing this strategy specifically? That's a great point.

37:18 L: That's a great point. I guess I would say that the answer is probably that Keith believes that editorial work is the best way to raise awareness and move toward that change we're hoping to move. If ultimately that means more eyes on a page, what's going to bring more eyes onto a page: a compelling story or an event calendar that has a pop-up blurb about the Mayors Conference coming up? I think that it's probably around his belief of how effective we can be.

V: Mhmm.

38:07 L: But you're right. That's an excellent point, Chris.

38:09 V: It's tough. No one has come from on high and said, 'We need to get better at storytelling.'

38:18 L: Yeah. That's true. Can you think about how much work we would all be saving if we were not doing this process at all?

38:22 V: Well and I think it's hard, too, because some people were here when that shift was started. Some people were here when Larry came on and he really made a push toward this as well. So, I think this has been a guiding force for a number of years now. But it's kind of hit this apex of, 'We've kind of decided on this one thing, but there are plenty of people on board who are like' but why do we do this?' Like, I don't have a historical understanding of why.

38:45 V: But I think for the most part, everyone on our team has a strong belief in storytelling. So, that's not really a question. People aren't like, 'Well, I don't think storytelling is the way to go.'

39:01 L: That's true. I agree with all of that.

39:03 L: It's just that messy work of getting to the end.

39:06 V: Yeah. Getting to some end.

L: Yes. Some end.

39:11 V: It was interesting that that came from Chris because I think adopting a new editorial approach has affected the way we all think about our stories' performance and what success means. I don't know how you view that from your perspective. I know you write for editorial sometimes, but you also have this very strategic focus on one program area.

39:35 L: It's actually very interesting. For example, when I've written editorial work, there hasn't been the expectation that it has an impact on the immediate goals of the program. It's kind of an added bonus. It's great to be telling that story. It's great to be raising awareness of it. People are excited about the spotlight, but as far as increasing the immediate metrics? It honestly hasn't been part of the conversation and I think that's probably where the disconnect is existing.

40:23 L: We're doing this work. We're telling the stories. Everyone agrees it's valuable work. But how is it then specifically tying back to strategies? Frankly, even tying back to dashboards and the way that we communicate with people and our numbers.

40:45 V: Yeah it's hard to say something is successful if it's not built into those goals.

40:49 L: That's right. We all know about the goal. I think we're supposed to be touching 30,000 entrepreneurs in the upcoming year. But if we're not looking at how our stories are doing that better or worse than a year ago, and or better or worse than other tactics we've used before, then they're almost just frosting.

41:19 V: So, what would you say then we are looking for as an editorial team in our work to define success?

41:27 L: I guess I would say engagements. I think about it kind of from a traditional marketing standpoint. I think we would want to be tracking the metrics around engagements, how people are engaging with our content. If they're clicking, how long they're staying on the page, if they're converting to forms we have on the page. And we could then hope that that secondary engagement leads to participation or activity in a strategy or doing the action that we kind of want them to do. So, if we keep them engaged with the content however that would be, we are kind of pulling them into our funnel and then they're taking a step later on to move toward a strategy or move toward work in one of our areas.

42:21 V: Yeah. It's tough because I hear people saying success is engagement, but then I also hear the other part of that dichotomy being success is impact. And I think we've seen successful examples of both but it's hard to know what led to either. We don't really have traction on that yet. And I don't know that we always have traction on conversion and participation just yet.

42:47 L: Yeah. I think it would be interesting to that. We're far from being able to do this, but it would be awesome to see a roll-up of all of our numbers for our online properties as they relate to our strategies. So, traffic that's coming to FastTrac that's then potentially driving to Kauffman.org and how that aligns with the allocation of the grant money that goes there. And then looking at that across the board. For example, 1MC seems to be underserved and under-budgeted and understaffed. If we did an analysis, we might find that 60 percent of the traffic that's coming to Kauffman.org is people who are trying to find 1MC information. In which case, then we need to be looking for ways to better communicate those successes and stories and better fund that programs. Because that's telling us that's a way in which people want to interact with our work.

43:52 V: Yeah. That's one way they get in the funnel and maybe follow down.

L: Yeah. That's right.

43:55 V: Yeah. That would be incredibly helpful in helping us communicate the value of what storytelling is to this program area or that program area or this particular grantmaking entity. I think that there's so much power in that, but it's finding the power to do that, to be able to track that.

44:21 L: We're just not there yet. We just don't have the rigor around that data collection yet.

44:29 V: And that's where I think that that is a huge goal that going forward would be interesting to continue looking into. Because that rigor that we would apply to me is so different from what the traditional media has been able to do, at least do themselves. I think there's significant people that can track that outside, especially in the political sphere. If Kauffman was able to track that stuff themselves and to use and implement that themselves, then that changes the game.

45:07 L: Yeah. I agree. I agree. It makes a huge difference. It could have a massive impact on not just our work but the way our work affects different communities and different people. It could be hugely impactful.

45:34 V: Yeah. We don't have that yet, but do you feel like at this point, under this approach and in all the confusion that's been there, do we have examples of success yet? You know, under the terms of what we would say are engagement or impact?

45:52 L: Let me think for a second.

46:07 L: I think we've seen pockets of success. I think that we've seen people engage with us more around different stories and different topics than they would have ever done two years ago. So, although it might not be on a repeated basis right now, I think that we are getting engagement in a way that we haven't before. And so, I think that those successes that we've had, we just need to kind of figure out how to replicate.

46:40 V: Yeah. That's what a lot of people have been pushing for I think. We've seen some success where we can say, 'Yeah. That was a great piece, or a great post.' But it's like so when are we going to do that again?

L: Yeah, how are we going to make that happen? Yes, that's exactly right.

46:59 L: That kind of probably is an internal issue. Working through the process of that and frankly working through the process just like it's a newsroom. At which point do we decide this story needs to be killed or this story actually has something there that's going to be engaging to people? I don't think we're quite there yet.

47:27 V: I think it will just take someone or multiple someones putting in the capacity to say, 'We need to build a case study around this and build out our toolkit to say, we know this works and it worked this way this time. And here might be some potential reasons why.' Even if we can't measure that to a point and say for sure that's why. I think we started to do some of that when we were trying to play with "Ideas at Work" and trying to break that out into segments, but we didn't ever translate that enough to other channels. I just don't think we got there. We kind of stopped/start.

48:08 L: Say that last part again.

48:09 V: I think about when we were really working with "Ideas at Work" and segmenting it out, we talked about this idea of having "quick wins" or building a toolkit. But we kind of got away from it and I don't know why or who was really overseeing that.

48:31 L: Yeah. That's a great point. I totally agree with that. I even think about in the last A57 workshop we did, we kind of. I don't think you were in my group, but we brainstormed different topics around the content pillars and then tried to flesh out the way that we would tell those stories to different typologies. And how we would do that. I feel like we didn't even do anything with that work. Obviously it informed the A57 work, but I feel like our group specifically had stories that could've come out of that that we workshopped through.

49:13 L: It's almost like that process...Maybe that process wasn't effective enough to implement, but some version of that process could be our steps to getting there.

49:26 V: Yeah. And that's where I think I was talking with Miles when she said we'll have to think about when we solidify our process, how we build back in that time for creativity. You know, is it kind of retreat format like we did with A57? It's like, 'OK. We're going to lock ourselves in a room for a day and just think about spitball any and all ideas that might be here. And spend some time thinking about how we execute on these and then we run with it.' That could be agnostic of any calendars, any events that are coming up. Just say, 'these are the really big ideas.'

50:04 V: Yeah. I agree. I just think we don't always have a clearly defined person who's responsible for pooling that knowledge and learning and then sharing it out. And sharing it out in a way that's like, 'OK. We're going to execute on this.'

50:25 L: Yeah. I agree with that. I totally agree with that. I think that kind of is where the struggle exists at. I guess that's kind of what I was thinking about. Yeah. I don't have anything else there. I was just ruminating on what you said.

50:50 V: Yeah. There's so much that's in people's heads that we remember right now, but the further we get away from it, it's going to be like, if we wanted to use that idea we've kind of missed our own opportunity there.

L: Mhmm.

V: Well, I know we're getting close to time, but we have a couple minutes before we have another meeting. I just want to make sure if there was anything you wanted to circle back to or that you didn't get to say, that I take that into account as well. And that could also be anything that you also want to continue conversing about or seeing our team talk about and work on. I know we've already talked about a lot of that.

51:31 L: Mhmm. I don't really have anything in particular. Overall, as we've kind of mentioned. We know this work is valuable. It's just looking at it and how it fits into the mix of things that Public Affairs is offering and then finding a way to effectively apply that mix to the work that we're doing. So that, overall, the foundation A) can make change and B) communicate change. That is just a wonderful process that we're all embodied in right now.

V: Yeah. It's a process, man. It's a messy one, too. And people do not like that.

52:22 L: Yeah. That's true.

V: Cool.

L: Wonderful.

52:25 V: Thank you.

APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – LARRY JACOB

Valerie: Go ahead and start off by telling me your name and how long you've been working here.

00:04 Larry: Sure. Larry Jacob. I've been on just a little over three years now.

00:08 V: Cool. And tell me a little bit about what kind of work you do here either for the editorial team or across the departments.

00:15 L: Sure. So, as vice president of Public Affairs, I have a few responsibilities. The first is to communicating the foundation's story externally, and that includes the editorial approach. It also includes direct communications to key constituencies and identified audiences. It includes our internal communications.

00:39 L: Part of Public Affairs as it's constructed here at the foundation also maintains our relationships and our grantmaking in Kansas City. So, I work very closely and involved in the sign-off on the KC Civic strategy and the work that's done in that particular grantmaking department.

00:57 V: Cool. With that being said, can you kind of give me an overview of this new editorial approach and the engagement with Atlantic 57?

01:04 L: Sure. So, it's similar to other brand journalism endeavors. What we recognized when I first came on is we had a perfect storm of things. First, we had local media really getting cut. So, the cuts at the Star started to accelerate as I came on here at the foundation. At that time, actually KCUR was pretty short-staffed. They've beefed back up. You also had just some local papers whether it's Startland just sort of finding their footing to put it mildly. I recognized something that as we were kind of developing our overall strategy in Public Affairs that the way we were communicating was a bit outdated.

01:55 L: So, we were communicating by basically publishing and getting eyeballs on research reports. When I first came on, that's pretty much all we were doing. There was value to that certainly for a specific audience, but to tell the foundation's story it wasn't really giving the full picture of what we were trying to accomplish throughout the new strategic focus and mission. So, that was a challenge.

02:24 L: So, you had media landscape changing. You had our strategic focus kind of changing. You had older systems internally for how we communicate, which was very much media relations-focused instead of a strategic communications overall focus.

02:41 V: Yeah. And you kind of spoke to some of that strategy shift this morning actually. And I wonder if you want to give a little bit of just context to that and how that's shifted.

02:52 L: Yeah. So. It did start with those things and then I started to think about 'what does the team need to be?' So, if we're shifting from an internal agency essentially, and that's how we were really operating. Where, 'you need a thing?' We'll get you a thing.' So, if you needed a brochure, we'll get you a brochure. If you needed a microsite, we'll get you a microsite. If you need a journalist to cover your report that you just put out, we'll get that done. And it was very much that, where we were basically an internal agency, and we used external agencies for overflow work.

03:25 L: The team didn't find that satisfying, as you can imagine because they were just, in their words, order takers. But also, the strategy of the foundation when I came on, right or wrong, what I saw was the strategy of the foundation, you'll never get there with what we were doing. And what I mean by that is this. You have the mission of the foundation in the simplest of terms is: You're born. You get tools throughout life. You take or make a job. You give back to society. To effectively do that for more people, especially those that had been historically marginalized due to race, gender, location and to fulfill Mr. Kauffman's legacy of overcoming all of that, doesn't happen with money. It just can't. There's not enough money to do that.

04:18 L: So, you have to come along the grantmaking strategies with a way to build constituencies to build a level of consensus, to build a level of momentum to create the policy environment, to create the personal connection environment. So, opening up new networks where more of that change can happen.

04:43 V: Mhmm. So, switching to a focus of 'We can't just give money. And we can't just share what we're learning in our research. We have to really motivate and inspire and get these larger people that we work with to take action on our behalf and to work toward that mission.'

05:05 L: Right. And really thinking through the audiences that we are addressing. So, when I first came on, the kind of internal lament was, 'My friends don't know what we do at the foundation, and they should.' And my question was, 'do they care about education or entrepreneurship?' Because those are the areas we're trying to affect. We're not trying to affect everything for everybody. So, if they do, then we should be talking to them. Then we should be communicating with them. If they want to see that kind of continuum change — and a lot of people do — but if they really want to weigh in and understand those issues more that actually is our audience. It's not the entire world.

V: Mhmm.

05:43 L: But when I came on, everybody was the audience. I would ask, 'who is this for?' 'Well, everybody.' 'Yeah, I don't think so.' Like, I've read it. It's not for everybody.

V: Yeah.

05:54 L: So, who is this actually for? Spending a couple years really trying to drill into who exactly is our audience, we engaged a lot of research around that. So, we started

with Global Strategy Group to look at our brand overall and dig into not only stakeholders but also beyond that with some other survey materials. And that helped to surface a lot of great information. A way for us to reposition our messaging and our brand and who are we and what we want to become in context of our strategy. But, there was still a level missing. So, this goes back to your initial question around editorial approach.

06:37 L: So, we could communicate in that context then at a very programmatic level. So, if you were interested in 1 Million Cups, we knew how to do that. We could, to a degree, communicate about entrepreneurship and about education, but internally we were thinking about all of these things separately as if they didn't add up to anything. So, going through the messaging framework and all that process, what I was trying to get to was: How do we tell the story of the foundation in a different way so that more people within our target audiences have a better sense of the totality of what we're doing? And start to get more into that. So, I always think of it from a double funnel piece. Because we're an operating foundation we have teachers. We have entrepreneurs. We have entrepreneurial support organizations. They're engaging with us in a very transactional way right now. If we can feed them over time and learn more about what they care about, then they're going to engage with us in a more thoughtful way. And they may still stay within their lane for a while. So, if they're really focused in entrepreneurship, they're really focused in education. But over time in the real world, those things blend together, and they come through what I call the "Kauffman funnel" at that point, which gets them down to more of an activist mode.

08:03 L: And we have real people that I can point to to show that. But we don't have enough of them, so we're hamstrung when we want to activate. We don't have great internal tracking on that, which we're trying to work on constantly. But those are the types of things that if we had 10,000, 15,000, 20,000 people that understand kind of as Mr. Kauffman did, like this is part of the same coin. If you want a vibrant economy, you need a lot more people, especially those that have been pushed aside, to get better skill sets through education. Better opportunities to start businesses. Better networks. Those are the types of things that we need a lot more people to champion. And that's what we're trying to create overall. And that's a shift away from a communications internal agency to a public affairs approach that's more focused on the strategy.

V: Sure.

09:01 V: No, that's really helpful. With that being said, knowing that the Atlantic 57 work was very concentrated on editorial work and how we build and communicate with audiences, what would you say are kind of the primary goals coming out of that just editorially?

09:19 L: Yeah. I think what we also recognized pre-Atlantic 57 is we had a content problem. And it was interesting because 2016 especially we had almost too much content being produced that was very specific research-based content and for a very specific audience. Then 2017 hit as the entrepreneurship strategy sort of refocused itself, and we

had no content flow. So, then Public Affairs had to start creating content based off of what the programmatic teams were doing in a way that it hadn't done before.

09:53 L: So, we started internally looking at different avenues for brand journalism. There were a few consultants that popped up to engage. We went with Atlantic 57 because of the type of work that they've done. They had worked with foundations before, as well. Which, foundations are a little bit different beasts when you're looking at brand journalism. You're not trying to sell the widget at the end of the day or the hotel room, so there's just a different...there's a slightly different angle on it.

10:33 L: So, that's why we went with them. It was to solve really the content issue, and how we would better produce that, how were we structured to produce that. What would we need internally and externally to produce it? So, that was really what the planning process in 2018 was engaged in.

10:54 V: Sure. Just kind of like how do we solve first like what content do we create? And then, what's the process for doing that? And what structures do we need? What people do we need?

11:03 L: So, they did ask 'why' question and the 'who' questions around that, and I think that was helpful. So, they took the Global Strategy broad-based foundation research and then also drilled in a little bit further with trying to cluster our audiences in a way that we could use. And that's where the audience typology conversation came up.

11:27 V: Yeah. And that's kind of where I want to head next I guess is just understanding: how has adopting a new editorial approach with typologies affected the way we think about audiences? Because I know we kind of shifted from personas, which is one thing. And then typologies is a whole different other thing.

11:39 L: Yeah. I think typologies for a lot of folks it's still. You're still wrapping your head around it a little bit. Because the thing about a persona is when you get into selling a widget, it's actually super helpful to think about: Here's Harry. Harry cares about these three things. Here's Jane. Jane cares about these five things. So that's what you're marketing to to get them to move on something. A [typology] is a lot more complex. It says Harry can be across a few of these things, but primarily he's this. It's still an interesting way for us to think about it.

12:17 L: For me, it wasn't clear in the Atlantic 57 work — even as we went through the whole process — of how we really execute on that. I think the last few months since February to now we're starting to figure out here's how you execute and here's also where there's deficiencies around it. I think from a storytelling perspective, it's useful. From a marketing perspective, you've got to keep drilling deeper into it.

12:53 L: So, again I'm very practical. I'll make this very real. If we write a story for a champion. If we know that's our audience that we primarily want, so this is a group that's going to help pick this story up and they're going to rah-rah this. If we want to expand

beyond our known champions and identify like champions and use paid advertising to do that, the typologies are actually kind of hard to use in that way. Because, who's a lookalike for a champion?

13:29 V: Yeah. And how you define a lookalike on the current platforms that we use. It's difficult to nail someone down based on motivation or interest or value. And the vocabulary that we use doesn't align with current vocabulary just on Facebook—

L: On Facebook and some of the other tools that we're using. So, we're sort of trying to fit those in and create proxies, which isn't unusual though.

13:56 L: And that's something I think that the team could get comfortable with. I'll give you an example on this. What surprised me moving into this world from more traditional public affairs and politics is that I know everything about you in politics. It's in my database, and I can depend more on that. And then I can score you based off your past behavior and all of your traits to get a sense of how you will lean in the future on certain things. Is that 100 percent accurate? God, no. But is it 60 to 70 percent accurate? Yes. So, is that better than where you are if you don't know any of that stuff? Of course it is, and it helps you target your resources more effectively and your messaging more effectively.

V: Yep.

14:45 L: I would really like to see us get to that point here at the foundation.

14:49 V: Yeah. It is easier in that sense that things are measured a little bit more consistently across the board and you just have more legacy there and how that's been done. How it's been done in media is a little bit more confusing, and we have less control over how that's conducted and how that changes.

L: It is. Right.

15:09 V: With that being said, I think that it's interesting to look at the typologies and just see just what values or interests these audiences hold and then how we want to communicate that in our stories. And what values Kauffman wants to communicate.

L: Right.

15:27 V: So, I guess for you, how do you understand that for each of the typologies? What values are really there? And are those values in or out of alignment with our work?

15:36 L: I would say that we can make them in alignment in our work is how I would approach it. We want to use the typologies as a lens by which when I'm sitting down to write something, I'm thinking about how is this going to be received by x, y or z group just to sharpen the approach. So, this is and this is more me doing it as someone who's written pieces for a couple of the different typologies.

16:09 L: So, in thinking about a practitioner, I'm thinking about writing in just a different way, but it's still promoting what the Kauffman Foundation wants to do overall. If I'm thinking about a champion, it's a bit easier since they're already sort of in our space. But if I'm thinking about a futurist, I'm still not just going to completely pander to what I think they want to hear. You know? It's going to have at least a lens, and my hope is that I can bridge a gap. If there's a gap there, I can get closer to what they are most interested in but what we want to talk about.

16:43 V: Yeah. There's still a strategy there and it's less about. I think it's difficult because some of our team members want to see it as, 'Here's how I would completely structure a story around this typology.' But it's a little more fluid. It is more of a lens than just this is the framework; this is the structure.

L: Right. Right.

17:03 L: And I do think it's. I use the word lens because we are still trying to have a Kauffman point of view. And I think this is part of something natural. I mean for 2018, and we were in a meeting yesterday where Keith referenced this. It was basically scout work. So, we pulled editorial out to figure out how would we actually make this even work in this kind of environment. Like what would it even look like? What would we need? All of that stuff. Now, 2019 is about like how do you fully integrate it? And I think there's going to be a lot of natural tension points when you do that.

17:44 L: And I will own this as the leader of the team. Part of the charge that I had for a stretch goal in 2018 was to ask an audacious question: What if the foundation were its own media company? So that's what helped stimulate a lot of the conversation around Atlantic 57.

V: Yeah.

18:07 L: The reason why I asked that in that way. And this is just something I do when I'm in a leadership role. Whether it was in my firm or it was something else, is ask an audacious question not with the idea that we're actually going to do that, but what can we learn from asking that type of question? That's just the way that I approach the work. Because if you don't, then you're doing the same stuff. Under that lens, the reason why I asked that: We don't have an ideological bent here. There's not a mandate from our founder or something else to say you've got to be over here, or you've got to be over here. We're in a weird place that we can do that. The second thing, unlike every other media company, we have literally no revenue conversation to have.

V: Yeah.

18:58 L: So, in this world environment that we're currently in, the media landscape shifting the way that they've shifted. That's a pretty unique position. So, that's what prompted the question. It's like, if we're going to tell the story not just of the foundation itself but what the foundation is trying to do and why, we can be a pretty trusted source.

We've built a reputation that's trusted, so let's figure out how to do that and get more people engaged in these funnels that we're talking about. And get more people down there. But do that through storytelling.

19:38 L: So, part of my challenge right now in leading the team is even just the language around it. It's like the editorial team is doing this. Ehhhh. Yeah, no. We're a team. Or this team is doing it. It's different. We're a team. We have functions. It's a challenge because some people like role clarity, and silos help with role clarity.

V: Yep.

20:06 L: So, if this is my silo, this is my job. This is what I know. But the reality is if this stuff is going to bleed across, there's nobody on the team that's doing one thing and probably never will. That's part of the balance on using editorial as the it. If we're telling the foundation's story and it does all kind of add up to why we do what we do, and if it comes all the way down to the program implementation. If there's not alignment between those two things — not just message-wise but strategy-wise — then we're off-track.

20:44 V: Yeah. It's hard. I think it's hard when you throw around different words and different teams. And it's especially difficult for programmatic officers to say then, 'Who am I dealing with?' That's where even when I was putting together this paper and proposing it as an idea, my committee really pushed to say, 'How are you defining this,? Is it editorial team members? Is it public affairs practitioners?' And I'm like,' Public affairs practitioners is probably the most general way to say this and that's how we identify our department.'

L: Right.

21:18 V: So even in our conversation yesterday saying, 'What is editorial? And how does that define and work out with marketing?' It's like, 'No, no, no, no. It's all Public Affairs. It's all strategic. It's all communication.' So, that was an interesting conversation to be a part of.

21:35 L: Yeah. No. I think more of those conversations have to happen because we can't assume what's in people's heads. Because what that manifests is somebody's producing this, thinking this, and then they come back, and they've got to rework the whole thing. And that's not a great feeling for anybody involved. That's a piece that we still have to solve for.

21:58 V: Well, and that's where while we don't have budgetary revenue conversations to have, time is a huge revenue piece for us.

L: Yeah. Time is time is it.

V: That's the real cost of all of this.

L: Mhmm. Right.

22:11 L: And we have a relatively short fuse on proof that this approach works. We're not going to do this for 10 years if it's not working, which is where the measurement comes in and why we have to show there's benefit back to the foundation.

22:30 V: In kind of thinking more about production and all of that, I want to spend some time talking about how has this new editorial approach affected what we're deciding to cover.

22:41 L: So, I think in some ways it's brought clarity to the types of things that we want to cover, and the emerging coverage areas at least give us another framework to operate within. And a way to go back to the programmatic team and say, 'Amongst our channels, here's the types of things we're going to be looking at. Here's who we're going to be talking to and why.' But we have to roll that out this year. So, the program teams haven't really heard that. Except for Education actually has. I think there's more understanding there, but with ESHIP we haven't rolled that out at all because we're not ready to.

23:25 L: I think we have some more work to do internally with our own team getting everybody aligned on how that actually works.

V: Sure.

23:31 L: But I do think that gives us our priority scale of like OK — to your point about time — 'we're going to spend this much time on this. We're going to spend this much time on this. We're going to spend this much time on this.'

23:46 V: In that time, you know, what kinds of topics is Kauffman really interested in covering within those coverage areas? And are those different from what we were talking about before or looking to do before?

23:56 L: Yeah. I think they are different over the last year. We were a lot more programmatic outcome-focused in our first year of content generation. So, if you look back at some of the older pieces, it's still very much reporting on something that happened. There might be a slight elevation to it, but it's really like, 'that's what happened.' I think what we're shooting for is, 'why did that thing happen? And what does it mean?' And that's where we start to feed into the broader audience conversation.

24:34 V: Yeah. Yeah, no. I think that's pretty true. I was talking to Katey just from her perspective as a newer member who's sort of been here in that last year. She said, 'It seems like even from the last story that I was working on, which was the EPN Convening piece, that felt like the last piece that I worked on that was very much just "this was the event. It happened. Here's what came out of that. Here's what was discussed."' And then as we sort of shifted to the end of last year and into the beginning of this year, we're focusing more on conversations, more on bigger trends.

25:09 L: Well, and when you think about our bigger audiences, whether that's on Currents or through our social channels, I think that trend is more relevant, and it's more interesting. The types of things that I hope we continue to do are looking for those stories that do blend the conversations around entrepreneurship and education so that they're not just an education story, an entrepreneurship story that there's more of a mix.

25:37 L: Before Atlantic 57 and manifests on the website redesign, we had Rethink questions that approached that. And it was this concept of pulling together work, the future of work, the future of learning, the future of place and weaving themes within a single piece. So, there's sort of a constellation of content within a single piece. But most of it's still pretty separate. When you read a piece, it's like, 'Oh that's the education portion of this. That's the place portion of this. And that's the entrepreneurship portion of this.'

26:14 L: And I think the coverage areas allow you to be a little bit more fluid in those definitions of what we write.

26:22 V: That's what I like. I appreciate seeing the coverage areas being defined very broadly. I think back to that one team meeting we had where we had our Venn diagram set up and we kind of all agreed we can't think about it as education and entrepreneurship. We have to think across both and kind of shift that topical thinking toward things that can cut across both and where we can add value to that without it being so siloed.

26:49 L: Right, and I think that's where kind of the new strategy design came out of really trying to think through how do those then...how do you do that? But then you also have when you keep going down your audience levels, you have people that only care about certain things and how do you meet that? And that's where the strategic communications continuum comes in for me. Right? So, a Kauffman channel — and we bring this up all the time in Education — using that to promote something in Kansas City around teachers is a waste of time. It's not a good use of anybody's time, but it's something that we're asked to do a lot.

V: Right.

27:32 L: Or using "Ideas at Work" which has a very sort of mishmash list right now of folks to promote a specific thing that's really targeted toward teachers. Like I want teacher X to show up on this date at this thing. But if you're a program officer and that's your day-to-day world, that's what you want to see.

27:54 V: Right.

27:57 L: You kind of care about the stuff that we're producing, but you really just want that thing. So, the trick of this team for this year is — and that's where I was pushing this in the conversation we had yesterday — so is that thing not happening? Because I see it happening. So then...are they still angsty about it not happening? You know. Or do they just want that for their own personal reasons or ego on a bigger channel? 'What are we

solving for there?' is the question we're going to have to keep working with program areas on to try to solve for that.

28:37 V: Well, and I think the difference now, too, for us is understanding like when we come to pitch ideas and we have the Kims and the Miles bring up those program officer needs, it's no longer appropriate to come and say, 'Hey, we have this event happening. We need to do a story.' It's, 'No. We need to sit down and think very strategically about what that story is for this larger audience.' And then it's like, if you want to get teacher X to Y event, then why don't we just be direct about it and send them the freaking invite?

29:05 L: Right. And what's the best way to send the invite, right? So, that's where I think we have a blend on our team of strategic comms and storytellers. Everybody plays a level of role on that. There are better ways for us to hit. So, when I first came on, there was an emerging event Amplify. First time being done. The idea was, well, just send it to this list. Well, we didn't even know who was on the list. And the list was...the intent of the event was for teachers of color. When I go back to every strat comm piece I've ever done in my life — political or otherwise — you think about 'who is the person I'm trying to get to act? How is that person going to best act?' It's usually not coming from an organization they've never heard of telling them to act.

V: Yeah.

30:08 L: It's coming from somebody that they trust to then inform them that this thing is going on. So that type of a thing takes a lot more work, but it's like where we've got to get to for that direct communication.

V: Right.

30:20 V: Well, and that's kind of. That where is really important, too. I guess that's where I'm curious just how you think this new approach is affecting the way we're using different channels. Because now we have the mission of we have all these tools but how do we reach people and where are they?

30:39 L: Part of that is in who are they? So, now that we have a sense of the types of audience and the types of people we want to engage, drilling down into that and using all of our tools, including paid tools, to bring people to the stories we want them to engage with. Then that's. I mean that's a big piece of this year's work and one of the things that I didn't mention but I lead on but the reason why I'm sort of obsessing about our different digital properties and bringing those into alignment and our CRM and all of that is so that we can get a better answer to that lookalike. We can get a better answer to really tracking somebody through so that then we can utilize them to help communicate our message, too.

V: Yeah.

31:29 L: So, when we had State of Entrepreneurship this year and we had an influencer strategy, and I'll put that in quotes. It was impossible to execute, and therefore we were all upset that it didn't come off the way we wanted it to. But everybody in this building has people that they can reach out to to help amplify the voice of State of Entrepreneurship. And we don't have a way to really execute that effectively or efficiently for anybody. So that's part of why that whole tech component. As much as we're talking about editorial and that work, we can't execute on our job if we don't have those other tools in place.

V: Right.

32:10 V: Right. Well, and it's interesting because I think another roadblock that I see is that even with the tools that we have and kind of know how to use, we're assigning very biased values to things.

L: Say more about that so I understand.

32:23 V: So, you know you kind of mentioned wanting to bring all of our digital properties into alignment. And trying to use all our tools effectively, but we can't do that if we assign and allow the program officers to assign higher value to one channel over another. And that kind of breeds this hierarchy of like, 'Well if my work is going to be placed anywhere it needs to be here because that's what we value most.'

32:50 L: Right. Right. No. It's interesting, you've raised it and I've reinforced this in a couple meetings. When I presented Public Affairs to the board and I said here's all the channels, and when you look at how I presented that, they're literally all on the same plane because there isn't a hierarchy. For each one of those channels, it depends on what the audience is that we're trying to hit. That's the key driver. But if you're a program officer and your grantee is part of this incredible video or this incredible story that gets picked up and others are talking about it, that's going to feel good. That's going to be special to you and it should be. But that may not be what is needed for the foundation's strategy. It's the challenge of we're not in the business of making program officers feel good.

V: Yeah.

34:02 L: We're in the business of trying to figure out how do you promote the foundation's strategy.

34:10 V: Yeah. And I think that's where it gets complicated. Understanding and piecing together audience-first, story-first. Do they both come first?

34:17 L: Yeah and I was glad to hear that came up yesterday because it's something that I feel like I need to be more focused on. It's always audience-first. I think where Atlantic 57's use of story-first kind of got a little bit overinflated was because they were talking

audience first. We didn't do a story journey. What did we do first? We figured out who our typologies were. We did audience research.

V: Yeah.

34:57 L: I think the way that Atlantic 57 would say that, though, is that's just a given. Right?

V: Yeah. That's how I would understand it, too.

35:04 L: And I think that's where a Julie would say, 'That's just a given.' I can assure you coming into the foundation it's not a given. The thought of audience of who am I talking to was not part of the communications. It was, 'Get everybody. Maximum eyes.'

V: Yeah.

35:33 V: It's hard because you think more people is better, but it's really if we want to make change you have to work with people and create trust with people who are going to take action when you ask them to. And when do you ask them, it's not going to be like, 'what the heck, man?'

35:49 L: Right. It is. The level of complication that comes with it. You need a set of eyeballs. Right? To get through the funnels. To get them to get to that action, you need a — and not everybody's going to take it. Most people are going to do low-threshold activities. You need to start big, but you're not starting with the world. I think that was actually the way we used to measure things. If you see our website traffic over time, you'll see a dip over the last few years. Like a real big drop off because we stopped measuring international traffic to our website. It had nothing to do with our mission.

36:40 V: Yeah. Yeah. That begs the question of Bahrain.

36:42 L: Well, yeah. I'm happy to answer that. So, I mean kicking off Global Entrepreneurship Week in Kansas City, which is where it started and partnering up on that in a different time, different strategy. Over time, all the United States work — which is all we fund, by the way — we only fund the United States work. Those ecosystems and that development, those weeks, that all feeds back in. The thing about the international travel, and it has diminished quite a bit, but there is value. I think some of the conversations that will be brought back, there is some value to understanding what other countries are doing. And thinking about how does that apply back to the United States, which is a strategic shift over the last few years. I will tell you when I first came here people were just going all over.

37:30 V: Well, if the object was to get everybody, then that's everybody.

37:35 L: But they were also. I mean like, FastTrac went international. So, there was people selling FastTrac in Europe and Russia, and they still know us. Like on these trips,

I'll go there and they're like, 'Oh. FastTrac. We love it.' And I'm like, 'OK. That's awesome.' That doesn't do anything for what we're trying to accomplish with our strategy.

37:53 L: So yeah. It is and there have been some interesting learnings that we've brought back from that international community, but we're bringing that grant forward again this year with new board members. It'll be interesting to see what kind of questions we get out of it.

38:08 V: Sure. Sure. That was just a curious piece from yesterday, but. Kind of thinking about aligning with strategy and all of that. I'm curious how we're thinking about stories' performance at this point. You know, under this new editorial approach what does success really mean and how do we measure it?

38:25 L: Yeah. What I've been encouraged to see going into last year is our numbers overall were dipping a little bit for the overall Kauffman.org, but Currents went up quite a bit. Time spent on the story itself went up quite. And those are the types of things I want to continue to track and see. Over time I hope we get more engagement with the stories. I think partly thinking about how do we engage the reader more to take some step, some action. Whether that's lower threshold or higher threshold. I think we need to get better at that this yea. Because to your point earlier, that helps sort of condition. At some point there's going to be a bigger ask that we want you to make.

39:15 V: Yeah. When you say engagement, what do you mean, specifically?

39:17 L: So, I mean I always think of engagement in levels of thresholds. So, a low threshold activity is liking something. Forwarding is like the next level up. You start to go down that kind of threshold. Commenting is pretty high usually on the threshold list.

39:42 V: Yeah. Yeah no. I would agree with that. It's curious because I've seen a dichotomy in people's responses to this question in kind of saying, I can think very clearly about likes, shares all of that. That's easy to measure. But I also hear, and I'm encouraged to hear a lot of our team members say, sometimes the success is just seeing a handful of comments that really feel like someone resonated with something. And we kind of brought up, it's Opening Day and people were talking about things like the Major League Citizens piece was. At least people have cited that as an example of success, even though it's not the most strategically focused to entrepreneurship or education.

40:25 L: Right. But it is for our civic. One of the things that we haven't hit on as much in communications is our third program area, which is the Kansas City component of this. So, I think there is that element of it as well. One of the reasons why I think that felt successful was it was one of the few times that we have highlighted a program that's run through Civic in that way.

40:59 V: Yeah. Do you feel like there are other examples of success that we've seen, at least in the direction of success that we want to see?

41:06 L: Yeah. I mean I think the Natasha video was particularly interesting to me. When I saw it, it was a really good video but just the legs that it had. And the comments and kind of the interaction that that had. I think that was a good example of the type of thing that was also multichannel. So, we were hitting that in a few different places. That was good. I will tell you there's been even just a couple other pieces around the Opportunity Zones stuff. It's been successful in a couple different ways. One, it got picked up in different venues, but it also has just been very helpful to refer back to on a very programmatic level to remind people this is why the foundation is engaged in this. So, even as someone who's sort of in that weird space as someone who's doing the work, and also having to refer back to the stories, it's been helpful.

42:12 V: Yeah. And that's a success that's not just creating something that gets talked about and shared and liked. It's something that's useful. It's information that you can use as a resource. And sometimes stories do a really good job of explaining that resource.

42:30 L: Yeah. There's been a couple other things that other media has picked up on, too. So, the Edie story that we did around 1 Million Cups. I mean, when done well, and this goes back to brand journalism and that potential of, if we write it, will anybody else write about it? Of course, they will. You're basically giving them one take on this story, but there's five other takes on this story. Go at it. So, when done well, we can have other legs. And that's one I tend to point to as well where it's like we can generate a few more of those types of hits that help really personalize the kinds of things we're talking about. And that one, it wasn't all about Kauffman. I mean sure 1 Million Cups was in there, but it was really about her journey and how she tapped into networks that she otherwise wouldn't. And told the story from the rural perspective. Things that a population never thought of. Like how would you run an internet business in a town that only has dial-up?

43:30 V: Yeah. Well, that's kind of the flip of what we've been talking. We're saying, 'Oh we want to be able to join conversations and insert a very unique voice.' We can also play a role in starting a conversation and having other people riff on that and add to that. I think that's another way to see success. We want people to be able to take action, and maybe that action is really having that public forum element to things, too.

L: Yep.

43:53 V: And I mean, that's really I guess the journalism piece of brand journalism.

43:56 L: It really is. It really is. It's kind of giving people a jumping-off point, an understanding point. And that's where I was trying to get to when you asked about it yesterday. Like what is it we're really up to in this editorial storytelling? And I know we have to refine that like right now as we approach this. But it is really about making the complex simple. You know? And more accessible to more of our audiences.

44:23 V: Yeah. I think that's key and it's hard to do that when I know the process here feels so complex. Making sense of how to do that work does have some translation into

what the end product is. That was really the thought for having these conversations. It's just: What the news means is based on how it's made.

L: Right. Yeah.

44:52 L: And there is levels of complication here. You run into things at a foundation that you don't run into at other brand journalism type entities. Not the least of which, you're talking about grantees or people that might be grantees, then what is then the expectation of the grantee after a story like that is produced? So, is the expectation that we fund them in perpetuity? Right? If you're sitting on the other side of this, you know. And then that puts a program officer in a challenging position. So, there are some of those types of considerations that are a bit different when you're dealing with a foundation.

45:39 L And then, one of the things that I know you know well pretty well just in the work that you've done, on the call to action itself. Our calls to action cannot be as direct as some calls to action may be if you were in an advocacy organization.

45:54 V: Yeah. Well, and, too, it's a question of capacity with calls to action. It's if successful work is people taking that action, how do we know they took it? Do we have those tools, do we have those structures in place? And we're not an advocacy organization. We don't always have a way to do that.

46:12 V: But that's where like seeing us use and even just this week for example I've been working a lot with Jason and I know you got looped back in, too, about this conversation with Phone 2 Action and using that for Victor's speech. It's like well, this is a tool we have, and we should use it.

L: We should be deploying it more, right?

46:28 V: And I know initial thoughts were like, 'Shouldn't we be directing these ads any clicks on these ads back to our website?' And it's like, 'What are they going to find on our website? What is that going to tell them to do? And are they going to go through the funnel, so to speak to get to that point?'

L: Right. Right.

46:43 L: Well, and, that was my lower tech option for Victor's speech was to direct them to the checklist. Which, is fine, but then to your point, we can measure did they download it? But that doesn't really tell us anything else and there's no sort of value add unless they signed up for, there's a sign up there, too. So, we capture some email but there's not a lot more of a value add there.

V: Yeah.

47:12 V: I guess I'm curious and value is such an interesting word. What do you hope that editorial storytelling creates value for? For the foundation and for our audience.

47:24 L: So, here's my hope. We have these typologies. We have people that are in those typologies now. I want a lot more people in those typologies, if that makes sense. I want more champions that we identify, and the storytelling starts to get them more in our orbit and we're tracking them, which goes back to my digital concerns earlier. I want more people in the orbit. The futurists, the practitioners. I want all of those audiences and those journeys. I want more people and that gets to we need those types of folks in the top of our funnel so that we can get them through at the end. My hope is that we can tell stories of the communities, the grantees through the lenses we've been talking about with the coverage areas that's compelling enough so that people are coming back to us. And then sticking with us. And then when there is something, whether that's speak up for reinventing high school or contact your local official because it's time to stop subsidies to large corporations, there's. If there's an active bill we can't tell them to take that call. But if there's not anything active, but we have 10,000 people in Nashville. They can make the call.

49:00 V: That being said, too. And knowing that I'm going to be writing this piece. What do you want other people to know about what we're learning from this process and adopting a real strong focus on telling stories?

49:17 L: I think I'd say one private foundations have unique issues that they have to deal with. So, you're writing about something that's a pretty rarified universe for this type of approach. So, the lessons and the things that I've talked about in this room today, if I were in a different room even at a community foundation or a family foundation, certainly at a corporation, certainly at a large nonprofit, I'd be talking differently. And I know for a fact I wouldn't apply the same lens or strategy that we're doing here. This is a fairly unique situation, so I want people to know that.

50:02 L: The other thing I'd say is, yes, I think we've had some internal communication challenges around audience first or story first. I think it always starts with that end user, that end audience member. That's just a given. Any organization they need to understand that's a given. And then how do you get to that person is based off of what that person is interested in and wants that's where the storytelling comes in. But that's also where potentially the direct comes in, and you're going to take them through a journey depending on where they are. And that's meeting them where they are.

50:50 L: And it's going to be messy if you're trying to retrofit this into any organization that has any legacy whatsoever. So, if you're not starting greenfield, there's things you're going to have to unwind. There's going to be overlap for a while. There's going to be a ton of ambiguity. People are going to freak out for a while. You've got to keep them together long enough so they can get through that and keep them talking enough so that they can get through that and hopefully get to the other side of it.

V: That's very true. Well, thank you for being our shepherd in that. And for taking time to talk about it.

51:25 L: Oh yeah.

51:26 V: I want to be mindful of time, though. I know we got started a little bit late, but that's really all the questions that I have.

51:32 L: Great. Thanks Valerie. I appreciate it.

V: Yeah.

APPENDIX J: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – MATT LONG

00:02 Valerie: Go ahead and start off by telling me your name and how long you've been working at the Kauffman Foundation.

00:07 M: I'm Matthew Long. Just usually go by Matt Long. And I have been here 25 years.

00:16 V: And then go ahead and tell me about what kind of work you do here either for the editorial team or across any other departments you might work with.

00:22 M: I do a lot of, I mean, primarily video production work. Audio/visual support on some projects. Live event support. Video production work. It's spanned anything from we're trying to produce programmatic overview pieces about different projects that the foundation is involved in or our grantees. That's how we used to do a lot more of that kind of work, that kind of explainer pieces. And it's transitioned probably in recent history to more of an editorial kind of. We still do some of the 'we're going to talk about what this program is.' But it's through a different lens as far as the documentary type or short-form documentary type pieces. But the bread and butter is still people sitting on camera talking about what they do and how they've been impacted by a program or a project or something that the foundation supports.

01:21 V: Cool. And then, you know, you kind of mentioned before we got started that you really didn't have a whole lot of involvement with the Atlantic 57 work, but from your own understanding, can you give me an overview of how we define this new editorial approach?

01:43 M: It's not going to be a good understanding because honestly I don't think I have a deep understanding of it. I think the focus on certain coverage areas has obviously become critical in terms of any project that we begin work on. It's like, 'Well, who are we.' You know, much more clearly define up front who is. I mean we always asked who your audience was, but in terms of actually the foundation identifying very specific audiences and tailoring communications efforts to those people is more than we've ever done before. Usually it's like we're going to do a video that's going to explain City Year. And it's like, 'Well, who's it for?' And it's like, 'Well, it's for potential new recruits for City Year.' Well, as we think about even doing a City Year video now, the way it's changed, we're just not going into it with the idea that we're doing a City Year video to promote City Year as it's getting off the ground. Or they have a gala coming up, and so we're going to produce a video to promote kind of the next phase of City Year.

02:50 M: Now it's, 'Well, how can it benefit us as an organization? What are the stories we want to tell about City Year?' And that's been much different. Even the other day. So, we had done a piece about the grooming project and Natasha Kirsch a couple years ago as just one of those kind of entrepreneur stories and like what barriers they face. We've gone through various, I don't want to call them fits and starts, but we've gone through various campaigns, I guess. Like Zero Barriers, you don't necessarily hear as much about

Zero Barriers, but I think when we started with the Natasha Kirsch piece it was like, what kind of barriers was she facing? Or the videos we did with Nation Swell. It started off kind of with what barriers were entrepreneurs facing.

03:41 M: So, the grooming project came back to us recently and asked. They said basically they were going to have a gala later this year and wondered if there was any possibility of — they called it a partnership — if there was an opportunity for us to work together again to produce a piece that they could show at their gala. Keith and I met with Natasha just last Wednesday I think it was. And we were taking the same approach that we did with City Year. It was like, well, we're not just going to say, 'Yeah we're going to.' I mean we're not in the business of doing videos to promote entrepreneur organizations. We want to tell their stories of what struggles they've had or how they've found success or how we can help other entrepreneurs along the way.

04:27 M: And with Natasha it was what follow-up story can we tell? The first one was fairly successful for us. It was like, what follow-up story could we potentially tell that would benefit both the grooming project for their needs into wanting to produce something for their gala, but then also a story that we would want to tell. The first video was a lot more about Natasha and the grooming project. How she got that off the ground and how it was helping people. And the next phase that we will probably tell is less about her. We'll ask her to get us up to speed on things. But it's more about what some of the graduates of her program what they're doing. Like, there's been growth. They're starting a salon out in I think in Lee's Summit, and a couple of the graduates of the grooming project will be running that salon. And they eventually want to start their own company, too. So, it's like, that's going to be the next version of the story.

05:26 M: This is a really roundabout way to say, we used to probably produce videos because we needed a programmatic explainer piece on a certain program. And now it's like as we look at pieces that we might produce, it's what editorial lens can we look at it that will benefit our storytelling efforts? But maybe work for them as well, which is what we're doing with City Year and what we're doing with Natasha and the grooming project.

05:56 V: So, it's just aligning closer to strategies and closer to kind of what we're doing as opposed to just putting information out there in support of a program.

M: Yes. Yeah.

06:06 M: And I didn't do a good job of answering your actual question, but I can say that there's a lot more intentionality to who we're thinking about, who we're going to produce these pieces for. But in some respects, I feel like we could probably rationalize any approach. Not any approach. I think with the City Year piece, for instance, we had a couple different options. Like Keith and Julie were kind of fixed on one specific option. Miles really wanted to put it back to the City Year people as a couple different approaches that we might take, even though Keith and Julie were really interested in a certain approach.

06:50 M: So, there's still that give and take, that push and pull between what the Miles and the Kims want to do or need to do just to fulfill if there's a communications need for a certain event or whatever versus having an editorial look at it, approach to it.

07:10 V: I guess that's actually a really good example for me of just understanding what kind of "story-first" means. That's kind of been a phrase that I've heard thrown around. Not everyone is quite clear on what that means. But I think that's a good example where we're trying to say, 'We want the story to lead this and help illuminate that information and that purpose of why you're doing this.' And really tell that story instead of just an explainer of like 'this happens.'

07:38 M: 'This is the grooming project.' Yeah and that was... When we met with Natasha, it was really an interesting dynamic because it was not just Natasha, but Becky Blades, I think she used to run a company Blades & Associates, you know, PR and all this stuff. She's great and she's well-connected. She knows Larry. She knows people, so it's like she's there, too. And she's just there trying to make sure that they, you know, are we going to commit to doing a video for the grooming project. But it was an interesting dynamic because you could tell that she wanted to be involved or provide direction. And she even said, 'I don't want to look a gift horse in the mouth.' Because she realized if we did it, we'd be doing it at no cost to them. But under our own, like what's our lens going to be on this story? And our lens primarily is telling the next part of the story with an entrepreneur who's created more entrepreneurs. You know, they want to start their own companies now as opposed to just going and getting footage of construction of the salon. Which Keith was like, 'Yeah, we're not really interested in that. If you want to do that, it's kind of on you to do that. Not us.' Anyway.

08:50 V: Well, with that being said, I guess what would you say are the primary goals of being more intentional with that work? What is maybe the reasoning for thinking more clearly in that direction?

09:14 M: I guess just to know better what our audiences want more of. What kind of stories they want to hear. You, what gets them interested in the work we're doing. If we're trying to rally more people to get behind and understand the work they're doing and almost how they can see themselves in it, you have to hook them somehow. You have to get their interest. And I honestly can't remember all the coverage areas. I know they come up any time we're starting a new project. But we're not as interested as much now in the...what's the one category? It's the people that we kind of — I don't want to say abandoned but —

V: The inquirers?

10:00 M: The inquirers. Was it inquirers?

10:06 V: I think it was inquirers because that's supposed to be the folks that are I guess a little more skeptical of the role that philanthropy plays in making forward progress in these areas.

10:16 M: So, I guess understanding better what kind of stories that they want to tell or want to hear and get them interested in our work more. Whereas in the past it's been a lot of, 'If you produce it, they will come.' You know, create it, put it out there and expect people to come to us as opposed to actually trying to make a concerted effort to produce a piece that someone would be interested in and want to know more about the work that we do and maybe work along with us somehow.

V: Yeah.

M: Maybe.

10:52 V: No, I think that makes sense. That kind of leads into some of my next few questions just trying to understand how thinking about audiences has changed through this new approach. I think you started to touch on that in saying that, we're thinking more intentionally, and we are concerned with what our audiences want to hear. And, you know, what they're interested in. And we kind of mentioned coverage areas, but I guess were you part of the discussions for the typologies with Atlantic 57? Because I know that was a part of more of the earlier work. I don't know if that was included as much in their last on-site visit.

11:25 M: I think I sat in on the meetings. Yeah. The early. But there was even an iteration before that before Atlantic 57 came on where it was. I can't remember what they called them. Did they call them typologies or if there was...

V: I know there was personas at one point...

11:40 M: Personas. For a while, we went down this road of personas and then that morphed into when Atlantic 57 came on. I think it morphed into the typologies. I was there for that, but I don't recall any of the typologies.

[Laughter]

11:59 V: That's OK. Do you have a sense of what that means, though? How are the typologies different than maybe personas?

12:08 M: No, I don't. Well, I felt like it was more specified. The personas were more general buckets of people that fit in certain categories. The typologies...I think they gave more specific examples of individuals that would fit within a certain typology.

12:32 V: OK. Yeah. I know with the persona work they talked more about demographic information rather than...and somewhat roles. But I think the typologies...They talked a lot about motivation, a lot about interests.

12:47 M: And I'm not sure really how much that furthered our efforts on the personas thing. I feel like the work with typologies maybe helped get us to where we are as far as

the coverage areas. But the personas felt like it kind of was a start and stop kind of thing. I don't know that we went...

V: Yeah.

13:10 V: Do you feel or has there been any change in the audiences we want to reach through this approach? Or do you feel like it's still kind of the same people?

13:20 M: I think it's largely the same people just I think we have a better...I think we've defined them better. And we have a better understanding of who they are, and we can look at specific people. Plus, with Chris' work we'll be able to identify individuals that would fit in certain typologies. I think that's part of what he's done that's helped us identify individuals better.

13:48 V: Yeah. Yeah. I guess knowing that with the typologies and better understanding audiences, we're trying to communicate more clearly. Do you feel there are certain values we're trying to communicate now that we weren't as clear with before? You kind of mentioned that we're trying to align things better with strategy, so I just want to get a little bit deeper there.

14:17 M: Repeat the question again.

14:18 V: So, knowing that we're trying to align some of our work more closely with strategy and also with audiences want to know, do you feel there are certain values that we're trying to communicate right now? Whether that be values, or just messages and ideas.

14:40 M: The uncommon approach to things seems to be a dominant value. I'm not sure how that actually manifests itself. I know we talk a lot about being uncommon or taking an uncommon approach to philanthropy. And having it come from Mr. Kauffman's uncommon approach to his business and philanthropy as well. So that seems to be the overarching message. And I think that for me that particularly resonates in education and some of the different work that we're trying to do in education, especially here recently. We used to be a little more timid on the education side as far as sharing what we believed on certain things. We would do an interview with Aaron, and if we wanted to create a sketchbook about his view on education or how we should change education. It seemed like there was a lot of hemming and hawing about what we should put into that.

15:59 M: It seems like with Rethink Ed last year, and this is again all through my lens — just what I've seen. But from Rethink Ed last year and really coming out and making a stand as far as like this is what we believe in. But in the past it felt like we didn't necessarily do that. We were always kind of cautious. I mean you're talking about education and young people. It's like you've got to have you act together before you get out there. And for Aaron to get out there on stage and talk about how the normal degree is not working now for a lot of kids. And we need to get them better prepared for the

workforce and how do we do that. That to me I think probably... We probably lost a lot of people, but I think the way they look at it now it's like that's OK.

16:45 M: There's certain people that we're never going to get on board with where we're going with this whole being ready, being educated for the world today.

17:00 M: I don't know that I always understand how our values with entrepreneurship are. I don't know. It sometimes feels like we're just kind of reinforcing just what's already out there in terms of entrepreneurship. It's kind of hard to. I mean entrepreneurship is such a well-respected, well-received. I mean, it seems like everyone's kind of behind it. I mean what's the downside of being an entrepreneur? I don't know what we're really doing that's radically different or uncommon about our entrepreneurship stance on things necessarily. But in terms of values of supporting entrepreneurs, trying to get them to be advocates for themselves. And then now, it seems like we change. There was Zero Barriers and whatever there was between Zero Barriers and now Grow Your Own. It's like it takes a new approach every year. It seems like there's kind of a different theme.

18:20 V: Yeah it's been an interesting just in the time I've been here to see kind of that transition and people are a little bit tense about that. But it's been interesting talking to you and Keith and Matt Pozel, who have been here a while, and there's kind of a distinct shift from I guess where things were when we were more of a research institution to now some of those strategies and some of those things are becoming a little more clear. Yeah.

18:48 M: We used to have a lot more even before that. The research presence, obviously, we had a huge research department. But even before that we had a lot of operating programs. It wasn't just FastTrac and 1 Million Cups, which were kind of like these, you know, tentpole programs that we have now. There used to be a whole slate. We had programming for young entrepreneurs and there was a lot of different programs we were running. And then also obviously the Founders School thing, Global Scholars. We had a lot of different — we piloted. You know the whole Kauffman Labs area was set up. It was originally supposed to be a little incubator of sorts, and they ended up doing some different...They had like an education fellows group that came in — or not education. There was an education entrepreneurship cohort that went through there. But then there was also like a bio kind of like a group that was more interested in biotech and things like that that came through. There was a lot more active programs than it seems like than there are now. It's definitely been full of transitions.

20:04 M: But even in the time that you've been here, yeah. Just thematically it's changed a couple times.

V: Yeah.

20:12 V: It seems like, though, with the coverage areas some of what we decide to cover is maybe becoming a little more solid. How do you feel that those coverage areas have affected the way we work and the kinds of topics we're interested in talking about?

20:37 M: I don't know that I have a good macro view you know of how...My particular from where I'm looking at things in terms of how a certain project comes to me basically is much more focused. This whole editorial-first view, story-first editorial angle thing has definitely been something that I've had to get used to more of. And not that I'm opposed to it in any way. I appreciate being able to tell a story rather than just spit out the facts of this is what City Year is and this is what it's about.

21:38 M: I'm not answering your question at all here.

21:42 v: But it's been a significant change in approach then. We're not just concerned with covering information and just informing. It's also a little bit richer than that with storytelling I suppose.

22:00 M: It's trying to...I think it's trying to make our work more genuine and relatable to people in our coverage areas. People can see themselves in the problems that an entrepreneur is facing might be similar to the problems a colleague is facing. Or whatever story the woman who closed up shop, the chainmail place and like having gone to 1 Million Cups. You're still trying to get your angle in there about the value of 1 Million Cups but through a very real person that other entrepreneurs can identify with. So, it's not just producing a sketchbook about 1 Million Cups or the programmatic overview of 1 Million Cups, which we've done. We still have those pieces, but to be able to tell one entrepreneurs' story about how 1 Million Cups affected her.

23:07 M: Or, this most recent for the board of directors thing, we could've done, and we were going down the road of producing a piece. And all these people talk about how great 1 Million Cups is but what Wendy really wanted the board to hear was how 1 Million Cups directly impacted them as far as, 'I went to 1 Million Cups.' And one guy was going through depression and had thoughts of killing himself. That was always kind of a weird angle — or not weird — but it was almost getting too personal. We kind of cut it in such a way he didn't come right out and say that he was thinking about killing himself, but then to credit 1 Million Cups where he started a company one week. And like, 'I'm going to start this' and he didn't even give himself much time to prepare his company. But they wanted to hear from direct whether it was an organizer and how it's impacted their community, or it was an entrepreneur and how having presented 1 Million Cups has impacted their company directly.

24:18 M: Those very specific stories are what Wendy wanted the board to be able to hear as opposed to just the rah-rah piece about 1 Million Cups. So...

24:30 V: Yeah. So, choosing to cover more of that direct impact rather than just largely putting out general information.

24:42 M: You're putting it in such a better way that I did.

24:44 V: I'm just making sure I'm understanding.

24:46 M: No, you are. That's correct. Yeah, I mean.

24:49 M: I mean if you go back and look at any of our...there's a place for both types of pieces. If you need an explainer piece, then there's value in that. There's value in the sketchbook videos. The sketchbook videos were originated to produce a series that might be hard visually to depict, so you can do it in animated form in kind of a fun way. Whether it's economics or whatever it is. If it's getting early-stage financing, we're going to do that in a way where it's like playing a Monopoly type game or something. It was just kind of fun ways to tell that story or depict a problem that we were interested in. Whereas it's shifted much more to. I mean even like the...we could've done the Let's Read video.

[inaudible]

25:58 M: We could've easily done a programmatic piece about what that program's about, but we focused on one family who was coming to this Let's Read program and how it was affecting this man and his two boys. It was a lot different approach probably than what we've done before.

26:19 M: I've found it interesting just to even like on that mayors' video where we had the piece that we did for...

V: Emerging Prairie.

M: The Emerging Prairie thing.

26:30 M: That was probably more like a programmatic type you know people. It was set to music. There was graphics and everything. But then like to remove the music and almost just the approach of it feeling different, looking different. It's still a bunch of mayors talking about the value of why we come to this thing. But I don't know, the approach. It was just a totally different feel once you started changing elements around a little bit.

26:57 V: Yeah, you kind of get that more journalistic documentary feel rather than this is promo-y and we selected this. And we set it to music!

27:08 M: Exactly. Which is funny because on the grooming project thing, you could tell that this gal, Becky Blades, was very much about. Because Keith and I were talking about this editorial version of the next step in the grooming project's story. And I said but that's not to say that for your gala there couldn't be a version that has music. It's like they're wanting the video that elicits tears at the end so that once it's done people are going to open up their checkbooks, basically. Because that's exactly how it's laid out to do in the context of the gala. Whereas we're wanting to produce a piece that's telling the story of these two women and how they're running this salon now because they want to run their own business. And we're not going to have music with it probably. It's just these sort of techniques are sort of fun to play with.

27:56 V: Yeah. It's interesting that we still can maintain that flexibility because that's just not true of more traditional newsrooms. A journalistic newsroom could not do that.

28:05 M: Yeah. Or they'd choose. They may not choose to do that. But I guess when you have $2 billion you can say how we're going to do a couple different versions of this story. One maybe benefits you more than us, and then one benefits us as well or might be interesting to our audiences.

28:27 V: Mm. Talk to me a little bit about the story planning and pitching process under this new approach because I think we've spent a lot of time reworking some meetings and providing some new tools. You know, how do we go about really bringing up stories and talking through them?

28:49 M: How are we doing it now? It feels like in our editorial meetings, at least the most recent ones with Julie running them, we kind of already know what's in the pipeline. It doesn't feel like it's much of a pitch, you know kind of what's coming up. And I don't know if it's because we're still stuck in that, 'Hey, we're going to have a weekly editorial meeting, and what are we getting out there this week?' Because we're still in this mode of we're going to put out a weekly newsletter or a weekly email, and what are the stories that are going to be associated with that?

29:34 M: It feels like so much of the responsibility is on Julie and Keith. More Julie, now, even than what it used to be, to kind of determine what are those stories going to be. I think people feel the freedom to throw ideas out there. But I haven't been involved even in that MadLibs thing. I haven't been involved in seeing how that's. You know if people are going to adopt that or not. It still feels like we're going to be driving most of that. That our Kims or our Miles are going to be the people who are bringing us those ideas. It's coming from various places, but I think Julie and Chris and Keith are trying to keep their ears to the ground in terms of what's going on. I mean just having the whole idea of a calendar of what's going on in the world, what's going on out there. You know kind of paying attention to what's in the news or what's even this time of year it's going to be...like graduation season is going to be in June and thinking far enough ahead about what we're going to be producing for that.

30:48 M: It feels like there's plenty of willingness to hear those ideas. I don't think we have the process down yet. I think it still feels like it's very much in flux.

31:07 V: Yeah. Yeah I do think that that new segment of our meetings that we're trying to build in around kind of current events and world trends is really interesting just in that. I mean I pay attention to the news. I think a lot of us on our team are pretty aware of what's happening. And so, to bring that into our storytelling as well is kind of a new thing. And something that I think a lot of people are appreciating.

M: Yeah.

31:35 M: No, I don't disagree with that. I think that's great that we're doing that now. Whereas in the past we were very much just like, 'Well, we have this event going on this week. Next week is Hill Day, so we'll tell our Hill Day story. That's it.' Regardless of what's going on in D.C. I forgot. I emailed the photographer that we're hiring for Hill Day and just this morning I said, 'Hey, are you still good for a 4:30 call this afternoon?' And he's like, 'Yeah, as of right now. It's been kind of busy in D.C.' And I'm like, 'Oh yeah. It has been for you, hasn't it? I forget that you're right in the middle of everything.'

32:09 V: Yeah, we just dumped a giant report on you.

32:12 M: Exactly. I don't know what kind of work you're doing right now. I'll be fascinated when we get him on a call later this afternoon, like what is this doing for you? He's obviously, just looking at his website, he's in the thick of everything. It's fun to kind of look at some of his material. And you know that he's involved in stuff. So, I don't know what he's covering right now, but I'm sure it is a lot.

32:35 V: That's where like the government shutdown piece was kind of fun to work together on. A couple of us were trying to reach different people and it didn't really have a video element to it. But just really being aware of what the conversations were at the time. It was really neat.

32:50 M: Yeah. Well, and what I think what's cool, too, is being open. I think when we went to a format where we were open to bringing in a lot of different whether it was stories from other places, too. Like linking other stories or videos from other places or whatever it was. Not even necessarily our work, but just, 'Hey. this is something we're paying attention to. What do you think about this?' I don't know if we're opening it up for comment. But just the fact that we were sharing other people's work sometimes I think was a departure from where we had been in the past.

33:30 V: Yeah. I mean just last week with The New York Times' piece. We're right in the middle of shooting these Kauffman School interviews, and this just happens.

33:38 M: Oh yeah. Hannah was like, 'We're going to have to pull some people away from you once in a while.' It was like, 'For what?' "Oh, The New York Times is here.' 'OK, well, I guess. Fine. Sure. I guess they take more priority than we are.'

33:53 M: 'We'll come back for more.'

V: We have better access at all times.

33:56 M: Yes. That was cool though.

34:00 V: yeah, but I mean it's neat that like there might be some overlap of you know this national audience has heard from The New York Times about the Kauffman School and to have that reiterated, potentially.

34:11 M: I was going to say, yeah. We'll have a video for editorial that'll come out probably in June that, 'Hey, what a great follow-up story for you guys, New York Times. Here's your first class of graduates talking about how they got here.' That could be fun.

V: Yeah. Well, and now we have this New York Times' piece that we can link to in our story.

M: Exactly. Brilliant.

34:33 M: But did we really plan it? That's what I didn't know. How did The New York Times story happen?

34:38 V: I don't know. I don't know if they reached out to Larry or something.

34:46 M: That just landed in our lap kind of thing. That's what it felt like. Because we didn't know about it. We were there — and I mean not that they're responsible — but in the midst of all the college scandal, how did they land on the Kauffman School?

35:00 V: I have no idea.

M: We should ask Miles at the meeting.

35:02 V: We should. We should. And we should look at the reporter. I don't know if they're like a Kansas City-based bureau reporter or anything for the AP. I mean, we didn't plan it but that's a case where we were paying attention to what was happening with the scandal and listening for things. I think there was maybe a time in Kauffman's history where we would be happy to get that media relations effort out there, but we maybe weren't as in tune with those conversations. And maybe wouldn't have had a role in telling a story editorially to follow.

35:41 M: Yeah. How to keep leveraging that relationship, too. I don't know that we would've in the past been as savvy.

V: Yeah.

35:50 V: And, I mean, in just speaking about change, I'm curious, too, how under this new approach we're starting to change our thinking about channels. I mean, like you said, we're kind of still tied to doing our weekly newsletter and we haven't really gotten away from that. But has there been any different thinking on how to use other storytelling methods and using video in different ways or using different social accounts and things like that?

36:18 M: Certainly, Julie is definitely pushing more of the Facebook Live. I think we've done a few Facebook Lives before other than the Inclusion Open. We did it in such a way. I'll put it this way. We did it in a way literally using a phone that I think the tech part of it was so cumbersome for her that it didn't free her up to be able to think about the

thing more holistically. The whole event and everything and what it can do and how to get the questions from the online audience to the people that are doing it. I think the way we did this last one where we actually pushed it — and I'm getting a little technical here — but pushing the Facebook Live the same way we did SOE. Pushing it through our Livestream channel. So, it was appearing on Livestream and then we were simulcasting it to Facebook. I think that took a lot of the technical issues that we were having previously out of it and allowed her to just create a better event, better experience for people that would be applying for that program, that grant.

37:46 M: So, Facebook Live. We've been for a while doing kind of our process. If we produce a piece, we'll still have like...let's say it's... Any number of pieces we've created whether it's Rethink Ed or one of Jason's programs. Whatever it is where you still have here's that the piece we created about this or that. Or even if it was the Grow Your Own Video. Are we calling it the Grow Your Own or the I Can video? People are calling it different things. Or what we call the Fog video. It's like we'll have this main piece that would be shown at an event but then Julie would go through and want to excise out a bunch of different pieces. So, that's been a process we've been doing for a while now. Not producing pieces directly for social consumption but taking from a bigger piece that we would've created and then making a bunch of smaller pieces. And sharing them through Facebook.

38:57 M: I'm not as familiar with the social side of things and how we do things on Instagram or Twitter or anything like that. Any video work that I've done with Julie has been more for Facebook. You know creating little video segments and the caption files and things like that. That's been my involvement.

V: Yeah. But even just excising little portions out it seems like we're diversifying how we can use the larger content that we create.

39:29 V: Thinking about, 'Well, we have this piece and we're going to show it at the event.' And then after the event or before the event, can I share the I Can video as a GIF? Can I share it on Twitter? Can I make this something, usable content for people to share and engage with?

39:45 M: And that's where on SOE, we were ahead of the game. We only got the video like a couple days before the event. That was finally done. But she got me a couple days. I mean right after we got the video she got me the subclips that she wanted so they'd be ready to go right after SOE, including just this to this because we want to make a GIF out of it or whatever it was. You know the push-in on the entrepreneurs.

V: Mhmm.

40:13 M: So, it was having all of those things ready. Something that in the past we would've maybe done a week or two afterward. Like, 'can we do these?' 'Oh yeah. We should do those.'

40:23 M: But, having the forethought to, 'Yeah, we got all these clips ready to go. And these bitesize little chunks that we can use to promote 'Grow Your Own'.' That was cool.

40:36 V: Would you say then, you know, Julie obviously in that case had some forethought on what we wanted very specifically before the event. But do you feel that the question of which channel should this story go on...do you feel like that's taking place more at the beginning of our work or while we're in process and really seeing what that content becomes? Or is it more like, 'Oh, we have this video clip now. How can we use it?'

41:07 M: Not so much in the conversations that I'm involved in. I'm not seeing that as much as far as they may be going but from my standpoint it's still, 'We're going to have a video. it's going to show at this event.' Or, 'We're going to have a video.' I think it happens some of the time and I'm involved in that up front. But it doesn't seem like, it's just like, 'Hey. We're going to do a video about this thing.'

41:34 V: Yeah. You kind of get that request later.

41:37 M: Yeah. Do the video and then chop it up.

41:42 V: I mean knowing that your work really is concerned more with video, and sometimes audio and other things, too, obviously. Do you feel like we still have a certain hierarchy for our channels? Are we still valuing certain things over others and using things over certain others? I know especially we've talked about YouTube and how that's kind of a languishing thing. I mean we post things there, but we don't put effort into writing cutlines for videos or really using that as a large sharing device.

42:14 M: And so, the question is do I think that we're giving more emphasis on certain channels over others?

V: Mhmm.

42:25 M: Well yeah. YouTube is a good example of that. But that's. That's such a huge thing that I don't know if we're just afraid to tackle that one because we have so much content out on YouTube. We used to post all our video content to Brightcove. At some point we transitioned to, I think we had a website update one time, a few times back. We said we're going to put everything on YouTube. We went through all the pros and cons of putting everything on YouTube. And so, it became this kind of catchall for all our content and that's where I mean I think all those video clips, the sub-clips of the SOE video. It's like I will upload those to YouTube whether they will ever be published from YouTube. they'll probably never be published from YouTube. But 95 percent of the time if it's something like that, I'm publishing it to YouTube just so I can create an SRT file to have captions for Facebook.

43:30 M: There's just so much content on YouTube that we're not. It just needs to be probably cleaned up a great deal. We use YouTube more as just kind of a, if we're going

to put something on the website, it's got to have a place to live. Or, if we're going to put something in the email, weekly email, we've got to have a link for it to be embedded or something. But it's not like focused on YouTube specifically. I can't comment on. I mean Facebook to take a large share, but then again I'm not social media savvy enough to know what they're doing on Twitter and LinkedIn and Instagram or anything else. I'm not aware of the strategy on those things.

44:15 M: Where I touch for video is mainly just Facebook. And I don't mind that because we get a lot of good play through Facebook.

44:23 V: Yeah. Yeah. And I know in some editorial meetings we've talked about in some of the newsletters like how people respond to having a play button for video in newsletters, whether that's really the best way to get video out there. Or we've even talked about, well, how many people are watching a video on our website? I think the reason Facebook very well is because it really showcases a video in a way where it's not, well, 'Engage with this story. And engage with the video. And have come to our website in the first place.'

M: Right. It's right there.

45:02 M: Well, there was a time too probably where we were like, 'Well, we got the video on YouTube. And we put the link to YouTube on Facebook.' You know following that one extra step is kind of a pain in the butt for people. At least, that's what the feedback was, so if you can upload it natively to Facebook, then you'll see a lot more views. But then, they're measured differently though, too. It's like a view on Facebook is like 3 seconds. If you hover over it for 3 seconds it counts as a view.

V: Uh huh.

45:31 M: As opposed to YouTube, which I forget what all the different settings are.

45:38 V: Well, and they'd probably change you remember them.

45:41 M: Yes. That's probably true. So, no point in remembering them. I'm not going to even try.

45:45 V: That's right. That's right.

45:47 V: It's curious that you mention analytics, though. I know that's more of Chris' area, and I'm not going to make you pretend to be Chris.

45:53 M: Good because I hate analytics. It's been in my goals for like the past two or three years and I still don't. I would always put it in there I think to...it's something Keith would be happy about it. But if he reads this transcript: I don't like analytics, Keith. I'm sorry.

46:13 M: I want to produce the video. No, there's. I'm sorry. I'll let you ask the question.

46:15 V: It's OK. You can continue. Um. I'm curious about how we're starting to evaluate our stories' performance now. I know analytics play an important part in that. And that's not to discount the importance of analytics and understanding them. But for you, as a storyteller working in video, how do you understand what a successful story is under this approach?

46:41 M: I don't because you can game the system. Because I can sit here and say that the grooming project was a big success for us. But we also put a bunch of money behind it. And unless you're comparing. We did one test that I'm aware of. One A/B — not an A/B test — but one test where it was we're going to put this Rethink Ed video, which was a recap of that event, with a similar headline. Like I can't remember if they put money behind both of them or not. That one and then the Carla video. Completely different style, animation and everything. And they basically from what I recall, they came out pretty even.

47:33 M: There was barely one edging out the other. Barely. I can't remember which one. So, I have a real hard time understanding analytics just because when we start throwing in paid for, pay for views. I mean that's when I think we've rigged the game somewhat. I mean people do that. People are advertising. That's what advertising is. I get that, but in terms of a completely objective view of how to produce a video, one versus another. It's not that it should be one versus another because they are different styles that are going to appeal to different audience members. But I have a hard time understanding analytics and how that impacts the creation. You know how we create a video. And that's my own ignorance.

48:43 M: But I know we've talked a lot about like that first few seconds of a video. You know to create something that's visually interesting. Because, if they are watching it on Facebook and it's. When we edited the piece on hip-hop architecture there was a lot of discussion back and forth about how the first few seconds should look. If it's just the subject, a person on camera talking, would that get more views, or will people stick around a little bit longer if it's a certain shot of kids working with little geometric designs or whatever? What's going to get more views? So, we made a judgment call and put it out there. We didn't do like a one versus the other kind of thing. So, I can see the value. And I can understand how being able to look at retention rates over a video how long people are actually watching it could then dictate how we cut it and how we cut other videos together.

49:48 M: But, you know, if there. And I guess that's where the SRT files come into play because if it's just a visual versus being able to actually read, too, what somebody's actually talking about. And you're trying to get some little nugget. Something to hook them at the beginning. A little piece of a story of that particular hip-hop architecture story or whatever it was. Something to get them to watch longer as opposed to just watching, 'Hip-hop architecture is about yada yada yada.'

50:19 M: But that's just. That's just also about trying to tell a compelling story, not necessarily producing it for a certain medium. But um, I'm not answering your question.

50:29 V: It's interesting you say that it's hard to look at this objectively. And we're often times comparing apples to oranges when it comes to some of our analytics. I mean if a view on YouTube isn't equivalent to a view on Facebook, that's kind of hard. But it is interesting because I think that from some of the conversations I've had, and you can disagree or agree with other people. But there's a split between, 'Yes. There's quantitative, analytic information we want.' Views, clicks, shares, all of that. But I think also with video, especially on a platform like Facebook, where the goal is also to resonate, is to engage. Seeing comments is more subjective to say like, 'Well this video maybe didn't get as many views, but we still got 5 or 10 comments that were really powerful. People really seem to enjoy the video. Really connected with it.'

51:29 V: Knowing that we're thinking about audiences a little bit more richly and thinking about what do they want to see, some of those measures are important, too.

51:37 M: Yeah, no. You're right. I hadn't considered it that way. But the engagement. I mean how they measure a view versus an engagement, how does one weigh over another? Obviously there's more value in engaging and commenting or sharing than just viewing.

51:56 M: You know it happening organically versus us paying for it to get in front of somebody is where I get kind of...

V: Fuzzy?

52:03 M: Yeah.

V: Yeah.

52:04 V: I do, too. I mean I was talking to Kim the other day and we were comparing notes on previous things we've done. Like we were talking about the most engaged with post that we did on the Chiefs photo of Mr. Kauffman and the owner of the Chiefs breaking ground. And Kim said, 'I want to challenge whether that's our most engaged with post or not because it was paid. And we did a lot around the World Series when the Royals were going in — I think 2015, 2016.'

52:31 M: 2015\. It was two years in a row.

52:32 V: She said, 'You know, we were posting a lot of stuff. But it wasn't paid. But it still got a ton of views and "likes" and all this stuff.' So, it is difficult to make that comparison. But it's interesting to see that change where we're talking about shares. We're talking about some other things, too. And thinking about, you know, do we want people to take actual action with some of our items as well?

52:58 M: Mhmm. Yeah. But how did it get to them in the first place? How did it get in front of them in the first place? That's what I'm not sure. You know someone who shared it with a friend because, hey, this is a really great about. You know Nation Swell produced this really great story about this guy who feeds the homeless or whatever in Kansas City. Did it get in front of me? I wasn't following Nation Swell. But someone liked it. A friend of mine liked it or shared it or whatever. And suddenly, it was funny because we were in the midst of working with Nation Swell. And when they were in town one time they just produced this story.

53:36 M: Like out of nowhere it seemed like. But they were just here. And I don't want to say we were making fun of Nation Swell. But we were having a harder time working with them a little bit during part of that process. And here they come and produce this video that's a great example of letting them do what they do. And they put it out there, but I saw it because it was... But how did that person see it? Because they got paid? I mean that was the secret sauce of Nation Swell was always kind of a weird. We didn't know how much of that was kind of paid and how much was organic. I don't know.

54:12 V: Yeah. It's tough. And I mean, even Chris will admit, and then it changes like a month later. You never know what the algorithm is going to be.

M: Yeah. Exactly. I don't even want to talk about the algorithm.

54:25 V: But it does make it hard to judge how our stories are performing. And what we think of them. But, the last thing that actually Chris did bring up that I thought was interesting was just noting that the Kauffman Foundation isn't a for-profit business. Editorial stories, as powerful as we think they are, they're not the product we're selling. We're really in the business of giving money away. So, if no one is forcing us to make this change in our editorial approach, then why do it? Why tell stories?

55:00 M: Well, we're all storytellers. I mean everybody on this staff is some form of a storyteller. I mean that's what they love to do. But why organizationally? You know, why did Ewing Kauffman sit down before he passed away and commit to 6 or 7 hours of telling stories about his life? He was convinced to do it by Bob Barrett at the time. But Bob Barrett was the communications director of the Kauffman Foundation at the time and knew there'd be enough value in hearing these stories of Mr. Kauffman's life.

55:38 M: I think we come from a history organizationally of telling stories. Matt sits down with people. I've heard this hundreds of times. His stall as I'm getting a microphone ready, or setting a light, part of his stall tactic is to say, 'Thanks for sitting down with us. We're the Kauffman Foundation. As you know, video is one of the ways we tell stories.' He doesn't know that they know that, but that's what he always tells them. He tells them, 'this is one of the ways we tell stories.' And we do. There are others who probably do it better than us in certain foundations. I did some research, and I can't remember which organization it was. But does some amazing documentaries about their work. But I feel like among foundations we have a really rich history of telling stories. You know, it may not be in the way that we're doing it right now, but we still. The number of people we've

sat across from and heard how Project Choice impacted their life or Project Early. Or MADE IT, which was mother and daughter entrepreneurs in teams. They were learning how to be entrepreneurs together, these mothers and daughters. We've told these stories for...there's a kid who's running for mayor right now of Kansas City who used to be part of our Youth Advisory Board. We used to have a group of kids who would help make grants for the foundation. They were the ones choosing where these grants went to. And now he's running. He's on the City Council, and he's running for mayor.

57:09 M: And it's like, these are all from what. It just feels like we have a visual history. That, yeah, a lot of it's on YouTube. Some of it's been taken down because it's old and it doesn't apply anymore. But we have this history of the organization — literal history, too, because we've obviously depicted Mr. Kauffman's story through this medium — but that's just one of the ways we tell stories here.

57:33 M: So, I feel particularly blessed to get to continue to tell stories, whether it's the entrepreneurs or their school or just the kids that we're involved in. And even our grants about reading programs or whatever it is. It's like Matt says: this is one of the ways we tell stories. So, I get to be part of that legacy.

57:59 M: We talk about these Project Choice kids being a legacy, and the Kauffman School kids who graduating now being part of this continuing legacy. I just feel like I've been able to be part of that legacy through telling stories through video. So, however we do it, that's just what we do. I mean we'll continue to tell these stories through video.

58:20 V: Yeah. It's just part of who we are.

58:20 M: It is. It's part of our DNA. Part of our secret sauce here is that we can tell stories through video. There's not many foundations that have their own video and produce their own content. And puts that much value in it. But again, Marion Labs had a studio where they produced. They had their big corporate stuff that they produced pieces for, but they also had an in-house studio where they would produce marketing pieces and pieces for their associates. And that's how some of this started. When I came here, it was like we were producing a lot of stuff for associates. But we also produced programmatic overview pieces about why we were invested in Project Choice, or Project Early or whatever it was. And it's...We're still telling the stories; we're just doing it a different way now. And in so many different mediums. I mean that's what's cool. It's that we can tell it in so many other ways.

59:11 It's a kick. I get to play with video every day. It's my favorite thing.

APPENDIX K: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – KEITH MAYS

00:01 Valerie: Cool. So, go ahead and start off by telling me your name and how long you've been working here.

00:09 Keith: My name is Keith Mays. I've just passed my 20th anniversary at the foundation.

00:14 V: Yeah. Congratulations. You and Pozel both are just true legends at Kauffman.

00:20 K: Ah. Matt Long has been here longer than either of us.

V: Really?

K: Yeah

V: I didn't know that. I knew he had been here a while, but I didn't know longer than that.

K: Yeah.

00:30 V: It's cool to get to talk to a range of people. Like, I talked to Katey who is probably one of our newer members. She's only been here about a year now, and to get also 20 years of history for this has been really neat.

K: Sure.

00:41 V: So, tell me a little bit about what kind of work you do here for the editorial team as well as any other departments you might work in tandem with.

00:51 K: Well, I mean my title is editorial director, but I think there's basically two components. There's the editorial side and then there's the digital strategy side. So, the editorial work is relatively new, certainly as kind of a main area of what I'm doing. It's only been a year and a half, or two years I guess focusing on that. That's generating content around the foundation's interest areas to hopefully better engage with our audiences.

01:41 K: And then the other side is really just about how best we use the various platforms and tools that are available to us. Kauffman.org, social channels, email. That sort of thing. So, that's really more of a... it's like search engine optimization, user experience on the website, all that kind of stuff. So, those are the two kind of basic areas in that work. I certainly have conversations with people around the foundation. You know, specific things come up.

V: Sure

02:25 V: So, you said the editorial side of this is only about 1 to 2 years old. How has that been kind of a transition from where things were before?

02:33 K: Yeah. So, I'll use, say, 10 years ago as a "before" starting place. The formula then would have been fairly typical corporate communications in that we would have a new program or a new piece of research or an event or whatever, and we would issue a news release and then there would be a media relations effort. And so, that was sort of our primary way of connecting to the outside world.

03:24 And I think the transition that we've made really goes parallel to changes in the media environment overall. So, it's not to say that we don't use some of those tactics still. We use a PR agency for media outreach, but very selectively instead of as the default way that we can get our messages out. So, in the changes in the media environment, the kind of gap that has come about in some ways and also sort of a change in philosophy and the foundation, which I can come back to, it just sort of made sense for us to really prepare and put out there — out in the world — our own content. Instead of wholly relying on other people to write stories that was hopefully kind of furthered our causes and that constant rolling of the dice in a way. But I think, one of the other parallels we were really known in the 2000s as a kind of research, think tank kind of organization in that way that kind of an organization operates or operated was we would come up with this important work. And it was sort of groundbreaking. I don't want to leave that out. And it was very sort of ivory tower situation where it was like, 'Here's this important thing. Drop it out of the ivory tower. You're welcome.' And that was sort of the approach.

05:40 K: So, aside from the fact that our board really wanted us to be getting into more actionable research, there was a movement toward realizing that we didn't have the money or the expertise to make the kind of social change that we wanted. So, if we keep everyone at arm's length, a step removed, and kind of do everything through the media, then we wouldn't necessarily be making the kind of authentic connections that we needed in order to do the kind of work that we want to do. So, I think overall, the way that we engage with communities is on a much more personal level now. And that's not even necessarily Public Affairs, that's around the foundation. We know that we really have to kind of rely on our collaborators to help get the work done that we think is important. We know that the amount of money that we have is really a drop in the bucket compared to say, the government, so we have to use that really wisely. So, kind of focusing in more on Public Affairs, it's trying to make sure that we're connecting with the right people and kind of getting them to understand what we're all about and hopefully forming the right kind of partnerships that we need to.

V: Sure

07:30 V: Well, and that kind of touches I guess toward what I understand of this new editorial approach. You're talking about engaging more personally and using kind of a story-first framework to do that. Can you kind of give me an overview of just the timeline of the Atlantic 57 engagement?

07:47 K: Sure. Yeah. Well, I mean we started talking to them in 2017, but didn't really kick off the work with them in earnest until early 2018\. I think it might have been March by the time we met for the first time. So, our first engagement with them took us through, I'd say, September. It was kind of half audience research and half editorial strategy. So, they took us to that point. And so, last fall we felt like, 'That's all really good,' but we felt like our feet weren't really on the ground yet in terms of being able to actually use some of the editorial strategy. And so, we asked for another smaller engagement, which was really focused on really practical things we could be doing. Everything from sort of the formats of our meetings to the whole idea of coverage areas. Really sort of honing in on what it would mean on kind of a day-to-day, month-to-month, quarterly what we should be doing.

09:24 K: And, so that basically took us through I guess January to finish that out.

09:34 V: Cool. Yeah. I think that tracks pretty well. I think I came in right in the middle of the summer when they were kind of in the middle of that audience research phase. I'm just trying to make sure I've got my timeline all correct here.

09:45 V: That being said, tell me a little bit how you would define this new approach. I know we use story-first a lot. What does that really mean to you and how would you say the team is meant to understand that?

09:59 K: Well, I mean I would say overall this is all still a work in progress and that we're still trying to define what a lot of it means. So, it's a unique situation of trying to inject this kind of thinking into a traditional corporate communications organization, as most are. So, I mean I think that it will be unique in any organization to try to say that, 'OK, now we're going to try to have this genuine editorial effort.' It's not content marketing per se. It's not marketing. It really is an attempt to tell real stories that are illuminating the 'why' of why we do our work and why we think certain topics are important.

11:05 K: I mean I think if you look at it as sort of self-contained about what an editorial effort is, it's probably not that different than you might see anywhere else. Since we've been sitting around the campfire, stories are a really effective way to engage with people. I don't think there's necessarily magic there, and people have been trying to figure out audiences forever. So, I don't know that there's a magic formula here. It's just like, how do you do all of that within an organization like this? And what does that sort of on-going negotiation look like? Of trying to balance sort of talking about our programs directly and kind of boosting those, promoting those versus talking about larger issues that are important to us as an organization, even if the promotion of ourselves as an organization is not there or is a very downplayed piece.

12:35 K: So, I mean I think that's kind of part of the ongoing education, if you want to call it that, of everyone. Like, seeing the benefit of telling good stories. There's not a direct line to promoting a unique product or whatever it is.

K: Tell me what the question was again? I feel like I wandered around that.

13:06 V: That's OK. I guess, what I really want to touch on and kind of get some clarity on is what does it mean to be "story first"? Obviously, I think everyone on the team agrees that stories are important, but what are we putting that ahead of and what does that really mean?

13:25 K: Well, I think it essentially means that there's a basic mind shift here. Even though we're saying it's story first, really what we're saying — and we play these games all the time and kind of chase our tails — is that it's audience first.

13:45 K: People outside this building aren't necessarily going to be interested in us patting ourselves on the back. That's not an effective way to get our information out there or get our priorities out there. However, people out there as all people are interested in a good story. So, that's just like the basic principle of what an editorial approach needs to be about is find a good story. So, that's sort of part of the ongoing discussion that we have to have, even within Public Affairs. That is, 'Yes, there's an event. We're speaking at it or we're sponsoring at this event. There's important people at this event.' We don't want to do a story about the event. We want to say, 'what are the important themes of it that maybe we'll pursue later?' Or, 'who should we be talking to and about what?'

15:07 K: So, it's not going to do anyone out there in the world a lot of good to say, 'Hey, we had this really cool event, and, by the way, you weren't invited to it. But there were a lot of important people there.'

15:25 K: Really, we have to say, 'OK. What ideas or what conversations were held in that event that really would be of value to people that weren't at the event?' So, it's really just a different sort of perspective than what we might have taken traditionally. I would say even within the time that we've had Currents, we've seen that evolve somewhat where, 'We did a video and it was really nice, tight video and it showed highlights of the event and all that,' but it was really more self-congratulatory than storytelling or that really conveyed important information out to the world. It's really just a change in perspective.

V: Right.

16:29 V: Sure. No, I think that makes sense. And, I think that's been clear in the conversations we've been having now. In talking to Katey about how we covered the EPN convening, she said that was pretty much an event coverage piece. But now looking at the piece we did on the government shutdown and other things, we're starting to think bigger about topics and about things people are interested in rather than just saying, 'this thing is happening.' It's just got a little bit deeper nuance there, and definitely more strong narrative to it.

17:05 V: We started to touch on audiences a little bit. And I do want to spend some time discussing that. So, how, in adopting this new approach how have we started to think

about audiences differently? Or are we considering trying to reach different audiences than we were before?

17:25 K: Yeah, so I think it's all about trying to reach the right people, and that may mean more people. It may mean different people. It's not to exclude any audiences or people out there who we already have. I mean I think we know fairly well that we're overrepresented in audiences that we created when we were operating a little differently. When we were a wholly research-oriented organization and that was sort of our lead product. We've just been seeing some sort of natural changes in that. You know, we got a lot of unsubscribes to our email newsletter because we hit on themes that some of our older audiences don't necessarily like.

18:37 K: I think there's a couple different ways of looking at audiences. I don't know that we've totally managed to knit them together. So, looking at audiences in the old way, it's sort of like looking at who's in our email database, who's following us on social media and all that kind of by channel. We could have continued down that path and kept getting better at targeting subgroups within those. And that was really where we were headed. Really, what we need to be able to do is target leaders of entrepreneurial support organizations or we need a product that just speaks to teachers — more of those kind of role-based approaches. We do do some of that. That's really more of at the program level when you think about our squid burger basically.

19:53K: So, I mean...I think that is kind of one of the good things that's come out of all the work over the last few years. And that's not necessarily all editorial. It's just been a component of that. But, to think about that there are different channels for different types of audiences. So, in some ways it's easier to think about, 'we want to get a group of teachers in Kansas City to an event. What are the best ways to do that?' And, so there's some real sort of pragmatic approaches to that.

20:34 K: That's still ongoing [inaudible].

V: Yeah

20:40 K: What we're trying to do at a higher level and sort of an uncommon level that we talk about is to think about audiences more broadly by their larger beliefs, their world beliefs. And that's what came out of the Atlantic 57 work. We've ended up with these audience typologies that are helpful in the sense of that any kind of lines you can draw about audiences that allow you to talk about your approach are helpful. I think what we've been challenged with is trying to say, 'We want to target a certain audience in social media, or we want to do a paid campaign to reach futurists or champions.' I'm not really sure yet that there's a one-to-one correlation between the way the tools out there allow you to target people and the way that we're thinking about audience typologies.

22:12 K: I'm not wholly sure where that leaves us, but what I think what it means is we just have a useful tool in thinking about how we frame up our storytelling. We also know what kind of themes we need to keep coming back to. Sort of this future looking, it's just

natural for an organization that's making change that people are interested in the future have that kind of world view. We want that sort of framing of stories or for us to hit those sort of topics, etcetera kind of down the line.

23:07 K: Like I say, it's very useful in how we go about thinking about our stories, how we frame them up, how we approach them. But I'm not as sure yet about how those typologies inform what messages go out through what channels and what channels to target.

V: Yeah.

23:33 V: So, distribution aside, how has the typology framework and all of that affected how you and how some of our team members maybe think about audience in our work as we're maybe planning or even writing stories? Where does that come into play? And how is it maybe different from before?

23:55 K: Well, I think the example for me that is most concrete is we have a few New Entrepreneurial Learning area...we have channels to give entrepreneurs practical information about businesses. So, even though we say practitioners are potentially an audience typology of ours, it doesn't make a whole lot of sense to within what we're trying to do in Currents and at our sort of foundation reputation level to do 'Here's five tips for you to manage your time as an entrepreneur.'

24:50 K: So, that's an example of something very specific that we know we don't need to do those kinds of articles.

25:02 V: So, we can focus a little bit more on the editorial side about thinking about futurists and champions and I guess those audiences that would align more with larger thinking and forward thinking rather than, 'I need just practical know-how to be successful right now.'

25:22 K: Yeah. I think there are some practitioner audiences that make sense for us because we don't really have another outlet. So, we'll occasionally do a piece on how we do evaluation as a foundation because we know that there are other people in foundations or nonprofits who are trying to figure out to measure progress and impact, which is difficult to do. So, we get a good response to those.

25:56 K: There is kind of a gray or overlapping type of area where we probably speak to entrepreneurial support organizations a fair amount. I think a lot times those people are probably have both a foot in the practitioner level of trying to run these organizations as well as potentially being a collaborator and being a futurist.

26:24 K: So, the same person can wear different hats.

26:30 V: Yeah, that's kind of the beauty of the typologies to me, I guess. It helps me think about just who I would be trying to connect with and what that person cares about. But

it's not a hard-and-fast, 'I'm only talking to this person.' It's understanding that that person might feel differently as they read and depending on what they're really looking for.

26:51 V: That being said, I do kind of want to shift to talking about just what kinds of topics Kauffman is interested in covering under this new approach. We've kind of talked about how we're thinking a little bit bigger and broader about larger conversations. What does that kind of include under the new coverage areas maybe?

27:10 K: So, I think that's where in some ways we're going to define those by doing rather than talking about them. And I think that we haven't gotten super far in the doing part of it. So, I think it's going to be this constant throwing — I don't know what the right analogy is. I was going to say darts, but it's not exactly that. It's like...'Let's do this type of article and see how it resonates. How do we feel internally about it? Is that really kind of furthering our cause between that type of article or not?' It's a little, I mean even with them...I mean we're not a general daily newspaper, obviously. Not anywhere close to that, but even within the fairly narrow lanes in comparison that we cover — entrepreneurship, education, Kansas City — the potential number of stories we could do can be overwhelming.

28:35 K: That's where some of the other...So, I mean I think our coverage areas are useful to an extent. And it's great that we kept narrowing it down and that we have these four. Some of them I feel stronger about than others. You know, closing gaps, is a total natural for us as a foundation. It works for us across the board from education to entrepreneurship about an approach where we feel like not everyone has an equal opportunity in this country and it's our role as a philanthropy to help people bridge the gap.

29:18 K: You know, we do a lot of work in communities in a lot of different ways from Opportunity Zones, Kansas City to talk about ecosystems. We're trying to kind of crack the code because it's really complex stuff. You know, what leads to why is a community vibrant? What factors lead into that?

29:43 K: We touched on the sort of future economy thing. There's a lot of richness there both on the entrepreneurship and education sides. The gig economy or real world learning or all these areas about making sure that people are ready for work and life.

30:14 K: Moving ideas to reality, that one seems a little vague to me right now. I mean I know it from a sense of that's a lot of what entrepreneurship is about, certainly. I think it's a little bit about what the entrepreneurial mindset would be in education. So, I understand that on that level. But the kind of stories that we want to do within that? I'm still trying to figure that out.

V: Yes.

30:47 K: We do entrepreneur profiles. You know, entrepreneurs and how they face barriers in different areas. All that kind of stuff. But that one seems to be the blankest slate in some ways, so they're not all kind of equal, I would say.

V: Yeah.

31:05 V: Well, and like you said, we're kind of trying this story by story. So, it's easier to say, 'We're working on this story, and we have it ready. And maybe that fits here.' But until we really have it an opportunity to say, 'Yeah, I think this is a moving ideas to realities piece,' we maybe don't know what that looks like.

K: Right

31:21 V: And I think part of the beauty and the struggle in that is that unlike a newspaper or another traditional news publication, like you're saying, it's not like a traditional beat where you know if you're on the city beat you're going to write briefs. You're going to write courthouse stories. You're going to do be this typical, kind of standardized story.

31:41 K: Yeah. Every day you're going to go by the courthouse, and you'll talk to the clerk. See if you can get a tip or whatever it is. Yeah.

31:54 K: So, I think constraints are really helpful in a lot of ways. We're kind of narrowing in on what our parameters are for what we're doing, but there's still work to do. Just coming out of South By (SXSW) and thinking about what I heard there, I feel like we need to sort of productize a little bit more our approach to the type of content that we do. So that we're not — so that every piece isn't a one-off. The one thing we're working on right now is this idea of Uncommon Voices, where we have some guest columnists. So, if we can get a regular stream of those, then that's one less thing we'd kind of have to invent on a weekly basis.

V: Yeah.

32:44 V: No, that makes sense. I think one area that I see us work really hard to kind of establish is talking about how we plan and pitch our stories. And that's a very kind of basic part of the news production process, but I think that we're changing a lot in that area. And we're trying to solidify what that looks like. Can you tell me a little bit about in this area now who can pitch stories and how that's done?

33:12 K: Yeah, well, I mean...In theory anyone in Public Affairs should at this point know that they can pitch a story. We've got this system set up so you can send an email to story@kauffman.org or I don't know where we left the form. Or bring it up at an editorial meeting. So, potentially anyone. We want to broaden it out to anyone within the foundation.

34:00 K: With the Uncommon Voices thing, I'm developing guidelines for that. So, we'll actually have a separate submission form where we'll ask people for ideas, because we don't necessarily want finished pieces before we talk to people about them.

34:17 K: But I also I think realistically since we're not sort of a publishing-oriented organization — everyone's wearing a lot of hats — we're going to have to generate a good portion of our content externally. That seems to be the thing that is becoming clear. One idea that I've had is that we get kind of a solid set of freelance writers, editors and they become experts in maybe a coverage area or maybe it's even narrower than that. So that over time those people could also be pitching ideas.

35:15 So, I think it's going to take getting ideas from a lot of different directors to really make for a robust pipeline of content.

35:30 V: It seems like we do have a lot of ideas in the pipeline right now though. I'm curious just to hear from your perspective in how this new approach has maybe changed the way you decide what we're going to ultimately cover or pick up. Just because now we do have this new framework that we're kind of considering and trying to implement. How has that affected the way you think about what we want to choose to cover?

35:58 K: So, I think one of the things, again, a lot of this seems obvious when you talk about it, but it just wasn't a priority. The coverage areas as well as sort of defining the types of stories we're going to do is really about how we connect our work to what people are talking about in the outside world. So, trending topics or it can be observance of a named day or whatever it is.

36:50 K: Historically we haven't really been too tuned in to what's happening outside of the foundation. So, it kind of goes back to a shift in philosophy. I feel like this approach really does parallel the idea that we need to be talking with people not at people. That's why the editorial approach can't be done in abstract of what's happening in the outside world.

37:30 K: So, I mean there'll be news that comes from within the foundation, and we'll put that out there. I do think that from our perspective and just in conversations internally that I've kind of gotten more tuned in to, 'Oh wait, I've heard about that topic three different times in different meetings from different people who are maybe more connected out there.' So, we should probably do something about that. For example, student mobility I heard about in talking to the director of Literacy KC. That's a topic that's on her mind. The education team talks about that, and School Smart KC is sort of looking away so that they can help with housing issues. It came up again with Kansas City Civic, and I still need to talk to Kristin, but they were funding some effort there all about this issue of the fact that students are not going to do as well if they don't have a stable home. And if they're constantly being moved around to different schools. And so, that's a rich topic that cuts across a lot of different areas of our work. So, it's something that we should probably look into.

39:20 K: So, I don't know. I feel like I partly answered your question. Can you restate it?

39:29 V: Yeah, so, I was just trying to get at how you decide what you're going to cover. I guess what I kind of got from what you were saying is that it's now more of a decision about what are other people talking about. That's the deciding factor more so. It's not necessarily what we want to say and what we think is important, it's what does everyone else think is important to talk about right now, and what conversations am I hearing? It's kind of what's happening outside the ivory tower, so to speak.

K: Yeah. Right.

40:00 K: Well, I might restate it a little differently because we're still an organization that's generating ideas and content. So, but it's really, how do we connect what we're doing with what's being talked about? So, I don't want to downplay the fact that we kind of have a traditional corporate communications role, certainly the department does. And that we need to let the world know about what the foundation is doing. But it's sort of, from an editorial sense, part of what we're about. It's not all of what we're about.

V: Yeah. Yeah, I think that makes sense.

40:55 V: I kind of want to shift gears and talk a little bit about where channels do play a role in our process and how we're thinking about channels differently now under this approach. There's been a lot of talk about how do we see our newsletters and things like that that have these constraints on them. And it's like, well if this is a weekly newsletter, we have to fill it every week. How are we considering channels in our work and when does that come into the process of thinking about how we create stories?

K: Yeah.

41:27 K: Well, I think there's sort of the idealized version of that that we may not have hit yet and then there's the reality.

41:39 K: So, yes, we still put out, for the most part, a weekly newsletter. And it probably generates more traffic to our stories than anything else still does. I've always felt like a general newsletter was sort of an odd creature in a way, because it's talking about a lot of different things with a lot of different people who may or may not share interests.

42:10 K: So, you know, we've kind of had that all along. The nice thing about a weekly newsletter is that it has created discipline of either generating content to talk about or just being consistent in our outreach.

42:28 K: This week was sort of 95 percent recycled content, but it was on a theme that was timely. I mean, this is again kind of being tuned in to the outside world because baseball season is starting. This was Julie's idea, which was a good one. So, you know, we were like, 'Ah, we're done with newsletters.' There was a period of time when we sort

of had a newsletter for every different audience, and then we merged it all into one. We've kind of gone back and forth over the years with those.

43:16 K: We've talked about can we create more dynamically generated newsletters that are really based on your interests. The fact of the matter is it's still sort of in a lot of ways the most personal, the most kind of guaranteed way that we get people to read our content.

43:39 K: I was just reading a New York Times column. There's this whole sort of rising genre of subscription email newsletters. You pay $5 or whatever because there's a person who has a particular expertise or is a thought leader in some way. And this is sort of like a really growing area. So, you can never like totally discount a channel like that. You have to constantly be looking at it.

V: Yeah.

44:19 V: I was just going to say with that, you know, it seems like there's some clear values that we have on channels at Kauffman. Like, would you say that some are more valued than others? And if so, which? Or, is the idea with this new approach for everything to be kind of fair game?

44:36 K: Yeah, well, that's sort of back to the idealized version of how we would be using channels. The idealized one is that for a given piece of content or given story that there's a story that will work better as a way to tell it both in the format of it but also in that you know you're reaching the right audience. We still have a lot more connecting of dots to do there.

45:15 K: Julie has been working on some social media guides basically. Like, what's our point of view on each of the social channels? Who do we think is following us on each of those? What types of content works best in them? How should we be best using them? So, given that, we know from experience what kind of content resonates in "Ideas at Work" better. Currents is really sort of the best showcase for content, but I highly doubt — and we need to look into it more — that we have a lot of people saying, 'Hey. I haven't really gone and looked at Currents this week. And I'm going to go directly there.'

V: Mhmm

46:16 K: It's not really like what they do. So, I think it's not a bad landing spot, but it's not necessarily going to be the place people think to go to first.

46:34 K: So, you know, value is kind of a hard way...I really value Currents. I probably will give it more prestige, if you want to call it that, than compared to just publishing something on social. I'm probably a little old school on that thought. But we are talking about what makes sense as an Instagram campaign. You know the image and kind of a mini blog post, essentially, that will go on Instagram.

47:18 K: We're always going to be experimenting, and of course channels are always changing. Facebook, we're like, 'Ugh.' You just don't even know what to do with that.

V: I think that's a lot of people right now.

K: Yeah.

47:37 K: So, I would say probably the right answer is that what we value is shifting all the time.

V: Yeah, I think that's true.

47:49 V: And I think that's where some people get lost, but it makes sense to me that our channels that I guess could be considered more owned would be more valued in some ways because we do have control over saying, 'These are the ones we can keep consistent. These are the ones we own, and we can track. And we can always put content on, and we put a lot of different kinds of content on.' Whereas, we don't really know what Facebook is going to do. We don't know how that's going to limit us. We don't know if Twitter is just going to all of a sudden not be the thing that's popular.

K: Yeah. Right.

V: So, we just don't have as much control over that.

K: Yeah, yeah.

48:23 K: Well, and I would say...and there's a whole tier of opportunity. So, between us publishing on our platforms and through our channels, even if we don't own those, and then kind of mainstream media. In between there's a whole tier of types of relationships we've tried to have with other kinds of outlets. Like RealClear Policy or the local public radio and television stations. So, we've been trying a lot of different kinds of relationships of, essentially, we'll do funding. We'll say we have license to say generally what kind of content we would like that funding to be for, but not really controlling that on a day-to-day basis. I think we've had varying amounts of success trying some different things like that, and it all kind of adds up to something.

V: Yeah, we're still kind of figuring out what the right mix of all that is. I would agree

K: Sure

49:44 V: You said success, and that is kind of the last area I want to touch on, which is just how we evaluate our stories' performance. And maybe how that's changed under this approach. I know that we're still, we're still inventing a lot of our content and what that's going to look like. But, can you think of or do you have an example of something that you would consider that's been really successful under this approach? Whether that's a

story, like a story on Currents or if that's something we've done more on social, you know really any piece of content.

50:21 K: Well, there's two examples which I would pick kind of deliberately as a contrast. One would be the Natasha Kirsch pet grooming project video that came out earlier in 2018\. And that was a paid campaign that we did on YouTube and Facebook. It was not a ton of money, but it got a lot of views and a lot of engagement. So, for us, relatively speaking, that video got viewed a lot and a lot more than a normal video would. And it also really resonated with a lot of people, and the comments were really great on Facebook in particular. So, that one kind of stands out as success in the sense of a broad reach and engagement.

51:30 K: But, another piece that I worked on with Matt was the Literacy KC piece. Which, I haven't really checked the numbers. I don't think it's done that great, but we know that it reached at least one right person. It led to that program, Literacy KC, being adopted by one of the large corporations in town as their charity of choice for the upcoming year. And it's going to make a huge difference to that nonprofit. We know that they learned about Literacy KC on our website. So, it's a totally different kind of impact, and I hadn't really thought in those terms until it happened about how important it is to those people in organizations that we choose to feature. What a difference that can make that's not necessarily about mass numbers, but it's about reaching the right people.

52:54 V: Yeah. I think that is a really a distinct contrast between on paper something numerically might look good, but we also have this example of where what we did had direct impact, had a significant action take place. And I think we struggle sometimes when we do have that as a goal with some of our work just as a foundation. It's so hard to know there's that strong correlation between things, but that is really is power to see. You know clearly something did connect.

53:30 K: Yeah, well, and I think, you know, from a pure numbers standpoint and we do kind of report numbers all the way up to the board, the Literacy KC thing won't be measurable in a way. Even though that story may have had more impact on them than the story we did on the pet grooming project, another socially oriented nonprofit in the area. I mean, I don't know. I think the pet grooming project was grateful for our video as well.

V: Yeah. We can't really guarantee that. Even if the formula is right and we do that amount of storytelling, we can't guarantee that it's going to make a drastic change for anyone.

54:23 V: But I think you raise an interesting point that it's not just about. It's not even just about that. It's about connecting someone to someone. That's really the greater value that comes out of it. It's if we see a comment that's really appreciative of a story or we just see people really engaging in meaningful ways, not just in large, broad numerical ways.

54:46 K: And that does make us very different from a traditional publication. I think the word that I didn't really use is that, the Kauffman Foundation being this esteemed

organization, when we choose to feature someone or an organization, we provide validation to them. It's sort of like some sort of stamp of approval that gives that organization a needed entry point into a broader network of support.

55:35 V: Yeah. And it's funny because I think that's unique to us in a way that, in some ways, how traditional journalism would be felt in an ideal sense that should be providing information and should be having change in people's lives. But I think that because our approach and because the work that we do is a little bit more focused, and we do have that esteem, we have a little bit more power to do that. And do that more directly.

K: Yeah.

V: Which, I guess that's kind of interesting because the last question that came up in some of my conversations this week was just, you know, no one has made us make this change. The work we do as an editorial team is not the main business of the foundation. So, why change? Why do this at all?

56:32 V: But, I think from what you said, it's so clear that this is about providing for our audiences and about connecting with people. That's what makes doing any of the work we do worth it.

K: Yeah. I think so. I think we just...

56:47 K: Hopefully we help catalyze the work of the foundation in some sense, by making those connections that weren't there before or bringing people around to our point of view on the importance of education and entrepreneurship and those sorts of things.

57:13 V: Yep. Very cool.

APPENDIX L: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – CHRIS NEWTON

Chris: Do you need a phone charger?

Valerie: No, I'm good. I'm all charged up.

00:08 V: So, just so I can tell these apart, just go ahead and start off by telling me your name and how long you've been working here.

00:14 C: Chris Newton, been here four years. Four years and three months.

00:20 V: All right. Tell me a little bit about what kind of work you do here either for the editorial team or other departments.

00:27 C: Sure. What do you do here. Still trying to figure that out. No. Kidding. I execute on digital marketing tactics, which could be email marketing. It could be social media management. It could be paid advertising through digital channels be it Google, YouTube. Social channels, of course, have paid advertising mechanisms. I also look into potential advertising placements on other channels like Hulu, or Netflix or I try to keep an eye on different ways we can get our brand and our message out in front of certain audiences.

01:28 C: And then, a big piece of my job is analytics. That would be the one thing that I do that probably not as many other people on the team do. They, depending on what they have access to, they might see analytics for like email marketing, but I look into analytics on all of our channels. On our website traffic and create reports and share that data out with hopefully purposeful insights, which is being improved.

02:03 V: Yeah. Yeah, I know we're still really working on figuring that out just with the new approach and kind of as years change. And as we adopt new channels, all of that changes as well.

02:13 V: With that being said, can you kind of give me an overview of the new editorial approach as well as your involvement in adopting that?

02:23 C: Yes, so I'll give you my understanding and my overview of the editorial approach, which is... It's about leading with a story. It doesn't matter what channel it's on. It could take different forms, but it's starting with the subject matter, which in most cases is a person or people. But it could also be a concept or topic. But, following a story closely related to that topic. So, it's a very journalistic, investigative reporting type of strategy, I guess.

03:05 C: And, my involvement is essentially marketing, in a more marketing sense, getting those stories out there. And then, from the analytics side, is measuring and identifying which pieces of editorial content are resonating or performing well or reaching mass audiences and how people are reacting to them.

03:36 V: Cool. I've been asking everyone just so that I can kind of track where everyone's been in this process, too. Do you know about or how long we've been working with Atlantic 57 on this change as well as when you were kind of brought into those conversations?

03:54 C: So, the Atlantic – my understanding — is the Atlantic 57 engagement was about a year, maybe just under a year long. Largely driven by Keith Mays, director of editorial and Julie, who I believe her title now is editorial manager. She and him manage a lot of the conversations and initial management of the work with Atlantic 57\. Probably keeping it pretty close to just them and maybe Larry for several months. And then, you know, they eventually invited Atlantic here. I was brought in probably during their first visit – Atlantic's first visit, which might have been five, maybe it was three months in to the engagement.

04:50 V: Cool.

C: Yeah.

04:51 V: Yeah, it's just helpful for me to know because I started kind of midway through the process, so.

04:57 C: Yeah, it wasn't too long of an engagement, but. Well, it was long but not as long as it probably should have been.

05:06 V: Sure. And you may have touched on this just kind of in your overview, but it's interesting to get everyone's perspective on just what do you feel are the primary goals of adopting this change either from where Kauffman's editorial team was before to where we're hoping to go?

05:22 C: Mhmm. Yeah. Well, I would say that maybe the editorial team before wasn't really an editorial team. I mean we functioned very much as a communications department, which would be more of a service where someone else in the foundation was doing something and said, 'Hey, I'm doing this. I need your help getting the word out.' And so, it was a very reactive approach from our position.

05:52 C: So, now, the editorial strategy I think is about us being in a more proactive position. Us being able to have a little more autonomy to say, 'These are the types of stories that or this is the type of content and outreach we want to put out into the world.'

06:14 C: Of course, it all needs to align to...We do a lot, the editorial team does a lot to make sure that the things we're putting out there align with some of the bigger foundation strategies and initiatives. But, it's less order-taker, 'yeah we'll go and make this infographic and blog post for you' like it used to maybe be.

06:39 C: I don't know if I answered the question.

06:41 V: No, I think that really covers it and that kind of touches on one area that I want to kind of address. Which is just, how has adopting this new editorial approach affected what we actually decide to cover. So, kind of what kinds of topics is Kauffman interested in covering under this new approach? And how are those maybe different than before if we were kind of doing this just as press releases or on a kind of case-by-case basis for a program officer.

07:06 C: Yeah. So, to repeat the question you said it was how does this new approach like influence the types of things we're creating.

07:18 V: Sure.

07:26 C: So, I will say that yeah it's very much in the past it was reactive and, 'Oh this is happening. Let's issue a press release. Let's maybe post something to our website or have a page about this.' So now, I think we've gotten a little bit further in sophistication and maturity as a department. I would say that we're doing a lot more brainstorming of potential content and ideas for stories. Again, it's less reactive, more proactive....us being able to say, 'Hey, this is a very interesting person. This is an interesting concept.' The other thing we have a lot more control over now, too, is responding to timely hooks that might be newsworthy in the world.

08:27 C: For example, the government shutdown piece. When the government shut down, you know, we had a story-first perspective where we interviewed certain people who were closely involved with how entrepreneurs get funded through like government programs. And so, we were able to tell that story during the government shutdown. We probably wouldn't have been able to do that in the past world because we weren't thinking of things that way.

09:00 C: Yeah. That's a tough question.

09:01 V: Yeah. That makes sense. It is interesting to see us kind of shift toward more of what, I mean, I would have from experience as a journalist in a newsroom getting to keep tabs on what's happening in the world.

09:15 V: With that being said, though, I know we've been talking a lot about coverage areas. How do those things kind of connect between, you know, we're in this new kind of space where we can really create whatever we want, but we also have some guidelines for that now?

09:31 C: Mhmm. Yeah. Coverage areas an additional layer to the madness. At one point, I think there was what, 12 coverage areas? And it somehow got whittled down to maybe there's four coverage areas now. And, my understanding...and Keith and Julie will be much better at all of this...but my understanding is that the coverage areas are not specific to a certain department of the foundation. Or focus area. So, it's not just entrepreneurship

and it's not just education. Those coverage areas sort of map and align to strategies that could apply across the board.

10:15 C: They put forth sort of the boundaries. Well, I don't want to say boundaries. They're not boundaries.

10:24 C: The coverage areas basically keep front-of-mind what [are] some of the core values, I would say. And kind of the mission of what we're trying to do. And it gives us just that lens and perspective to start there when we're thinking about a new story idea. It is, 'Oh, we could have something in the,'...

10:56 C: So, we have an ideas to reality coverage area. Which, to my understanding, is supposed to be about someone who has an idea and following through, persisting and executing on that idea from start to finish. That could apply in both education and entrepreneurship, but it gives us...Now we have something — ideas to reality — ... something to say, 'OK. We're looking for an example of someone who took something from the beginning to the end.' And maybe it's a success story, maybe it's a story of failure, but in any way we're trying to showcase other people's ideas and how they went about achieving those.

V: Yeah.

11:36 V: I think it just provides kind of that framework that, like you said, kind of keeps us in line with our mission and everything going forward.

11:45 C: Yeah, but I will note that I mentioned boundaries, but I don't think they're boundaries because you will very often see content and ways that we go outside of those coverage areas for one reason or the other. And sometimes it's playing off of – not news jacking – but we're playing off of things happening in the world. And maybe we have to enter into a conversation that doesn't really match with the coverage area, but we have to kind of bring those other people in this other world into the way we see things.

12:22 V: Gotcha. So, we kind of talked a little bit higher level, but I do want to try to get an understand of just how this process unfolds and how that's maybe changed. Like, how do we plan and pitch our stories in our meetings, and kind of how does that stepwise work out?

12:42 I know that you've proposed a lot of new topics lately, so.

12:45 C: Yeah, that's a pain point for me.

12:45 V: I really admire that.

12:47 C: That's a pain point.

12:47 V: I feel like they've all been really solid, so I really do hope to see them come to life.

C: I appreciate that. I appreciate that.

C: Thank you. That was on the record. This needs to be in any publication.

12:59 V: On the record, Valerie thought they were good ideas.

C: Yeah. There you go!

13:02 C: So, yes. This is all, let me just say everything I've said thus far. Now you're getting into the core of my true feelings. I think the process for editorial is still very much not a process. We're working through it. I'm confident we'll get there, but the people — and the people being Keith and Julie, who are editorial managers or directors who have editorial in their titles — have to own that process and basically say, 'This is the system and the process for how we do things.' And everyone else can play along. I think everyone else is pretty agreeable.

13:41 C: There's not a clean process, in my opinion, right now with how a story gets pitched, and then accepted, and approved and on-boarded. We have two or three different mechanisms in which someone could pitch a story. Like, an actual system or a tool or they email a certain email address with the story idea. More often than not, those systems aren't used right now. It's usually because someone in passing or just through word-of-mouth said, 'Hey, we need to do a story about this because this is happening.' So, again, it's going back to that reactive tendency and habit that, 'Hey, there's this event happening in education or in entrepreneurship. Well, we probably should have something about that. So, let's find a story in there.'

14:34 C: I hope we get to a point where people feel like they've got some good concepts and ideas of like, 'this is a really interesting story that we could really tap into.' They put it through the appropriate systems, and then within X number of days, they even get a response that like, 'Hey, we'll look at that maybe two weeks down the line.'

14:59 C: But right now, it's kind of like filling a blackhole. Like we're just putting our story ideas and our pitches in a blackhole that aren't really getting responded to. A lot of that's capacity. It's not people...people are busy. There's a lot going on.

15:17 V: Yeah. Well, better to have too many story ideas than not enough.

15:21 C: There you go, Keith. Listen to this.

[laughter]

15:26 V: That kind of helps answer the next question I had, which is just around, you know, how do you decide what ultimately gets covered and kind of who's involved in

that? I think our program officers still serve as pretty strong stakeholders in that, which is not— it's neither good nor bad. It's just kind of they have a lot of weight still, and that kind of pushes us to kind of stick within our same box that we've always been in.

15:51 C: Yeah. You know the dynamics of an organization and the reality that there are other departments, like Public Affairs isn't the only department. And so, we have to live with other people on this earth. It's a reality, and so feelings get hurt. People have sensitivities. And, there's a real thing to be said about how inclusive you are of other people. I think we want that, and we need more of that where we're empowering people in other departments to realize that they have value to add to many of these conversations. And we need to have them be kind of the thought leaders. We help them craft some of it.

16:42 C: But yeah, we need to utilize other program area staff more than we already do.

C: I did not answer the question.

16:52 V: That's OK. I mean, I think we have a pretty strong understanding that Keith and Julie are still really the ones kind of setting the agenda. Even if everyone can pitch and can pitch in multiple ways they still are the end of the funnel.

C: Yeah. True. Yeah. That's exactly right

17:10 C: The editors so to speak. It's a manager who decides if a story runs or not. And that's kind of the function they're running. If we had, if us other underlings had serious ideas that we really wanted to pursue and we were getting frustrated that it wasn't going through the system, I'm sure the editors would tell us, 'Well, you always have your LinkedIn channel. Post it on your LinkedIn.'

C: So, yeah, I mean they're in control of the channels that have the foundation name on it, I guess.

17:48 V: Well, we seem like kind of there's been a number of associates who started making awesome Twitter threads and different things. So, people can circumvent the system if they really want to. And we encourage that in some ways.

C: Yeah, yeah. I've seen that. Good Twitter threads.

18:08 V: So, you mentioned the word inclusion. That's kind of where I want to shift for just a minute about talking about under this new approach, how have we started to think about audiences differently and consider them differently in our work.

18:22 C: Very slightly. I don't know that it's been significant enough to where it needs to be. Through working with Atlantic 57 on this editorial approach, I guess the one tangible thing they did put forth for us was what are called typologies. Where they tried to say,

generally speaking, that people that you're trying to talk to with your content fall within maybe one of these four or five typologies.

18:56 C: Those are like champions, someone who's a real champion of the foundation, your content. Maybe someone who's a futurist. They're really looking toward the future. There are practitioners, which are supposed to be those people that are really in the day-to-day grind of helping entrepreneurs or helping people in education, helping students and teachers, and the constituents in education. And collaborators, people who are practitioners probably also. Maybe they're champions. None of these are mutually exclusive; someone could be more than one. But, they're collaborators. What sets them apart is I think they're more of the people who can amplify and want to work together in a stronger partnership to spread our content or our ideas.

19:51 C: How we've changed in terms of reaching these people has not been much. I mean we've done a few experiments. For example, on paid advertising targeting and social channels it's not like you can go to Facebook and say, 'Hey. Give me anyone who is a futurist.' There's not really that data segment in Facebook that can be targeted. If someone has an interest of futurist on their Facebook account, we could target them, but it's not that widely used is what we've found. So, it's not — those typologies have not been actionable for us. Twitter is a different thing. We could, if someone had futurist in their bio on their Twitter bio, we could say, 'OK. Show this message or these ads only to people who have futurist in their bios.' So, there's a little more reach on Twitter for that particular group.

20:50 C: But, those are the types of things where I don't think we've done as much to take those typologies to the next level. I don't know that I hit on anything about inclusiveness.

21:02 V: That's OK. It's more just about who we're including now in our content. Who do we want to reach. It's interesting because I think it's hard for them to be actionable because, from my understanding, the typologies are based more on, kind of like you said, what people do, what their values are and what their interests are.

21:21 V: It's not like I walk around saying, 'I'm a champion of the Kauffman Foundation.' It's kind of hard to nail down who someone identifies as.

21:31 C: Sure. Yeah. Exactly. It's all, yeah. There's a lot we could do even with email marketing to segment lists better. Like, if we had a mechanism where someone we could say this person's a champion because they clicked these many emails, and they left these many comments, and they've hit a certain threshold that made them a VIP champion. We could email content directly to those champions.

21:56 C: Same thing could be said with futurists. We could pull back in email marketing data where, 'OK. Give us all of email addresses where someone has clicked in one of our three Currents stories that have to do with the future of work.' So, we could have a future of work segment within our database.

22:23 V: Or, your feeling is that we're not really quite there or there's not really a way for us to get there just yet.

22:30 C: Correct. Well, you know, we're not there yet. I've tried to surface conversations personally about we can do it from a technical and a systems perspective. It's easy to say, 'These people clicked this. Put them in a segment.' I think the question is more about the decision-makers and owners of editorial being aligned with like, 'yeah let's create a segment. That's worthwhile.' And them feeling like they're part of that decision as to how we're targeting people.

23:09 V: So, we have the capability but we're still kind of figuring out if that's a priority.

23:15 C: Yes. We are professional vacillators. We waver back and forth and talk, but we don't execute quite the way we need to.

23:26 V: That's something that's been kind of curious for me. I've been trying to ask everyone just how actively do you think that we're thinking about these typologies or these audiences in the work that we do? Whether that's in a planning stage or as we're working through it or even as we're publishing things and kind of directing content across one channel or another. I don't know if there's a good example of when that happened or when it hasn't and maybe should have.

C: Hmm. Let me think of an example.

23:58 C: As I'm thinking of that, I will just say that I think the typologies have helped us get aligned in vocabulary and general understandings. So, I think the way our team in person communicates with each other as colleagues, we now have a little more alignment when we're talking about, 'Hey.' There are times where people are like, 'Hey, we're really targeting a futurist here.' So, the typology helps us a little bit with that, but when it comes to again executing and actually saying, 'OK. Let's put this out there and get to those futurists and make an intentional effort to grow our futurists database and reach those people in more mass ways,' that's where we're falling short.

24:48 C: I guess an example [clicks pen]

24:58 C: An example...let's use.... [clicks pen].

C: I'm trying to think of all the content we've had out lately.

V: Mhmm.

25:11 C: There was a time in "Ideas at Work" and on Currents we had a story about a report that came out of Missouri that said essentially there would be a deficiency in workers in the STEM world. So, engineers, mathematics that type, you know, technology space in the state of Missouri.

V: I think that came out last summer, right?

25:43 C: Yeah. And we've resurfaced it a few times but what we do is we basically just say, 'Hey, this is going to go in our weekly newsletter that's going to go to everyone.' There has not been as much of an intentional effort to say, 'OK, you know what, this topic and this content is a great piece for this type of person.' Possibly a futurist, someone who's thinking about the future. And like, OK, what's the economy look like in the future? And what do jobs look like? And how does that impact how we prepare people for jobs and education? So, it's an example where basically again we just put it out on our mass channel and hopefully maybe a futurist will see it. And that is what happens. I mean people see it. But it's not as hyper-targeted like it could be, or intentional as it could be.

26:41 V: Yeah. That's an interesting example because right now I'm working on kind of the follow-up to I guess that report. Which is looking at how do we improve the diversity in the STEM field based on some of that report as well as other stats that we've seen. And, even with that, it seems like we haven't really used that vocabulary of the typologies to really talk about who we're reaching. It's kind of laced within everything, but it's not been like a one-to-one conversation, like, 'Valerie, this is who we're targeting.'

27:12 C: Yeah. Yeah. It has not been. I mean, it really is a conversation that needs to be had. Hopefully your interviewing of our team presents these questions, and everyone can go back and realize there's work to be done there. There has to be a tangible workshop like convert. Like meetings that are productive where we're saying, 'OK. We're going to walk out of this meeting, and we're going to have these typologies that Atlantic 57 gave us.' And, we're going to know, OK, when it comes to Facebook, when it comes to Twitter, when it comes to what are just some other websites out there. Journalism or news media outlets that match with some of these typologies.

28:03 C: We need to have kind of a map that basically is our roadmap. That's like, 'OK. We're trying to reach this typology, well, how does that typology get reflected on other channels?' On Facebook it might be that we're targeting job titles. I don't know. But that conversation needs to be had.

28:21 V: Yeah. We're kind of diving into channels, which is kind of the next area I want to talk about. Just in understanding how we think about and use different channels in this new approach. And since adopting this kind of story-first approach, when does story placement across channels come into play when we talk about editorial planning and our production?

28:46 C: When?

V: Mhmm.

28:48 C: Well it doesn't. [laughs]

28:52 C: I know that's what you wanted to hear. That's the quote you were looking for.

V: That's a much better answer, but if you can expand on that it'd be great.

29:03 C: It comes up. Well, I shouldn't say it doesn't. I mean, rarely. How about that? I'll soften it to say it rarely comes up.

29:14 C: I'll give you an example. How about that?

V: Sure

29:17 C: There is a piece on our Currents section of our website, our leading sort of blog article section that has a story about an entrepreneur named Chanel Scales in Cincinnati. She runs a shoe and accessory store in a very urban sort of district within Cincinnati. It's a great story about her. It's got some great detail about how actually one of our foundation grantees helped her get to where she is. She was working for other people in Atlanta running other stores, and then eventually took the entrepreneurial jump herself to start her own store. The story talks about that other group, Mortar, in Cincinnati, which is the grantee that kind of helped her along the way.

30:23 C: That story could be done in many different ways on different channels. So, on YouTube that's where you'll find the video. But within the YouTube channel, for example, there's not like a pretty good description. There's a lot of room for text. You could tell more of the story in text on YouTube itself. On Instagram and Facebook, typically, I think we've done a good job of just like, 'Oh, here's a post,' which quickly tells you, 'Oh, check out Chanel Scales' story,' or something. And it links back to the Currents article.

31:02 C: But I guess my question would be to challenge our group to think about how can we tell that story on that channel without the link back to the website. So, how does it stand alone in that channel by itself? I think in Instagram there's things called like microblogs. Or maybe it's a series, like it's a few photos of Chanel maybe. And maybe two or three paragraphs that just get at the heart of her story. And maybe it's inspiring and it's got a bunch of hashtags that pull new people into that story.

31:39 C: So, our channels are under-utilized. There are different reasons people are on different channels. There are different ways to present information depending on the channel. Very rarely does that come up in our weekly brainstorming meetings. Sometimes. In fact, I'll even say that more often than not the Currents channel on our website gets too much focus. And our social channels are often thought of as like bottom-feeder. Like, 'oh just post that on Facebook. That's a quick hit. Just get that out on Facebook.' But, if you look at the analytics, which is a primary part of my job, is you'll find that the engagements and the potential reach is far greater when you have content in the social channel than posted on our own website.

32:46 C: You're just going to get more eyeballs. You're going to get more people reacting to it, especially in a shorter, more concise form. Bite-size kind of content.

32:59 V: People engaging directly with that content, too. Not going to the website and then commenting there. It's all happening there on that social platform.

C: Yeah, it's all on the channel. Yeah.

33:07 C: But, again, that's not to say that the website's not good for its own purpose. The website's great because you can really do something long-form. You can really bundle content in a unique way with the website code and different ways to present information that you can't do on a social channel.

33:25 C: And, you could also control and moderate comments a little bit more on your own website than in most cases than on social channels.

V: Yeah.

C: Yeah.

33:36 V: I would agree with that. I think from what I see our audiences have a strong value for our website when it comes to projects like the Kauffman Indicators project, which is, when you think about, really long-form storytelling about research. It's not really narrative, so to speak, but that's a really useful tool and there's a lot of interaction that can take place there. But that's not always true of like the story about Chanel Scales. There's not really much to interact with there. It's just a story about her. You can read it. You can like it. And you could comment if you want to, but there's not really much else for you there.

34:12 V: So, you know, on social it might be more, 'I can watch this video and have a conversation about someone else I know that's like this entrepreneur. Or, I can ask questions about Mortar and other grantees and things like that.'

C: Yep.

34:28 V: Yeah, and that touches on, too, just how different channels are valued within our team. I think that we still do have a strong tie to Currents and with that, and you can disagree or agree, but I think we still have a strong value for our newsletters. For "Ideas at Work." But every other channel, I feel like we talk about what great things we could do, but we don't do it.

34:58 C: We are professional vacillators and idea people... who don't want to have to do the work. [Laughs] Don't put that in the publication.

35:09 V: I don't think that it's that we don't want to do the work. It's just that we don't have the capacity to do it in-house if we are still tied to doing "Ideas at Work" and things like that.

C: Yeah.

35:22 C: I'm very surprised at the amount that we don't try to do more on external channels or unowned channels. We had a great piece hit about the Kauffman School this last week in "The New York Times." Not everything is going to be a "New York Times" article, but could we get other people to write even on Medium? Could we get content on, let's say, BabyCenter.com? So, I'm a new father, so that's a website I read a lot of content on. I don't know that there's a direct correlation or a play there for us. But maybe as my kid gets to be 5 or 6 years old. And it turns into more of a parenting website, how does parenting and education and how do you navigate education? Can we get people to write stories on other websites that point back to some of the things we're talking about at the foundation?

36:32 C: We don't have as much of that. That was a really bad example.

36:37 V: Well, I think that, I mean for your example, like don't we have the tips for Henry, which was one of our associates writing to his kid? I think, yeah. There are places for content to live on unowned channels, but it's still that's even a lesser value than our own social channels.

37:02C: Yeah that's even lesser.

37:04 C: But, see, the thing is that the reach and the potential to discover new people and bring them into our universe that aren't already in it. You know, we're talking to the same people the way we're doing things right now. We're not tapping into all of the other people in the world that are out there.

37:29 V: Yeah, that's a good point. That's something that I've kind of worked with Kim a little bit on a couple months ago. It was just defining some other unowned media outlets and things that we could be reaching, but as far as I know that list really hasn't been used. Maybe it's helped inform some of the work with GSG. But, there's just not really a lot of grasp across departments of why that would be useful. Why we would want our content and kind of our own mission to be shared across other platforms. Why would we give people that control. There's not really a good understanding of like how that wider spread could be useful. And maybe that will come across more as we get our feet wet in really what it means to be storytellers and how we can invite other people into that process. But as far as I know there's really not been any continuation on that.

38:29 C: No. No. It's a missed opportunity for sure.

38:35 V: So, with that being said, I want to talk about other opportunities. And just how we understand success in our newsroom right now. And how we want to understand success under this new approach. So, kind of, how do we evaluate a story's performance at this point? And, where could that go under this new approach?

38:56 C: Sure. Well this does dive into a lot of my focus with analytics. I've done analytics probably a hundred different ways in my four years here. And that a lot of the times is because strategies change or things outside of my control change. Or, the tough thing with analytics, too, is systems and platforms change. What Facebook might have given us a year in data they no longer give us. A very easy example of that is when Facebook rolled out reactions. They used to just have just a "like." Now you can "heart" something. Now you can "Wow" something. That completely changed the way their analytics system were outputting data into digestible data CSV form. Which impacts the ability to create reports quickly. It just it's a very technical thing that I'm not going to go further on, but that's a very small change that creates headaches from an analytics perspective.

40:12 C: But, how we measure things now, we're getting closer with this new editorial approach. We've only met monthly twice now, and I think every month we're meeting is getting a little bit better. But we've sort of got our objective as an editorial team, and that's essentially to have people engaging with our content.

40:39 V: What does engaging mean?

40:41 C: Yeah. So, engaging is meaning a few different things depending on the channel. A very, very soft light engagement, you could argue, is just that they read it. That they read the article, or they watched the video. So, it's a very soft engagement. It's sort of one-way. Like they took from us, but they didn't add to it.

41:08 C: And how we actually measure that from a technical perspective is, for our website, we can track people's scroll-depth. Now, someone could argue, 'Well, that doesn't mean they read it. They might have skimmed it. Just scrolled down the page. But did they really read it? Did they really dig in?' I guess you could argue that.

41:28 C: But, that's where kind of down the funnel of engagement these deeper engagement — not the soft engagements — that's the stuff that if we can continue to accumulate in greater volume those other engagements. Which are: they shared this article, or they shared the post wherever it is with friends. Did they like it or react to it, like a thumbs up or thumbs down or a "like" or a "heart"? Same thing applies for Twitter. It's like a retweet. So different channels call them different things. Of course, commenting. Are they commenting? Are they reaching out? Tagging friends. Those are some deeper engagements that we measure as a way to say, 'OK. People like this.' Like, what is the sentiment toward this article.

42:30 C: So, in our editorial approach, I guess you can envision what we are trying to get to is for every piece of content that goes out, you can say, 'OK, let me see across the board how was the engagement on that piece?' And that helps the people who are creating the content understand, well, that piece did really well. And you can start to hypothesize maybe why certain content and topics were clicking more than others.

43:07 C: But then all of that boils up to an aggregate of overall our editorial team had X hundred thousand engagements in 2019\. So, we kind of measure and look at things in a more macro sense as well. Which, those are our kind of indicators and our benchmarks for measuring how we're doing in general. Overall.

43:39 C: When I first started at the foundation, I brought an analytics framework and model that was focused on measuring things in a few different categories. One was awareness: Just generally how aware are people of the brand of the foundation and are aware of our content? So, we had a score, think A, B, C, D or a scale of 1 to 100, our awareness score is an 86\. The next step was engagement. So, you have awareness, then you have engagement. So, how often are people engaging with our brand, our content. And maybe our score was a 75\. The last step of the funnel, which is always the hard part, and we've wavered. We called it...at one point we called it authority, where people looked at us. Like there was an indication that people looked at us like we were the authority on a topic. This was very much when we were in a research, thought-leadership, think-tank kind of world. So, we wanted to be known as an authority. So, we had a score for that. We switched that from authority to action. Which is, is someone taking action further than an engagement? It's not like they're on our page, and they're liking it. It's like, what are they doing in their community? Or, what are they doing after they read that article when they step away from their computer? Are they taking an action? Are they going out and meeting with a Congress person? So, that's a lot harder to measure. I mean, those things don't happen instantly.

45:17 C: And so, what we found in creating this framework was that when it comes to measuring editorial and just measuring content, we kind of have to stop at just the engagement level if we're wanting to drill down. And down the line, long-term, hopefully we learn about some of these actions that are happening. But, it's really hard to draw a linear line from this post then presented this many engagements and then 30 people actually went to Capitol Hill and stormed and pushed legislation. Like that's a different thing.

45:58 V: Yeah, I think that's where we can see some relationship between what the editorial team is as far as our work in promoting stories and sharing voices, but then also having our program officers provide those opportunities for action. Or, at least highlight them if we're not creating them ourselves.

46:19 V: I think of Hill Day that Jason Wiens is leading is a really good example of if we promote stories about advocacy, like the government shutdown story. And talking about how this affects small businesses. I think Hill Day is a really good opportunity for people to take action as far as, 'I want to be a better advocate for myself and for entrepreneurs in my community. And this is me making an active effort to respond to that.'

C: Mhmm.

46:47 C: It's interesting. It's almost as if for every story or every time we pitch an idea or we're like 'this is in the hopper,' we should identify as a team, 'OK, what are maybe one

or two actions that if someone reads this and they walk away, what is the one or two things we really wish they would do next? What's their next step as a reader?' It could be interesting because it might, and I think we need to do things to help, either on the page or in the post or whatever it is, do things to help people get to that action. To trigger that action.

47:26 C; But we don't do that because we don't have to. Because we're not like a for-profit business that needs revenue in order to keep the lights on.

47:40 V: Yeah, but that kind of ties to our conversation in our last monthly meeting around the whole concept of tweet-to-post (click-to-post) and that being people's next step. Even if it's maybe a softer action than what we're kind of envisioning in the big picture. You know, just having people respond and provide their own thoughts as a small engagement but also maybe a small action if they're tagging someone. If they're reaching out to someone specific, whether that's a policymaker or another entrepreneur or something like that.

48:12 V: I think we are moving that direction in terms of what we talk about, but not in terms of what we do.

C: Yep. I agree.

48:24 C: I think we talk a lot. But we don't do.

48:28 V: That being said, though, do you feel like in terms of what you would consider successful on these measurements as far as what we can actually track, but then also what we can't yet track, do you think we have an example of a successful story or piece of content under this approach right now?

48:46 C: Well, I guess it's all how you define success. Compared to...The foundation has decent clout. And by that I mean there are pockets of this world that think this foundation is amazing. [laughs]. I think the ego and the amount of...I think the people inside the building think it's a lot greater than the people outside the building. But, so, to define success we're measuring against ourselves and what we already know about ourselves.

49:26 C: If we were to put our web traffic analytics or our social engagements up against, like, a "New York Times" or a "Washington Post," or other big outlets that are big fish, we would feel like a very small human being. And very tiny. Because the amount of impact that we could be having and by impact I mean reach and engagement. The amount of reach and engagements we could be having could be hundreds of thousands more than what we currently get. But knowing that we're up against ourselves and really we're just trying to improve year over year versus our own baselines, you know, we're like, 'OK yeah. We're doing OK.'

50:18 C: An example. Here's an example of success. It's not as much editorial, but we made a post about Ewing Kauffman. There was a picture of Ewing Kauffman with the

owner of the Kansas City Chiefs when they were breaking ground for the sports complex that now the Chiefs and the (Kansas City) Royals play at. So, it kind of is a piece of content that plays off the legacy of our founder. That was our single, that post was the most liked post, the most reached and engaged. Basically, every metric when it comes to Facebook. Was far and away the best that we've ever done on Facebook in a given day or on a single post since the Facebook account has been created, what, 10 years ago.

51:06 C: That kind of success could be the new normal. I mean, that type of post could be an everyday type of piece for us. Whereas, we reset the baselines. But that's not going to happen unless we continue to improve the way we target. Improve our content and our messaging, so that the people who are most likely to engage and react to something are the ones actually being targeted by it in the posts. It's really good.

51:38 V: I think that goes back to your point about we don't really have standalone content on those channels, and we don't think about how what seems like a one-off post can actually garner a lot of value.

C: Yeah.

51:50 C: That one post probably, in terms of engagement and reach. Well, in terms of reach, it was more than. It was probably more than all the Currents articles have been viewed this year — just in reach of users. Engagements, that one post alone has more engagements than probably five or six Currents articles combined.

52:21 C: So again, the other channels are not being utilized to their fullest potential. But, again, you've mentioned capacity, bandwidth. What's interesting is the way our organization or our department is structure is the person who's running social channels for the most part is also the person who's in charge of being an editor role on the website. You could argue that in most newsrooms, I could almost assure you if they have a healthy budget — so not most — would have unique roles like this is this person owns that channel. This person owns this. So, there's more focus on each of the channels that needs to be important.

V: Right

53:14 V: Do you think that there's the potential for more of our editorial team to play small roles in kind of taking the weight off Julie. So, like, even if I don't own a channel, but I own this story, can I kind of propose and run my own social content? Or think about ways to create standalone content within things?

C: Yes.

53:33 C: I have been an advocate in proposing that we instead of having a social role that is social media by committee. That maybe there's a small cohort of staff on the team that co-manage all of the channels. And they work together to create the content to react and listen to the community and the users on those channels.

54:06 C: I have been an advocate for that. I have yet to succeed in getting social channels out of Julie's kung-fu grip. That's on the record.

V: Well, who knows with the interns coming in. We have new interns. We have new things happening.

54:26 C: I'm in charge of Facebook now, I guess. So, she has released some control.

54:33 C: The angst for her to keep the kung-fu grip is about voice and tone. That's her biggest thing. It's, 'Well, the voices all need to be consistent, and the tone.' And there's something to be said about that, but again I would be a millionaire if I made a penny for every time we sat around and wavered and didn't actually do something different and change. We just keep being OK with it because what's going to make us change? I mean, again, we don't have a reason to change. No one's losing their jobs right now. No one's business, the revenue, isn't going down. We're not really worried about that.

55:20 V: I mean, that's the interesting thing I guess about this whole editorial approach. I'll be interested to get Keith and Julie and Larry's perspective on just why even make this change? This isn't the main business need of the company we work for. So why do it?

55:35 C: That's a great question. Yeah, grant making is the primary. Giving money away is the primary objective. I think we do it because we need to tell the stories about why we're giving. It helps validate a lot of what we're doing. But people like stories, and it's a way for people to see what we do in a story form. And maybe we're reaching — if we do our job right — we're reaching new people. Bringing them into our universe, and maybe someday the story will be about them.

V: Yeah.

C: That's a quote. That's a quote. Come on! Of all the jargon I throw out today that makes no sense. It's like manic thoughts.

V: No, that really helps illustrate kind of why my role was created, honestly, and the idea around branded journalism and branded storytelling. And it's the idea that someone who doesn't have a newspaper or a main publication, where news is not the main business need, there's an understanding and a strategy around the fact that telling stories creates value — additional value — around that main business need. That's why you do it.

56:44 C: Yeah. One of the best-case studies in the business world is Red Bull.

V: Yeah. Yeah. That was one of the main studies in some of the classes I took.

C: A company that literally could be like any other drink manufacturer that just puts their drink out on the shelves. But why do they have an entire website about content around Red Bull? Like people skateboarding and ' Uhh. I'm gonna drink my Red Bull now.' I

don't even know. I just know they're a really good content leader. I can't remember the specifics that I looked into one time.

57:15 V: Yeah, that's a great example. But I see people waiting outside the door, and I think we've gone a couple minutes over.

C: Yeah. It's been fun. It's been real.

V: Yeah, thank you so much for agreeing to meet with me, give me some solid quotes.

57:28 C: Yeah there's one. There's one in there.

APPENDIX M: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – MATT POZEL

Valerie: Cool. So, go ahead and start off by telling me your name and how long you've been working here.

Matt Pozel: My name is Matt Pozel and I've been with the foundation for 21 years this year.

V: Yeah, congratulations on that. That's pretty neat.

M: Sure. Yeah. No. Been a year at a time, you know.

[Laughter]

00:18 V: So, I mean 21 years is obviously quite a career. Tell me a little bit about the work that you do here now either for the editorial team or other departments that you work with in tandem.

00:31 M: Well, I sort of landed in this I mean I work on a day-to-day basis on some kind of internal kind of communications for the foundation. The daily updates to a platform called Courtyard, which people can contribute to and then we can push things out. Also, some of the working with Talent & Culture on some of the engagement opportunities for associates, whether they go out in the field with Lunch and Learn trips and then come back and talk about them, or other gatherings we have to share ideas. That's sort of my internal communications role.

01:18 M: To support programs and then more recently to support editorial needs, I work on stories writing stories, producing stories, video. So, those are my two big — you know I came to the foundation as a writer. That's the way I was used to telling stories. That's the way I was the most comfortable. You know, translating stories. I learned here that the Kauffman way of telling stories is more through video, and so, I've gotten more comfortable with that as the years have gone by. I think my favorite is sort of a little bit of both, you know. So...

V: Mhmm.

02:02 V: Cool. Yeah. I know, I mean. I've always known that you work pretty closely with Matt Long, but as I've worked here I've seen a little bit more of what you do on Courtyard and all of that. So, it's interesting to hear from everyone how their roles have changed just in the last few years as the editorial team has really become an editorial team.

02:21 M: Sure. Yeah. I think. Yeah I mean we've gone through a lot of different versions of the department structure, and I think I've had a chance to contribute to that from time to time. I mean I've always seen myself, whether it's in this role or throughout my career, is just to be. I mean I've never been at the level where I can make I think big decisions,

but I've always wanted to be able to feed into those. And I've been pretty...I haven't held back in expressing my thoughts about that. I feel like that's what I'm here to do. I'm here to be me. I'm hired to be me. But then, once those decisions are made then I feel like I want to be a good soldier and carry them out. And contribute the best way I can and give others room to contribute. Because what I appreciate about my job through the years has been the ability to express myself. Express myself creatively to express myself in ways that coincide with my personal values and beliefs. I feel like through the years I've been lucky to work for organizations that I believe in their mission and the way they're...what they're trying to accomplish.

03:52 M: I feel like I have a, from the first time I discovered I had an ability to write something and reach people was like a magic moment. But then it was also that moment to be cognizant of I can influence people. I can play off of people's emotions. I can create something that is legitimate or illegitimate, and I need to be careful about how I apply that.

V: Sure.

04:22 V: Well, in talking about expression, just in your own words can you kind of give me an overview of what this new editorial approach is for you and for the team?

04:33 M: You know I think it'll give us some structure, I hope. I don't think we're there yet. I think it's been a little bit of back and forth. A little bit of two steps forward and one step back, or one step forward and two steps back in some cases. I haven't been shy about expressing where I think it's.... the analogy that I've been using is this idea that we're working on the plumbing, and I want to turn the faucets on. I want to put water through the pipes and see where it's leaking and see where it's running smoothly. I feel like the reins are still on us a bit as we're trying to figure out process. I'm not — I mean I understand structure. I understand process and the need for it, but I guess I'm not as tolerant of it.

05:35 M: I'm anxious to...I'm more of a plan for it, do it, figure out what you could've done better. Do it is the second part of that process. So, I want to get to the "do it" part. I think until we do that, we can't give a fair analysis of whether it's working.

V: Sure.

06:07 M: I feel like it's still a work in progress. I'm not sure...it doesn't feel finely tuned right now. I think from a practical standpoint we're spending still way too much time on like the weekly getting the weekly email out. I think I would like to see that transition to producing content and then using the email as another platform to say, 'Oh this would be good to present through the email.' Just like we do on social media channels, instead of letting the newsletter or letting the email sort of lead the way.

V: Yeah. Yeah.

06:52 V: I've definitely heard that from others, too. I think that that will become more clear as we kind of do work through that and understand what the constraints are around us time-wise and what are the expectations of others in the foundation. Like, is that newsletter really effective or other things we can be spending our time on.

07:13 M: And my experience comes from, too, I did the newsletter kind of by myself. Not by myself, but I was chiefly responsible for doing it every week. So, I understood the weekly grind of it. And I brought people in at different times in the process. But it was my assignment to do it, and so I would try to just let everybody do their work. Let everybody post what they were posting. Present what they were presenting, and then at some point during the week, I would think, 'OK. This is the snapshot of the foundation that we want.' And then I would produce three...I started with the three items, which was actually a take-off of the "Three Things Sketchbook" from years ago. There was going to be three items and then I would send it around for approval.

08:06 M: So, it was less. I mean it was more on me. It was less labor-intensive throughout the foundation or throughout the department, I should say. You know, how much time and effort was put into it. People still had their say on what went in and what didn't go in and how it was presented. But it was way less of a team effort, but it was way less of a team chore, too.

V: Sure. Sure.

08:39 V: I'm curious then, I mean, obviously you've been working through different variations of what this team is for a long time. Kind of when were you brought into the conversations around Atlantic 57? Because I think that engagement has been going on since like last May.

08:58 M: Yeah, I mean I feel like I was...I mean I heard parts of it. And, part of it, too, was at one point there was a thing called the digital team, which was a precursor I guess to the editorial team, and I wasn't a part of that either. I think Matt and I were sort of separate from that. I've got no opinion about that. It's Keith call how that, what he needed from those meetings. I'm sort of the fewer meetings I can get into, the better I feel about things.

09:28 M: So, I wasn't missing the fact of contributing to that. I think that might have grown out of that or an offshoot of that. I'm guessing it was something from one of the trips to South by Southwest, and they got exposed to a presentation by the group from Atlantic. I felt like I heard about it rather late in the game, like what exactly they were doing what the expectations were.

V: Sure.

09:58 V: Do you feel like those primary goals of this change have been illustrated now to a better degree? Like what are we hoping to get out of making this change?

10:11 M: I'm not real clear on how we're going to judge whether this is a success or not. I will say I think I am more on board with this team than I am with any consultant. And I just...It's hard to be the person who's been around for 20 years and not be seen as the person that's, 'Oh, this again.' Or, 'We've tried this, and it didn't work.' But I do feel like consultants could learn something from us, or that we could teach consultants something. When I sit through some of their presentations, I mentioned this to Larry at one point in passing. And he was like, well you know. He agreed, but it was. In his experience, and he's brought consultants in at very high levels. There's been times where he's tried to make points and they weren't heard with him internally. And then you bring somebody in from the outside and there's some kind of magic that happens when you hear it from somebody from the outside, especially the Atlantic.

11:29 M: I'm a huge...I mean the Atlantic, the New Yorker, they're my go-to airport airplane reading things. I really admire the work that they do as journalists. I think I mean and on some level I think it might have been more helpful to say to have us highlight the Atlantic and what it does editorial. The New Yorker and what it does editorial. You know maybe there's some websites that we admire what they do editorially. And bring them in to talk about that instead of hiring whatever version of the Atlantic 57 represents.

12:12 M: Have the conversation less about advising us on how to do our process and more about their thinking about their context for stories and how they think through the life cycle of a story and regenerating a story. And how they've actually done that.

12:45 V: Yeah, so, digging into more concrete content and the thinking that goes into that. Rather than just here's how we're going to run a meeting to talk about those stories.

12:55 M: Yeah because ultimately that's going to fall back on us. It's great that they have an opinion about that but it's still, it's us.

13:08 V: Cool. Well, I kind of want to shift gears to talking about how some of this advising has changed the way that we actually think, whether that's in great strides or small ones. And I know that you had a lot of really solid points when we were just starting to dig into the typologies. So, I wanted to get a sense of how adopting this approach has affected the way we think about audiences in our work. Whether that's an email list or typologies or how we're really thinking about that now.

13:39 M: You know, I think there's always going to be a mix between what the person you're talking to wants to hear and what you have to say. I just think that starts with any normal human conversation and expands out into the wider world of trying to connect with people. I think essentially you're trying to connect with a person in a meaningful way somehow. I guess one of my criteria for consultants is how many words like taxonomy or personas that they throw out. Or typography?

V: Typology

14:35 M: Typology. So, are you talking about types? Is that the word? I'm a word person. I sort of cringe a little bit. I cringe, frankly, at some of the things that get thrown around the Kauffman Foundation and in philanthropy. I feel like a big part of what our job is to try to translate the big fancy words into words that actually have meaning to people.

15:00 M: So, that's always like a red flag for me. I also feel like in part of those conversations. I feel like people are just more complicated than you're a skeptic or you're a true believer or you're a thought leader or whatever. I think trying to target a message to this idea that you are wholly a skeptic, so therefore this is the message that you want. I think there's things I'm skeptical about, and then there's things that I feel very confident that I am an expert in as an individual. So, in the course of one article in the Atlantic I think there's things that hit on those different things. Or anything that I'm consuming.

16:01 V: Yeah. I guess that's the beauty of kind of what they define typology as. The word itself is maybe not very helpful, but the thinking that someone can vacillate from sometimes I'm a skeptic and sometimes I really believe in this. Or sometimes I really am looking to collaborate on this idea or making this concept really understood. And so that's where...I guess I've kind of understood thinking about audiences more so. I think we're trying to get to a point where we're thinking about audiences in terms of their values and their interests. But I think we're still a little hazy on what values and interests those audiences maybe hold.

16:44 M: Yeah. And where they tie back to our values and interests. Because you spend a lot of time trying to convert people. Or you can spend a lot of time equipping people who are already on...I mean we have already staked our claim and it's not going to change that we're going to be the true believers in entrepreneurship and education and Kansas City Civic. If that's going to be our point of view, I think trying to keep that context in the equation I think is important, too. Because otherwise, for instance, I think it's great that we can weigh in when the government shuts down with a point of view. Frankly, I'm not sure if the person in any of those audience types where they work themselves down to the Kauffman Foundation.

17:52 M: So, for instance, I'm a fan of the Heinz Foundation in Pittsburgh. The president there came from a communications background. He's a wonderful writer, and he's written some really eloquent presidential notes about things that are happening in the world. I haven't gone to read what Grant says about the government shutdown, even though he may or may not have written an essay about it because I don't have the energy to work my way all the way down to the Heinz Foundation. For something that big, I'm going to the Atlantic or I'm going to The New York Times or the Wall Street Journal. And I feel like where we weigh in with a perspective and what our perspective is just as important as weighing in. Just because...I appreciate when the Atlantic got to the point in our last session where they said, 'What would help you as a writer say get your message across? What would you want to know from research?'

19:01 M: And when we talked about this idea like what are people searching for? And what are they finding? So, if someone is looking for, I don't know second-act

entrepreneurs. Baby boomers turning into entrepreneurs or retirees or whatever it is. If that search is being conducted and then we find that there is slim picking in that area. That no one is really addressing that. To me, that seems like something we could really weigh in on. If we search for millennial entrepreneurs, and we find there is an unlimited supply, and people who have captured the audiences we want to capture to a great degree. I'm not sure we're going to resonate there.

19:59 V: Yeah, it's hard to resonate and to stand out when someone has already fulfilled that need for the audience. Where they've already found an interest in that and gotten the information or the sentiment that they wanted to hear put across. I agree that there is something to be said for weighing in and adding your voice to that conversation, but I think you're right that the pieces we're going to see be really successful are things that are going to be gaps in people's information that they are looking for. That they're saying, 'I need this information.' Or, 'I want to know if there's someone out there like me or has had this experience. And I just can't find it.' ...That's the whole point of understanding audiences as interests is understanding that they want something. And if we can give it to them, then we'll have a much better mutual relationship than just saying, 'We're going to produce whatever we want and hopefully someone will want it, too.'

M: Yeah.

21:02 M: And again, I would say, it's that mix of what's our. So, I'm about as far away from an entrepreneur as you can get, I think over time I've kind of caught some of that. What entrepreneurs do. And I know, I think about value proposition a lot and what is the unique thing that the Kauffman Foundation has to bring to the conversation. If we're going to have a roundtable about whatever subject, why would they invite Kauffman? Why would they want to hear what Kauffman has to say? What do we have to say, and how do we distinguish ourselves so that our point of view on it is maybe has historical context, maybe it has a different point of view? We talk about the lenses we have for entrepreneurship and education. I think that's of value to bring to the overload of information that people are hit with. I think that alone is of value to people, if you can sort of make sense of everything that's being thrown at them. And give them some sort of context or relevance. I think that can be helpful.

22:34 M: I know it is for me.

22:39 V: Yeah. I mean, I think that goes back to how we think about the news and information that we consume. Is it relevant to my every day? Is it giving me some better understanding of the reality that I live? Is it timely? It's great if I see this article about what happened three months ago, that might still give me some understanding. But that's maybe not what I needed right now.

23:00 M: Well, and does it represent special interest, too? And that's something that I think sometimes we don't acknowledge. That we feel we are advancing a point of view. At one point we were talking about language, and I'm sorry but words matter to me. And I'm a bit of a word nerd about at one time when we were talking about being unapologetic

cheerleaders for entrepreneurship. That's where I will go back to my own personal values and say, 'Is it legitimate to tell somebody that when we don't have any stake in it? That Valerie. You know, this idea that you have. You need to pursue that. You need to quit your job. You need to go all in. Take a risk, because that's what entrepreneurs do. We're not going to fund you. In fact, we're just kind of going to be on the sidelines. We're going to be cheerleading for you.'

24:14 M: When we know the odds are maybe 50-50 or maybe they're even worse that you're going to succeed. I think we need to be careful about how much we are pushing the idea that everybody needs to be an entrepreneur. Or that entrepreneurship is somehow the answer. Now, I think changing the chances that you can succeed. I think that trying to create more entrepreneurs is only legitimate if you're trying to make the entrepreneurs that are already out there more successful. Changing the odds that you're going to succeed. So, it's 1) creating more entrepreneurs 2) increasing the chances that the entrepreneur is going to be successful and then 3) paving the way for the entrepreneurs that are already in the game to continue to succeed.

25:14 V: Yeah, I think that alone those words that you're using in just bulleting that out that really speaks to the values that we're trying to communicate more so than saying we're unapologetic cheerleaders. Because it's like, would you really cheer on someone who's going to go into debt and ruin their livelihood? When instead that person might be able to continue doing the work they do and can play another role that will help someone else be more successful.

25:42 M: And I think it flies in the face of what we actually know about entrepreneurship. And so, if we're going to be the ones that present ourselves as the authority on entrepreneurship, which I really think we can legitimately claim, then we have to be realistic. And I think we are. I think when we go to the ESHIP Summit and Victor's presenting or Philip or Andy, I feel that. I mean I heard Andy talking to this tour group about being realistic about where we are.

26:23 M: I think one of my concerns about the editorial approach, and I've said this to Keith, and I think I've said it in our meetings is that we have gone through a lot to craft a strategy for Kansas City Civic, for education and entrepreneurship. I'm a little bit nervous about and we hold the program areas to those pretty tightly. And there's a lot of tension from the program areas to push away from some of those. And we're usually the ones to play cop and say, 'Now, wait a minute. How does this fit with your strategy? How are we going to measure this?' I'm a little bit nervous about creating an editorial strategy, which sometimes seems separate from the program strategies. That we're doing exactly what we've told people you can't do.

V: Mhmm.

27:24 M: And if they see us doing this without any sort of reins, guard rails or anything. Then I think we lose our authority to come back to them and say, 'Wait a minute. How is this fitting in with your strategy?' That's where I feel like I'm not exactly sure where if

we're presenting the editorial strategy as outside the program strategies. Well, where it fits really.

V: Mhmm.

28:07 V: And I think that's something that Keith and Julie are still working out, but kind of where I want to head next is just talking about how, within these kind of loosely defined rails, how is this affecting what we decide to cover? What stories we decide to tell. Because I get the sense that even across the longer trajectory of things that we have shifted away in some sense from the typical. Like, we're going to put out a press release and we're going to tell people what the news is. And a lot of that's just going to be based on events and just initiatives here. I just sense that there's been a bigger change in that maybe the story-first editorial approach that we're proposing really highlights that.

28:56 M: Yeah. And I don't know. To me, and I've told Keith this. I'm not sure, but I'm not sure what story-first means. I'm not sure what audience-first means. Scratch the unsure, because I don't know what that means.

29:14 M: I think going away from the news release thing. I don't think anybody that was ever producing news releases ever thought that they were changing the world. Or that there that was sort of. It was a low-level cut-and-paste kind of presentation, and it gave the story brief if you will to media outlets. That may or may not capture their imagination. They were going to do their own story anyway. I don't think when we talk about news releases was our bread and butter, I don't think anybody ever saw that way even when we were doing them. It was sort of a necessary evil in just saying, 'This is the way you communicate with media outlets.' Now, as media outlets blew up and changed and things. I think that thankfully went away. And I don't think there was ever anybody who was like, 'Hey, why don't we do more of news releases?' You know? It wasn't the world that we were in.

30:22 M: I think things like when Lisa Murray became chief investment officer, and I had a chance to interview Lisa. We videotaped her. We told the story of who Lisa Murray is as a person, including her background growing up, what influenced her. She even did the...She played hockey in college at a very high level.... She was one of the greatest teams ever in the history of Princeton University and then tried out for the women's Olympic team. She then used the famous Wayne Gretzsky advice about playing hockey. You don't go to where the puck is, you go to where it's going to go. Or something like that. It was a perfect fit to running the investments. You don't look at where the investments are, you look at where they're going to go. And so, she made that connection.

31:24 M: I think as I was laying out some of the things I had done throughout the year to talk about some year-end stuff with Keith. Those kinds of things were coming up. And to me, that's a very practical example of the kind of approach. Now, is that story-first, is that audience-first? I'm not sure. It's a different way for us to present Lisa in her new role,

both internally and to an external audience. And I think, you know, I think doing more of those kinds of things would be great.

32:00 M: I think the idea that we're going to completely get away with of event reporting or something. So, another example was the Rethink Education event, which happened as an event. We, at the time, reported on it in a Currents article. And I think you could make the argument we took a little bit different approach in that we talked to more students than we normally would. We really didn't seek out presenters to see what they're saying on stage. It was more the participants and trying to capture some of the feeling for what it was like to be there. Months later we did the piece about the hip-hop architect Michael Ford. And it was separate from the Rethink thing, although we mentioned that he was there as part of the Rethink Education. Now, he hasn't got a grant from the Kauffman Foundation. He's really not connected to the Kauffman Foundation, but he was part of that event. So, if what the Rethink Education event was trying to do was to get people to think differently about how we can educate kids, Michael Ford's story tells that in a very real and meaningful way that's different from, 'Hey we had a conference so that people would think different about education.'

33:33 M: I think the ESHIP Summit. I have less use for the ESHIP Summit like, 'Here's what happened at the ESHIP Summit' thing. And here's the Currents piece. Than I am whatever follows. Whatever we can generate from that. And the mayors' thing is the great example. And I think I'm a little bit. It's a little bit discouraging that we haven't really. I know you've mined those interviews. And I was like, you know, where are those?

34:05 M: So, again, those are stories. If we're story first, then where are those? I'm wondering if you're feeling after reading that some of my frustrations are sometimes I get to do these interviews. Wonderful stuff comes back. Then it's like, you know, what are we turning those into? How are we using those? How are we getting this message out? Because having Matt Pozel here those or having Valerie read those doesn't do a whole lot.

34:47 M: I thought it was really cool that you took those on. That you were looking at them from a journalistic. I thought the fact that I felt like you were animated by those or excited about what those things had to offer, pieced them together into story segments...

35:09 V: Yeah. To me, that is story first. It's not looking at it from a 'We need something for the newsletter this week, so we'll write a story.' It's, 'We have a story, so we'll put it in the newsletter because that's the best way to share it.' It's really looking at those interviews and seeing these people are doing incredible stuff. And then connecting that maybe to...maybe it's within the guardrails. Maybe it's within the coverage areas we've defined and defined very loosely for that reason. But I think that we still haven't figured out how to execute on that. I think we are very much idea people, and we're good at saying 'that would be a great story.'

M: Yeah.

35:49 V: We're maybe not as good at saying, 'Here's how we're going to tell it.'

35:51 M: And that's what I want. That's what I mean about letting the water flow through the pipes. Because let's put them out there. I mean we've got them. Let's just put them out there because. And this is the other thing. This is where I will lean on however many years before that that I've been doing this in different ways. I think sometimes we were very arrogant about, 'We know the stories, and we sit in meetings and say this is the story we want to tell. That's never the case though. In my experience there's a version we want to tell. But until we talk to the mayor of West Sacramento and he tells the story about how he ignored whatever local rules there were about reclaiming this abandoned place so that a brewery could go in there. And then he says, 'You know what? We're going to look the other way. Let you start this because that only makes sense and because we want to take the risk along with you.' To me, that says more about risk taking and about policy than a speech that we give or a version of it that we talk about in an editorial meeting. Here's a mayor of an actual city. You want your local entrepreneurs to take a risk, but government doesn't want to take that risk with you? He's willing to take it.

37:33 M: Or, the mayor that said I want my first answer when somebody talks to my staff, I want their first answer to be 'yes' instead of 'no.' That's how it really plays out in the real world, and the stories that we imagine are always better when we put them out there and we hear from people. That's why I like the listening thing so much. That's why I like when we talk about listening so much because when we put our concepts out there and we hear them back from people they are always — without exception — so much better.

38:20 V: And I think that's why I get so animated when I get to read through interviews because for me my only job is to find the story. It's not about craft this interview, get the quote. It's really just let this person sit in front of you and talk. And then from there, I think there's conversations that we have. As long as we're still having the conversation, then finding the story to pitch will be easy. As long as we're listening and paying attention to what's happening in the world that becomes a lot easier.

38:53 V: And I think that that's where we're moving. I've really enjoyed seeing us break up the meeting segments into more talking about what current events are happening, what are some key conversations that are already existing. I think that gives a lot more independence to each of us as storytellers to pipe up and say, 'I read this cool thing.' Or, 'I know this is happening and I think we should do something.' I think giving a little bit more democracy to that process and saying like anyone in three different ways can tell a story.

39:29 M: As long as we don't overthink things or overtalk things or, to your point about getting paralyzed by...I think it's been a little bit frustrating sometimes but. I don't know, does this fall under our criteria now? And then somebody will say we're story-first now, we're audience first. I'm like, again, I'm not sure what that means.

39:57 M: If that's going to be our go-to thing to say.... I don't want to belabor but these mayors things, if that's not story first to your point, then I'm further confused.

40:18 V: I say let's go with that example. And let's say that is story-first. I guess the next piece of that if we say we have the story and it meets one of our criteria. Risk taking, that's one of our coverage areas. Then, the 'do it' part of it like you're saying is really figuring out then, what's the best way to tell that story. And I think that's where we're feeling that paralysis right now. And you can disagree with me or correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems like the way we value our different channels where we place stories...There's a lot of emphasis on Kauffman Currents and on Ideas at work, our newsletter.

41:00 V: I think we're getting paralyzed because we know that the channel to tell that story is not one that we value most.

41:09 M: Yeah. Again, until we start doing this stuff it's hard to know what we know. It's hard to say. I mean I remember back even when I was doing the newsletter we would go back and say, 'OK. This thing got this much, and people clicked on this. Or that happened.' But then there was not comparative analysis to say and then we would change the subject line, or we'd do a dual send or something. But we do it for one week and then we would not do it. And it was like well, I don't. I'm not sure on what criteria then we're going to make these adjustments. I mean you can't put something out, change something and then change something different the third time and then make any sort of analysis about what happened. Because was it this variable or this variable? I mean that's basic.

42:23 M: Yeah, what fits where? Not what do we value but what does the audience value?

42:38 V: And I think that's the hang-up. The way I've understood it, regardless of what it means. What it means to me when we say story-first and then to me second is audience, third is channel. And the way I see these stories for the mayors, regardless of how we value our channels, I think we have these great videos. If I were watching this, I would want to see these videos come up in my Instagram feed and just automatically start playing and telling me story. And hearing them tell me this story from their perspective, seeing them on my screen, having that visual connection. Because, for me, even just reading the interviews, it's totally different when I get an audio cut back from Matt. The whole thing comes to life with that piece, and then once I see the actual video, it's totally different in tone, in energy, everything. So, to me, it's like we almost need to run the experiment of what would happen if I put these videos and pushed them out weekly on Instagram? And then what would happen if they were also housed on Kauffman Currents and we shared this piece? And then what would happen if we also shared out 30-second clips, minute clips on Twitter. Like, run the test. Just do it and just see what happens. And then use that as your case to say, 'It seems like our audience really resonated with these videos and this story when they could view it and hear it. And there was no way to escape that.' It wasn't like the point of the post was to click back the website. It was just engage with this here, now.

44:07 V: I think that's where our editorial approach hasn't necessarily affected our different channels just yet. I think we're thinking about the channel uses. We're just not doing it.

44:19 M: In the meantime, we sort of have this backlog of stuff that it's like, well, we're not using it. So, why not put it out there? And maybe part of our editorial meetings could be what do we have that we just haven't. It's not made its way up to a Currents thing or it's not...The other advantage of that is once it's out there, then if something happens down the line in the world or in the United States that it's like one of those lessons that becomes super relevant, then we bump it up or reuse it. This is another thing I think when a consultant comes in and goes, 'You know, you could reuse existing content.' I almost just want to cringe and think, 'Yeah, we all know that.' Right?

45:18 M: So repackaging things, rearranging things is pretty fundamental, but step one is to use it in the first place or have it in the first place. Not to have it in the pipeline all this time.

45:38 M: But yeah. I'd like to see the flood gates. I'd like to see the faucets turn on. I have an old house, and it's always nerve-wracking whenever you do big plumbing work. You turn the water off in the whole house. You try to do these valves and do this stuff. And at some point, you turn the water on. And you feel it go through the house. And you're like, 'Is this going to hold?' And it doesn't and then you gotta turn the water off. But I mean at some point that was the analogy that I felt like in sitting in with the consultants and going through some of the same ground again, I felt like, 'Oh Lord.'

46:19 M: Let's just turn the water on. See what happens. And I feel like we've been able to do that on occasion. I mean the Lisa Murray thing is an example I give. But I have no idea.

V: If that lands, if it means success to Keith and Julie. All of that.

46:37 M: Yeah.

46:40 V: And that's where. I guess I want to bring up one that people have told me is successful, and I know this is something that I think you pitched to begin with. It's kind of unusual, unusual for what we normally do but. The photo that we posted of Mr. Kauffman with the owner of the Chiefs when they were breaking ground on the athletic complex. That was our most engaged with post of all time since we even started a Facebook. I was talking to Chris the other day and he said, 'You know, I think that that had probably more engagement pieces than all of the Kauffman Currents pieces in our newsletter that week, than probably five or six Currents pieces combined.' And it was completely standalone. It didn't link back to anything. There was no, 'Go read this full story about Mr. K on our website.' It was just engage with this piece of content right here right now.

47:37 M: And it was barely even relevant to the Chiefs or anything.

V: Or entrepreneurship.

47:44 M: So, yeah. I was surprised by that. I think finding the right whether it was just by coincidence or happenstance. It landed in the right place, I guess at the right time.

48:05 V: I mean the timing around that; I mean we were in the playoffs. There was a lot of nostalgic feeling around, we haven't been in X amount of years, and everybody is really feeling that pride for Kansas City, for the team. You and I are both not from here, but that I guess was kind of the feeling at the time. Do you feel like that post really captured that? Like that's the coincidence — we just hit the right tone?

48:33 M: You know I think nostalgia is a pretty powerful thing. I do think growing up in a place and being from a place where the sports teams are so local and so connected to local, I mean the family that has run the Pittsburgh Steelers can famously walk to the stadium from downtown Pittsburgh. I mean the Rooney family is iconic. The fact that Ewing Kauffman is really the only local owner from sports team that Kansas City had for many years. And now Sporting Kansas City I think is, you could say that about. Lamar Hunt was never a local owner. As much as he's been committed to Kansas City, he was never local. David Glass now is not local. The owners of the Kansas City A's before Ewing Kauffman.

49:38 M: I think that's part of it that I think attracts people. I think the two-stadium complex was an innovation that has sort of been an under-the-radar thing. We've talked about in terms of it being ahead of its time. I don't know. It's funny because last week when we did the Royals ticket giveaway. I told Chris based on that, I said, 'Hey.' I gave him the picture of Ewing Kauffman signing with kids in the stadium. And I also on eBay last year found the first program for the Kansas City Royals where they have the article that was the original Kansas City Star article about the "Why Royals Lancers." Which we never knew about that was in the first season of the Royals. Mr. Kauffman gave money to the YMCA to run this program to field baseball teams, girls softball teams, a choral group that sang at the stadium and a group of students who would come together to talk about issues in the inner city. Kids, like teenagers. It was 1969\. I was blown away by it.

51:01 M: So, I was like, 'OK we're giving these kids now tickets to the Royals game.' I said, 'What if we had that picture.' I had scanned the article from the first program and the cover of the first program, which was very nostalgic looking. Kind of deco-ish. I sent them to Chris with a cutline sort of similar to the stadium think. And said, 'Look if you have time or if you think this is worthwhile, what if we pieced together something that coincided with the Royals ticket giveaway?'

51:45 M: You know I never really get personally invested I guess. To me, that's part of being part of the team. You submit these things. You do the work and you put them out there. And then for somebody else to decide for these to fit in or anything.

51:58 M: But I will say over the weekend, I was like, 'Oh, I want to see if that posted on Facebook.' And it didn't get posted. But I was interested in seeing. And I didn't present it that way to Chris, but I was interested to see if a sort of similar thing...

V: Happened.

52:22 M: And I felt like that had more substance to it. Because I don't think a lot of people know. I mean I work at the Kauffman Foundation. I was very familiar with the history of the Royals and Ewing Kauffman. But that was a different. Now, we've talked about it before. It was in the piece about 5 ways that Ewing Kauffman changed the game of baseball.

52:43 M: I don't know. What do you think?

52:43 V: I mean I think that builds on, we've talked about building this constellation of content and I think that 5 ways pieces is a great example of that can live on Kauffman Currents and that's great. That's where it should be. But then the piece, this historical piece that we have. This total gem of just like, this is just a random story and something that we've come across and there's just some of kind of spontaneity to that. And I think that that would read really well across Facebook or Instagram. To maybe have just a quick gallery of like see the picture, see the story, have a really well-written caption of just. And it doesn't necessarily have to be around the giveaway, it could be around Opening Day. It could be around just people's love for baseball. People's love for Kansas City. And just say, you know, 'It's spring time. It's baseball time.' Everybody's in that mood now. You know here's this gem just giving you that nostalgia of just, what did baseball give to you? Did it give you community? Did it give you learning from peers? Did it give you a connection to other current issues? If it was like, you grew up on a baseball field that was a total sandlot and not this big fancy stadium like the Urban Youth League is amazing but that's not everyone's story.

54:07 V: So, to have some of that connection there, I think it could be really powerful. But I think that's where it would be interesting to run that case just to understand, was it presentation? Was it meeting people where they are? And saying people care about baseball, and they show that care not on their professional blogs. They show that on Facebook. They show that on Instagram. On Twitter.

54:29 M: See, what I like though about the way you present it is, Ewing Kauffman gave us the Royals. That's ancient history. I mean one of my concerns about. I hate to characterize myself this way, but if I'm one of the standard bearers of the history of the Kauffman Foundation or of Ewing Kauffman, I want to be careful about how we use that, too. Or apply it where it really doesn't make sense. But what you said, 'what did baseball give to me?' If we present it like, Ewing Kauffman gave Kansas City the Royals. What did baseball give to you? And turn it back to try to get some...

V: Interaction

55:22 M: ...Feedback. And you know like put people. Because when I think and I talk about the Kauffman legacy, I don't want it to reside with Ewing Kauffman or the building or the stadium or the performing arts center, but with the person that was at 1 Million Cups yesterday or the kid that walked into the Kauffman School today. The person that is going to Opening Day, or the kid that got the tickets through the whatsoever community center when they came back and said, 'Hey, the Kauffman Foundation is taking us to a ball game.' Or not. I mean, 'we got tickets to the ball game.' That's the legacy. So, if we can turn around the history of Kauffman and then say what do you bring? What's different about you? And then people are a part of it.

56:27 V: And I think...That ladders up to we like to say this, and whether these words really have meaning to anyone or not, to say entrepreneurship is a community sport. This is a perfect example of where Mr. K made that happen before that phrase was even in our vernacular. But now we can turn it around and say what did sports give you? What did baseball give you the power to do?

56:52 V: Because I know for me I grew up going to my brother's Little League games all the time. And that gave me a relationship with my brother, with my dad. I mean, I don't really follow sports, but I remember watching the Astros win the pennant for the first time in the early 2000s. And to me, that's nostalgia for me. That's home for me. And there's still a hometown pride around that. And I saw what it gave my brother and I saw what it gave my dad. And so, there's a connection to that. So, just having the opportunity to share that with you in a conversation that tells you a lot more about me. And that's valuable.

57:32 V: I mean for us to see our audiences telling us that back, that's really cool.

57:39 M: Yeah. And I think the cover of that first program. I thought it was really interesting because we've talked through the years that one of Ewing Kauffman's innovations was small market, but he sent busloads of players. Before they had even played one game he was sending busloads of players to Goodland, Kansas, and Hastings, Nebraska, and all this hundreds of miles away. There was no team in Colorado at the team. There was a St. Louis team and then we pretty much there's no Arkansas. Iowa. You know where do people from Iowa and Nebraska, Oklahoma, Colorado, Arkansas. Who are they rooting for? So, he sent these caravans of buses out to little co-ops, you name it to try to drum up support for the Royals. And that first program shows not Kansas City. It shows the Midwest and it shows a star in Kansas City, but then shows the entire region. Like, you're all our fans.

58:42 M: Again, it also shows the foresight of Ewing Kauffman to say, 'If I'm going to have a professional baseball team in Kansas City, it's not going to be in Philadelphia or New York or Chicago. I'm going to have to...I have a stadium to fill. I'm going to have to bring people from all over.'

59:04 M: I don't know, but again finding that mix. I don't want to always look back to Ewing Kauffman. I want people to feel like they're a part of that. And I think when you

look at that Facebook post about the breaking ground, when you read the comments people did take it to where what it meant to them. There was some that were like, 'Mr. Kauffman was great. Thanks Ewing Kauffman.' And things like that. But there was a lot of reminiscing about what it meant to them that we have the sports complex. We have the sports teams.

59:46 V: Well and I think that's where when what we talk about makes a successful, when we see those comments. It's maybe not. Even if it wasn't our most engaged with post, even if numerically we couldn't say that it was successful, if we said, 'Look, five people connected with this and shared a story with us.' That's what makes it successful because stories should beget stories.

1:00:12 M: And Julie did a cool thing during the EMK 100\. I had counted backward and figured out we're going to do a 100-day countdown. She then took that and went through pictures in the archives. And I think we had on Instagram we did

V: One post a day?

M: Yep.

1:00:40 M: Which was awesome. Now, it sort of lent itself to that, obviously. And I don't know. I mean it was very popular. Lot of comments. But we did it that one time. We haven't done anything like that since. Are there other things that lend themselves? I mean we're back to 'what are the platforms?' What are the best uses? What are the things that are best presented that way?

1:01:15 V: That circles back to the idea of where do you find that niche. Of what are people not getting? And if they're not getting that sense of Kansas City nostalgia, that understanding about what entrepreneurship is. And maybe they don't really have someone to connect entrepreneurship to, so for them that's Mr. K. Then that's how we provide that. I think that's where we can have a unique approach potentially.

1:01:40 M: And I mean we're lucky that we have a sort of an unstained sort of a person out there for right or wrong who is seen as a very inspiring and people associate good things with Ewing Kauffman. I think we need to make sure we keep it that way, which is a little bit scary.

V: Mhmm.

1:02:09 V: It's part of maintaining the legacy, I guess.

1:02:12 M: Yeah. And being real about it, too. I don't feel like I'm an unapologetic cheerleader for Ewing Kauffman. I mean the guy. He gave up things in his personal life to pursue his entrepreneurial path. And again, it's like, 'OK. Is that what we're promoting?' If you had to live your life over again, do you live it the same way? I would like and when we tell the Ewing Kauffman story we tell it in its entirety.

1:03:02 M: I think that helps people identify with it, too, because it's more genuine that way.

1:03:15 V: And we don't abuse it. I mean we use it from time to time, but I think we keep ourselves in check, saying like, 'We're focusing on the legacy and what he stood for not for who he was necessarily.'

1:03:28 V: So, we're getting close to time but something interesting came up with my conversation with Chris yesterday, and I think it's a good point. You know we've kind of talked about what role our team plays and how that's changed, and the reality is that the Kauffman Foundation team and our editorial team. It's not a for-profit business. Editorial stories aren't the product we're selling. We're in the business of giving money away. So, with that being said, so why stories? Why make this change at all? Why is telling stories important to us? And maybe how is that different now that we're adopting this approach?

1:04:04 M: Well without getting too gather 'round the campfire, that is the way we have as humans made sense of things and put things in perspective. The world isn't getting any less complicated or demanding. Years ago, we talked about our mission was self-sufficient people in healthy communities. And that was seen as a little too soft. And I feel like we're closer to that now. We've sort of come full circle. And that's what happens if you work long enough. I really like that in that it gave us free rein to think what do people need to be self-sufficient? And what do communities need to be healthy?

1:05:11 M: Being able to have honest adult conversations about the world and our responsibility to it. Understanding our past but also being able to cast a future is what stories do for us. It is so discouraging to see how just flat out to have leaders that have no regard for the truth. What's real or what's not real. What's authentic. So, in some ways I feel like it's more of our responsibility to fill that void because there are segments of society that are working against that.

1:06:35 V: Yeah. I mean Chris' question was really just around like if nothing is making us change, why are we changing? And I think that's a good point. If we want people to be successful, part of that success is discussing reality. So, we're trying to promote that. We're trying to share that and engage with people on that.

1:06:57 M: Well it will be interesting to get the perspective. I don't know if you've talked to Keith and Julie who brought Atlantic 57 into the mix and what they were seeking or what they felt was missing. Because again I don't remember us as an organization or us as a department more to the point of ever sitting down and saying, you know what, we need to have this conversation around 'What are we missing? What do we need to change? What are we going toward?' It just seemed like we went there and then we were all like following along.

1:07:41 M: And without being too like the whole story first thing or audience first, is that am I not? Is that being used against me now? I'm not understanding this. So, how are we

going to come together and sort of start contributing to this in a meaningful way? And to Chris' point, what were we lacking to begin with? What were we looking for Atlantic 57 to provide?

1:08:20 M: I think there were a lot of ways that they didn't. I mean if they're the experts in knowing their audience, I'm not sure they to my satisfaction were understanding of what the Kauffman Foundation was about. And the other thing frankly, and I think this is interesting in our field. I don't want to be too much of a curmudgeon. But I think you can make the argument that whatever the traditional media was they completely missed the boat. If they had known what their audience wanted, if they knew what the messages were, then they wouldn't be in the situation that they are today. And for us to learn from traditional media like they're the ones that like they failed. They failed. They're still failing to figure out how to monetize what they do, how to present what they do. Now, there's hope I think in that what I said earlier about this disregard for truth.

1:09:34 M: Probably more than ever in my lifetime the traditional journalists, like real journalism coming from not broadcast but print. Every day the New York Times and the Washington Post especially trading back and forth every once in a while the Wall Street Journal will fill in or some other outlet. But those two are like every day producing in another time would have been historic windows on what's happening. That's important and meaningful. They've really stepped up their game, and I think they're, as a result, they're going to be so much stronger going forward, which is great. The good news, because there's a lot railing against that.

M: I forget where I was going with this.

V: It's OK. I think...

1:10:44 M: Oh, but, so. You know. It would be like now the Star seems so decimated. They're losing people and everything and they've really sort of lost their way. If the Star was going to come to the Kauffman Foundation and say, 'Hey we're going to tell you how to run your communications program.' It's like, I don't know if you're the one who can really tell us about how to find audiences, how to reach them.

1:11:07 M: I mean I understand that they're looking for another revenue thing. This is where I'm super cynical. So, the Atlantic is not generating what they've been able to generate just through traditional thing. So, what they're going to do is set up a booth at South by Southwest and because they're Atlantic, that organization who's like Kauffman or whoever are going to say, 'Hey, now you tell us because we want to be like the Atlantic.' I don't know. Do we?

1:11:39 V: Well, I think that's where it'll be cool to see from the conversations I have with everyone what we can tell people we're learning. Because we're not done with this process. But I walked away from my last classes at Mizzou understanding kind of what this kind of storytelling is, and what it has the power to do. And I think that if Kauffman

is able to do that successfully and if we're able to tell people what we're learning and what we're struggling with that that could be a very educational thing.

1:12:15 M: So, what's the gap? What do you see is the...what's going to connect that?

1:12:22 V: I think that we're getting caught up on the initials. Thinking about audiences and thinking about stories is really key, I agree. Those should be first and second priorities. But I think there's still a block on understanding what I was told is like treatment. So, if the story is I want to help someone understand how we can improve education. So, people are looking for information on how to get better educational opportunities. If that's the need, it's understanding where people are going to go for that content and how are they going to engage with it best. I think we don't understand the how of that very well yet. Because we still feel a need to say, 'Well, we have a need of we need to put things in our newsletter. So, we'll write something that will fill that gap,' Instead of saying, 'Well, maybe people want to have a podcast on this conversation. Maybe it's a whole series of content.' And I think it's 1) a block of not understanding but 2) a block of capacity. And saying like we have to be willing to risk like we're not going to do Ideas at Work for like a month and we're just going to really pour ourselves into working together, collaborating with the best of our team to make this happen. And to really work as a team. Not like, 'Well this is Valerie's story about the mayors, so she's going to edit it and she's going to work on it.' No. It's, 'Pozel know the story best. Get him in the room. Get Valerie in the room Get Julie in the room. Get Chris in the room.' And talk about and plan all the different ways you can achieve that 'how.' How can you tell that story?

1:14:04 V: Because I think we've done the work and we talk through the very basic conversation. And the framework that I learned; I feel like we're covering that. But I think that the second part of it, the how and why we do it and how we justify the time and the capacity that goes into. We're not there. So, it's kind of like you're saying. We're not doing the 'doing it' of it.

1:14:29 M: Did Chris mention because I'm intrigued by the idea. I don't mean to say. Ideas at Work, the years I was doing it is not what it is today. I just want to make that clear. It was and I felt because it was a weekly thing. Just for my own sense of getting it done, I needed to make it as much of a routine as I could.

1:14:53 M: So, for instance, on Wednesdays when it was 1 Million Cups, I would listen to 1 Million Cups and type. I would make sure by the end of 1 Million Cups on Wednesday I was done with a draft of Ideas at Work so that I could start sending it around. And I felt like the more of a routine I could make it for myself and for everybody else, the better chance we would have of turning it around week after week. Because it's like, my God. I've done weekly things. I've done monthly things. It's unrelenting. And Courtyard, the reason I started with Courtyard. Is like, I want it to be under the radar. I want people to know that I got it.

V: You don't need to worry about it.

1:15:44 M: Yeah. But it is like an everyday thing that I do think about. If it's a daily thing, a weekly thing, I try to build routines. I wonder if we're to the point with technology that can't something just like find our newest thing that we've posted, something on Facebook and a Twitter conversation that's interesting. Put those together almost automatically once a week. And then have somebody — not a group of us — but someone look at that. Maybe it's Chris that says, 'That's it. That's "Ideas at Work" this week.'

V: Mhmm.

1:16:29 M: So, it's nothing new. Then, it would free us up to say, 'what are we producing?' to have the kind of editorial meetings that you're talking about. Or project meetings or story meetings or whatever they are.

V: Yeah.

1:16:47 V: That's what when I was in a newsroom in college we had a really outstanding social media director, and he had some of his students on his outreach team every day for our 10:00 budget meeting they would draft a report of what stories are getting the most engagement right now, what stories are getting less engagement than we would've expected for the amount of work we put into them, and then there were some pieces that were still tracking. Like why is this still getting clicked on even though it's old? Like those three things alone, that could be "Ideas at Work" every week. If you're just looking at those three metrics of just what's the most popular or what do we want to keep capitalizing on, what's something that wasn't getting as much click on it that we want, and what's something that's maybe a little bit older but maybe still relevant.

1:17:31 V: And that was just. It was literally just a note in Slack that got updated every day.

1:17:39 M: And what is our. The other thing I think about. When I think about audience first, I think about me as an audience. So, for me, what do I pay attention to? There's newsletters that I get that some poor person is putting together that maybe I'll click on, maybe I won't. I should just unsubscribe. My son worked at KCUR in the summer in an internship and he put onto this daily newsletter that they do. And I was like ahh. He was contributing to it. And it was like, 'All right. I'm going to sign up for it.' I love it. I mean it's great. But I get it at 6 a.m. every morning. I don't know when our newsletter goes out. I don't know if people are getting it at the same time every week. I don't know if a weekly thing works but when you think of audience first. When you think of what does somebody do with a newsletter from the Kauffman Foundation or an email that they get every week really?

1:18:52 V: Yeah. Sometimes it lands, sometimes it doesn't. But that's where I think it would be interesting. I think that the post that you shared with Chris about that baseball stuff for Royals giveaway. I think we could really have a couple work sessions and put

together a suggested content plan of here's what this could be on Facebook and Instagram. And if you want to create a Kauffman Currents piece of it, just let us take the risk of asking people to give us responses back. And just generate those. And then you write a story on, 'What did baseball give to me?' Like follow that up as some content to Mr. Kauffman.

M: What do you have to lose?

1:19:32 V: Like what do you have to lose by posting that? If no one clicks on, maybe we lose a couple hundred dollars on advertising. But I think if we made the pitch to Chris that we want to test if the Kansas City Chiefs thing. If we can get the timing right and think about that, we want to see if this — if we can make a case for doing that more often.

1:19:51 M: Well, and I think your idea like the mayors thing, too, would be a worthwhile thing to put out there. I saw a presentation by somebody that did analytics for YouTube and it was a presentation about the most popular things on YouTube. So, it was this very pop culturish guy that sees double rainbows. And he traced back what made them so popular. The double rainbow thing had been on YouTube for maybe 8 years and maybe 16 people had watched it. And then some part-time bartender was working in New York City at an NBC function and he was showing it to somebody. You know he was bartending, and he showed it to somebody who then knew Jimmy Fallon, who showed it to Jimmy Fallon. It showed the trajectory of how it...so I mean. Not that I harbor any hope that someday Jimmy Fallon is going to come upon a sketchbook or something. That's another thing that when we do our reports and see what's the most popular things. Those sketchbooks still people go to them.

1:21:14 M: We can lament, and I kind of do, that some pretty complex information just never gets any pickup. But then you put it in a 3-minute cartoon and people are like, 'Oh OK. Now I get where entrepreneurs get their money.'

V: Yeah.

1:21:35 M: So, putting stuff out there like the mayors things. Unless they're out there. The one thing we do know is if we don't put it out there, no one's going to get it. It's going to be a story that you and I talk about. This cool story from West Sacramento. Or we'll mention it at our editorial meetings. It's like OK. It's...

1:22:00 V: Well, that's where I guess I'll have to think on this. But I think I would challenge Julie and Keith to say just let us pilot this. Just let us do a pilot run of this. What do you have to lose? We'll make our case. We'll drop the content and we'll think through some ways to share it. And just go with us on this.

1:22:21 V: Because I think right now I think I fall into the trap of waiting for Julie and Keith to tell me something is hot and then I work on it. But if I say just let me run this in

the background. And if I come to you with something you're totally not cool with, fine. But at least we'll have something ready that you can potentially run with.

1:22:40 M: And I think that they would. Hopefully they would.

V: Yeah. I don't think they would be opposed.

1:22:55 M: As a lot of writers do, I would sometimes get freaked out with even starting to write things. And this is when I was already starting to see myself. I was in college and I was talking to my dad one time and he's like, 'You know just start. The right way will come.' And I think about that so often. But if I get started...I think I ingrained that in myself so much that I believe it. That it happens. So, I feel that way about I think our editorial approach our strategy is going to come from us producing editorial material. And over time like more and more examples are going to start piling up. And we're going to see a clearer direction, but until we start seeing things we aren't going to know like where these things belong or what our options really are.

M: So, I think I'm taking too much of your time.

V: I am going to have to go talk to Jason, but...

APPENDIX N: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – MILES SANDLER

00:00 Valerie: Go ahead and start off by telling me your name and how long you've been working at the Kauffman Foundation.

00:05 Miles: Miles Sandler, and I've been working at the foundation a little over a year and a half.

00:11 V: All right. Yeah. We've got a nice range of experiences. I talked to Matt Long who's been here forever. And then we've got like you and Katey who have been here a year now, but so much has happened in a year.

00:23 M: Oh my gosh. Yeah. It feels like a lot longer than a year and a half, but yeah.

00:28 V: That's awesome. Tell me a little bit. In that year and a half kind of what kind of work you do now whether that's for the editorial team or other departments that you might serve with.

00:36 M: Sure. So, Overarching, right, I'm technically on the Public Affairs team embedded in Education. I see my role in three parts. My primary role is to really help tell the story of the Education team and the work that they do whether that be through many different mediums. I think my second part of my role, which is actually becoming more and more prominent, is really to support engagement. So, we see that as any way that we kind of interact with the intended audiences that the Education team either wants to connect with and or learn from. In that regard, we see kind of the opportunities as events, focus groups. Sometimes it's more research-based. Sometimes it is more opportunities to connect on a social medium kind of platform or with a campaign.

01:40 M: But whatever that looks like, really that role of how do we make sure that we're learning from community instead of just communicating out to community? And then I would say the third role is just kind of internal comms work. So, anything that's needed on the team. Sometimes just very tactically like a piece of collateral or also how the team communicates with itself, the Education team specifically.

02:12 V: Mhmm. Cool. Well, that gives me a pretty nice overview. I feel like I know everyone in their editorial roles very well, but I don't always work with the Education team. I actually have very little overlap, so that's cool to know.

M: Sure.

02:23 V: That being said, can you give me an overview and your understanding of what this new editorial approach is? Like how would you define it?

02:33 M: Hmm. How would I define it? Other than the squid burger?

02:42 V: I think that needs to be in my paper. Like as a diagram.

02:45 M: Yes. Yes. It should absolutely be in your paper. And you should call it squid burger.

02:49 M: So, I think the approach is really, if I was defining it, is a way for us to prioritize our storytelling in a way that we feel like connects well with our kind of typologies and or audiences that we want to reach the most. And then allows and creates mechanisms to do that better. I feel like that's the refresh of the process.

V: Gotcha.

M: Yeah.

03:23 V: No, that's really helpful. I feel like for some people it's like, 'Boom. Got it. Can put it in words. I understand it.' For other people, it's like 'Ahhhh. We're still...I don't know.'

03:34 M: I often feel like we're still in the 'Uhhhh, I don't know' space, but I think that's — in my perspective — that's the intention.

V: Mhmm.

03:43 M: Whether we've gotten there or not, that's a whole other thing.

03:47 V: And kind of with that intention in mind, what do you see as the overall goals coming out of this? Are there things we want to change or see as outcomes of making this more intentional effort to prioritize storytelling and to prioritize audience?

M: Mhmm.

04:01 M: Yeah, so I think the goals are to be able to tell more poignant stories that are, again, much more interesting to the folks we want to tell them to. I think it's also an intention to this weird way it is to be in a foundation, and what does that mean on an editorial, journalistic level? And so, to help prioritize what gets told and what doesn't, I think you need this process. Otherwise, everyone thinks everything is important. And if you don't kind of give a filter and a way to focus what actually gets told or what energy or work gets put into, then it leaves people — and I say people in general — but I think programmatic folks with the feeling of like, 'Oh. You just don't think what I do is important.'

05:02 M: And that's not it. Right? But, you have to focus and make sure that you're setting a tone to the type of storytelling that you want to do as an organization. I feel like that's the difference.

05:18 V: Yeah. Yeah. I think there's been a lot of focus on how do we articulate the strategy? And the squid burger is still in process, but I know that that's a big sensitivity.

And I know that Public Affairs kind of plays a role in helping others in Education and in Entrepreneurship also stick to their strategies. And making sure that there's continuity over time with that.

05:38 M: Yeah. Yeah. But I think what the tension is is again on the editorial level, there has to be appeal to a kind of broader audience. Where, on a programmatic level, certain things just have to get done. So you might need to market something. You might need to get the word out about something or what have you because that's what you need to do on a programmatic level. But that's not a story.

V: Right.

06:05 M: so, how do you surface the things that are actually going to have a broader interest? And then, how do you deal on the other part of Public Affairs, which is just that tactical level? Because there are things that have to be addressed for programmatic teams, but that don't get moved up to editorial because they don't need to.

06:29 V: Yeah. It's definitely an interesting dynamic. In talking about this kind of broader appeal, how do you think this new approach has affected the way we consider and think about audiences in our work? I know you've kind of mentioned the typologies and that framework.

06:43 M: So, the thing I liked the most about the Atlantic 57 typology framework is less about where we landed. I think they're primarily pretty general. But I think it helped us to start to think about motivation instead of type of people. I think motivation when you're thinking about audience is so, so important. And so, when we're trying to capture stories that reach futurists so to speak, we can think about, well, what motivates a futurist? Right? They want something that's progressive, that's thinking outside the box. That's thinking about what comes next. They want to hear something that is not perfectly buttoned up but has a sense of optimism and solutions to it as well.

07:37 M: I think when you understand an audience's motivation, you can actually craft a much more compelling story. Versus when you just kind of say, 'Oh. We want to get this to people that are in education.' Well, that's a type. Sure. That's a persona you could kind of boil down from that, but it actually doesn't mean that you'll get to the right type of people.

07:59 M: But when you think about motivation, it really changes what type of story you're trying to tell and who you're trying to tell it to.

08:05 V: Yeah. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think thinking about motivation, thinking about interests, while it might be more difficult for some team members to envision, 'Well, who is that person then?' I think on a broader level it helps us generally understand, well, here are the kind of people that are going to be engaging with it. And knowing that those can be in flux, too, is really helpful for me. And I don't know how you understand it or how everyone kind of grasps it. But I think knowing that you could be

multiple typologies is really helpful, too. Because my demographic information might not change that much, but the way I think. The way I feel. That's fairly ingrained in deeper values and beliefs and things like that.

08:47 M: That's right. That's right. And depending on the subject matter, right. I might be a champion on one subject matter because that's what I live and breathe, and I hold up all the time. But I might be a futurist in another subject matter. Where like I'm maybe not doing that, right? But I absolutely promote it because I'm like, 'Yeah! That is forward thinking. That's really interesting.' Even on a personal level, I often times what comes on from the Entrepreneurship work, I will read that not because that's my work but because it's interesting. I'll never be a champion of that work. I'm never going to go into the body of that field, but I can be a futurist in that space. Of saying, 'Wow. That's really interesting. How do we think about economic development in a different way?' And I can share that with folks who I think might be interested.

09:37 V: Right. Right. Absolutely. We've talked a little bit about motivations for audience members. I'm curious if you have any thoughts on what values or interests Kauffman has in communicating and if there's alignment between those two things.

09:54 M: Ask that question one more time.

09:55 V: Yeah. So. We're talking about audiences and what they value. I'm curious then, on the flip side, how do we align Kauffman's values and interests as well?

10:09 M: Yeah. So, I think it's difficult because again we don't have the...we're not journalism. We can't just kind of follow the trends of the day. And we have to kind of shoehorn — sometimes it's shoehorning — what the foundation cares about and what message it's trying to get across. On the flip side, what I think always makes it interesting on the editorial level for us is how do you actually? Because...I'm going to jump around a little bit. I think a foundation has a really unique role in this kind of communication space and editorial space because there's a social mission. And because there's a social mission, there's a real core values that you're trying to inspire other people to grab onto. And so, as much as we need to obviously figure out what people are interested in, what motivates them, what are timely kind of subject matters we can connect with, we consistently have to have this drumbeat of values that we're trying to communicate because we are trying to shift behaviors.

11:38 M: We're trying to shift perspectives. We're trying to provide the opportunity for people to see what else they can do around these social issues. So, that to me is kind of the higher calling. We always need to keep that forefront and then help connect that to things that are going to get eyeballs on it.

12:03 V: Yeah. Absolutely. I mean coming from kind of a mixed background and I know a lot of people on our team have backgrounds in journalism or some of those areas, it is interesting to see the work that we do can invite people to make change. It can convince people to think differently. It can persuade them to think about new concepts and to think

not just about their experience but what the experience of future generations' is going to be. It is very powerful, and I think that's where storytelling is a good fit for that. Because it captures all of those feelings and that mission very well.

12:41 V: That being said, keeping audiences at the forefront, do you feel like that's truly the case? Are we actively thinking about our mission and our audiences in tandem when we're working? And has the approach maybe gotten us to do more of that?

12:58 M: I think time will tell. I don't know if we're there yet. I think the coverage areas will be helpful in that regard. I think it helps, again, focus kind of what kind of stories we tell that are very much in line with our missions. And then, on top of that, I think those kind of overarching values that we hold onto will help tighten that even further and prioritize.

13:31 M: But then, of course, that next step, OK, then what is our audience interested in? And or are we even reaching the right audience? Or, do we need to start to figure out, which we've already been doing, but on social, on these other different channels, how do we reach the audience that we're most interested in?

13:47 M: For example, with my intern this summer, I'm going to be doing some kind of student voice project. And really the goal is — because I don't expect the intern to be able to accomplish all that much in the 8 weeks — to start to flesh out what would an embedded strategy be around elevating student voice. And what are some levers that could easily get pushed throughout the year that we could actually accomplish consistently elevating student voice.

14:27 M: So, that's going to maybe be a very different audience that's interested in that than the one we currently have. For definitely the one we currently have for "Ideas at Work." Maybe it's more of the folks we have following us on Twitter or Facebook. Maybe. I don't know yet. But that's the thing. If we were just a traditional media platform or something like that, we wouldn't introduce something that we didn't feel like was going to appeal to the audience we already had or grow our audience. But as a foundation, we have a bigger mission. So, this might not be a game-changer in growing our audience, but it might carve us out an audience that's really important for the work.

15:13 M: We need to elevate student voice because we need to start elevating that their voice as the end-consumer to our education system is essential in actually defining how we actually make changes in our education system.

15:27 V: Yeah. I mean that makes total sense to me, especially since students have so many different experiences now. No one is following one path, and they never were. But I think that is a voice we're kind of missing and that'll be interesting. That's cool to know.

15:45 V: You know, in kind of shifting to talking more about the coverage areas and how that is helping us focus, I'm curious then how that's maybe affected what kinds of topics we're interested in covering either for these audiences or for our mission?

16:05 M: Ask the question one more time.

16:08 V: So, in thinking about the coverage areas and how that's maybe helped us focus, with those, what kinds of topics is Kauffman interested in covering? And are those any different than maybe they have been in the last 2 years or so? Maybe when you just got started.

16:29 M: Well, hm. So, processes can change all they want, people don't change all that quickly. I think that the coverage areas gives us a new filter. I don't know if we have per se shifted enough to actually be pulling out stories that fit those filters. I think what we've done more of is like, 'These are the stories we were probably going to tell already. And then, what's the angle now of those stories that is different through those filters?'

17:08 M: So, for example, we're working on the Ewing Marion Kauffman School graduation story. We have now looked at those coverage areas and said, 'OK. What if we told this story in the angle of an idea to reality? So, at one point the school was just an idea. And then, they started to actually build the school. Create it. All the things that went into it. And when you start having rubber hit the road, and you actually had students and teachers and parents and families and all those dynamics. How did they take what their idea was and transform it to what it is now? And how did that actually lead to success? By listening, by responding to what their students' needs were.'

17:57 M: So, it's not that we wouldn't have told a graduation story before. We absolutely would have. It's really important to us, to our work. But now, I think with the coverage areas we say, 'OK. What's the filter? How do we want to tell that story that's in line with our coverage area?' I think that gets us a meatier result than maybe what would have happened previously.

18:23 V: Yeah. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think there's been a lot more conscious focus on not just saying this event is happening, OK, so we'll go find the story. It's saying what do we want the story to be? How do we want to tell this? And thinking much more proactively about how we shape that. And I guess that's, for me, where there is that alignment between we know what our audience maybe wants. We have a fairly good general idea of what they might be interested in. But then we also know what we are very much interested in in terms of our mission.

18:57 M: Mhmm. Yeah. In that point, too, we know our audience is probably not that interested in the graduation story. But they're really interested in that idea of a startup and what it takes to make a startup successful. And if we think about the school and again that idea to reality framework, of like literally it was a startup. 'We don't know how all this is going to work, but we'll put it together and figure it out.' To like all the learning that had to happen to then now get to this result that's amazing. And these young people are having all this success. That's the story we want to tell. So yes, I agree with you.

19:43 V: So, keeping in mind that the thought is maybe we're not changing what stories we cover just how we cover them, has there been any shift in how stories are really planned or decided upon in this approach?

20:05 M: Yeah. I think for good reasons it's started to actually get more centralized back to Keith and Julie as really the editorial team. So, that instead of things popping up and getting put on because someone decided to write a Currents piece or what have you, there's a little bit more of that filter that it goes through. Even our process of the creation and the implementation, all of those steps to help make sure, 'Hey, is this really what we want to tell? Does it have the right angle? Does it fit in our coverage area?' So that by the time it actually gets put out there, in whatever medium it gets put out there, it makes sense to the overarching work.

21:02 V: Yeah. And it seems like that would be a better fit for your role, then. So, you're not necessarily the one who's like. While you can still make suggestions for stories and you can bring awareness to things that are happening in the Education space, it's not up to you to decide what the frame is, what the angle is.

21:23 M: Yeah, I've become more of a... I provide the opportunity, and then the editorial team — although I'm a part of that time but I'm not the core of it — really dictates how this gets said. Even to the point that...Again...I'm just going to use this graduation video as the example. But, so, even with that, I'm taking my thoughts to Keith and Julie and saying, 'Hey. This is how we were thinking about telling this story. This the way that we saw the editorial version. What do you think? Does that fit? Does that work?' So, yeah.

22:09 V: Yeah. That opens a little bit more brain space to say, 'I have this idea. You don't have to go with it.' But then it allows more creative thinking around, well, we could do that. We could also do this. Instead of, I think, at least when I started here I think I felt like some of the stories we were putting out it was a kind of a process where you or Kim would say this thing is happening. My program officer wants to see this covered. And the assumption is it'll probably be covered on Kauffman Currents. I think we're thinking a little more strategically around, 'OK. Yeah. That's happening, and maybe we make a call to that if we do cover this event or maybe we make a subtle nod to that, that this happened in some other story if it ties to a bigger topic or a bigger social trend.'

22:59 M: Yeah. Yep. Absolutely. Absolutely. And it also, it's starting to open up more to again different channels that can be utilized. So, when I have a program officer or someone from a different team saying, 'Oh. I really want to talk about x, y and z.' There's more options now to say, 'Well, you know what? That would actually do better on Twitter. Or that would actually do better if we did some creative whatever whatever.'

23:28 V: Yeah. That was kind of...You jumped the gun, thank you. I am curious if you feel like if there's been a shift in how we think about channels in our work. If we're doing more of that, if we're thinking about more of our options and getting away from some of these old standby approaches.

23:45 M: I think we are. I think that's probably. Honestly, that's probably the area that needs the most growth. I also think there's a real risk in it, and I'm not quite sure how we navigate this because people tend to go to extremes. So, I think we've been very limited in what we've used. Now, we're kind of exploring all the options. You could also go to the opposite extreme of all the options at all times. I know Keith and Julie have been really thoughtful about that. Like, let's not throw a podcast in there. Let's not create a whole new blog series. Let's think about what we have and have already built an audience around. And then let's see where other people might have built audiences that we can support or tap into or something to that nature. And I think that's wise. I feel like that's the area of most growth, particularly on an education level for our program area folks to say, ' No, these other channels are valid, and they actually can get you more than your basic Currents piece can.'

25:02 V: Yeah.

25:03 M: However, I also think we can fall into the risk of too many channels. Even my own self. I'm an ideas person, so I recognize I can go down that road really easily.

25:20 V: Yeah. I mean, it would be very easy to bite off more than we can chew, and I think that there is concern around that. Do you feel like there are any other risks there? I feel like, part of us, there's a hesitancy to using other channels just because we don't know what we don't know.

25:37 M: Mhmm. Yeah. Yes. I think what you kind of indicate a little bit. Again, I think it still goes back to what audiences are you trying to reach. I don't think it would be a bad idea for us to explore some audiences that are younger, that are millennial audiences or what have you. Or even younger than that with some of our Education work. So, I do think about like how do we utilize Snapchat? How do we utilize some of these other mediums that we don't think about as much or know as much about?

26:18 M: It's always come down to the fact like, how much capacity? What do you really have time to do? And you have to prioritize what's most important. So, it's a thin line. If you don't want to go overboard and then you do a lot of things not well. But you also don't want to go "underboard" and not really explore what your options are and kind of ignore mediums that could be really, really useful. We just haven't played with them yet.

26:54 V: Yeah.

M: It's tricky.

V: It is.

26:58 V: And I think it's tricky from two points because I think we have a lot of options, and we know that we have the ability to really do whatever we want. But the other side of it, too, is I think some people have expressed that we're getting caught in a space now where we're overthinking so much. We have this filter and we have a pretty good

understanding of what it can do for us, but I think that we almost overthink sometimes and kind of hem and haw about, 'well, how would we do it that way? I don't know if it would be worth it to do it that way.'

27:34 V: And that comes with time. We'll have to experiment more and have to do more. It's hard to say we're going to do more right now.

27:39 M: Yeah. Right now, it feels like there's enough to do. I think one thing that you're bringing up, which I still feel like there's a need for, but I'm not quite sure where it fits. There is a lot of creativity on this team, but creativity needs space. It needs the ability to really ideate and I do think that you actually have to build in time to just brainstorm and think outside the box and explore ideas and all that kind of stuff. I think where we're at right now is a really good place because we've been more in that space and not enough in process. So, right now we're just trying to buckle down on process and really get that strong, which I think is extremely important. And once we've really gotten a regular rhythm around process and feel confident in that space, I will encourage that we start to build in some time that is just for ideation and brainstorming. Because what I think about the Rethink articles, right? When I think about some of the interesting things that we've done, they've come out of this space of truly just ideas on a wall and 'what could we do?' And 'this is really interesting to me.' And I actually think you find some real gems that way.

29:04 M: The other thing I'll add, too, on an editorial level, I think engagement plays a succinct role with that. There has to be opportunity — program folks do it all the time or most of them do it all the time — for our editorial team to be able to go into those spaces. Because we're going to hear things differently than programmatic folks. We're going to hear the stories. Where they're thinking more about like, 'how does this impact the work?'

29:38 M: So, finding opportunities for us to go into the field, go to an event, go to whatever is going to actually help us bring in more ideas and stories. So, building in that time will be important as well. But, I think we have to just buckle down and get the process right now. And then once we get that rhythm, we can start to think about what else.

30:02 V: Yeah. I think that brings up a new area of just questioning where is that time for space? Because I think we had it at first in some of our status meetings, talking about just weekly, weekly what are we trying to produce? And some new ideas would come up, new things would come out of that. Now that the meeting is a little bit shorter, there's a little bit less time for that. And that's not the purpose anymore. It's meant to be, like, what's in the pipeline already? I don't know if that creative space then comes in a monthly meeting where we're just charting these bigger things that we might be looking at throughout several months or over a quarter. I don't know. I don't think yet in our process we've made a space for that. I would agree, because I think right now the expectation — at least how the tools and things are built out — is if you have an idea you're welcome to share it. But you don't necessarily have the opportunity to bounce that idea off of other

people and to build it out out of conversation, and conversation around capability and people who have other expertise.

31:02 M: Absolutely. And might have a whole different angle or perspective than you were thinking about. Yeah. I think we'll need to figure out where that lives eventually. I don't think it has to happen immediately. But I think we'll need it. We'll need it back because some really great ideas came out of that just brainstorming and somebody pitching out a concept and then us building upon it as a gathering.

31:33 V: Yeah. That is one thing through the Atlantic 57 work that I did really appreciate. I guess in our last on-site visit we had an opportunity to take these three stories and kind of build them out. I mean I really appreciated the work that you did talking about the idea of building out content around the Board of Education anniversary, which is huge, and we could have a lot of voice on. And hearing Matt Pozel stand up and talk about the idea of what does it mean to be first generation? I mean that kind of stuff exists in people's brains and to not have the time to get it out there is just a shame.

32:06 M: Yeah.

32:08 V: But, you know, maybe it is modeled to something like that. Who knows?

32:12 M: Yeah, who knows? And again, is it kind of retreat format? Is it a monthly thing? I don't know.

V: Yeah.

M: Yeah.

32:22 V: I do want to circle back to something which is just the existing hierarchy of our channels. Do you feel like, in this new approach even, there are still some existing values set on channels that place them above others?

32:36 M: Yeah, definitely. I think, again, you can create all the best processes, but people change a lot slower. We did put more value on "Ideas at Work" and our list serv and Currents. That was the value set. Right? That was the most important thing because that was the engine that was running constantly. Like, 'Oh. We have to have that for this week. We have to have that for this week.' That was the driver. Even if we've changed gears in our process, people don't change that quickly. So, for the Public Affairs team and the rest of the foundation, that's still going to be, 'is that going to be a Currents piece?' That's still going to be the most important thing.

33:27 M: I think that we.... The best thing that we can do is start to elevate the other channels. I also think, and this is a lesson that I've taken, I realize that I wasn't showing any analytics to the Education team. So, I'm expecting them to go on this ride with me of using other channels when I'm not actually showing them like, 'Well, this is actually how much more eyeballs and how much more engagement we got putting this thing on social

versus putting it on our Currents piece.' So, you have to show them the evidence for them to start to sway their opinion. And I just realized that feedback loop, I wasn't providing it on the Education team. I'm not sure if Kim was on the Entrepreneurship team, but I know I wasn't.

34:13 V: Yeah. That's a good point, and I mean that raises the question of has that been an intention in the work that you do? Because for you, if you know that some of your audiences might be resonating more on Facebook, then it's challenging to say, 'Well we're going to put this story that's more education-focused in "Ideas at Work," but maybe that's not really where my audience is. That's not really where my program officers are looking to gain eyeballs.'

34:35 M: Yeah. Exactly. And again, I can't just say, 'Hey guys! Facebook is the place to be at for your Education content.' I have to show them why am I making that decision? How is that actually going to help them programmatically?

34:54 V: Yeah. And I mean I think that's where eventually some of the reports that Chris reports on a monthly basis can be very useful. I also think that's also where this is so new that we haven't created as much as we could. We don't have these case studies to say, 'Look. Look at this example, and here's maybe some other things in the pipeline that we're thinking about. We would like to do a similar approach for this event that you're leading or this new initiative that you're leading.' And that way they have something to go on. They can say, 'Oh. Well, it worked for maybe Entrepreneurship or maybe it worked for KC Civic really well.' I think there is an education component. There is a learning curve to all of that.

35:39 M: Yeah, absolutely. You're right. And having kind of those case studies that will start to build. You know, the other thing, too, with Chris' work is we used to do a ton of A/B testing. Right? Every "Ideas at Work" that would come out was a different A/B test. But I don't know what the lessons were. It was always kind of a new thing that we were testing, and it didn't kind of grow into like, 'Hey, we've been tracking this one concept for the past few months. And this is kind of the lesson we've learned from it.'

36:09 M: So, I think that the analytics conversation through Atlantic 57 has been helpful in that regard. And we're going to start to get into a little better of a place of actually saying, 'What are some key questions we have? What is our hypothesis?' And then, 'What can we actually start to track in our analysis to see what's real and what's not?'

36:31 V: Yeah. And kind of set those guides of like, I want to track this for a month.

M: Yeah.

V: Or I want to track this over the next 8 sends. Yeah. I think that we have. We sometimes change too quickly in that. We don't know why something isn't working as well and there's sometimes where there's too many variables to really gauge one thing.

So, we have a lot that we don't know, and we want to fill those gaps. But it is hard to do all at once.

M: Absolutely.

36:59 V: And I mean that's really another area that like understanding story performance is just difficult. I think people have had a hard time grasping that, too. Just, you know, how has adopting what it means to be story-first changed the way we think of, 'Well, did my piece really land?' 'Was this good?'

37:19 M: Yeah. I think it's...I think we have to...The only way analytics works is, again, if we have some key questions that we're asking. Actually, asking ourselves. And kind of a hypothesis of what we think would happen. I think we need to prioritize even that of what are we actually trying to find out? Because looking at maybe I don't know. We've looked at so many things. So, looking at different headlines or looking at...some of that might be helpful. But if it's not centered around a bigger question, then it just kind of gets knit-picky. It ultimately really doesn't matter. Or in my perspective, I would say it ultimately really doesn't matter.

38:13 M: And so, I think that story-first, what that at least pushes us to say is like, what we care most about may be, for me I would say, engagement. I want to see that people are engaging with it. Not just that they've opened it to read it or that they've clicked on the video quickly. Like, did they engage? Did they watch the whole thing? How long did they stay on the page? Did they write a comment? Did they click the links? Did they share it? I want to see the engagement level. To me that's actually much more of an indicator of there's a level of interaction that we're getting. And that we're building a group that wants to interact.

39:06 M: We've talked a lot about should we bucket our audiences in their interest areas? I think that's an interesting question. I think that now with these new coverage areas, we might actually want to question. It's not about bucketing Education versus Entrepreneurship, but it may be about bucketing a little bit of your futurists versus your practitioner. Because those story angles are very different. And what those audiences — what their motivations are — are very different.

39:42 V: Yeah, no. I think that makes a lot of sense. If we're talking about motivation, our two questions really are what motivates engagement on a general level, but then what do we want to motivate a futurist to do? What do we want to motivate a champion to do? What do we want to motivate a practitioner to do? And maybe some of those audiences don't necessarily align perfectly with all the editorial content we create. Because I can see where things like FastTrac and more practical application, just how-to information is better for a practitioner. But then I can see a lot of value in saying we're going to elevate this larger story to a champion who totally believes in the mission, who totally knows what we're doing and can expose that to a larger network.

40:28 V: Yeah. I think we don't necessarily have answers to those larger questions yet. Of just what do we want to know? What do we want to do beyond just tell the story? What does the story do for us?

M: Yeah. Absolutely.

40:42 V: What does it really do for our audience?

40:46 M: Right. Yeah. My dream of dreams — and I'm going to get to get into some of this with the Real World Learning work — is to do some larger scale surveying work so we can see if there's actually perception changes. In the Real World Learning work we're going to be able to do some of that because it's so focused on certain parts of our region. We're literally going to hyper-focus on certain parts of our region, so you have a finite kind of place to look at. But I think that there's some...I'm hoping that there's some lessons from that that we can take on a broader level of how do we actually start to look at — even for the Entrepreneurship work with their public policy kind of work — how do we start to look at perception change? Because ultimately that's what you want. You want people to start to perceive entrepreneurship as a new form of economic development. High-arching. So, how do you start to build in through our communications some gauges? Whether it be a very simple 2 to 3 survey questions under each thing. I don't know but like how do you actually start to see are people's perceptions shifting with what you're putting out in the ecosystem.

42:10 V: Well, and that becomes a very nice blend for the Kauffman Foundation, which has vacillated from being this very research-oriented foundation to this more social activism kind of foundation. We now have an existing blend of both, and so I think that work might allow some lessons for Public Affairs to know this is how people's thinking is changing, this is how we might want to reevaluate our audiences. But then, also, putting that out into the larger world and saying, 'In this specific area, this is how people feel about entrepreneurship. This is how they perceive the importance of small businesses in their local economy. And this is the current sentiment of things.' If we're reading that a little bit more, that's valuable information to a whole bunch of third-parties and to second-parties, to people who we work with very closely.

43:03 M: I think what I would even say is the next level to what I would say is that perception-change work is the role we have as an influencer, our greatest power or ability is that we have all these partners and grantees. So, if you started to get all your partners and grantees, not to say the same thing, but to have the same framing about their. So again, if all these Inclusion Open folks for ESHIP, if you had some consistent drumbeat of certain languages that you're trying to get them to communicate, you can really start to shift broad perceptions. And that is the magic place that a foundation can play.

43:56 V: I would agree. I mean that's what to me makes this nontraditional newsroom so interesting for the world right now to learn from. The word influence and influencer is so big right now, and I don't ever really know that the larger traditional media understood its role beyond just saying, well, we inform. Well, inform is different from influence. All

knowledge has some kind of slant to it, has some kind of bent to it. So, I do think we play a critical role in that. And like you said, we can play a very niche role especially if we are thinking about engagement and if we are thinking about channels in a broader space. And thinking a lot about what I think the Education team does very well in terms of having events, bringing people in face-to-face, getting that time together.

44:53 M: Absolutely. Yeah. I mean as much as we...It may not be a great thing for society, the fact is news is being less and less trusted. You know, the traditional avenues for news is being less and less trusted. But what I think is the opportunity in that is I actually think philanthropy plays this really interesting role. Not that philanthropy doesn't have an angle, because, absolutely, they're private institutions. They have an angle. But they can be a little bit more neutral because they don't have the pressure of having to maintain an audience, having to basically sell ad dollars. There's a lack of pressure there and accountability to a certain degree. So, there's some level. They could become these trusted partners for some level of objectivity or at least truthful, well-researched information.

46:00 V: Yeah. And we can be transparent. Even if we can't say we have no stake in this, we can say we have a stake in this because we believe in it. And we're going to be transparent about that in the hopes that we're reaching the people who also believe in that or want to believe in that if given the right tools. If given the right information. And given information they can trust. Yeah. No. I think that is really well-said.

46:23 V: Keeping that in mind, just around what the Kauffman Foundation is and the role that we play. Something that Chris brought up that I think has been really interesting. And I think everyone has found a little bit more provocative to think about is, the Kauffman Foundation isn't a for-profit business. Editorial stories really aren't the product we're selling. We're in the business of giving money away and we're a philanthropy. So, if no one is forcing us to make any editorial change, then why do it? Why is storytelling important to the work that we do?

47:01 M: Yeah. I think that is the most important question to ask. The thing I've learned about philanthropy unlike any other space there is no kind of natural pressures. And without pressures, it's actually the conundrum of a utopia. so, the conundrum of a utopia is like, 'We have everything we need, and yet no push to actually progress or do anything really different.' So, it goes one of two ways: You're either pretty damn stagnant, or you hold yourself accountable. The foundation itself creates the accountability internally to push itself to do the best work possible because it wants to actually create outcomes.

48:17 M: But it has to be self-imposed accountability. So, when you say like, well, there's no pressure, really. Why do we do this? I would say that it hearkens back to the role of influence. And how if we want to make the larger changes that we talk about in Education and Entrepreneurship. If those things are core to the mission of the foundation, and everyone is holding themselves accountable to that, you do not make those changes without actually changing people's perspectives. You could have the perfect process but that doesn't change people. People can stay and do the same thing. We just had this

conversation with a project management roll-out they're doing. It's amazing all the tools they've made and this and that. But the real work comes in changing people's behaviors to actually use the tools and want to be a project coordinator or project lead or actually fill out the paperwork to start a project, to initiate it. And there's going to be major pushback on that because people have not been operating in that way and people don't like to change.

49:44 M: So, when we're talking these major shifts in, again I'll focus on Education because that's where I know best, talking about Real World Learning and changing high schools. And how young people need to learn to be prepared. You're getting to personal elements for folks. You're talking about their high school where they went to. You're talking about that their education wasn't good enough. You're talking about maybe their child should actually consider going into construction instead of a 4-year program of college. And all the value sets that have to do with that. So, our role in editorial is much bigger than just telling a story. It's telling a story that's going to catalyze the work that we're doing in a way that's compelling, that's motivating, that's inspiring and that hopefully starts to shift people's perspectives.

50:43 M: And obviously us alone won't shift those perspectives, but if we can, again... To me the holy grail is like if we can start to develop that set of languages that then partners are sharing and grantees are sharing and you have en masse these same messages, that's when you start to see shifts in perception and behavior.

51:08 M: So yeah. I think that's what we hold ourselves accountable to. And that's where I would like to see us go in even analytics, which is a much deeper, harder question to say. But how are we seeing perception changes? And therefore, are we seeing behavior changes?

51:26 V: Yeah. I think we see that in small doses and we're wary to make correlations as we should. But even Julie's comment earlier today at the editorial meeting talking about a post we made about a stat that we shared from the Capital Landscape and kind of using a little bit edgier language. We were a little bit bolder, a little bit more transparent in saying, 'This is what we believe. Either get on board or don't.' That's very much the mentality of the channel. On Twitter, it's a "like," retweet or completely scroll past kind of world. I think those moments like that are nice moments to indicate and say, 'Yes. We saw engagement.' But, 'Yes, we maybe also saw influence,' because we were open about what we think, and people respond to that because they're pretty open about how they think on social media, too.

52:16 M: Absolutely. You're only going to get. You're never going to get everyone. The intention is can you get the folks that you're calling out to. Can you get the folks that you know are part of your tribe? And then again, can you help support others to emulate similar messages so that we'll reach out to their tribe? And eventually you have this wave of communications. So yeah. I think we, on an editorial level, we discount ourselves if we don't see ourselves as just as essential to the programmatic efforts, as giving out the money. Because, again, you can give out money all day long. You can have all the

processes in place. We've seen it. We've done it. $40 million out the door for Education every year, and we still haven't achieved some of the outcomes that we wish to achieve. This is not a big region, right? For $40 million to go out the door every year, we should be seeing some dramatic shifts.

53:18 M: Why haven't we seen those dramatic shifts? I would say it's because we haven't engaged and actually found out from — had the design of the programs constructed by the folks that are receiving the impact of the programs. And I would say second is because we haven't actually communicated in a way that has compelled and convinced and inspired folks to think and perceive and behave differently. And those two are to me the most essential pieces on the front end, the middle and the last part. And often times the things that are last thought about versus first thought about.

53:59 V: Yeah. That is very well said. I know we're at time but thank you for sitting down and sharing your perspective on this. I think that gives me a very strong look at the role. I think people see internal communications as very internal. Like, this helps me do a lot and communicate a lot and maybe it has an external impact. But to say, no, we're just as important as our program officers in getting change made.

54:29 M: And we haven't gotten there yet as Kauffman. But that's where I hope we get to. But we also, as a team, have to value ourselves on that level. We have to see that we are that essential. And then I think if we have those key questions and we start to actually track it, we'll actually start to see that's the level of impact we can make.

54:56 V: Yeah. And we can justify that to other teams and say, 'Look. This is the impact we're having on your audiences. On your people.'

55:03 M: Yep. Which gives us such much more bang for our buck. And we all know it. We all talk all the time. We know the influence of media. We know the influence of literally perspectives people held at one time in history and they shifted. Yes, things happened and part of it was that. But it was also because of the stories that got captured. The stories were inspirational. When people got attacked on Selma Bridge for walking over it. It wasn't because people got attacked on Selma Bridge that people reacted and came and wanted to participate. It was because of the stories that were told. It was the way that it was captured was on film. It was the reporters and how they articulated it. If that had never happened, if that component had never happened, you would not have the big march that happened afterwards across Selma Bridge. You wouldn't. You wouldn't have Jewish leaders and Catholic and Christian leaders coming to support that movement. So, yeah. I don't think we should underestimate. Obviously, that's a dramatic example. But I don't think we should ever underestimate the power of storytelling as a catalyst for change. It's essential.

V: Yeah. I'm going to go ahead and stop there.

M: Sure.

APPENDIX O: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – JULIE SCHEIDEGGER

Julie Scheidegger 03-26-19

Editorial Manager in Public Affairs

00:04 Valerie: Go ahead and start off by telling me your name and your title because I think it's changed recently, right?

00:10 Julie: Julie Scheidegger. My title is now editorial manager.

00:22 V: And then how long have you been working here?

00:25 J: It was three years March 1.

00:28 V: Wow. OK. Congratulations.

00:29 J: Thanks. It feels like no time and lots of time all at the same time.

00:33 V: I'm sure it does. Tell me a little bit in your role and under this new title tell me what you do for the Public Affairs team as well as any other departments you might work across.

00:47 J: I might say when I was brought in I feel like what I was brought in to do is probably very different than what it looks like now. When I was brought in, I feel like it was much more along the strategy and digital. Kind of where we were before where I did a lot of what Kayla does. A lot of the building on the website, which is scary because I'm self-taught coding and all that stuff. So, it was a lot of asking questions on some things.

01:17 J: they were still doing the blogs then. They had the Insight blog for Education and Growthology. The research team did that. So, even though I was doing social media, I was doing a lot of the production work. Those blogs really needed a shepherd because at the time we had a communications director. She was the one helping ESHIP. There was no capacity for it, so they were like the Wild West. I used to refer to them as the drunk uncles. Of my Kauffman family, they were the drunk uncles.

01:46 J: And then the Education team because their point person, too, who at that time was not a director-level position, she was strapped, too, in terms of helping with that. So, I kind of stepped in to help shepherd those blogs. So that was kind of where I get a lot of my value as a journalist and that kind of really played is to do that work. Ultimately, we decided the blogs weren't great for a lot of reasons. There was just a lot of stuff built into that then. And also, because we dismantled the research team.

V: Yeah.

02:20 J: They were the ones who created that. So, a lot of things. It was hard for Education. They're not writers. And they don't want to be published like research people want to be published, so it was very different. Ultimately, that was kind of the start of the whole change in strategy. We realized what we were doing wasn't really working. It wasn't working for associates. It wasn't really working for us overall, even though the Growthology still gets tons of traffic to it because of the content.

02:49 J: That's kind of where I started. It did kind of start to shift where I think Keith and I both having a journalism background and always the Matts, too, and people who really see the value of storytelling and how that can really help us tell Kauffman's story better. I think we just naturally wanted to get back to that. Where in the past press releases and updates to the website were OK in the past, it no longer worked in this new media world.

03:29 J: I think that's kind of where the shift happened, and I was really lucky last year or a year and a half ago when I got the opportunity to be part of that shift. I remember actually maybe two or three South By (Southwest)'s ago. We work in South by Southwest terms. We actually met with Jason Tomassini from Atlantic 57 years ago. And he just wanted to have a meeting. We had breakfast with him and talked about things. At the time, we were like, 'I don't know. Seems kind of like a big thing.' We thought about and thought from our standpoint it was like, 'What can we start to do to move things along? What roles do people want to play?'

04:22 J: Luckily, I worked into a role with Keith that he and I, because we work really well together, could start to move some things. I think because of social media, being now it's not an afterthought to the content we produce, but being a distribution platform, that is equal to — or I would dare say greater than — the actual website in some ways, we kind of have been able to bring that along. to something that we as Kauffman. We realize press releases won't work even though people still have old habits. But there had to be a new form. And that's kind of where I've gotten now. It's been a strange path to this, but now I'm squarely in the middle of this new Kauffman frontier.

05:06 V: So, we met with A57\. You guys have this breakfast maybe a couple years ago. Can talk to me a little bit about the engagement that I guess has been going on over the last year?

05:20 J: Gosh it's so long ago. We've worked with them so long now that we've outlasted many of our team members that originally started with us. We outlasted two I know for sure. It really started first with them getting to know us in terms of what we were, what we were doing well, where we needed help, where we were feeling stressed or concerned about, what we knew. To be honest, everything Atlantic 57 told us, we knew. There was no surprise. Honestly, to our disappointment. I was like, 'Really? That's it?' Everything single bit of it was what we knew. Even though we have confirmation or validation of 'Yes, your instincts were correct. These are the things we need to be doing,' it still always comes down to the how to get it done. In terms of process, it was very much a get-to-know-you. Once it kind of got to that point where they felt like they had seen enough of our stuff. We shared a ton of our internal stuff. They looked through all of our content,

social media. We shared lists. You know, all the things we could possibly give them. Other stuff we had done with other consultant companies that looked at our audience. We did that with Velir a few years ago. So, we shared tons of stuff with them, so they became familiar.

06:41 J: Then we set out to say, 'OK. How do we learn more or fill in the gaps?' That's when we did surveys. They did one-on-one interviews. They did all kinds of stuff to try to hone in on our audience to at least give us a start. And for them, too, doing this kind of a case study of us to see: where does Kauffman add value in terms of these external conversations? How do they break through? That kind of stuff to help us see what our role is now.

07:14 J: So that's where they gave us that first report. That first report...It's their opinion. I think that Keith and I do look at that and kind of struggle with what feels right and what doesn't feel right. I think typologies are one of those where they presented these typologies and it's about however many percent of it feels pretty true. Even the surface level part of it, like the names of the typologies. It's like those feel pretty true, and then at the same time when you try to apply them, they don't feel true.

V: Yeah.

07:54 J: So, there's things like that that I think we're still trying to figure out what is our editorial strategy versus what is Atlantic 57's look at our editorial strategy. I think that's where we're at now. It's trying to make sure it holds true for us.

08:14 V: With that being said, do you and Keith feel like you have some primary goals from trying to apply that? Or goals for going forward from that work?

08:24 J: Yeah. They set forth a plan. Remember? It was like there were so many of those original goals that it was like this is a joke. For some of them, it was like flagship editorial initiatives. Coverage areas. Different things like that that they actually had way down the line for us that in some ways we kind of felt like, 'I don't know if we can do some of this stuff if we don't have the framework of coverage areas. In some ways, we kind of need to know where we live.' In some ways, we're broad enough in some regards and narrow enough in others that it gets kind of muddled. You need to know what lane you're riding in in some ways.

09:07 J: So, that's what we did start to work on. Coverage areas. We started to really work those out because that made sense to Larry, too. He liked being able to have that framework to work from. The typologies. I think everybody was really anxious for them because we wanted to know who we were talking to. But I think that's one of those where Keith and I struggle with, 'Has it done more harm than good introducing those early?' Because we don't have the evidence to prove out any of them yet. We'll test for them, and we are. We're trying different content and testing for them to prove them out, but we haven't done it yet. So, in some ways, they really are just an assumption.

V: Mhmm.

09:45 J: So, some of those things, like I said. A lot of the things that were in that report were stuff we knew. Were already actually in motion, were already things. Now, it's a lot of chicken or egg. Like which comes first? Do you do the coverage areas first and then do the flagship editorial later? Do you do typologies first or wait to do some testing, prove it out, do that later? There's a lot of chicken and egg with some of this that I think, too, we're to a place where we don't want to do anymore start/stop.

V: Yeah.

10:17 J: We want to make sure that it's thoughtful what we're doing, so we actually can learn from it and build on it. So, it's trying to figure out what do we start with so we can build on it and build on it and build on it. So then, by this time next year, we've actually built a real editorial system that makes more sense to everybody.

10:41 V: Yeah. I think that chicken and egg kind of conversation has come up, too, just in how we define this approach because I've heard us throw around story first. And then Keith and some others have said, 'Well, story first is maybe how Atlantic 57 said it, but we're really trying to think audience first, too.'

10:56 J: Yeah. That is one of those where I think Atlantic really muddled their message a little bit. In terms of setting strategy, they had it like it was story and then audience. It was kind of like it had them in different places, and we switched them around. Nobody really quite agreed on where audience should fit in in terms of planning. So, I think we're still working with that. I mean Keith and I kind of agree that story is always first just because. Let's say it this way: We've done really good stories here for a really long time. We were ahead of video and we're able to do video in a way that nobody else really was able to for a long time. Of course, the world caught up. Technology got a lot easier. We've always done good content, but it's in the distributing and the strategy where we need to get to it.

11:59 J: So, in some ways, it's continuing a legacy of really strong storytelling and making sure we're doing that in a way that really reflects what we're trying to share of Kauffman. But then, with new distribution methods and all the things that go into the complicated nature of media distribution now, those things have to be aligned. You do have to know who your audience is. I think right now there's a lot of assumptions made of who it is or why it is. I spend a lot of time in my car, in the shower, in my head thinking about all those things and I have for a while said, 'I'd really like our typologies to not be roles or people or the persona type. I really want it to be defined as motivations.' Because that's really what it is for Kauffman at least. We need people to be motivated to do something by our content. Whether that's follow us on Twitter, it's a like and a share or a follow — something really, really small — all the way up to 'I went to this event. I went to ESHIP Summit with my friend on a lark and now I'm totally into this and want to be an ecosystem builder.' There's so many different levels, but we need our content to motivate people.

13:12 J: I was thinking, actually, today, that we have practical motivation, aspirational motivation, which is like the futurists. You have transactional because people just want the money. And then you have whatever would be called the champion mindset, the cheerleader mindset where people believe in the mission and love Royals baseball and knew Mr. K and will always champion Kauffman. I think if you think about it in those ways, more as motivations, to me it makes more sense. When I distribute that out, it makes more sense to me because I know what I'm trying to get them to do. They're motivated because I'm giving them practical tools or advice or whatever it is. Or they're motivated because they, too, believe that by closing gaps we will design a new future.

14:05 J: It's all these motivations more so, than 'Well, I'm a grantee, and I believe this.' Because half the grantees I know, they're futurists. They're not practitioners.

14:12 V: Yeah.

J: So, it's tricky.

14:16 V: I'm curious then, I know that the typologies are new, but do we feel like we're trying to reach different audiences at this stage? Or does it feel like it's more of the same just with new vocabulary?

14:27 J: No. I think it's definitely new audiences, and I see it all the time, especially on Instagram and Twitter. The thing is because Kauffman for a long time was very academic, very research-focused, the education stuff was very quiet because it was very much in Kansas City. Where in Kansas City people really knew, nobody else really knew that we did education. I think the last time that people knew we did education was when Mr. K went on Good Morning America and was like, 'I'm giving everybody college for free.'

14:58 J: But I think because of that, we had a lot of academics. A lot of research folks. We used to be a very 'high-skill, high-tech, high-growth entrepreneurship.' For a while, it was like that's what creates jobs, so we focused really a lot on that. We see this a lot with our legacy lists in "Ideas at Work." That created a certain group of people. With our interviews, they came back, and this is why I think the typologies feel so weird. They came back, and they said 90 percent of your audience has a post-graduate degree. And you're like, 'Pshh. I don't think so. That feels weird.' And so many of them are old, white, male, highly educated, but that is a result of what was the past.

15:54 J: That's all good and great, and we need them to come with us on this shift. But now I'm seeing so many more people of color, so many women and from all over the country and from small towns to big cities. And we're seeing this. I think for them, they maybe had always heard of Kauffman if they were in an entrepreneurship space or they had maybe been aware of us giving money. Now I think they're finally coming to us and realizing that we're saying some things that are pretty interesting and we're putting a focus on closing gaps. I think with our education stuff, too, it's not the old model. It's a

very different model of really listening to our community, taking people to other communities to learn together about education. Doing Amplify. All that stuff.

16:44 J: That was the one thing GSG looked at. Our new Twitter follows are totally skewed in the opposite direction. Now it's so many more education folks. It used to be 90 percent entrepreneurship on Twitter when you looked at it. Now there's a huge shift of education people. Demographics are looking different. The whole thing looks different. I know even though it doesn't feel like it because I know Miles feel really frustrated when we put something in "Ideas at Work" and it gets no engagement. And it's like, 'Yeah, because it's not the audience.' It'll get a total different result on Twitter to some of the people we know are looking for that.

17:26 J: For example, we did that early education story on El Centro. It's about closing the early ed gap for Spanish-speaking families. We have done it all kinds of ways in the e-newsletter and different places to see. Because it wasn't getting any real traction, and it's like 'Why?! It's such an interesting thing.' Then, the last time we did it, I switched it from a DEI (diversity, equity and inclusion) headline to something like 'the ROI on early education.' Then it got, because for that audience and that newsletter, I took out the DEI part of it because they had no idea what it was about. But once you put 'ROI.'

18:19 V: That just clicks more for that audience, for their motivation and interests.

J: Right.

18:21 V: That's interesting because people asked me when I proposed this project. They were asking me a lot about our audience work and saying, 'Are they seeing richer demographics?' And I was like, 'I don't know because that's not the end goal. The end goal is not to see 50/50 men and women. The goal is really to connect audiences to content that they're interested in.' So, I was like, 'While we would love to see diversity in those numbers, I would think, that's just not what we're aiming for.'

18:49 J: I will say it's part of my own social goals. It is a goal. In terms of making sure that...Twitter, specifically, has been very male heavy and very entrepreneurship heavy. To make sure that we're getting more of a balance in terms of female voices, in terms of people of color and education versus entrepreneurship. And we're getting there. We're seeing the shift. So, that feels good. I feel like on Instagram it's so much more diverse. I think ESHIP Summit did a lot for that because that crowd, they love their Instagram right now. I'm seeing a lot of them there. But I will say Facebook is always that really interesting thing, which Facebook will not be Facebook for much longer. So, I always feel like let's not waste too much time on Facebook. However, it's very interesting with Facebook because despite your followers or whoever is there, your audience is different every time. I always think it's interesting because we can target, but when it comes down to it, those people who are connecting with it, you may never see them again. They're an audience that is completely different. Maybe we will. Maybe it builds recognition after a while.

20:11 J: Some of our biggest stuff has been baseball related. Those people, I mean I'd like to think that somehow they learn a little bit about us. But with that audience, I look at it, and honestly I get more women a lot of times on those posts and they're a lot older. So, it's a totally different thing than when we try to promote for the internship applications. Last year we had a huge amount of success because we didn't do it on Facebook as mush. I knew we'd maybe get to the professors and those kinds of things, but to get to the kids, we did Snapchat and Instagram story videos. And we sent them out through KSI and through some of our young partners who had those kinds of accounts. And we did awesome because that's where the kids are. They're not on Facebook. It's a huge tangle of where everybody is but that's the game we play constantly.

21:10 V: Yeah. It seems like that's really the case. Would you say that we're really thinking about audiences more actively as a result of this larger shift but also with A57 having that common vocabulary to talk about now with typologies?

21:27 J: Yeah. I mean we definitely talk more about it. I think we were before. And I wonder if Barb or whoever was sitting here what they would say. I think maybe we did have a pretty good handle on who our audience was because like I said we knew it was researchers, we knew it was entrepreneurs, we knew a lot about the ESHIP audience. And in Kansas City, it was the education community here in Kansas City. I mean we knew the audiences. I think it's realizing now that we have to broaden that audience. We do want it to include a more diverse group of people. It needs to go beyond just the people talking about entrepreneurship to the people who are doing something about entrepreneurship. We've changed the whole strategy of how we're approaching the ESHIP stuff, so we have to adapt with that.

22:21 V: Yeah. That makes a lot of sense. I kind of want to shift to talking about what we decide to cover. And that might have a lot to do with coverage areas. How has adopting this new approach affected what we're deciding to ultimately cover or tell stories about?

22:42 J: Probably the easiest way to say straight out is.... I feel like we relied really heavily in the past on, 'We did this, so we tell people this. Or we gave money to this, so then we show them we gave money to this. And this is what it looks like.' I'm not trying to put that down. But we were really talking to ourselves. It was a comfort level. I think a lot of foundations and a lot of places do that. That's where the comfort zone is. It's like, 'We did this thing So, here's what we did. Let everybody know.' Back in the day, news organizations would pick that up and say, 'Kauffman did this,' and it was news. Now, that is not news.

23:25 J: It's really hard even with the really big things like we give millions in college tuition. Meh. You know? That model of and that comfort of feeling we can control the message; it really is a feeling of we're talking to ourselves. Without any thought to what makes someone on the outside who doesn't know maybe anything about what we do, what makes them excited about this or would get them motivated to share it? I think in the way we talk about what we do, now it cannot be as simple. The Capital Access report is out. Tell everybody we have the Capital Access report. GSG has been out there talking

to media outlets over and over and over again with that summary, and all of them are like, 'Meh. Let me know once the summary is out.'

24:33 J: I have to sit there and think, 'OK. When you really look at this, what people want to is how will it actually close a gap?' And want to see the numbers. Show the inequity in that. And have Kauffman actually be an authority and take a stance.

24:47 J: That's why I pulled up that one tweet at the meeting yesterday because that tweet really had a voice like, 'Let's be clear. The majority of entrepreneurs do not get bank loans or VC.' And I think our new audience is responding to that a lot. Same with female funding and female tech stuff. They want us to have a point of view and an attitude about it like they do. They want us to be a little mad. I'm noticing that, so we have to think about how we do those things.

25:21 J: Also, we can't assume everyone gets 'it' sometimes. I think with Capital Access, we really need an explainer piece. And I'm not talking about a really long written 'this is how this works.' It needs to be a quick, fun, visual explainer of how it works from the money from Kauffman going into to a fund and it going to people and somehow we solve the world's problems. You know? We do have to think now in a different way. How can we make it visual? How can we make it exciting? Can we get it done in 10 seconds so people will watch it on Facebook and Twitter and Instagram? There's so many different levels now where it used to be: You write something. You put it online. And yeah, then Julie would dissect it and throw it up on social media. Now it really has to be content made for all the distribution platforms and we have to figure out, 'OK. If it's on Kauffman Currents and it is a written piece, what do we provide them? What's the value in them coming to our website and reading this piece or getting the resources?' And then at the same time, knowing that on Twitter or Instagram they're not going to click through. What do we have to give them there to give them enough to know and start to train them in understanding what we're doing?

26:31 J: It really is thinking on so many different levels how you put content out.

26:37 V: How has that thinking affecting the way we plan and pitch our stories? Are we starting to think about that much earlier on or is that still kind of a once we have the content we'll figure it out?

26:47 J: I think we're all trying to get away from the retrofit. Which is like, 'I've got this thing, and I've written it up.' It's kind of this fully baked thing and then we have to figure out like, 'Well this definitely isn't going to work for any of these platforms. So, what are we going to do to make it work?'

27:06 J: Or, with their best intention, they were like, 'This is what this is about.' And it's like this whole thing about this, and it's like, 'Actually I don't think that's going to make sense.' Case in point, God love the eval guys. And they have a good evaluation. People who do evaluation love their work. So, they kind of look at it and it's like 'I want to tell people about evaluation and how we do this thing and the learning report.' But the rest of

the world is like, 'Ugh, boring.' It only appeals to really niche, which is fine because I've had like Matthew Carr do stuff just on his LinkedIn because that's where people find him, and they love that stuff. But for the bigger audience, we do have to think about what is it in here that would appeal to other people?

27:50 J: So, I do think some of the trick and what I see happening when we get into the bigger editorial meetings. Our team is very good about wanting to help, wanting to brainstorm, but I think maybe because of typologies not feeling quite true, everyone is coming from different motivations on things. We kind of get in this thing where it's like, 'Well, we could do this story. And it could be this and this and this and this.' And suddenly we go back to this whole, 'it's everything for everybody' thing.

28:24 J: Or, again, we find ourselves back into we're really just talking to ourselves again, but we're using all the right words to say it's really for somebody else. Even though we all kind of know it's not. So, I do think that's still one of those where as we start to test out what works, we start to figure out where Kauffman is really going to be able to add value in these external conversations that are happening. There's a lot of conversation around closing gaps. There's a lot of conversation around access to capital. There's a lot of conversations around these different things externally. Where do we add that Kauffman lens to add to that conversation not just join it?

29:05 J: Because it's one thing to be like, 'Hi, we're Kauffman. We're here.' It's totally different to actually bring something forward that then furthers that conversation. So, I think a lot of it is when we are thinking about stories or choosing stories or creating an angle, I find us a lot more so now saying, 'What's the one thing that's really going to make sense right now? And to what audience?'

29:33 J: Like what's really going on? Like the shutdown article. That was one that we were able to kind of jump on. And realizing, too, and I think Matt Pozel is the one who kind of brought that angle in. Which was like, 'everybody has a shutdown article We're not adding anything if we just keep piling on that.' But if we talk about it as... use the lingering effects. This is what's going to happen long-term with this shutdown, then it became something people were interested in. Not just because it's interesting, but because it's Kauffman saying it's interesting.

30:00 V: Yeah. And it's Kauffman saying we've done some of the research. We've talked to some of the people in our network that maybe you don't have access to that can really tell us here's what might happen from this. I think that was the difference instead of just reporting on this is what is happening. That's kind of the journalistic view is saying 'This is what's happening right now. We're just capturing the current.' Instead of saying we're looking ahead. We are going to try to somewhat predict the future, which every journalist would be running away from that.

30:31 J: I think it is...Kauffman. As much as Keith and I work journalistically minded, we're not journalists. We're not a newspaper or a news hub. We don't have the obligation that newspapers might to have to explain the whole thing. To actually report on this is

what's happening. Since we don't have to do that, and I think this is where we struggle sometimes, we are freed to give it our own angle and that Kauffman lens. So, we have got to get better at doing that instead of just saying, 'O. This is what happened.' Or, 'here's this program.' Or whatever. We can go farther beyond that, and it's harder. That's the problem. It's so much easier just to say, 'OK. Well, we did individual school grants, so let's put out a thing that says we put out individual school grants. This is how much we gave. This is the schools that received it. OK, great job, guys. Done.'

31:28 J: But that's not going to do anything. That's not going to motivate anything more then maybe a transactional audience member. So, now we have to go, and we have to show them what does it mean to catalyze Excelsior Springs curriculum so now that their high school is transformed. In terms of the time, and space, and how kids go to school. We have to go and show that. We can't just say we gave them money to go and do all these really boring things. Show the result. That's what we have to do, and it's much harder.

31:59 V: Yeah. It seems like in some ways having that freedom, it creates more challenges for us because we can do anything. But we have to be very particular about, 'Well, if we want to do this thing that's going to create change, that takes a very particular kind of storytelling.'

32:15 J: Yep. And I think Matt Pozel. In my interview, Matt Pozel was in it. And he's like, 'The blessing and the curse of this place is that nobody is ever going to tell you there's no money to do that.' I came from a newspaper background where you're like, 'I just need a camera.' Really basic. And it's like, 'Nope. No money for that.' Whereas here, if there's a great idea, and there's a good reason behind it, we'll find a way to do it. The problem where we are right now is trying to figure out the how. How do we do that? I'm only one person. There's still only 24 hours in a day for me. I keep telling Keith I would love a little pocket where I could like climb in and nobody knows I'm there. And I could work for like ten hours and then come out and it's the exact same time as when I went in.

33:03 J: That is also the thing. Keith and I are the ones dedicated to editorial. But we're only two people and it's not really. We're 100 percent in charge of editorial strategy. We're also 100 percent, with Keith, on digital management and social media, and management of that. So, it's like, how many things? The 'how' is the really interesting part for us right now because we're looking at trying to develop a bench of freelance writers. And not just people who can write, but people who truly can report and understand what we need and how to do it quickly.

33:45 J: And we're looking for people who can do video, graphic illustrations and designs for social media, data viz. Because we have in-house people, but they're doing other things. And so, it's kind of one of those where there's still much to be figured out in terms of how we're using our resources, where are our priorities, how do we create that machine. My dream is that I come into work, and I basically am just pushing buttons. Where it's like I check in with 10 different people and where 10 different things are, and I know all that stuff is coming at the end of the week.

34:31 V: Yeah. So, you can play a truly management role rather than being the manager and the producer.

34:37 J: And the creator. And the person who schedules it on social media. And the person who manages the community on social media. Yeah. It does get to that. I never want to stop being in the creation of things or in the doing of things. There's always going to be stuff I just want to do because that's my nature. But I would love to get to a point where we have the Uncommon Voices thing in place. Where we have all these external voices who, every month, we have how many different pieces coming in from how many different diverse, smart, wonderful people who are giving us their best stuff and we're putting that out through Kauffman. Or having Native Digital do...I say Native Digital. I don't know if I'm going to hire them. But they're people I've talked to lately. Having them do microblogs for us where we give them a number of entrepreneurs to talk to and they do profiles and we have that that comes every other week.

35:26 J: There's all these things that are kind of like the building blocks. They're in process and planning. And once we can get one done and the next done and the next done and the next done, we will actually have a content pipeline that will make a lot of sense. But right now, it's a lot of external resources. Trying to pull those together. And figuring out how those things then complement internal things. Because internal things move very, very slow, if you hadn't noticed.

35:56 J: So, it's trying to figure out how we build this content pipeline that actually works by doing both those things. So yeah. Stay tuned.

36:07 V: I'm curious in that space then, too, I know part of the process is just choosing what stories to tell. How we produce them. How then are we starting to think about channels a little bit differently in that process as well?

36:23 J: Here's one of the great burdens of my life. On social media, I'm on there always looking and seeing what everybody's doing. On Twitter, especially, it's constantly this fast-paced thing. I see a lot of great stuff. I even see some of our internal people sharing a story or different things. I'm like, 'Oh! That's interesting.' The problem is with some things because of shifts in strategy and because of different things, I'm not sure like, 'Can I....Can Kauffman retweet that?' Or, 'If I retweet that, how should I frame that?' Or, I need to go back and look up that one data point to pull that in to then frame it correctly so I can retweet this article and make it make sense. And because of that, I feel like it slows me down a lot.

37:21 J: Because that's a totally different game, right? There's social media as a distribution platform. As our original content. I take our stuff. I know what to do with it. Put it out there. Schedule it out. That's the easy part. It's the being in a conversation and adding to some of this ongoing stuff as we go and being there in a real way, that's what's really hard.

37:47 J: Arlan Hamilton is a good example. We recently saw Arlan at South by Southwest. We talked to our folks. She's been doing amazing stuff. She's on the cover of magazines. It's insane how much media has loved her. Been following her on social for a while. So, I wanted to make sure at South by Southwest I met her and talked to her about, 'Hey. We could do Uncommon Voices,' or something like that in the future. So great. So, we did in Kauffman Currents a little thing about what she talked about in her session along with others and put it together a South by Southwest voices piece.

38:26 J: But then, right after that, news broke that Arlan didn't meet her goals for her fund for women. And so now all this media came out. And Arlan. It was not a surprise. She had basically been saying, 'Hey. I had to lay off some people. I had to do some of this stuff.' But the media that loved her before, suddenly it's like she failed. So, then it makes people nervous, and she's also in the pipeline to get a grant. So, then you have program people who come and say, 'Whoa, whoa, whoa. We did a piece on Arlan?' And it's like, well, not really. We saw her at South by, like many people did and just shared out the things she was saying. And it's like, 'Yeah, but this article!' 'Well, yeah, I don't think that disqualifies her from having an opinion on funding underrepresented folks.' And it's like, 'Yeah, but what if people think there's favoritism because she's in the pipeline?' Well, we had no idea she was in the pipeline.

39:19 J: So, it's stuff like that that then becomes tricky when engaging with stuff like that on social. In terms of distribution channels just simply, I think I have a much better handle now. I have rewrote the social strategy probably three times since I've been here. Because every time I do it, then the strategy changes. And then I have to adjust. I've had the gurus of social media in here to talk about things. It's amazing really. But I do think now we're really to a place where we can kind of stand still for a bit. And I do think Twitter will always be...we have a lot of audience there. And we have a lot of engagement there. So as long as Twitter is kind of that, it's kind of bread and butter right now. It allows us to kind of engage with a lot of different people. Hit different things. Be part of those conversations. So, Twitter is our meat and potatoes. Bread and butter. Whatever you want to call it. It's still a big thing for us.

40:30 J: LinkedIn has probably the most opportunity because everyone is on LinkedIn. Whether you're an early grad or you're a grandpa, you basically have a LinkedIn account. So, that one we have the most opportunity. And we've noticed when we put the right content there, we get a lot of good engagement. That's the thing with LinkedIn. It doesn't want every kind of content. It does not want everything Twitter wants or even whatever Facebook wants. People are there for a reason. It's like Christian Mingle. It's like a dating app. You're there for a reason. Same with LinkedIn. So, you do have to give people thought leadership. You have to give them resources. That kind of thing. That's what LinkedIn wants. Instagram is another huge opportunity for us. Instagram is more difficult than Twitter because you have to have so much digital assets. So that one takes longer to create some things to make it look the way you want it to look.

41:36 J: But you're not going to get the click-throughs that you might get because it's Instagram. It's a little bit different. And because we're not selling a product. Like some people get great click-through if they sell a product, so it's like 'shop now!'

V: Yeah. There's a lot of tools for that.

41:48 J: We're not necessarily that, so it really is a place for brand recognition, brand awareness. Teaching people who we are. Stories is a great place to give people a little bit of the behind-the-scenes, to show them what we do here. That we can cultivate a little bit more. IGTV now is becoming a thing, so we've been trying to do more of that. So, there's a lot of opportunity with that. We're actually going to do an IG takeover with Hill Day. I'm really excited about that to see how that plays.

42:21 V: Yeah. It's cool. I see us using things like that and even Facebook Live to create more. I guess they're still high effort in some ways, but lower effort events. Like ways for people to engage with things in smaller ways. I would agree. I think there's a lot of opportunity there. And it's been cool to see us picking up on more of that. To say, like, putting this on IGTV is kind of running an event or running a Facebook Live. It's a way for people to engage that's not writing a story. But it's still in that same storytelling area.

42:52 J: Well, and I think I'd like people eventually when using the audience. I think, too, you just think of the Kauffman culture. And you think of Kansas City culture and that Kansas City nice. People come to Kansas City, and they're always like, 'Everybody's so nice. They told me how to get to here and here. And they told me the best places to get barbecue,' and all of that. However, you want to experience that.

43:12J: I do think Kauffman the heart of the voice and the tone we want to put out through our distribution channels is that feeling. Mr. K would sit down at people's desks whether you were a secretary or whoever and ask you what you thought about things. And I do think that's something that we need to uphold. And I think social media gives us a very good opportunity to do that where you have Facebook Live or you have things where they literally get access to the program officers and the people who are dealing with things and putting out RFPs. You can really ask questions and get answers. That's amazing. And you can do it if you're in Fargo, North Dakota, or if you're in New York City. You can get access to that. I want to make sure that who our stuff — where we used to be very academic and straight and everything about us was very buttoned up — whereas that feels very safe and controlled to a lot of people, I think there's a certain amount of realness that people want. And transparency that people want. And access that people want. We can provide that very easily now through social media, but it's trying to find that balance. Of being truly transparent and real and authentic and hearing the pitch of what they're talking about and being able to reflect that to them. And at the same time still being able to hold down the things we need to control and being careful about who's in the pipeline. Or this or this or this. It's a strange balance we play, but I think we can get there as some people get more comfortable with that approach and see that it works.

44:43 J: And for us, being able to untether ourselves a little bit from programmatic strategy or whatever to really run with the editorial strategy to talk to people outside of these four walls.

44:56 V: Yeah. I think that is the struggle. It's difficult because I've heard from others that Public Affairs has played a role in the past of really making sure that our programmatic teams adhere to the strategies they put forth. And making sure that there's some continuity among all of that for the larger foundation. So, to now say, 'Well, maybe our editorial strategy is a little less refined. Maybe it's got a little bit wider guardrails.' I think some people are worried that we might lose some authority there.

45:29 J: I think that's the thing. I don't see that it has wider or looser guardrails. Honestly, I think in some ways I want to bring them in. It sounds contradictory to me. But I think sometimes because we think all over the map, with programmatic it was kind of like topic du jour. They would come in one-offs constantly at our desk. Where it was like, 'I have this thing. I want to do this thing.' And we were constantly always just popping at whatever dreamed up to do. Whereas I think now it is kind of, 'Tell me what your goal is. Don't tell me what you need. Don't do the strategy part for me. Tell me what your goal is.' It's like, 'Oh. OK.'

46:08 J: Knowing that is what we should do if someone like Jacqueline says, 'We need to make sure people get to this info session for assistant principals.' It's like, 'Whoa that's a super narrow audience. Definitely not going to make it on Twitter.' So, let's talk about how you could do that on LinkedIn and get to that network. Or, let's talk about instead of an in-person info session, why don't we do it as a Facebook Live? And we can really target to make sure all of that group in Kansas City is there. So, I think in some ways instead of this shotgun approach of 'well, throw it out there and see what sticks,' it really is trying to meet their goals to help them understand, 'We could do it a different way.'

46:53 J: Or, like, Major League Citizens is the story that nobody came to us with that. Nobody said we should really do a story because we gave $1 million to Kansas City Urban Youth Academy. We saw a great story there that said something about community and said something about why we and many, many others in this community would give millions of dollars to a baseball park. People I think from different corners would be like, 'OK. They did a whole summer project on Kansas City Urban Youth Academy?' It's like, 'Well, yeah, because it says a lot about who we are as a foundation in terms of why we support that. What it does for kids, what it does for a community.'

47:35 J: So, I think I'm hoping people will start to see the value in that. The value of instead of just writing a piece on the academy but doing a beautiful photo story on the summer sandlot league. Letting the child be the voice of this experience. Letting not the big muckety muck. But the guy who runs the baseball practices, let him be the voice. And he's like this amazing, eloquent guy. That's beautiful. That's to the heart of the journalistic idea of what we should be doing. That's the kind of story we should be do for everything. Well, not everything. Not everything can be that big. But the heart of that and the spirit of that, that's what I'm hoping people will start to see. That yeah we could just send out a

press release or write a little something but tell me more. Tell me the people who are in this.

48:28 J: It really is working a beat. There's people now...I'm getting to the point especially with the Inclusion Open folks because I've been able to do so much with Chris and Natalie. I can DM or call quite a few people in their portfolio and be like, 'Hey, what's happening in Tennessee?' You know, 'what's up in Chattanooga today?' And really work the beat in terms of starting to be able to tell real stories and not just these superficial or drop-in kind of stories.

48:55 V: Yeah. I think it's interesting to hear you use words like transparent and real. Authentic. And I've heard genuine thrown around. It's interesting because I think we're getting to a point where that's how we want to define success in our work as opposed to saying.... There's not as much of a focus like you're saying in making sure these events are covered. Or that there's just this awareness. It's more than that now.

49:19 J: Yeah. I think the word I remember hearing Wendy Guilles saying a long time ago. She had kind of said. And I think it was her. She had thrown out relevant. I think that's really what all of us really want. Kauffman has always been relevant in different spaces. I think that's now more important than ever. We want to be relevant in these conversations about community and opportunity zones. In entrepreneurship and education. We want Kauffman to be relevant. I think the authenticity and genuineness and realness and transparency, I think that comes from the one audience that we tossed out, which — I think is interesting — is the inquirer. Because you'll even notice it. I think Kauffman Scholars. There's a lot of them. They are just bought in. They see the opportunity Kauffman gave them. They got to go to college. They are full-on Kauffman champions for life. Right? And there are people like that all over who, for whatever reason, had a relationship with Kauffman that now whatever we put out, they're going to be like, 'Hell yeah, Kauffman! Great job!'

50:21 J: But there's a lot of people out there who still are like, 'what are you going to do to fix that?' And 'don't talk to me about the stats of diversity, equity and inclusion until you're showing me how my kid's school is different.' There's a lot of that out there and for good reason. You look at the climate in the last however many years, and the distressed and the misinformation and all kinds of things that have happened. People now want to feel like not only can they trust us and believe us, but that they know people here. There's people who know Chris and Natalie because they work with them. That know Murray because he's out in the neighborhoods and schools all the time. That really is something that we can do that other places can't is build that trust in a real way. And to make sure people don't look at us like Kauffman up on the hill decreeing, 'here's the state of entrepreneurship.' To really have people trust us not only because we're an authority in the space, but because we are humans who are trying to within this weird philanthropic role with billions of dollars behind us try to work with people to move the needle.

51:38 V: Yeah. I think that's where Major League Citizens is a unique example of something that at least I felt was successful in that it does get at those core values of

being relevant, of being real. Because you're not just hearing from the Kauffman Foundation, you're hearing from your Little League baseball coach who you probably had a relationship with. You're hearing from that kid on the sandlot that you can probably identify with. To me, I've had the conversation about analytics, and then I've had the conversation just about performance. I think seeing us being able to reuse that and still seeing people engage with that is what's for me what I understand as success under this approach.

52:18 J: Yes. I think, too, there's the intangibles that are harder to measure. Keith did the Literacy KC video and it did not do great on "Ideas at Work," other places. Like when I first put it on Facebook, it did not do great. I then altered our targeting, and it did a lot, lot better. It actually did amazingly well once I altered the targeting to be something different. But the great takeaway from that one was then Literacy KC got a huge amount of money from a local corporation. And now that's going to further their work. It was because of that video. That's huge, and it's not how many retweets did it get. But that's a real thing.

53:02 J: The other thing. I did the video on Chanel Scales in Cincinnati. It was really, really important to me with that video, especially with our increasing work with diversity, equity and inclusion, to make sure that that video was done through the correct lens with the correct voice. So, usually we hire this company Cruise Control, who we'll just call and say can we get a crew to go out to wherever. Instead of doing that, I went to Allen, who is one of the managing partners at MORTAR, and said, 'Who do you work with? Who would you want to shoot a video like this?' And so, he gave me the name of Simeon Collins, who is a really, really young guy in Cincinnati. And he lives literally maybe a mile from her business. This is probably his first really big job like this. And he actually is now part of MORTAR. He's doing their program as an entrepreneur because he's running his own video company.

54:08 J: So, I looked at his stuff and his stuff's gorgeous. Is he young? Yeah. But he had the right lens. So, I hired him to do it. I said, 'Allen, you're going to be the boots on the ground.' He was good with that because that's what he does. He comes from a graphic design, creative background, so I knew I could trust his eye and his instincts. I sent him like a million questions. And they were like, 'Well, you're coming, aren't you?' And I'm like, 'Nope.' And Simeon was like, 'I'd really feel better if you came.' And I was like, 'Nope. You're the director. You've got. You'll be fine. Allen will be there if you need anything. Allen knows what we're trying to do. You do not need me there.' One, like, why show up and be the white girl in the corner from Kauffman that makes everybody feel weird and changes the mood of the room? I had to realize that that's what would happen. So, I kind of was like, I'm not going to do it. It went fine. It was a lot of me. Simeon, he edits at night. So, it was a lot of me being up at 1 a.m. with him while he's working. But the great thing about that that was the intangible that we can't necessarily measure is that I looked. MORTAR put up on their stories. They had their 18th and 19th new cohort. I was looking through the stories and looking at all their pictures and stuff, and there I saw Chanel's video playing to this huge crowd of new MORTAR folks. And that to me said more than anything else. Because I was like, 'Oh my god. We did it.' We created a video

that sounded like them. That was their voice. It wasn't Kauffman from on high. We still said all the things we wanted to say. We still created the story, the narrative we needed people to hear, but we did it in Chanel's voice and with MORTAR's voice. And with Simeon's vision.

55:58 J: And so now it makes sense. That's a video they'll play at MORTAR, whereas if we would have done it as Kauffman with talking heads and this and that, it would not have gotten played.

56:10 V: And now that can serve as kind of that inspiration, motivation for people in that community. If it really tells their voice, they can use that to have a 20th and 25h cohort.

56:19 J: And I think some of it is just realizing we don't always need to be the voice. We can empower and uplift and amplify the voices of the people we serve in their communities and let them speak clearly about what they're dealing with. I think, too, even just going to Allen and saying, 'Hey. You tell me who the subject is.' And he immediately was like, 'It's Chanel.' We talked things through. I talked to her on the phone. There was even a time where I was like, 'Oh God. I don't know if she's the right person' because she was so crazy busy. I couldn't get her nailed down. But I just kind of trusted it, trusted that Allen knew what he was doing, what he was talking about, and it worked out great.

57:03 J: And now Chanel is all over our Instagram. I see her all the time, and she's doing stories all the time. It's great. There's stuff like that that I feel like, yes, it's not an analytic. It's not a stat, but I see change happening. Or even when I went up to the person that works with Arlan and was like, 'Hey, I'm Julie. I'm with Kauffman.' She's like, 'You guys just did that Capital Access report.' Yes, we did. Somebody who I don't know if...it's a different...I'm just starting to see changes that they may be small, and they maybe don't have the analytics to prove it out, but there's all these things that are happening.

57:45 V: I know we're getting close to time, and it's 11:03\. I don't know if you have another meeting...

57:50 J: I talk too much. It's a curse. I'm OK. I just need to check something on Twitter because Wendy is speaking right now at some angel investing thing.

[Pause for Julie to check social]

59:31 J: OK. Never mind. Nothing there. Nothing to see there.

59:32 V: That's OK.

59:33 J: Thanks for letting me take that break.

59:34 V: Oh, it's cool. It's cool. I've just got one last question, and this is something that Chris brought up that I think is important to ask here. And that's understanding that the Kauffman Foundation is not a for-profit business. And editorial stories aren't a product

we're selling. We're really in the business of giving money away and in making change. So, if no one is forcing us to make this change as an editorial team, then what's really motivating us? Why tell stories here?

1:00:03 J: Yeah. I think Chris from a marketing standpoint, it is...You almost wish you just had a product. I remember telling Lauren Aleshire that when she first came in. I was like listen, 'you have the best job in the whole building because you have one product. You have a thing and that thing is the one thing you get to just focus on and market. You have the dream.' Victor and I were talking about something the other day. It was super complex and we're trying to figure out, 'how do we do this as Kauffman? It's so big.' And he's like, 'You know, the one thing we really do well is write checks. That's the one thing. We just do it really, really well.' [laughs] And it's true.

1:00:48 J: So, for some things, there is like, 'Where can we just write a check and make good on some of that?' But I think it does come back to what Mr. Kauffman said, to be cheesy, is that, 'All the money in the world can't solve problems unless we work together.' And I think, we do take that into a lot of what we do. I think when it comes back to relevancy and how we're going to continue the Kauffman legacy and our mission, we do have to be relevant. And because we don't have 'buy this Kauffman whatever,' because we don't have that, in some ways we do have to sell this inherent belief that what we do here matters. And that it doesn't just matter to us here in Kansas City or to Mr. K who now a lot of people don't even remember him. I think it really does come down to us telling the stories of why all this matters.

1:01:57 J: I always kind of go back to this quote from Chinua Achebe. He's an African writer, and he said, 'Story explains society to itself.' That makes a huge amount of sense. It's a basic human need to understand. Some of what we do is super complex. Some of what we do is really pretty simple. You know, we want to make sure kids get an education. Even though we can overcomplicate anything in this building, it simply is: we have to be good at telling our story. We have to be good at telling why what we do matters, and why, especially in today's world, understanding other people's voices matter. And I think in telling stories, it's not just us decreeing here is a story. It's bringing in everybody's voices to show we are working with everyone. We are the fortunate people who can put a lot of money behind what you're doing to help catalyze or help make something possible that maybe wouldn't have been possible, to allow you to risk or to fail or whatever. But if we aren't good at telling that story and selling that belief that it matters, then we're not doing our job.

1:03:14 V: Yeah.

1:03:17 J: So, Chris can just take it!

[laughter]

APPENDIX P: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – KAYLA SMALLEY

00:30 Valerie: So, go ahead and start off by telling me your name and how long you've been working here.

00:34 Kayla: OK. My name is Kayla Smalley. I've been with the foundation since July 2017.

00:39 V: Cool. So, coming up on two years. That's exciting.

K: Yeah.

00:44 V: It's really great to get to talk to everybody. Obviously we have a range of experiences here. So, everyone's perspective is unique and really important. So, thank you for talking with me today.

00:55 V: So, go ahead and tell me a little bit about what kind of work you do here either for the Public Affairs editorial team or across other departments you might serve.

01:05 K: So, my title is digital content coordinator. I report to Kim Farley. My role is essentially the execution of digital content, primarily on Kauffman.org. So, whether that's building a Currents piece, whether that's building an event long-form website for ESHIP Summit, for example. Anything that is built and published on the website I usually have some sort of role in seeing that through.

01:41 V: You also do a little bit of content creation. You said you got to help with social this week. That's awesome.

K: Yeah.

01:46 V: And you're working on the Tiny Jackson piece.

01:53 K: I am working on the Tiny Jackson piece, but I wouldn't say content creation is my main focus. And most of what I did for social media was not creating new content, but repurposing content that had already been published.

02:08 V: Gotcha. Cool. Well, it's good to get that clarity. I know sometimes we kind of cross over roles and have the opportunity to do that, so just want to make sure I get everyone's functions clearly described.

02:20 V: So, that being said, I want to know just about roughly when did you get involved with the Atlantic 57 engagement. Was it kind of when they were here and doing mostly team stuff? Or were you part of any of those conversations earlier on?

02:35 K: It was mainly when they were here doing team stuff. Yeah.

02:41 V: Gotcha.

02:44 K: I don't even remember when that was.

02:47 V: Yeah. It's hard to say because I guess maybe around August or September is when the first on-site happened when I was here, and we talked about the typologies.

02:59 K: OK. Yeah that was...I think that was one of the first ones.

V: So, like early fall.

K: Mhmm.

V: OK.

03:06 V: That being said, in your own words, how do you define or understand what this new editorial approach is for our team?

03:16 K So, I look at the editorial strategy as story-first approach in telling the story of the foundation. So, that basically means instead of telling the story about an event and letting the event dictate us writing a piece or creating content around that piece, or letting the weekly "Ideas at Work" dictate that we're going to have X amount of Currents pieces and X amount of social, we're really trying to figure out what is the story? And who are we trying to tell that to? And what is the 'why' that we're telling this story?

03:58 K: So, it's breaking free of those constraints that we had been tied to in the past.

04:06 V: And my understanding is that's very much still in process.

K: Mhmm.

V: Cool.

04:13 So, with that being said, what do you feel like are the primary goals of making this change? What are we hoping to get out of this?

04:24 K: Well, I think that we're trying to better express to our audiences, our typologies why we do the work that we do and why we think that it's important. When we better express the why behind the events or the programs or the grants that we make, we'll be able to relate to our audiences at a deeper level, and hopefully inspire change through that connection.

04:54 V: Gotcha. So, trying to really bring people onto our side so we can activate them or motivate them in some way. I know the famous Mr. Kauffman quote is really, 'No amount of money in the world is going to solve all the problems. We have to work together.'

05:12 V: I think that that is really...this strategy ties in very nicely to that and that thinking.

K: Right.

05:20 V: So, I know that you kind of mentioned that you work more on the publishing and building side, kind of the end of our news process. But I'm curious how you feel adopting this new approach has affected how we think about audiences. And that might come into our work at different points, but I imagine it's more of the initial.

05:44 K: Yeah, so. I think that while we're figuring out process and while we're figuring out how to work in this audience-first, story-first approach there's room for me as the end of the production cycle basically to be like, 'OK, so who are we building this for?' Really making sure that the tone, the voice, the language that we use that gets published on our website matches to the editorial strategy of that piece. I think we're still trying to figure out the best process for this work, and sometimes all of that is clearly defined at the forefront. And sometimes there's room to be like, 'who is this for?' near the end.

06:35 V: Yeah. I definitely think some of that clarity comes with just what content you create and who you talk to and all of that. But it's interesting, because I think you play a unique role in that you see the final and you get to have some input on and feedback on about things about tone and voice, which are very much structured within the entirety of a content piece rather than just one element here or there. It's a much larger view of things.

07:10 V: You know, based on these typologies and what we consider our audiences, do you feel like these groups are different than those we were engaging with maybe when you started here or before we made this editorial change?

07:25 K: I'm not super sure what the editorial strategy was before I got here, because when I first started was kind of in the midst of 'we're shifting this perspective.' So, I know that we did personas before I was hired, and in that regard, typologies are different. Because typologies are motivations-based and not tied to a person's job. In that way, they are different, but I don't know if they're a completely new set of people. I think we're just thinking about who's engaging with us differently.

08:06 V: That's really well said, because I think some people struggle to really struggle what personas were, what typologies are. So, I really appreciate hearing your grasp on that.

08:19 V: Because these are more motivation...We're thinking more about motivation. You know, what kinds of values or interests do you feel these audiences hold?

08:33 K: Well, I can tell you what Atlantic 57 said. I think, so if we're thinking about futurists, I think futurists are motivated by the future. Right? They're motivated by big-

picture change that betters the world, and they see education and entrepreneurship and Kauffman playing a role in that.

09:01 K: Practitioners, they're more in the weeds doing the work. So, they may be more motivated by data or more motivated by examples of storytelling that show that the work that they're doing matters. That shows their work as important. But everybody can be any type of typology at any given point. So, it really just depends on how you frame a certain piece, the language that you use, which is why I think this work is so challenging. Because you can justify any kind of content to any kind of motivation. And you can frame it in all sorts of different ways. So, figuring out what are those? I mean I don't know if I know yet. But I'm also not in a content creation role, so there's that as well.

10:02 V: Yeah. Well, and at your stage, you know, I guess to your point, we've already justified creating the content. At that point, it's more saying, I suppose, 'how do those motivations tie to Kauffman's interests and what we want to communicate, too?' Because ideally that alignment exists.

K: Right.

10:27 V: That being said, I'm curious just if you can give me a sense about how actively you're thinking about the people you're creating or building this content for. You know, when you're thinking about tone and voice, what goes into that? What are you looking for?

10:46 K: So, I think about it in terms of search engine optimization. So, if we're trying to reach a certain group, how can we implement search terms into the final product so that they may be able to find that content? But I think that most of figuring the tone and the voice is during the editing process between the writer and the editor of that piece. So, I don't shape that as much as I probably could.

V: Yeah. Yeah.

11:31 V: Do you maybe have an example of when you were maybe really considering audiences recently? Or maybe something to kind of ground that in? I've tried to get an idea of how people visualize this in their work, too.

11:46 K: So, we're working on moving Education Rising, which is on an old template, over to a new template. With that move, I've been thinking about who is really the target audience for all this content? Because there seems to be content geared toward a certain set of people versus content on the same website that's to a different set of people. Which is fine. You can have multiple audiences, but having clarity around editorially what is the story that we're trying to tell with this website? And can we think bigger picture? So, I've been thinking about that. That's going to be a larger conversation with the key stakeholders on that one.

12:36 V: That's a neat example because I think when we use the word content and consider story. I think some people have a default view of, oh, a story is a video or an article. But then to think a whole website could be telling a story. A whole interactive data visualization could be a story. Like, I really admire the work that we did Kauffman Indicators, and I've brought up in conversation that that is also storytelling. Those numbers reflect real people. So, I think it's really cool to see us doing that work and using all of that in different ways.

13:22 K: It's interesting because when I first learned about the editorial strategy, I was like, 'Oh. This is Currents. This is narrative. Beginning, middle, end storytelling.' I also have a degree in creative writing, so when I hear storytelling, I think of that narrative kind of cadence. But it really is broader than that. It's storytelling that breaks out of Currents, and it's also on your social media. It's also, like you said, in websites. It's data visualizations and GIFs. It's still something that I'm wrapping my head around, but it's like a constellation of all these different assets across all these different channels that collectively tell this one message, this one story.

14:19 V: Yeah, and that provides different entry points for different people. Very cool.

K: Mhmm.

14:25 V: I know that you've sat in on a lot of our weekly editorial meetings. And while you're maybe not responsible for writing a story at all points, I'm curious how adopting this new editorial approach has affected, in your opinion, what we decide to cover.

14:41 V: You talked a little bit about how we're shifting away from thinking about just events or very programmatic articulations of this.

14:51 K: Yeah. Moving away from, 'Here's "Ideas at Work," we need three stories: education, entrepreneurship and Kansas City to feed the weekly "Ideas at Work" beast, if you will. I feel like I bring value to those meetings in just asking, 'which typology are we thinking about here? And what's the coverage area of this piece?' Because it could be super intuitive to some people, but I need to really see that spelled out and have a conversation about it.

15:28 K: So that's been helpful. And then the main reason why I go to those meeting is for transparency in workflow. Like what's going to be coming onto my plate at any given moment. I like to be at the forefront of that as much as possible.

15:44 V: Yeah. Yeah. I've noticed that you are one of the first people to ask for that clarity on how does this tie back? Or what does this relate to? Because as someone who may be coming into that process later, if you know upfront what's already been discussed, it makes your work a lot easier and you have a lot more context. Kind of the downfall of it being run by the Keiths and Julies of the world is they've probably already had that conversation, and we're all walking into it later on.

16:12 K: Yeah. I do know that they talk a lot and try to really be able to articulate in a clear and concise way to the rest of us. Because it is a very ambiguous soft squishy kind of thing, editorial. Like I said before, you can justify any which way, so I'm glad that they take the time to try to figure out what the best approach is ahead of time. Because we could talk in circles for hours about what the best approach is, and they're closest to the work and understand it much more innately than I do. So, I appreciate their expertise.

V: Yeah. Of course. I mean, they're trying to shepherd us through this and it's hard. I totally agree.

17:00 V: I'm curious from your viewpoint how stories are being planned and pitched at this meeting. Has that really changed with the structure of the meeting changing? Or does it still feel like it's still this squishy thing that we're working out?

17:18 K: Well, I know when I was first hired on our weekly editorial meetings were more based on looking at the Teamwork calendar and seeing what events were happening in the next couple of weeks. Knowing that an RFP was going out or we were going to have a convening of some kind would then be the deciding factor as to whether or not a piece was written. So, I assume that that still happens, and I know that Julie has kind of a working doc between our directors of engagement so that she has a really good sense of what is coming up. And then she can think about, 'OK. This is event is happening, but what's the "why" behind this event and how can we take that event to a higher level? And tell the story of that event to a broader audience.'

V: Mhmm

18:18 K: I think, too, we are shifting more toward trying to make sure that our storytelling is relevant to an outside world. Which means keeping your ear to the ground for news that is happening outside of these walls and outside of our programs that are still relevant to the work that we do, so that we become people in that conversation and relevant to people who are not invited to certain events.

18:51 V: Yeah. Yeah. I think that's been one of the most intriguing portions of our meetings that we've started to add. It's kind of that 10 to 15 minutes to discussing trends that are happening and seeing. I think Chris has done a great job of plugging some stuff in there and I've seen a couple people speak up, too. It's cool for one to see what news everyone is interested in. But two, I think relevance is such a huge thing that we're trying to incorporate now, too, because we've kind of shifting away from this mindset, 'Well what is Kauffman doing?' And that's going to set the agenda. Whereas now our audiences are really setting the agenda for us and telling us what conversations they're interested in having.

K: Exactly.

V: Cool.

19:40 V: So, in this next section, I really want to kind of shift to talking about these channels in our work. And how adopting a new editorial approach has affected the way we use them or the way we value channels. Especially if story is supposed to come first. Or audience. I don't know. That's becoming less clear by the minute.

20:04 K: Story-first approach: What's the story we're trying to tell? And then, OK, we have a story in mind. OK, who's our audience? And how can we best reach that audience is how I think we determine what goes on what channel.

20:21 K: I think that that is a slow and steady shift. Because originally it was like everything has to be a Currents piece and if it's not a Currents piece, where does it live? We don't know. But I think that there have been stories that are pitched or ideas that are pitched during our weekly editorial that we've said, 'Oh that would be a really good Twitter thread.' Or, 'Oh. That could be a really great Facebook Live.'

20:58 K: So, we're breaking out of the traditional, 'We're going to write a long-form piece that's going to go on our website and we're going to put it in "Ideas at Work" and that's how we're going to get everything out.' I'm curious about the data behind how those decisions are made. I'm really interested in seeing how that all works. I think there's obviously value to tailoring your stories to different channels, but how do you decide which channel is used?

21:37 V: Yeah. I don't know if we really have data on that yet. I think that we have a lot of good frameworks going in now. I think that's a lot of what people have said, too. It's going to take some time to define what's really been actionable and how we've defined this.

21:58 V: You brought up the idea of a constellation of content. Can you maybe explain that a little bit and your own understanding of what that means?

22:05 K: A constellation of content would be you take a higher-level story and you tell it in different ways across different channels. So, you may have a Currents piece, but then you also have some Facebook posts, and you also have some Twitter posts. And they may be telling the same story, but they are tailored to those channels so that it feels native to the channels. Because you don't want to regurgitate. Something that works on Facebook isn't going to work on Twitter necessarily. It's, to your point earlier, it's different entry points for people because you have different channels that different typologies get that information from. So, if you can activate them across a broader landscape of social channels, then you're more likely to get people into the funnel.

23:00 V: Yeah. It's interesting that you say it doesn't necessarily work on Facebook the same way it does on Twitter. I think a lot of that goes back to just your understanding of audience and knowing that not every typology, not every audience is going to be in the same place. And those different entry points might provide different facets of the same piece. It can provide that different motivation, that different understanding of this interest. And maybe a different voice in that conversation.

23:30 K: And understanding how your audience uses those channels. What content are they consuming?

V: And for what reason?

K: And for what reason. Exactly.

V: Yeah.

23:49 V: Do you still feel like we have value structure to our channels? Like are we still setting Kauffman Currents above other things? Or are we trying to move away from that?

24:06 K: Hmmm. How do you define value? Like what do you mean?

24:10 V: I guess if you were to imagine a hierarchy of some sort of our channels, do you feel that some are put above others? Or are we trying to break that down more?

24:26 K: So, like are some held to a higher standard? Or are they like prioritized more than other channels?

V: Yeah. I think priority is probably the better word.

24:35 K: So, I still think we use Kauffman Currents a lot, but recently that's been a shift. We're much more comfortable saying, 'That doesn't make sense as a Currents piece, but rather that makes sense in some other format.' I don't know. I don't know if I would say we prioritize one channel over the other. But we have different metrics for each channel, so we measure them differently.

K: Yeah. I don't know. That's a very interesting question.

25:17 K: I know that we've built out a really robust audience on Twitter, because Twitter is our oldest or one of our oldest social media channels. So, we probably spend more time feeding the beast of Twitter than we do like Instagram, for example. But that's because Instagram is also newer, and we're trying to add a visual element to something that is not a product, which is also really challenging.

25:48 V: Yeah. I mean, when you envision what an entrepreneur is it's hard to think of what image comes to mind. It's a very abstract concept for most people. But I really appreciate the way you talk about. I think it is interesting to see the parallel between what channels we're comfortable, with and see that comfort come from the audience that we've built there. So, we know that people are there. We know that people are engaging and interacting. And we kind of know what they expect. So, maybe we use those channels more not because we think of them as more or less valuable, but just because that trust that understanding with our audience is already built.

K: Mhmm.

26:33 V: And so, it's easier to create content for that piece than it is to say, 'I'm going to create this thing for Instagram and maybe it'll work. Maybe people will like it.'

26:44 K: Right. Right. And you have to take into consideration the algorithms of all those channels as well. Facebook's algorithm I feel like changes every two seconds. So, how do you use the algorithm to your advantage, but then reach the audience you're trying to reach with the right content that motivates them? It's challenging.

27:12 K: Kauffman.org doesn't have an algorithm. I guess, well, the algorithm to Kauffman.org is search engine optimization, right?

27:18 V: Mhmm.

27:20 K: So, search engines have an algorithm. Everything is an algorithm.

27:24 V: It's interesting to see that those are really more of our constraints now. I mean we still have a newsletter that we're filling almost every week. We still have some things, some pressures to update our website and do all of that. But it's interesting to see so many of these other constraints come from external forces rather than ones that we've created internally.

27:48 K: And I think something that we've broken out of in terms of constraints is with "Ideas at Work" we used to be like, 'Oh. "Ideas at Work" is only going to be Kauffman content.' At least, that was the pattern that I saw. But now we're more comfortable with linking to external resources, external stories that still ladder up to the themes that we care about and the values that we have.

28:14 V: So, there's a little bit of an aggregation piece there, too, now. Yeah.

28:20 K: Mhmm. Playing into that relevance piece as well.

28:24 V: Yeah. I mean, I think time is one of our big constraints, too. If we want to be relevant, we can't do all the reporting in the world. That's not our main business function. So, if we want to tackle all of these conversations, we don't have the capacity to do that level of storytelling. Yet. Maybe we'll get there.

28:46 K: Yeah. I think it's challenging to enter that constantly changing news cycle when the strategies behind our pillars are constantly in flux as well. So, it's. And that's the challenge that we're facing now in terms of coverage areas. How much can we tell a story that is relevant to our values and how much are we still needing to tie it back to a programmatic strategy, if that makes sense? Like, can we tell stories that have nothing to do with Kauffman, but tie to a value that Kauffman has? Or can it be, or should it be more like, 'here's what we're doing in Entrepreneurship?'

29:38 V: Yeah. We still have that programmatic battle of does it have to be that tightly tied? Or can it just be... In order to build rapport with this audience, we have to be speaking their language and meeting them where they are and being part of the conversation, they're having in real time, whether or not that aligns perfectly with what we do.

29:58 K: And it's tough because representing the foundation, you want to represent the work that we're doing in an accurate way. You don't want to make program officers feel uncomfortable where they're like, 'Oh, that's not what we're doing here.' So, it's a balance.

30:14 V: For sure.

30:18 V: You've mentioned algorithms and you've mentioned metrics. So, I do want to be cognizant of just how adopting this new editorial approach has affected the way we evaluate our stories' performance and how we understand success in our work. Whether or not that was firmly understood before, I have no idea.

30:41 K: I don't know either. It's really tough. That's something that...It's hard to put a metric to catalyzing change, which I think is our end goal. So, you can measure the reach of something. You can measure how much people are engaging with it. They're liking it. They're sharing it. They're commenting on our website. You can measure conversion points. So, say someone clicks on our Chanel piece, and then funnels into becoming someone who applies for a grant or something.

31:31 K: I don't know if we can measure that super well right now because we don't have a login system to our website. All that being said, you can measure all of those things, but then how do you know that you're reaching the right people? Maybe you're reaching the right people because of engagement. But then if they're engaging, how do you measure whether or not they're making changes in society that will reduce those barriers for economic success for other people? That's very hard to measure.

32:06 V: Especially when who we consider the right people is constantly changing, too. You know, they might be the right person in an education context, but they might be a little bit out of alignment when it comes to entrepreneurship or something like that. That might be something they're interested in but maybe not ever going to be motivated enough to make a change.

K: Mhmm.

32:26 V: But since we cover both, they might wind up in that funnel.

K: Right, right.

32:34 V: All of that measurement is so key, but I also have been interested to understand in people's own words, how would you describe a successful story. Like if you had to choose 3 or 4 words, what would come to mind?

33:09 K: Hm. I don't know. Three to four words?

V: Yeah.

33:13 V: Maybe it's helpful...I don't know if you...Do you feel like we have an example of successful work under this new approach?

33:23 K: Yeah. So, Julie has used this example a lot, but the Facebook Live for Inclusion Open. That converted into hundreds of applications for that program because you were telling the story of the importance of that RFP in a way that really resonated with your target audience. So that would be a great way to say that that was successful. But that's a metric that you find out later. In the moment of the Facebook Live, you don't know how many of those people are going to be applying for the grant or not. But in the moment, I thought it was interesting to take a look at the amount of viewers throughout the duration of the video. Because if it's irrelevant to a bunch of people, they're going to click in, watch for a couple seconds, and click back out because it's not what they expected. But we had a very steady consistent viewership throughout the entirety of the Facebook Live. So, that gave me confidence to say, 'We are talking to the right people.' Or at least the people that are interested in this work, whether or not they're qualified for the grant. Or whatever, that's different.

34:58 K: So that's a call to action, right? There's a specific conversion point end goal from doing that Inclusion Open.

35:11 V: Yeah. So that event is an example of something that, to your point, was highly relevant. It was highly engaging. And even though it was both of those things, it was still informative, and it motivated some action.

35:27 K: Yeah. And it spoke the language of the people that we're trying to reach. It wasn't like us being like gatekeepers to the money. We really wanted to level with people. And be like, 'Ask us your questions. We want to be as transparent as possible throughout this process.' Like, here's what we're looking for, but we also don't have all the answers. That's something that, as a foundation, I've heard we're really trying to move towards. Like maybe we weren't so much in the past, but based off our community work, we want to work with people that are more representative of the pain points in the community. Because we can't come at it from a top-down approach. You know what I mean? Research has shown that doesn't work.

36:27 V: You've got to work along with them rather than top-down. Yeah. Yeah. I think that's been a really interesting shift in. You know, I didn't work in nonprofit fields before this, so it's interesting to see us play such an active role in trying to help people feel like they're supported and give that support right alongside them. Rather than being like,

'Well, maybe someone will grant me this support.' Whether that's monetary or in the form of being recognized and validated through storytelling, through some of other format of support that Kauffman gives. It is really interesting to see that through our work.

37:16 V: With that being said, do you feel like that shift toward trying to inspire change, is that tied to this new editorial approach and maybe emphasized by that, or was that there before?

37:30 K: That's a great question that I don't have historical knowledge to answer really. I would assume that the Kauffman Foundation has always been trying to enact positive change in the community. I mean, you go back to Mr. Kauffman and how he was so philanthropic before even starting the foundation. He brought baseball back to Kansas City because he wanted to give back to the city that gave him so much opportunity. And so, I don't know how that has evolved over time, but I think that's always been a constant. In any nonprofit you want to leave the community in a better place than how you found it.

V: Sure.

38:22 V: I'm curious what role you feel storytelling has in that. And how it's an effective way to do that.

38:34 Storytelling adds that human element to the work that we do. It allows people to connect to the work that we do in different ways. People are not going to change. They're not going to engage unless they are motivated to do so, and I think that storytelling is an avenue in which to motivate people to understand what we do, and relate to it, and act.

39:14 V: It's funny that you bring up how hard it is to get people to change. This is something that came up in a couple conversations, and I think we touched on it a bit in our quarterly meeting. Which, unfortunately, not everyone was a part of, but hopefully people are hearing about some of those conversations and they'll continue. But, you know, the Kauffman Foundation isn't a for-profit business. Editorial stories aren't the product we're selling, as much as we might wish they would be. We're really in the business of giving money away. So, if nothing is motivating us to make a change in our editorial approach, then why are we doing it?

39:53 K: What do you mean nothing is motivating us to change our editorial approach?

40:00 V: Like, no one from on high is saying we need to change the way Public Affairs works. This wasn't something that someone told Keith and Julie they had to do. So, why do this at all? Why make this change?

40:15 K: Well, I think when Larry came on there was a shift. That's why we went from Communications to Public Affairs, because we shifted from fulfilling the immediate communications need to being a strategic partner with our program officers across the foundation.

40:42 K: And, you know, as we are shifting our work to be more community-focused and as we are learning more about what the community actually needs, we need to be able to also relate to them in order to find the right people for our RFPs, for our grants. And I think that storytelling is more successful in doing that than, say, releasing a press release to a major media outlet. Which we still do, because we still find people that way, but there's a difference in tone and target audience between a press release and a story.

41:36 V: Why do you feel that way? Like what's different about it to you?

41:41 K: Well story. Press releases are very formalized. It's...I haven't written a press release in so long, so I need to like get back into that headspace. You're really telling. Your target audience for the press release are media companies, in order for them to pick it up and write a story. So, you're not targeting the people that you're trying to reach for that initiative. Does that make sense? So, us taking control of the storytelling aspect allows us to communicate more directly with our target audience versus trying to shape what we're doing in order to be picked up by a media company that may not have the target audience that we're even looking for anyway.

42:44 V: Yeah. So, it's just more direct and it's more personal.

K: Yeah.

42:52 V: You're like one of the first people to talk about press releases so that's interesting to hear a different perspective.

43:02 V: I'm curious how then you view what does it mean to be a strategic partner. I know we use that in our vernacular here at the foundation, but how do you understand that as far as being strategic partners for our programs but then also strategic partners by extension to the community, to the people that we're talking to?

43:23 K: Well, we're strategic partners in that we help people tell the story of what they're doing through storytelling through our editorial strategy. And I think that the editorial strategy with its...it touches everything that we do, so it's not just Keith and Julie saying we need to write stories, and we need tell stories. It's more like our strategy behind if someone comes to us and says I need an email, we say, 'Why? Who are you trying to reach? What is the purpose behind this email? What is the motivation behind this event that you're throwing?' And once we have the goal in mind, we can then relay that information in a way that relates to their target audience in the way that it makes the most sense.

44:13 K: So, in that way we're strategic partners rather than just the vehicle to get email out.

44:23 V: Gotcha.

44:25 V: Yeah, I mean. I think about that being the vendors — I mean not vendors — the clients that we hire and what we do internally. Obviously, the people that we bring in from the outside, they're still thinking about strategy, too, but we internally have a better understanding and can really ask those 'why' questions about purpose, about audience. All of that.

44:51 K: Yeah, because we're motivated differently than our clients are, right?

V: Sure.

V: Well, I want to be mindful of time. We're wrapping up a little bit early. So, I know you were a little hesitant to be part of this process. Is there anything that you want to circle back to or felt like you didn't get to expand on? I want to make sure I give you that time.

45:25 K: I think that there's a still a lot that I need to learn about how to articulate our editorial strategy. I think that there's so many ways that you can approach it, and it's hard for me to articulate because I'm not part of strategy at this current moment in my career. So, I'm excited by what I'm hearing. I think there's still some work to be done to articulate what an example of success is or like taking something that we've done and putting it through the editorial wheelhouse and seeing what comes out. But I'm excited for when that happens.

46:24 V: Yeah. One thing that I hope will come out of kind of having all these interviews with everyone is being able to provide — at least internally, maybe not in what I publish — just a sense of what people do want help articulating. What conversations people do want to be having even if they're maybe not involved in that strategy development for our team early on or very intensely.

46:53 K: I think. I mean. Larry says editorial is everything, right? But in our quarterly conversation there was some confusion around is editorial everything? Or is editorial one thing and operational communication is another? I think once we have clarity around that, then we'll have a better sense of how we can all plug in and make this strategy have legs. Do you know what I mean?

47:29 V: Yeah.

APPENDIX Q: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – KATEY STOETZEL

00:07 Valerie: So, I'm going to get started. I just want to start off, if you can, so I can tell these recordings apart. Tell me your name and how long you've been working for the Kauffman Foundation.

00:16 Katey: My name is Katey Stoetzel, and I've been here for about 11 months.

V: Ok. Tell me a little bit, you know, during that time frame of what kind of work you've been doing here. So, either for the editorial team or, you know, for the Entrepreneurship department.

K: So, let's see. Most of my work is around email marketing. When I first started, it was a lot of copy editing, proofreading stuff as I was kind of, you know, learning the ropes. But the large part is the email marketing. Although, I do, I have written for editorial. Some of the Currents pieces, anything else that has to do with other ways to tell stories if it's through like social media platforms or email campaigns or something like that.

V: Cool. So, yeah. So, you've done a little bit of reporting. You've done a little bit of writing. You've been pretty involved with the editorial team. It seems like that's kind of how things started out for you, right?

K: Um, yeah. I think so, yeah.

01:22 V: Mhmm

01:23 V: Then, tell me a little bit, too, about you know, your experience with these conversations around a new editorial approach. So, you've been meeting with Atlantic 57, but I don't know when you kind of got roped into those meetings.

01:38 K: Well, I think the only time I was ever a participant in those meetings were like the larger editorial meetings that we would do. So, I can't remember the first time. Maybe in like August was when... I don't know the timeline, but it must have been at like a weekly editorial or one of the monthly editorial meetings where it was kind of like we were putting aside our main editorial meeting to talk about Atlantic 57 stuff. Um, and then there was, and then we like set aside time for the larger editorial meeting. Like, when Atlantic 57 would come on site, we'd like schedule a 3-hourlong whatever meeting kind of thing.

K: So, it was never an, it was always with the larger group where everyone was there.

02:35 V: Gotcha.

02:36 V: So, knowing that you've kind of been through this — I think our work with Atlantic 57 started in May, and I think the larger team was brought into it later in the

summer. Just, from your perspective, can you give me an overview of just what this new editorial approach is. So, how would you define it?

02:53 K: I think they're really wanting to from what I understand since I don't sit up on that floor, I feel like there is a little bit of disconnect.

But, from what I understand it seems like they want to do more longer form stories. Whether that's, whether that's you know based off of word count like going from 500-word story to maybe like 1500-words to just tell more personalized story-first approach. Or doing like a series of stuff.

I think that, like when we were talking about the government shutdown, it seemed like that was going to be a series of stories, but I don't know what happened to it. But that's what I'm coming to understand, especially with like the typologies stuff. You can definitely, based on the typology, like figure out you know certain series of posts you could do or articles you could do, whether it's about education or entrepreneurship or KC Civic or whatever...Because I know...I don't know when they stopped just doing press releases or research-based stuff, but ever since I've gotten here it's always been we're trying to do more story-focused articles.

V: Mhmm. Yeah, I think that fits with what I've kind of heard with all the conversations I've been a part of since I started here, too. While you've kind of in the middle of that change, what do you feel is kind of like the primary goals of changing toward more of this personalized, story-first approach?

K: Well, I think it allows us to have more...I don't know how to word this.

05:07 K: I don't want to say that it allows us to have more of a leg to stand on, because I think the research allowed us that, too. But putting a story around that research makes it easier to grasp, and I feel like it can make us a part of the conversation better.

05:23 K: This is just a personal opinion. I don't know if this is what, you know, why they want to do this. But the way I see it is allowing us to have this more story-first approach where we're not ignoring the research, but the research will help amp up the story.

05:47 K: But allowing us to tell stories of entrepreneurs and people that are on the ground working in the field, it's easier to grasp for audience members if they're reading our stuff. I mean, anyone likes reading stories. I mean, I don't know who doesn't. Rather than just reading a bunch of data points.

06:14 V: Is that where like personalization kind of comes into play. We're thinking about audiences more.

06:20 K: Yeah. I think people can relate to it better if they're reading a story about someone that maybe they know or they've heard of and when they're reading that story they can see themselves in it, rather than reading a bunch of data points.

06:37 V: Or a press release that's not really intended for them, right?

K: Yeah. Exactly.

V: Yeah. That makes sense.

06:43 V: So, I kind of want to shift toward talking about a few different areas of where this might be affecting your work. So, the first area I really want to talk about is just, you know, audiences in general. So, understanding how adopting this new approach is affecting the way we think about and consider audiences in our work.

K: Mhmm

V: So, you mentioned the typologies. From your perspective, could you kind of give me an overview, what are these audiences or typologies that Kauffman is looking to engage with?

07:15 K: So, it seems like there are a few specific ones that we're really targeting. And that's like the practitioners, the collaborators and the futurists. I think those are the ones, every time we're in an editorial meeting, we kind of always talk about them. There's also champions and inquirers. But, the champions are the ones that are already on our side, so we don't really need to spend a lot of time trying to reach them.

And the inquirers we've talked about how like, "Why would we spend a whole bunch of our work and effort trying to convince them?" So, I think those three middle ones are who we talk about a lot in editorial meetings.

08:10 V: Would you say that those audiences are more aspirational, like they're not as built-in like the champions are?

K: What do you mean?

V: Like do we already have an established relationship with them?

08:29 K: So, yes and no. Certain people, yes, but there's a million other collaborators out there that probably don't know who we are that we want to collaborate with. Practitioners are usually our grantees, so those are pretty much already inherently established.

[inaudible]

08:57 V: So, a mix of both.

K: Yeah

V: Cool. No, no, that makes sense. It is interesting to see kind of how we've phased out the inquirers and some of the champions. I definitely see that, too, so.

09:10 V: You know, kind of thinking about press releases and who you were engaging with before, how is thinking about a typology different from just thinking about an audience in general. What sets that apart for you when you think about typologies?

09:25 K: That's an interesting question because I feel like since we've moved into typologies, I haven't really written a Currents piece since like August. And I still feel like we're in this transition phase of actually really focusing in on those typologies when we write stuff.

09:50 K: But I would imagine it would make writing it a little bit easier if you're aware of the audience you're writing to. So, if you're writing something that's like the future of education or the future of the economy, whatever, obviously you're targeting futurists. I feel like that one is pretty easy to nail down. But that would make sense.

10:23K: I feel like it gives you sort of a framework in your head. It's a framework, but I feel like it's pretty malleable, especially the more you keep writing your article. I don't think the typologies are meant to be set in stone because I also feel like we've talked about how a person can be a collaborator and a practitioner. So, they kind of cross-contaminate a bit. So even if you're writing something that's about the future of the economy or the future of education, the futurists could also be collaborators.

11:13 K: I think it helps in some ways, but I think you also have to be careful to not dig yourself in a hole if you're so focused on, like, "this is who my audience is." If you're so focused on that you might leave behind other audience members.

11:30 V: It's interesting that you use the word cross-contaminate because I think in talking about this a little bit with other people, typologies on one end is more helpful as a framework because it guides you more toward, like you said, a futurist is probably interested in these innovations in the work that we do. So, it's more about interests rather than just who these people are. Because interests can kind of move and change, right?

11:57 K: Exactly. Yeah. Yeah I like that it's more about interests than who the people are, because people can be anything. And they have many interests. So, yeah. I like that word.

12:13 V: Yeah. It's interesting because when I was kind of writing these questions, people asked well, 'how are we tracking demographics?' And from my understanding — you might feel differently just based on the work that you do — we're not as interested in what the make-up of our audiences are as far as women and men and people of color. I mean, does that kind of — is that kind of true to you? I mean I don't feel like the typologies really apply against like we want to see diversity. It's kind of a different conversation

12:43 K: Yeah. I feel like we've never really talked about that when we talk about the typologies. It might have happened in one of those very first Atlantic 57 meetings in which they presented their original findings. I think they were going over who they interviewed, and they might have broken it down by demographics then. But, beyond that, I don't really think that's come up in the conversation at all.

13:10 V: Yeah. I know another piece of understanding these typologies or our audiences is really about values as well as those interests. So, from what conversations you've heard and what stories we've been working on, what do you feel like are the values — and that might be tied to interests, too — that these audiences kind of hold?

13:36 K: Can you expand a little bit?

13:38 Yeah. So, when thinking about the practitioners, the collaborators, these typologies, what is it about them that defines them? Which values or which interests really matter to them?

13:55 K: OK. I think I guess it depends on the typology, but I think everyone. I don't want to generalize, but I think everyone that we want to try, and reach are everyone's wanting to work towards a better economy. And bringing the voices of entrepreneurs to life. I would imagine that's what everyone wants. I don't know. I feel like that wasn't a good answer.

14:37 That's OK. No. I think that's important, because what we consider a better economy makes up some those interests, too, right?

K: Yeah

14:45 K: Yeah, and they might be very specific. The futurists are going to be looking toward more innovative and fringe ideas while ecosystem builders are pretty focused on the community aspect of stuff.

15:06 K: The overarching thing might be the same, but the very specifics of how everyone's doing that are going to be different.

15:13 V: Sure

15:16 I'm curious about this, too. I mean, do you feel like knowing that about each of the typologies that we're working to communicate through our stories those same values and interests?

15:36 K: I'm not sure, because we've established these typologies, but I don't, I haven't seen us really talk about them while someone's working on the story, you know? And maybe it's just because I haven't been involved in writing a story. And I just hear about other people's stories while we're in the editorial meeting. But when we're going over stuff in the editorial meeting, no one ever really brings up the typologies.

16:09 V: Mhmm

16:09 K: I don't know if you've noticed that. Have you noticed that?

16:13 V: Somewhat. I feel like it's a conversation that kind of gets sidelined in the planning process to maybe some of Julie and Keith's roles.

K: Yeah.

16:24 V: For instance, I got some edits back on a story I'm working on right now, and it kind of said, 'We're looking to identify and talk to these kinds of people.' So, there was a little bit of that, but that's not like a 1-to-1 conversation we had.

K: Got it.

16:40 K: Yeah, because I guess I'm not sure either. What typology are we trying to reach? Is that decided upfront before you start the story? Which, I imagine it has to be. But then, like how much are you thinking about it while you're writing something?

V: Yeah

17:02 K: I don't know, because I haven't been a part of process. To me, I don't know if this is just a personal thing. I would have a hard time. I don't know if it helps to just be having that on your mind the whole time you're going through the writing process. I think I would be more comfortable being like, 'OK, this is the typology I'm reaching for, but I'm not going to focus on that as I'm writing the story.'

17:35 K: Because then I just feel like I tie myself down to something. It's sort of like when you write an outline for a story, whether it's a fiction story or an article or whatever, it doesn't mean you necessarily have to stick to it. Because if you're having issues writing it, you should be able to expand or change direction if you need to.

18:01 V: I guess that's where you start to see the relationship between story and audience in the work that we do. Just because, I mean, we say story first. And so, I think what you're saying kind of confirms that. You know, we're thinking about audiences and we're kind of aware of them when we set out to tell a story. But, the story will change however it does. That doesn't necessarily mean that the audience has been lost.

18:29 K: Yeah, exactly. And is it OK if you decide halfway through the story like, 'It's not working reaching this audience,'? But maybe if I switch it to a practitioner level, the story works better there. Like, is it OK to do that?

18:45 K: I just think maybe that's why we don't talk about it a lot in editorial, because it shouldn't be the most concrete thing about the writing process. I feel like just focus on the story. That's my two cents.

19:12 V: Well, I think that makes sense. I mean, I've kind of thought about it abstractly as, "We think story-first, audience-second." Because the nature of our typologies can shift, I guess I understand that the story might change and so will the typologies. So, there's no way to know if things are going to match up perfectly. That doesn't mean a story is not worth telling, and that doesn't mean that an audience won't find interest in it.

19:41 K: But I also want to say it is important to know who you're writing for, obviously. But, I would worry that while we're establishing this new set of parameters for our editorial process, being aware that it's not be-all-end-all once you start a story.

20:06 V: No, no that makes sense. No, that really does make sense because I think I feel that way, too, in my work. It's something that is conscious on a minimal level, but it definitely as the story changes, I don't feel like, 'Oh, well now I'm getting away from this audience, and I'm not doing my job.'

K: Yeah.

20:27 V: It's interesting though, can you give me a sense of whether or not thinking about these kinds of typologies comes to play when you think about creating content in other spaces like not necessarily for Kauffman Currents? Or are you thinking about this too in your work in emails and all of that, or is it different?

20:51 K: It's a little bit different. I don't really think of it as, 'I'm talking to practitioners.' Mostly because that's who I am talking to. I just think about of them as the grantees because I write a lot of the emails for like Jason's grantees. Or Natalie's grantees. Or, you know whoever. That's just how I think of it. And there's a certain way that you talk to them, I guess. But I don't think of it in those terms. And I think it's only because I've only ever written emails to people on the practitioner level.

21:30 K: Now, I am getting ready to do a new project that's for policymakers specifically. So, that will be a little bit different because they are...they would be a different typology I think. Would they? What would they fall under? Collaborator?

21:49 V: That's what I would think, but I guess I think that because they have a little more authority in the same way that Kauffman does.

21:57 K: Yeah because practitioners are people that are on the ground working.

22:03 V: Well, and I don't know if this is true of your understanding of policymakers, but I feel like we treat them as collaborators. As like a bridge between entrepreneurs and the organizations and powers that be.

K: Yeah

22:18 V: OK. Yeah, I mean I think that makes sense. It makes sense that inherently we have some audiences that we know better, and like we can identify them as practitioners. But that's more solid in some cases than others.

22:37 V: So, keeping that in mind, we've touched on the messiness of this process in some ways and just how things have changed. I want to get a sense of how adopting this approach has kind of affected what we decide to tell as stories. So, I mean, you might know just from being in meetings, but what would you say are the kinds of topics we're interested in covering under this new approach?

23:08 K: I know where you can find all those topics listed. Which is on the squid burger. And honestly I have a terrible memory, so I don't remember what those five things are, but I know like community is in there. The future of work might be in there, too. Those are the coverage areas.

23:34 K: I feel like those are a little bit more helpful than typologies just in terms of understanding what kinds of stories we want. I do think. I don't remember. I think I wrote my first Currents thing in June last year. And, they were pretty...They weren't like hot topic things.

24:07 K: I mean it was just about...one was about KC Source Link and their 15-year anniversary. And then another one was about; I wrote another one about the Startup Champions Network and their new grant. Which, on the surface level, those are kind of boring. No offense to them, but kind of boring topics for a Currents article. And honestly, ever since I wrote them stuff like that hasn't come up in editorial anymore. I feel like we are looking for some of the more hot topic kind of articles to write, which I like. Because I thought my KC Source Link story was good, but that's not what I want to read on the blog of a foundation that supports entrepreneurship.

25:09 V: Why do you feel that way? Do you feel like it's just irrelevant or?

25:12 K: Not irrelevant. It does go into some stuff that's 'this is what's happening in Kansas City specifically.' I guess I like more of the hot topic articles.

25:28 V: When you say hot topic, do you mean like current issues or bigger conversations happening?

25:34 K: Current issues, yeah. Like the government shutdown one. I feel like Chris always pitches good topics to do a deep dive on. I just like deep dive articles. I don't know.

25:50 V: So, it's more, do you feel like that transition in content is now less one-off, or kind of event-focused and more around a larger conversation or a larger topic, rather?

26:07 K: Larger topic, I think.

26:14 K: Because I also think, I don't know if this is true because I don't feel like I have enough evidence of this. But it does seem like we are, for events that happen, like I feel like...we're getting good about saying we're not just going to write about this event because it's an event that's going on. We're looking for the story for it.

26:49 K: For example, yesterday I asked Julie if there were any editorial plans for Hill Day, and I was expecting an answer that was like, 'Yeah, someone's going to write a Currents blog about them going.' Because, these aren't the same events, but that's kind of what happened for the EPN gathering last year, which I wrote that one. But actually, she said they have this whole photo essay, audio combination planned. And I was like, 'Oh, that cool. We're not just doing a Currents blog on it.'

27:29 K: I feel like I'm getting away from my answer.

27:30 V: No, that's OK. No, I think that helps. I kind of wanted to circle back to one thing. You mentioned that you feel like the coverage areas are more helpful. Can you talk to me a little bit more about that? How are they helpful in the storytelling process more so than just, like you're saying, 'We have this event, so we're going to write something.'

27:54 K: I think they're helpful because it's a place to start looking for stories. You can look at the coverage areas and be like, 'OK, what fits under this coverage area?' And then you can literally find any sort of topic in that coverage area, and you've got it. I don't know.

[inaudible crosstalk]

28:16 V: So, it's more of a framework for guiding work rather than just saying, 'Here's an event, go make something of it.'

K: Yeah

28:24 K: And I guess I shouldn't say like...OK. The better answer: They're easier to grasp than typologies. Because I feel like we're still working with typologies, whereas the coverage areas are really like 'these are the kinds of stories we're going to focus on.'

V: They're just a little more concrete in that way.

K: Yeah. That might just be a me thing.

28:52 V: That's totally OK. That's why I'm talking to a bunch of us.

28:56 So, I want to dig a little bit into the process as well. I know that you've stressed that you're not really involved in this at this point, but I imagine you'll get roped in in different things.

K: Yeah, it's on my list of goals, so obviously, I have to do it.

29:12 V: So, tell me a little bit how, you know from the meetings and all of that, how do you feel the process is? So how are stories kind of planned and pitched. Like, can you walk me through what that feels like or what those steps look like?

29:29 K: Yeah. Well, there's apparently an email address that you can email. And those get sent to Julie and Keith. And if there's enough information for them, I guess they go through them and decide what's going to go up on the board in Teamwork. So, there's like an on-boarding thing, and then it goes to create, and then review, and then publish, I think.

30:04 K: As far as like who gets assigned stuff, I don't really know how they decide that. But I know when I get a story it usually goes...the process of that...I get the assignment and then I talk to Kim about the high-level stuff. Like who should I talk to, what questions should I ask, what's the story about, the angle. I go off and do my work and then I write the draft. And then I send it to Kim. And then she gives me edits. And then I get it back. And then, if it's all good after I make edits, it should go to Keith and Julie. And there shouldn't be anything else to mess with.

30:57 K: Although, actually before it goes to Keith and Julie it needs to go to a program officer if it has something to do with a program officer. So, they can see it. But, by the time it reaches Keith and Julie it shouldn't have a whole lot of issues. That's not always the case.

31:15 K: And then from there, there might be a few edits back and forth with them. And then after that it should be good to go.

31:24 K: I know that has not always been the case and it's always not been the smoothest process. And there's like multiple reasons for that whether it's waiting on the program officer to look at it, waiting on the confirmation about some of the information. And I can't think of anything specifically, but maybe there wasn't enough talk upfront about what a story should have been or something. But, it's been a while since I wrote something, so I can't really speak to what that process is like.

32:03 K: Now, there was one time when I kind of cut Kim out of the process because she didn't need to be there anymore. Because she had already looked at it. But it was when we were still struggling with I think it was the Startup Champions one. And I just went directly to Julie. And we sat down for like an hour working on it, which was nice instead of there being a bunch of back and forth between people on who's editing what and who's seeing what and how many times.

32:38 K: But I feel like from what I can see in editorial meetings now, especially since we've cut them down to 30 minutes. Because at first, when it was an hour long, I feel like people tended when it was their turn to talk about a story people tended to talk and talk and talk and talk and talk about their story. And it'd just be a conversation between like Julie and the person writing it. And then it's like, 'There's 7 other people in this meeting,

and we're just taking forever. And I don't know anything about this story, so I don't really care.'

33:15 K: But by cutting it down to 30 minutes... well and usually after that's done, everyone just kind of disperses and then is like, 'Did we decide anything?' But by cutting it down to 30 minutes, I feel like we're getting better about, 'OK this person after this meeting, this person is going to go do this thing, and this person is going to go do this thing.' You know, what we've talked about on the 'Known Norms' that people should do is the next steps at the end of each meeting. And I think we're getting better about that. Even if you're not directly assigned something, but you can find out information about something, that's your next step at the end of an editorial meeting. So, it's not just about who's writing the story, but who can help with whatever, which makes it feel like more of a team effort.

34:08 V: Yeah, well, I think that makes sense because all of us play a different role as storytellers. So, I think I agree. The shorter meetings help focus our energies a little bit better, because it's not more about how can we collaborate to tell a story rather than we're just going to have a conversation, check up on one and spend the whole time on that.

34:31 V: Gotcha. It's interesting, though. I think there is still some confusion around ultimately who decides what gets covered and who has the authority to put a story on the board, so to speak. Because I think everyone can pitch now, even people outside of our team can pitch stories. But, it still is kind of unclear who ultimately decides that this is something we're going to take on. Does that feel right to you?

35:05 K: Yeah.

V: Yeah.

35:10 K: And I really like meetings that are brainstorm meetings. I'm going to bring it all back to high school for a second. But we would do story assignment meetings where everyone by the end of the meeting everyone would get a story assignment. We wouldn't sit there and have a very long conversation about what the story was, but it would be like, 'Hey, here's the story.' Well, someone would have a story idea and we'd write it up on the board and then we'd get a bunch of story ideas, and we're like, 'Who wants this?' And then we'd give a short line about, 'OK, this is what the angle is. We can talk about it later.' I feel like that doesn't happen here. I feel like the only stories that we see that are like coming up are the ones that are on on-boarding. We don't really talk about what they are, and we don't really talk about who has an idea for it. Does that make sense?

V: Mhmm.

36:23 K: I feel like I would like to see more of that.

V: More interaction, then?

36:27 K: Yeah, like what could this story be?

36:31 V: Yeah, I think we're still working that out. I think there's freedom for everyone to pitch a story, but we're still working out how to devote time to really exploring all the possible ways to tell it. Like I don't know that that's really ingrained in our process in the meetings yet. I think we have a lot of time to discuss topics with the new current events kind of thing, and kind of breaking things down into, 'We're going to spend 10 minutes talking about new issues. We're going to spend 10 minutes talking about what's in process and 10 minutes talking about what we need to do.'

37:12 K: Yeah, but we don't really talk about the new issues or hot topics or whatever that's going on. Like yesterday when Julie was talking about the 60 minutes thing and she brought up that tweet. And we talked about it for a while, and by the end of it, I'm like, 'So, what are we going to do with that?' And I feel like there's not enough of that. Like we could try to figure out something to do and maybe that's longer than a 30-minute meeting. But we talk about a lot of things and then we don't decide on them. I think we're better at deciding on, for the more concrete assignments that are coming up, we've gotten better at deciding who's going to do what to further that process. But in terms of the big story ideas up on the board — the new ones — we don't really workshop those ideas at all.

38:11 K: I mean I think we've done that a couple times but it's not every time.

38:18 V: Yeah, there's definitely not as much consistency as there could be. I agree.

38:23 V: So, I kind of want to shift to kind of the next part of that process I guess as I understand it. As, you know, we're kind of getting on this as far as how do we flesh out ideas and how do we tell them. Under this new approach, how do you feel like adopting story-first has affected the way we use different channels to tell stories.

38:46 V: So, kind of like you were saying with Julie's piece about the "60 Minutes" thing. We never really arrived at deciding what to do with it.

39:01 K: Could you repeat the question?

39:01 V: Yeah, so in thinking about some of these story ideas that have put up on the board. How then under this new approach do we think about using different channels to tell stories?

39:16 K: Well, I think we always talk about wanting to think about using different channels. And then, we don't. Or, we do, but it's mostly all relegated to Julie. Which makes sense because she's like the social media manager. But I feel like some of us could be brought in more because that's a lot of work, obviously. I feel like we could share the load on that a little bit.

39:45 K: I mean, when I've written stuff Kim has always told me when I turn in a story to Keith and Julie, like put in a couple of suggested tweets or some Facebook posts. Just as

like suggestions or something. They've never used them because they suck. But, I mean I've heard a lot of cool ideas for ways we could tell stories just on social. And I've heard Julie say that a bunch in editorial meetings, but then we never really dig into how we could do that. So, I don't know if it's always just like she has the idea and she's going to run with it.

40:33 K: I wish there was a little more planning around those and seeing how each of us can help with that.

40:40 V: Yeah.

40:43 K: Because I would like to.

40:45 K: At the ESHIP Summit last year, there were a bunch of cool ideas. Like, Kim Farley and I walked around that street party doing on-the-street interviews with people that were like those quick one-sentence 'Why do you do what you do?' thing. Actually, I think that was the question. And we were going to turn it into a little flip book video with their quote down at the bottom of it. And it was supposed to be for Instagram, but it never happened. And I'm like, 'Why didn't it ever happen? We turned in the stuff and nothing ever happened with it.'

41:28 V: Yeah. It seems like, and you can disagree either way, but it feels like adopting this approach there's a lot of talk about story placement at the beginning, but not so much when something is already in production or afterward.

41:42 K: Yeah. Well, I think that part of that is we're still very focused on having content for "Ideas at Work." There was a lot of talk about taking a break from Ideas at Work to figure some of this out and to have enough content up on Currents, so we didn't always have to be writing for the newsletter. And I don't... I haven't really seen us move away from that yet. Maybe in like some small terms, but we're still putting out "Ideas at Work."

42:23 K: Yeah, I think we've gotten better at just letting us repurpose some content if we need to. But it's still like, 'Well, we need to get something up for "Ideas at Work".'

42:37 V: Yeah, with that being said, do you feel like there are some channels like "Ideas at Work" that are more valued than others? As far as like where stories get shared.

42:54 K: I guess. I don't know. That'd be a Julie question. I know our engagement on Twitter is pretty good. We get a lot of likes and retweets on stuff. Instagram might be like a hit or miss. I know Julie posted that one picture. Oh, it was Lamar Hunt and Ewing Marion Kauffman breaking ground on the stadium, which got a lot of hits.

43:31 K: I do know that internally, especially people down on this floor, are obsessed with wanting stuff on Currents. So, I think down here, people think Currents is the be-all-end-all. Like if we don't put something on Currents then it's like we're invalidating their

work, or we're not putting focus on their work because we might not be deeming it important enough, which isn't the case at all.

44:05 K: It's that whole, you know, not writing for something for the sake of having content. But writing for a good story. And I think it's just a matter of letting people know that maybe this story isn't appropriate for Currents. It could just be an Instagram story or post or essay.

44:37 V: Do you still feel like there's a lot of confusion around like explaining to people why telling a story doesn't necessarily mean writing a Kauffman Currents piece? That telling a story can be effectively done across different platforms or channels.

44:53 K: Well, I've never had that conversation with anyone, so. I don't know. Kim has, but I don't think there's ever like been a formal platform for us to communicate that. I know we had a Cookies & Conversation once. But all I remember from that was that we showed everyone the 'Uncommon' video. I don't remember what exactly we talked about.

45:21 V: That's OK.

45:24 V: Yeah, I think that that's still an area that we're finessing, but there definitely is still some tension around, 'We still have to do "Ideas at Work".' We still are kind of set in our old ways. But, I think, like you said, there's small changes being made to get away from that and think differently. Like, I don't know what will happen with Hill Day, but that was a really good example, I think.

45:51 K: It's like we're stuck in that cycle. I was explaining yesterday when I was stuck in my own cycle of celebrity obsession. It's the same thing where we're like, 'OK, we're going to stop "Ideas at Work." And just each week we're putting it out because that's all we know.'

46:08 V: Yeah. Yeah. The last area that I kind of want to touch on is really understanding how we evaluate a story's performance under this new approach. And, I know that you might be getting a better grasp of this as you work with Chris some on analytics and on email marketing. But, that being said — analytics aside — can you give me maybe three or four words you would use to describe what you think a successful story is like under this approach?

47:05 K: I'm going to come at this at a personal angle. The way I determine if something is really getting to someone is if they retweet it. Retweet it with their own commentary or they comment on it. I don't know how much that happens on our Twitter. But it could just be the number of shares. If it's being passed around to people, and it doesn't have to be a lot of people, but if it's getting passed around between people and it's starting a conversation, then I think a story is successful.

48:02 K: I think anything that can start a conversation has done its job. Whether it's providing the opposite point or if it's an agreement, it's starting a dialogue. Which is what it should be doing.

48:23 V: Yeah, I think that's really well-said. Do you feel like you've seen a good example of that in our work lately, or not so much? Or maybe something that's getting there?

48:52 K: I'm trying to think of an example. I'm not remembering the data points, or the analytics for this. I know it went out on "Ideas at Work." I feel like the government shutdown might have had some comments on it. Commentary. It might have been shared a lot. I'd have to go back and look. I feel like I remember that being the case because it was a very tangible thing that was happening at the time and we were providing a voice, providing a perspective on it. And it was a perspective that maybe not a lot of people had considered even if there was a lot of voices on Twitter. There were a million like Twitter threads that were people talking about how they had just started a business, but now with the government shutdown they're kind of screwed because they can't get the proper forms to continue the business or something. So that would be one example.

50:00 K: I know there's some others, but I can't come up with anymore.

50:04 V: No, that's OK. No, I think that's a good one. I think it kind of speaks to what you'd said about not just telling stories that gets clicks and things. It's stories that get commented on, that get engaged with and talked about.

50:23 K: This is a random [inaudible] this is something I've always wondered. Do we have a policy on like replying to comments that do that are like someone maybe just providing some extra insight or asking a question or maybe having a differing opinion about whatever it was we wrote?

50:47 K: Because I remember there was one time when we were looking at like how Ideas at Work had specifically done one article. And Larry said something like, 'Oh, we need to go in and reply to one of these.' Or something. So, do you know if there's a policy around that?

51:02 V: If there is one, I don't know that it's clearly established. I think sometimes we've debated who would be right to respond to comments. I remember one of the stories I worked on for the summit, there were some comments that came out of it. And we had a discussion about it, and I mean I was never asked to reply. I don't think anyone did reply. And I don't know if that policy is different based on channel, like if we respond more to things on Currents than we do on Facebook. Because I've asked that question even just outside of the context of storytelling like for events. Like who's handling responses on this event page?

51:43 K: That would be interesting because, going back to like what makes a something we write successful. And if it's starting a conversation down in the comments section, do

we continue to be a part of that conversation if we started it? That would be interesting because when I write film reviews and someone happens to comment on it, I'm like, 'Well I'm not going to leave them hanging. I'm going to continue this conversation.' And I'll jump in there, but that's different obviously.

52:24 V: Well, and it seems like that would align with how we think about typologies. If we're saying that our audiences are based on interests and values, then should we not be fostering conversations around those things. Like, is that not part of telling a story?

K: Yeah.

52:45 K: And, there's the other side of it. If there's enough people down in the comments section or on a Twitter thread just talking with each other, then that's also doing our job. If we started it and then it creates this dialogue between two people who've never met who've never collaborated with each other, but they're offering their two points, then our job is done. It's not done, but we did it.

53:20 V: Yeah, it seems like there's some tension in what you're saying that kind of like ideally that would be a measurement that we have around engagement, but do you feel like there are other sorts of measurements and responses that we're looking for? As far as looking at what makes a story successful? You know just based on what's talked about in our meetings and kind of the monthly reports that we get from Chris.

K: Yeah

53:56 K: Well, in our last monthly ed we talked a lot about that tweet option and how not a lot of people use it. And I think we were bringing that up because we want people to use it to sort of continue this conversation of whatever. We want other people to be part of the conversation that we're trying to have. I don't know if that tweet-to-post option is the way to do it.

54:29 K: I also feel like Julie has talked a lot about those tweet-to-post options are easy because people do it because they don't have to write out their own thoughts. So, I don't know how much if people are just tweeting the same thing, I honestly don't know how helpful that is if people aren't providing their own voices to the conversation.

54:59 K: But, I do think that we keep providing that because we want that. We want people to be part of the conversation with us.

55:14 V: Yeah, I mean that's where the value of share...if it's just sharing the same thing, is that still valuable to us?

55:25 K: It's like, 'Oh, a lot of people clicked on this tweet, but I don't know what that means.'

[laughter]

55:32 V: Yeah that's a good point. I think we're still figuring out how to define what all of it means. And what is meaningful to us in the end.

55:45 V: Yeah, it's interesting. I'm really interested to have this conversation with everyone because I think everyone has a different perspective based on the work that they do and what they feel like is going to make this work successful.

56:01 V: That being said, is there anything else you would want to add just to any of this or things that you feel like we didn't give enough time to that you want to circle back to?

56:12 K: I just think once we figure everything out, it's going to be awesome. And also, a lot easier. Being in this like weird shift that has been happening since like last spring has been weird. And kind of hard to grasp at times, especially since we don't just do editorial. We do a million other things, and so it's like we're trying to make this giant shift in our editorial process while we're still doing our own separate work.

56:55 K: It's kind of... I don't want to say messy.

57:02 V: I think that's an interesting point because while doing other work allows us some flexibility to say like, 'Yeah, of course it's a mess.' But, when I think about how other newsrooms might struggle with this, you know if editorial is all you do, then it's kind of hard to say, 'our process is going to be in flux for a while.'

57:24 V: We'll see. That's what I hope to learn more about from this. So, well, we're getting close to an hour but thank you for joining me for this conversation. I promise you've been very helpful, and I know it seems like one perspective out of the whole doesn't seem like a lot, but I really do appreciate it.

57:42 K: Yeah. No problem.

APPENDIX R: INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT – KIM WALLACE CARLSON

Valerie: So, go ahead and start off by telling me your name and how long you've been working for the Kauffman Foundation.

Kim WC: Sure.

00:06 K: Kim Wallace Carlson. I have been working at the Kauffman Foundation for about five and a half years. From 2012-2015 and then 2017 to present, so there's a gap in my employment, but it adds up to about five and a half years.

V: Cool.

00:28 V: Then, tell me a little bit about what kind of work you do here either for the editorial team or across other departments.

00:34 K: Sure. So, my role is the director of engagement entrepreneurship on the Public Affairs team. My work is embedded in the Entrepreneurship team. I'm a dual team member on Entrepreneurship and Public Affairs. The purpose of my work is to ensure that all of the projects that the Entrepreneurship team are doing are supported with strategic communications plans, core messaging and understanding of how it all relates back to what the foundation is doing.

01:10 K: As it relates to editorial, my key role there is to ensure that the larger Public Affairs team that focuses on storytelling knows some of the key projects, events, speaking opportunities, panel opportunities that the Entrepreneurship team, which I will call our subject matter experts, are participating in. So, while we have a lot of different things that the Entrepreneurship team participates in, I attempt to sort of filter them by, 'Oh, this is really important,' or 'This aligns up to a really key strategy for us.' Other times there are things that our team is doing that even I sort of question, like I'm not really sure why they're doing this, but 'Hey, larger team, you might want to dig in and ask questions, because this could yield an interesting story.'

V: Sure. So, you really just provide that awareness and go-between for each of the teams.

02:09 K: Awareness, context and sometimes some prioritization, too.

V: Cool.

02:12 V: So, with that being said, can you give me an overview of your either participation or involvement in this new editorial approach that Kauffman has been adopting. Kind of, when were you brought into that process with Atlantic 57 and how would you define what that project has been?

K: Mhmm. That's a great question.

02:31 K: I feel like the work has been going for quite a while. The one point where I really remember feeling more looped into it was when the Atlantic 57 team actually came on site to Kauffman and sort of shadowed our different editorial work. So, one example, the first example that I remember is the team participated in our Public Affairs "sticky standup" and just kind of watched how we shared the stickies on the wall. How we talk about the different projects coming through. And they just observed us. And then I believe — I don't remember — they actually sat in on an editorial meeting, but that was like the first time it was like, 'OK, here's who these people are.'

03:16 K: I then remember also being briefed when the Atlantic 57 had a presentation to share around the typologies they defined after doing some survey work for us. But in between that first on-site to then that first presentation, it was more so that I knew they were doing some work, but I wasn't quite involved in it.

V: Cool. That just gives me a little bit of understanding, you know, and talking with Keith and Julie obviously their roles were much more involved, but kind of where people came in. And knowing my own timeline and where I was in that process, too.

K: You got it. Yep.

03:55 V: So, kind of moving on, how has adopting a new editorial approach really affected the way we're thinking about audiences in our work? For you that might be a little different since you're kind of playing a go-between role and you're talking more about the entrepreneurship side of things.

K: Mhmm. Mhmm. Can you say the question one more time?

04:15 V: Yeah, so, how has adopting this new editorial approach from the A57 work affected how we think about audiences in our work?

K: Who's we?

04:25 V: So, we, I would say the editorial team.

04:28 K: OK. I think it has offered both a little bit of clarity but then also confusion. I say that because the A57 work in my opinion offered the typologies, and that was a new concept for our team including myself. We're used to either talking about personas or talking specifically about groups, such as policymakers, grantees, teachers, et cetera. So, I think it offered a little bit of clarity into motivations of different types of people. But then when it came down to who are we actually talking to, who is a champion, who is a futurist? I feel like there is still confusion on who those people actually are because I believe that sometimes you need to put a face to a persona group. And, again, I'm saying persona group there.

05:43 K: So, I think it's been a little bit hard to adopt because we've had different ways of thinking about our audiences, and I'm not sure if we have agreement on how we should be thinking about these different groups when it actually comes to applying our work.

V: I see.

06:08 V: Yeah, I think that's been kind of a general consensus that at this point we have an idea of what the typologies are in the abstract, but I think it would require further research and further work to really define then who are these people, are they within our current audiences that we've built as personas, as specific roles, or are they more aspirational? And if so, where do we find them and who are they?

K: Right, yeah.

06:37 K: And another thing that I'm a little unclear on is have we looked at those typologies compared to past personas and then run that against who's actually on our list or in our databases? Like, who are the people who we know open our emails or come to our things? What's reality versus what's aspirational? I'm not quite clear on if that work has been done or if we're going to be doing that work. Another just question I have out of the editorial update planning process is how, if at all, were program teams consulted for their feedback? So, as the people who are closest to some really discrete audiences, how is that represented, and do they have a voice in that final kind of way of the foundation thinking about audiences? So, you know, because I live in program land, I know that mayors are important to us. I know that federal, state, local policymakers are important to us. I know that the people that we call ecosystem builders are important to us. On the education side, I believe that teachers are important to us and there are other groups there.

08:04 K: So, I kind of wonder how are those different really specific people, how do they roll up to the typologies? And did the program teams give some input or feedback? I just don't know.

08:19 V: Yeah. And I don't know that we've gotten to that stage yet, either. I think like you said we really walked away from A57 with a strong abstract understanding, but it hasn't necessarily been applied to, 'Is this just an editorial thing? Is this programmatic and it applies everywhere?' Yeah.

08:39 V: That being said, you mentioned the word motivations. And I just want to make sure I have your understanding of the typologies and, if you could break down for me what motivations or interests do these typologies hold? And how does that kind of intersect with what the foundation stands for?

08:57 K: I don't remember all the typologies. Like, I remember champions. I remember inquirers, futurists, practitioners, collaborators. Is it five or are there six?

V: I think there's five.

K: OK. So maybe I do remember them, it just takes me a second.

09:14 K: So, how I interpret the motivation of a champion typology is the person who is ready to do more, ready to spread the message, take action and has a lot of influence within their sphere. Where my mind immediately goes, are those like the CEO-type people? Because in my mind, I think that a champion can be anybody from a CEO to a person on the street who just has a really big network. But I don't quite know, and I don't know if we all know that.

10:01 K: Also, I feel like what I just said is really general because spreading a message and really wanting to be involved in the things Kauffman is interested in, I don't know if they're motivated by Kauffman because Kauffman's interested in this work. Or are they just motivated because they're interested in the intersection of education, entrepreneurship or the future of work and future of learning? I don't quite know, and I don't know where Kauffman fits there as far as are they champions of our specific work? Or are they champions of the topics and things that we also care about? So that's where my kind of gray line is.

10:43 K: When it comes to the practitioner, which I believe to be the actual person in the middle of the work, doing the work. So, whether that's a mayor or a community activator, community builder, ecosystem builder type person, an economic developer. Those seem like to me the people who really want the data, the how-to, the best practices. They want to know like 'learn today, use tomorrow.' They really want to know, 'what are the things that I can be leveraging to use?' I still go back to, are they looking at that necessarily from Kauffman? Or are they looking at that from the fields that we touch?

11:31 K: I don't quite honestly remember what a collaborator is. The futurist one is really interesting because from how I remember the typology, the futurist is obviously way ahead. They're thinking through future problems, how to solve those. They're thinking about VR, AI, the implications those things can have on work and education. What I don't know is if we're actually reaching a futurist, or if what we are communicating in either our stories or our projects is maybe too basic for the futurists. I don't quite know who a futurist is to us, and I think that's where my hesitation is on them because it seems like a really interesting crowd to meet and reach. But I wonder if our work is applicable or if we are just scratching the surface. So, it's hard for me to know, without an idea of who a futurist is, how they fit.

12:42 K: The inquirer one. I think it's really interesting that we have that as a typology. I think there's been a lot of discussion on, do we even care about inquirers? Because if they are those who are either new to or skeptical — I don't know if we used the word skeptical in the typology doc— but if that's the person who is still kind of questioning philanthropy's role in education, entrepreneurship or questioning whether those things even intersect, I'm not sure that we even care to have them on our radar. Or if it's just an FYI that these people exist. But I think it's an interesting notion. But I feel like from a communications perspective and a storytelling perspective, we should go to the audience

that we believe that we can best serve and who are on board or about to catch the bus for us and want to be on board.

13:41 K: I really don't remember what the collaborator is quite honestly.

V: That's OK. This is not meant to be an exam, so.

K: [Laughs] Yeah. I have no feelings on the collaborator. I don't know.

13:49 V: I'm curious though, through that confusion then, how actively would you say the editorial team is thinking about and considering audiences in the content we're creating?

14:04 K: Hm. Can you tell me more about what you're asking?

14:05 V: Yeah, so, just in thinking about this new strategy and the idea of story first, and knowing that audience plays a huge role in what stories we decide to cover, how actively then is that translating in the amount we're thinking about our audiences? However, we understand them.

K: Yeah. That's a really great question.

14:29 K: I think that's one that...I think we have a conflict. I do. I think that a great story is a great story is a great story. I very strongly believe that as a brand, as an organization, as a non-newspaper, magazine institution that we should consider what our audience needs from us and wrap the stories around that.

15:07 K: So, I actually really believe that we should put our audience first and tell the best stories that our audiences need to know. That we believe they need to know. I think there is a really big difference between telling a cool feature story that makes you feel good or makes you think, you know, and that's on the news or in a magazine or in a tweet or whatever. But as a reader, I want to know why is this person or this institution telling me this story? So, when I see a cool story, and it's, you know, on "the Today Show," general news, general things, a little update. Oh, it's cool, it's a feel-good story, whatever. When I see a story from a brand, I want to understand like why are you telling me this?

16:02 K: So, I feel conflicted on that one because I believe that we should be putting our audience first. And I believe that telling a really great story because it's about entrepreneurship or about education or about Kansas City, it needs to map back to who cares, why are we telling the story, and why are we telling it now. I think that Kauffman, in our editorial work, we can tell profiles of entrepreneurs day in, day out. But if you dig into that more, why is Kauffman telling the story of Kim the wonderful entrepreneur? Are they going to do something cool to fund Kim's nonprofit? Or what's the backstory there?

16:46 K: I feel like in a world of fake news, branded content, advertorials, native advertising, that consumers, readers are smart. And they can follow and see like, 'what are you selling me?' I know that Kauffman literally isn't selling me things. We're a nonprofit, or a private foundation. But I think that readers and consumers are smart enough to ask, 'what is your angle here? What is your agenda here?' And while our agenda here is entrepreneurship and education — it's quite a noble agenda — I think we should be more intentional about why we're telling a story to a specific audience versus just telling a good story.

17:27 K: I feel like for us as an organization with limited people, we should be telling the stories that have the biggest bang for the buck. And for the buck meaning like, does our audience need this? Why do they need this?

V: Yeah.

17:51 V: Yeah. I mean that's definitely a different way of thinking, and I think that's kind of what separates out Kauffman's role as a storyteller versus what we would think of traditional news and some of these other things that you mentioned. In terms of really understanding what people need then, how does that either align with or conflict with what we're deciding to cover? Either according to coverage areas or what values Kauffman has.

18:17 K: Yeah. Can you say it again?

18:20 V: Yeah, so I just said kind of in thinking about what people need, how does that come into conflict or align with what we're deciding to cover, either according to our coverage areas or toward larger foundation values?

18:38 K: Yeah. I feel like we have a lot of conflicting ideas on how and why we should tell stories at the foundation. So, what I mean by that is if we think about our audience, which at least on the Entrepreneurship side where I can speak more thoroughly to, policymakers, potential grantees, so nonprofit organizations who are looking for funding, those are folks on ESHIP. Let's just stick with those two.

19:23 K: If you look at what a policymaker needs, they probably need data. They need strong points of view on why entrepreneurship is important or not important. And they want to know how it affects their bottom line, which is the economy, and what their constituents want. If you look at what nonprofit organizations who are looking for funding for their entrepreneurship efforts need, they want to know, how do I get funding from the Kauffman foundation? What are examples of quality programs that you've funded and why they got funded? What the impact was. What are some cool outcomes from the people you've funded? I think the stories that we have begun to tell don't quite touch on some of those things because we're telling them at a broader level, and I think we need a mix of content, stories, et cetera that our audience really really wants from us and wants to know from us, as well as a mix of maybe just damn good storytelling that touches on entrepreneurship, education, Kansas City, et cetera that is just there to inspire

you. That only we have access to because we have such a great network and we know Richard Branson or we know different politicians or whatever it is.

20:45 K: I think right now it feels like in the beginning that we're a little bit over-indexing on just telling those wider stories. And it causes a bit of a tension with our program areas who are trying to do work to provide funding or reach discrete audiences.

V: Yeah.

21:07 K: So, I guess my answer is we have to do all of it. But right now we're leaning in one way, and it's causing some confusion and tension around our program teams of, 'That's a cool story, but how do I get my thing out that I need? And how can storytelling help me with that?' Right? So, I feel like we need different layers of storytelling to support specific program and brand needs and also those more elevated inspirational stories about cool entrepreneurship, education things, youth after school things, things that we do.

21:42 K: So, yeah. The other thing that I think we need to be thinking about is... We've talked about in our coverage areas, you know, the conversation that's happening in the world, and how we may or may not be applicable to that conversation. And if we are applicable, how do we run with it and Kauffman-ize it? If you will. I think what's difficult is we want to run with a trend or a topic in the news, but with a Kauffman point of view. But I think we forget sometimes that the Kauffman point of view also has to come from our programmatic teams.

V: Yeah

22:25 K: So, an example of that would be if we know that we are potentially funding an organization. They're in our RFP pool or they've applied for something. They're being screened. And that organization is really hot right now, and they've been in the news. If there's not communication with the program team, with Public Affairs, with the engagement director that, 'Oh hey. They've been in the news, and it's entrepreneurship. And we want to get onto that topic. But hey, actually wait a second, we might be funding them, so are we sending a signal? Should we maybe not do that story right now because there's a brand implication?'

23:03 K: That's a really big loop we have to close from a brand reputation standpoint of like, the right hand's not talking to the left. If we as an editorial team see this cool thing happening in the news, and it's about entrepreneurship. Here's this cool person who's doing something great. We might know her we might not. If we don't know that, 'Oh, that person is in our network, and they're actually applying for funding.' 'Oh, we're going to go write a story about her.' But you don't know that she's applying for funding right now, there's a mixed web there. So, that's where I go back to we want to tell damn good stories. We want to be relevant with what's happening today, but we also need to be mindful of what our core business is, which is grant-making.

23:46 K: So, there's got to be an elegant way to make sure that we're not going so far to the side of we're independent storytelling journalists, because we have brand needs to serve, too.

V: Sure. Yeah. That definitely makes sense, and I think we do a good job of checking ourselves right now, but do you feel like some of the tension we feel in swinging closer to these broader stories comes from having to compensate for a lot of the other where it was, you know, we're reporting on and talking a lot about our own news, our own events?

24:28 K: Maybe. I'm not sure. Maybe. I think it was such a swing from 'press release, just the facts about all our stuff, and we sound so great' but there's no like real human element or story to it and, you know, just scripted quotes to, 'OK. We're just going to go tell great stories about stuff that doesn't really ladder back.' Or there's not a clear ladder back to our work. Or a clear call to action, or a clear linkage. So, I feel like there's gotta be, in keeping with Kauffman themes, something in the middle that serves what our programs need, but then also human elements and better stories in service of those things.

25:15 K: Can you say your question one more time because there was something else that I was...

V: That's OK. I think we're spinning our wheels a bit. So, I kind of want to dig on something else, which is, you know, in this confusion, in this space where there's still a lot of mix of what are we going to cover, how then are we deciding what we cover? Who's involved in that? What does that look like? Who are kind of stakeholders in that?

25:38 K: Yeah. I think it's a mix between the VP of Public Affairs, the director of engagement on Education, myself — the director of engagement on Entrepreneurship, the director of editorial. I think, speaking for myself, I know based on my team in Entrepreneurship from our VP or from our senior director what some major priorities are. So, I know when I need to lobby hard that something needs to be covered. But I won't dictate and my VP and my senior director won't dictate how it's covered. But we'll say, 'This is really important to us. We would like some sort of story around it.' So, I feel like I am a major stakeholder in shaping what is marked as a priority. I think it's those folks. I think it's those directors.

26:40 V: Cool. Yeah, no, that totally makes sense. I just wanted to make sure I had that clear, because I think a lot of what I've talked to people about just how we plan and pitch stories is now very unfocused. The structures of our meetings and kind of those processes are a little bit more fuzzy. Because, it's my understanding now, and maybe this was always true, but really a story idea can come from anyone in the foundation at this point.

27:08 K: Yeah, you know, I don't think that's true. Or it hasn't really been socialized well. So, I say that because, well, you know, when A57 was on-site the second or third time, so the most recent time, and we were all in the conference center, there was a preview of the Storylibs form. I'm about 99 percent sure that nobody on my Entrepreneurship team knows that that exists. So, the message to the Entrepreneurship and most likely the

Education team has always been, if you have ideas about things you need to send it to your director of engagement. The director of engagement model has been have a single point of contact for Public Affairs send your needs, your requests, your ideas for anything that touches the Public Affairs space to that individual.

27:57 K: So, while a story idea, yes, can come from anywhere, it's usually filtered or it's supposed to be filtered through your PA director. Your PA engagement director. I don't believe that the Entrepreneurship team knows about the Storylib form. And they have been trained to come through me for the things that they want to talk about.

28:26 K: A great example of when that has worked recently...Derek on our team, on the Entrepreneurship team forwarded me something about a grantee who had a paper, or something like that. I don't remember. And it was interesting, you know, it was about the future of work, the future of learning, something like that. Roll with me there. And then I said, 'Cool. This sounds great. I'll forward this on to the editorial team, and then they might reach back out to you for more questions.' I forwarded that on to the director of editorial, editorial manager and then our little like story task board within Teamwork. Forwarded that on, 'FYI here's something you might want to do with Derek. Here's the synopsis below. It sounds interesting.' A couple weeks later that story, it happened. It was cool. So, in theory, that idea came from Derek, but it was filtered through me. Whether or not that's the most efficient way to do it, I don't know. But I think there is something to be said about ensuring that we don't create confusion on our program teams of how they can get work done or ideas out. And I'm totally open to what that means.

29:37 K: The other thing that you said was, you know, pitching stories. I don't believe that we have a pitching process. It's idea sharing, maybe some lobbying, or like, 'We must do this story,' and we have already decided. So, I don't really think that there's a pitch process at all. And I don't know if there should be one or not, but the way that I've seen that stories get suggested is whether it's tied to an event, a speaking gig, a paper, or some sort of thing that's being made. The way that I've put it in there is, 'Here's this thing that's happening.' I'm not pitching it. I'm not framing it. I'm just saying, 'Here's a thing that's happening that you might want to dig into.' Because I feel like it's my job to present the different opportunities and things that are going on. But then it's on the editorial team to ask more questions, figure out the angle and then figure out whether they want to pursue it.

30:37 K: My asterisk there is, when I say like, 'Hey, this is a really hot thing that we really have to get out. Help us frame it in the right way, but we have to talk about this thing because of x, y and z.'

V: No, I think that's an important clarification to make because it isn't a very formalized pitch process. Ideas don't necessarily come up and they have all these angles fleshed out and stakeholders identified. It's not really one person lobbying for an idea. It's really just, 'Hey, I know this is happening.' Or, 'I know this is a priority and we should find a way to tell this story if there is one.'

K: Yes.

31:13 V: Cool. So, I kind of want to shift toward the place channels has in our work. And I know this is an area that can get kind of touchy depending on who you talk to, but with adopting this new approach how are we using or thinking about channels a little bit differently than we have in the past? If at all?

31:39 K: What do you mean by the past?

31:41 V: Well, knowing that Kauffman Currents is still pretty young, I would say maybe in the last 3 to 5 years. And I think that Atlantic 57 has pushed our thinking a little bit more in one direction on how we think about channels.

K: Yeah.

32:05 K: I think that there's still a bias towards Currents, towards using a website channel with a long-form story. I think we have pushed our thinking around it's not just social or we're not just going to distribute this.

32:28 K: I think there is still room to grow in thinking about how you do unique channel-based storytelling or channel-based campaigns. Versus, in the past, a lot of times we would use other channels like social media or like email to just distribute content versus having channel-specific content. So, when I say this, I mean you can take one story or idea and break it up to fit different channels. Looking at something like the Urban Youth Academy story that the team worked on, there was a long piece with some beautiful photography in Currents. I don't remember if there was a video or not. I don't remember if we pushed that to making an Instagram campaign with just we had some really beautiful photography. I think we're talking about that and thinking about that more. I don't know that we're executing on that more. So, taking one cool story and idea and then repackaging it for different channels versus just using different channels to distribute it, I think we're warm to it. But we haven't done it yet.

33:42 K: I still think that we are using some channels such as Twitter or Facebook purely as distribution. We haven't totally leveraged those channels for channel-specific content that only lives on Facebook or only lives on Instagram or only lives on Twitter. But I think it feels like we're warming up to it, but it's just a matter of figuring out how to do that and how to build in the time to do that and really think about it. Versus creating once and publishing everywhere. So, that cope mentality, create once, publish everywhere is sort of an old-school way of thinking. It's not as effective in 2019, or 2018 or 2017 or 2016\. So, it seems to me it just really comes down to a matter of individual capacity to be like, 'OK. We're going to take this one cool story. Kim, you're in charge of the Instagram version of this. Valerie, you're in charge of the Twitter version of this.' And letting different channels be run by different people to then reimagine and repurpose and repackage that content.

35:00 K: I think if I were to say that, that people would probably agree. Like, yeah, we want to do that but it's literally a matter of who and which channels do we prioritize.

35:08 V: Yeah. Yeah. I agree that there is some hesitancy there. I think people are really excited by the idea, like you've said. And we're getting there. But it is a matter of capacity. We don't necessarily have the people to say, 'Yeah, I can own the Instagram channel. And I can handle that on top of everything else.' And then it's also just a matter of lack of knowledge, you know, I don't necessarily know what the most effective way to do this is or when is the right time to be publishing this. And then it also is a little bit of hierarchy concerns, too, in saying, if I split up all these roles and if I know we're going to do this in one way or another and this is my justification for that, then how do I still keep tabs on things? How do I still manage things and create some sense of continuity. If it's not consistency, then continuity of voice, tone and just what the foundation is.

36:06 K: Yeah. You know, there is a really great example of one way where we did do this whether it was intentional or not, and it was pre-A57\. And it was pre-me coming back to the foundation, actually. The EMK 100 campaign, so I believe that was in 2016\. I wasn't here at that time. It was for Mr. Kauffman's 100th birthday in September of 2016, and when I came back to the foundation in 2017 and just kind of re-familiarizing myself with all the different accounts and pages and et cetera. The team did a cool job of telling the story of Mr. K's life on a longform template on Kauffman.org. A scrolling page with videos, pull quotes, lots of text and different pagination. Then, I also remember because the foundation launched Instagram, there was a cool Instagram campaign with 100 pictures, to support the EMK 100, of Mr. Kauffman with cool captions and stylized treatment. And it was really neat; I really liked it. I don't know how it came to be at all. I wasn't here, but to me that's a great example of instead of putting all your effort into the website and then taking screenshots or whatever of the website and putting it on Instagram. Or taking bits and pieces, they reused... It was all the same imagery, but then they kind of repackaged it for the correct channel and the channel's needs. It had like some cool text overlays and whatever. I thought it was really neat.

37:41 K: And I think there is also something to say with when you're putting a content campaign, pick a couple channels. You don't have to do all of them. So, for that one, from what was visible to me, the website and then Instagram. I assume there was probably stuff in an email as well that was probably maybe custom as well. But I think that was a really cool example of doing something and publishing it everywhere but publishing it in a way that's not just like a copy and paste.

V: Yeah, it doesn't link back to something necessarily.

38:16 K: Yeah. I kind of just wonder if maybe we overthink a little bit, too. When the pressure is on of, 'Oh, we've got to use all these different channels,' maybe we take a step back and say, 'What makes sense for this story? And how could this story live on email or Instagram or on Twitter?' And if the answer is really like, 'I don't know and it just seems like a stretch,' then maybe you say, 'OK. We don't have to use that channel.'

38:41 V: Yeah. It's interesting. Matt Pozel also brought up the EMK 100 example, and he was talking about that process and just how that was something really cool that we did. Clearly, because people talk about it still. I mean.

K: Yeah. I wasn't even here!

V: Yeah. And I've read through it and I think it's a wonderful project. And I see other things that we do that I just don't know that we consider to be editorial.

39:05 V: Like, I think about recently the Kauffman Indicators stuff. Those pages are so interactive. They're so informative. And while someone might not say 'That's really narrative. That's not really editorial.' That's the kind of capability we have to do on a website, and that's when something should live on a website.

K: Yeah.

39:24 V: But then I also see people engaging with those same data points when we wrap them into narratives, when we wrap them into posts that live on social. So, I think we're getting there I just, yeah.

39:34 V: I think there is a little bit of overthinking and this I think has come up recently, too. We were talking about, and I've heard several people cite as an example of really successful work being the post we made of a photo of Mr. Kauffman with the owner of the Kansas City Chiefs back when the athletic complex was being built. It's a photo of them breaking ground at that complex, and it was one of our most engaged with posts of the year. Of all time, actually.

40:05 V: And it's interesting because I think that was a case where we didn't overthink it. We posted a photo. It had a great caption with it, and it was the right timing. People were all up in arms for the Chiefs.

K: The Chiefs, Super Bowl. Absolutely.

40:21 V: And we were OK with it just being that post. We didn't have to write another story. We didn't have to produce a video. It was just something we could pull from our archive and post.

K: Yeah. Absolutely.

40:33 V: I'm curious then to you, with those examples in mind and then other work that we do, what does a successful story look like under this approach then?

40:48 K: Under the A57 informed approach? M

V: Mhmm.

K: I don't know.

40:58 K: You know, a lot of the things that we talked about with the A57 team were frankly some reminders. You know, you want to have some data, some sort of fact or something to point to that is true. And then, a human element to it. I think we have a team full of storytellers, former journalists, former PR people. People who know how to craft a message or craft a story. I think we have a really talented team. So, I think some of the things were just repetitive or were just reminders. And I do want to go back to the overthinking of it.

41:40 K: If we can marry things that we know to be true, things that the Kauffman Foundation believes — our point of view — with humans, people who illustrate those points, that link back to what we want people to do, what we want them to take action on. Whether it's in education, entrepreneurship, Kansas City, our history, whatever. I mean maybe that's the recipe for success. You know, take action doesn't have to mean give us your first-born child. It could mean give us some feedback. Make a comment. Or tell us we're wrong. Challenge us. Or, sign up because you want to learn more and you believe in this. Forward it to your friend. Write us a letter. Call us. I mean, you know, all those little micro-actions there give us some clues as to what's working and what's not.

42:44 K: I think the saddest thing for us is if we put out a lot of things that we call great stories and they just add to the noise of the internet, why are we doing it? So, who does it matter to? Are we getting stories out to the right people and are they reacting to it? So, when we hear stories like, 'Hey, I read that piece in Currents and it made our nonprofit... It helped me convince my leader of the nonprofit to do x, y, z.' If we can get some of that feedback back, then we know we're doing good work.

43:20 K: I think the most frustrating thing to me, though, is when we tell ourselves that we're putting together really great content, beautiful video, beautiful photography, whatever, it can all be from an execution standpoint done really well, if it's not having people take some sort of action, then it's kind of like then we don't know. Then we don't know what to do more of or less of. So, you have, you know, something like a really cool Facebook post with a great picture of Mr. Kauffman that's in the right context of current culture and it's a throwback thing that inspires you. Makes you feel warm and fuzzy. Like, we got a lot of feedback on that. Even if it was just like, 'This is so cool. I remember this.' And it's like, these are people who care about the legacy of Mr. Kauffman in Kansas City versus a really in-depth piece that we do about the future of learning, I don't know. If we're not getting feedback on it and we're not sharing a strong point of view, or data that can help people, it's just hard to know if it's successful.

44:28 K: And I think to me that goes back to: Who are we creating it for? Are we creating it for ourselves to just create content? To say that we're participating in the content game? Or are we creating it to offer help, to offer inspiration.

44:42 K: I mean, I go back to like the quadrant of like educate, inform, inspire. So maybe that's a three one, not a quadrant. Educate, inform, inspire...

V: Maybe motivate?

K: Maybe motivate and take action.

44:58 K: I think we should look at that lens sometimes, because sometimes we do just might want to have some cool inspirational stories. When we tell cool inspirational stories of Mr. Kauffman, we know that those always do well because he's such a beloved figure in Kansas City and in the nation, quite honestly.

45:11 K: And if our sole purpose is to inspire, and that's what we work for, then it's a success.

45:18 V: Well, and I would argue, too, then. I don't know that it's so much that people love the story of Mr. K because he's this great figure. I think they love it because that shows us that they needed the inspiration. That's why it was successful because it was connecting that need for that feeling. Whoever it was. But that's the unique approach we can provide.

K: Yeah.

45:43 K: And I think if we can just be upfront with, 'what do we want this piece of content to do?' If it's an informative piece, with a ton of data and downloads or whatever, and we want you to do something with it, cool. If it's an inspiration piece or a thought piece just to make you say, 'Hm. I don't know.' Like, as long as we kind of know the intent of our pieces, I think we'll feel better about what the measurements are that we're trying to get. Because if it's really just to inspire you, having some nice comments around, 'Oh this made me feel good.' Or a "like" button, maybe that's good. I don't know.

46:19 V: And I think that's part of what defining success and evaluating our stories, it becomes difficult. Because if we're not clear about what we want it to do, then it's easy to say, 'Well, it was successful because it got x amount of clicks. Or so many shares, or so many people clicked on it in our newsletter versus other pieces of content.' Those sorts of comparisons are kind of useless if the goal was not to just see engagement but to see response, to see that it mattered.

46:49 K: Yeah. And I think if we can also look at various metrics that we put into place or measures that we put into place to even just inform us of what has been working, what hasn't been working. And if we can start to identify patterns and trends and make some educated guesses as to, 'Well yeah, a Mr. Kauffman post of him breaking ground at the athletic complex posted during the Super Bowl time when the Chiefs are in the Super Bowl...Yep! that's going to do well.' But, if we posted that in the middle of basketball season and there's no context for it, it might still get some engagement because it's Mr. Kauffman, but like it probably...

47:30 K: Like can we start to draw those conclusions? And better inform what are quote, unquote Kauffman best practices for content. Because we went by some quite honestly logic what to post and when. But, can we do that beyond Mr. Kauffman things? Can we do that with the stories that we're telling that support our work. So, we talk about the right time, the right channel, and we all believe that, but then how can we better apply that? So, when is the right time to share Indicators work or Education work within the whole scope of the year?

48:13 V: Yeah. I think it'll be interesting to see how we build out those kind of tools in our toolkit of what we know works. I was talking to Matt because he had sent to Chris another photo of Mr. Kauffman and a program that he'd gotten from the opening day at the K when the first season they opened here. And it was this very art deco-y thing. And there's a little bit of a story attached to it. It kind of paralleled with the whole idea that Mr. K brought baseball back to Kansas City, that's kind of what he gave people. I said, 'I think that could be a really interesting post. I really interesting standalone thing that could do well on Facebook or Instagram very similar to the Chiefs photo that we posted.' But I said, 'We don't really have any tracking knowledge of whether that's true. It would be cool just to run it as a test around Opening Day. Around this event where people are really tuning back into something, and just test the waters and see is that true.'

49:23 K: Yeah, I think as a team to inform our editorial work, our editorial across all channels, if we can become more disciplined at sharing and documenting knowledge of what works we can find these trends. In my role at Kauffman previously, I ran our website and our social media. And in 2015, I think it was 2015 is when the Royals went to the World Series and we won, I posted a ton of content leading up to the final games leading to the World Series and we won that were Mr. Kauffman baseball photos. And they did outrageously well just like the Chiefs one did. So, we know that. We do know that, but I'm not sure how well it's captured.

50:11 K: You know, it's probably in some emails, like reports and things like that. But building out that knowledge base of here's what worked when we went to the World Series. Here's what worked in...I mean I don't know if things will change over time, but we do have a lot of collective knowledge, but unfortunately it's in a lot of people's heads just like that was in my head of like, 'I remember that.' I actually even kind of challenge the Chiefs one being the best all time one because in 2015 when we posted the World Series stuff that was all organic, nonpaid. These ones were paid. So that's another sliver of it, things that we're learning with paid and organic.

50:51 K: But I think, yeah, that's a big lesson learned for us is we should be documenting this somewhere. So, we meaning who? I don't know. And where. Because there's a ton of knowledge that we've learned over the years and then as algorithms change, platforms change, et cetera where can we predict our pivots to be?

V: Yeah.

51:12 V: Well, I think it's just interesting from my point of view and kind of the work I'm doing now. I do hope that these conversations lead to greater learning and understanding around this process as we figure it out and as it continues to be applied or whatever happens to the work of A57\. I think it's led to some good conversations. It's brought up a lot of questions people have around conversations that still need to be had. It's also brought up a lot of things that we're not doing that we could be doing to help us.

51:47 V: But, something really interesting that came up and that I think is a good point. And I think you kind of touched on it, too, you know. The Kauffman Foundation is not a for-profit business. Editorial stories aren't the product we're selling. We're really in the business of giving money away. So, if no one is forcing us to make a change, then why change? Why is it important to tell stories for Kauffman?

52:11 K: I don't know. I don't know. I think that we should tell stories in support of what our core business is. I think we as a foundation, as foundation leadership team, as programmatic leadership team, as Public Affairs leadership team, have to come to agreement as to what our core business is. And I think we might have differing views on what that is, which is why I think there are various tensions on 'why do we do this instead of that' 'How do you do that?' 'Well, what about my thing?' So, I can't really answer that definitively because if we did not tell stories as a foundation, we can still do our work. It may or may not be as effective. I don't know, but our editorial function is relatively new. We've always told stories in some capacity whether it be through speaking engagements, through press releases, through events. We've always told stories in some way. I guess I kind of flip it on its head and say, are we doing anything that's new? Have we just called it something else?' And maybe we're being more intentional about it or wanting to be more intentional about it.

53:42 K: But my bottom line is I believe that the foundation, key departments, and leadership have to come together to define what it is that we are trying to do and if and how storytelling can help. And if we believe storytelling can help with what our core business is, then we need to really align on the best ways to do that to support those core functions.

54:16 K: I don't know if that's a non-answer for you or not.

54:19 V: No. It's a good answer, and it brings up a lot of things that I think have yet to be addressed. But, it was a really sharp comment made. You know, like no one's forcing us to do this. And I think being several months out from the Atlantic 57 engagement because there is so much confusion, there is a lot of feeling around like, 'I don't know why we're doing this anymore.'

54:48 K: Yeah. I think we have a lot of opportunity for more collaboration between departments to really understand what the needs are, and if and how storytelling can help. So, what are the needs from a total cross-foundation perspective? What are the needs from program perspective? What are the needs from individual leadership perspectives? I mean, we haven't even really touched on thought leadership for the CEO or for VPs, et

cetera. Do we believe we need to have their voices out there in written or video or speaking ways? I feel like there's just a lot of opportunity to further do some quote unquote "need finding" and conversations with people whose work could benefit from storytelling.

55:45 K: I think it would be interesting to hear why different groups don't want to do it or do want to do it, but what their specific needs are.

V: Mhmm.

55:59 K: And I think that as an editorial team, as a Public Affairs team, we have to be really open to understanding that our role is both support but also in like strategic partnerships. So, I want to help you get your thing done, but I want to help you also think about it in a different way so we can come to an even better end product. But, if we only talk to each other as a Public Affairs team, we're missing 75 percent of the foundation. So, I think without having been super super involved in all of the A57 work, I don't know if those conversations happened. But I think it's a little bit of a flag to me that, and it could be that I don't remember, so I don't know. I don't really remember doing like a stakeholder interview with the A57 folks. I really don't.

56:57 V: Well, I think that shows. I've heard from several folks so far that, 'I don't know if they really understood who we are, what we do, who Kauffman is. So, it's hard to know if any of this is valid.'

K: Yeah. Yeah.

57:13 K: So, I just think there's just room for a lot of more collaboration and different perspectives and voices. And, you know, doing discovery work, stakeholder work. Really understanding the organization and all the different people. It's hard because it's schedules and it's timing, but it's really important to do all that upfront to really get a full picture of the organization and then how storytelling could fit.

57:39 K: I love storytelling, and I do believe in it. But I don't like telling stories just to tell stories when you work inside of a brand, because I think that we have to make sure that how we're using our people and our talent is aligned to helping the foundation achieve its goals.

58:03 K: I don't like just adding stuff to the internet just to have something out there. I really think it needs to align back to what we want people to think, feel, do.

58:15 V: Yeah. No. I think that's very well said.

APPENDIX S: PROJECT PROPOSAL

Rest in peace, press release: A case study exploring how adopting a

story-first editorial approach affects news production in a nontraditional newsroom

Valerie Hellinghausen

University of Missouri

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

The way news becomes news has fascinated me since I became a reporter for my high school newspaper my sophomore year. So much so, that I made it a point to rise through the ranks from reporter to page editor finally to editor-in-chief not because I wanted the title, but because I wanted to make a better newspaper. And I believed that the final product would turn out better if there was clarity and consistency along the way from the time a story first got pitched to when it was finally set on a page.

In college, I followed a similar thread of curiosity in working for the Columbia Missourian. While I was required to work there as a news reporter and copy editor, I spent five semesters working as a teaching assistant on both the interactive copy desk and the print design desk. With every role I moved into, I worked to better understand how the newsroom functioned and how everyone played a part in getting the newspaper out each night. I found that this interest led me to become a better, more empathetic journalist, as it led me to try to better understand the responsibilities and frustrations of my colleagues, my superiors and the readers we all served. No matter where I worked, whether it be as a copy editor for *Newsday* or *The Dallas Morning News*, I quickly realized that many newsrooms faced the same challenges when it came to meeting deadlines with ever-shrinking staffs, readerships and budgets. And while many sought to find solutions to revive ailing news publications, many also told me the same two things: Print is dying, and you should get out while you can.

I never believed that print or journalism as a whole was dying. Rather, I saw that journalists were struggling to adapt their product when the places and processes that produced it remained pretty much the same. As such, I spent two year in graduate school

studying strategic communication in hopes that I would find new industries to apply the skills I had crafted as an undergraduate student studying print and digital news editing. In those two years, I not only broadened my skillset, but got a better grasp of the industry and the problems it faced not only where norms and practice were concerned, but where theory had tried to answer bigger questions about how journalism and other media were struggling, changing and growing as power changed hands, technology evolved and audiences lost or found interest.

In my final semester of graduate studies coursework, I found myself hanging on every word in a branded storytelling course taught by Jim Flink. I signed up with little knowledge of what branded storytelling or content marketing were. In the end, I trusted that Jim Flink and our guest lecturer, David Germano, were right when they explained that branded storytelling and content marketing were quickly becoming the future of advertising. Despite how new buzzwords like branded storytelling sound, I had learned that the method itself borrowed heavily from the skills and structures found in journalistic newsrooms. In short, brands were looking to find creative minds who could create added value around a business' existing product by telling stories, creating experiences and sharing information related to audiences who might someday buy a business' existing product. Several companies, like Red Bull and Under Armour, have successfully done this by creating content for video series, blogs and phone applications among other things.

When the course ended, I knew that I wanted to keep exploring the branded storytelling industry and try to find a job there once I finished my graduate studies. Sooner than I could finish my capstone, such an opportunity had found me. In June 2018,

I accepted what would later be extended to a yearlong position as the first branded

storytelling fellow for a new program with the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, a

nonprofit in Kansas City, Missouri, focused on funding entrepreneurship and education

efforts. There, I would work across the Entrepreneurship and Public Affairs teams to

develop content strategy and put my journalism skills to use writing and editing stories

for the Public Affairs editorial team.

In Kansas City, I am still learning what branded storytelling means as I further

define my role in this fellowship. At the same time, I am learning what it means to be part

of a nontraditional newsroom that is also ever-evolving. Within the last year, the Public

Affairs editorial team at the foundation has worked to adopt a story-first approach with

the help of Atlantic 57, a creative consulting agency that works as another arm of *the*

Atlantic magazine. The conversations and challenges adopting this new editorial

approach have been a hugely enriching addition to my experience as a fellow. While I

had no idea that I would be part of the team rethinking not only what stories we tell, but

how we go about telling them and to whom, these major changes have shifted the

structure and way we think about our work. Furthermore, it is these shifts that have

reignited my interest in the news production process and sparked the inspiration for the

research I set out to conduct in this professional project.

PROFESSIONAL SKILLS COMPONENT

Logistics

Over the course of 14 weeks within the larger extension of my fellowship, I will work 40 hours a week at the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City as a branded storytelling fellow. In this role, I will employ my skills as both a journalist and strategic communicator working across the foundation's Entrepreneurship and Public Affairs teams. The position, which began in late June 2018 and will end May 31, 2019, will be paid. The 14-week period for the professional project will span from Jan. 22, 2019 through April 26, 2019.

Role expectations

During the timeframe outlined above, I will be responsible for a number of tasks including but not limited to developing strategy for upcoming events, writing and editing marketing copy, and reporting on assigned stories for Kauffman Currents. These tasks will require me to employ my interviewing, writing, editing and content strategy skills. In addition to these tasks, I will be overseeing a research project led by Technical.ly, a Philadelphia-based agency. In this project, I will ensure that the parameters and timeline of the research project are met in order to produce a census and contact list of entrepreneurship and small business-focused news publications in all 50 states as well as Washington D.C. and Puerto Rico. This project will allow the foundation to seek out future partnerships and sponsorships with these publications later on.

I will also be expected to attend regularly scheduled meetings as well as participate in foundation-wide opportunities for professional development and education. All of these responsibilities are in accordance with the outlined and approved goals the

student and supervisor agreed to at the beginning of 2019 when the Kauffman Foundation media fellowship was extended.

Evidence of work

In my final professional project report, I will be expected to show sufficient physical evidence of my work by gathering all video and text stories published during my fellowship. In addition, materials created for marketing or event promotion such as emails, programs and infographics may be included to show final evidence of my work. Before then, I will submit weekly logs to my committee chair detailing what I have been working on each week for my fellowship, as well as what progress I have made on the analytical component of my professional project. These logs will be emailed to the committee chair by 6 p.m. on Friday of each week. Additional weekly phone calls to check on this progress may be held in keeping with the expectations of my committee chair.

On-site supervision

Throughout the course of this professional project, I will meet with Kim Wallace Carlson, my on-site supervisor, on a biweekly basis to review progress on assigned tasks and projects. In these meetings, I will have the opportunity to discuss feedback on my performance and address any concerns. In addition, I will meet weekly with my supervisor and other team members to review priorities for the week and progress on Public Affairs and Entrepreneurship team projects.

Professional direction

This fellowship has continued to provide me with ample opportunities to demonstrate my practical mastery of the skills I developed in my undergraduate studies

as a print and digital news editing major and graduate studies as a strategic communication student. Following the end of this fellowship, I seek to find similar employment that will allow me to use my skills as a content strategist and communicator either at a nonprofit or corporation.

RESEARCH ANALYSIS COMPONENT

Rest in peace, press release: A case study exploring how adopting a story-first editorial

approach affects news production in a nontraditional newsroom

INTRODUCTION

At the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, a nonprofit in Kansas City, Missouri,

the Public Affairs editorial team produces a weekly newsletter called "Ideas at Work."

Each newsletter promotes both new and old stories resurfaced from the foundation's

blog: "Kauffman Currents." Every Thursday, this newsletter is emailed to a variety of

individuals interested in entrepreneurship, education and innovation. And each week, the

editorial team races to produce a new article or two to fill the newsletter with fresh

content. This news cycle has carried on week by week, month by month for a few years.

And it would have continued to do so until Shari, an executive assistant in Investments,

asked a simple question: Why?

Newsrooms often are chained to an endless news cycle, whether it requires filling

the pages of a daily newspaper, cutting video segments to fit an hourlong television news

block or updating a social media feed. No matter the medium, traditional journalism

newsrooms often find themselves bound to maintain a steady production pace to provide

consistency for their viewers and to ensure they regularly have a fully fleshed-out product

to sell, so to speak. In nontraditional newsrooms, where the news produced is not the

main business, this cycle can be more readily broken. At the Kauffman Foundation, the

editorial team has broken several routines in its news production process, deciding that

simply putting out a newsletter every Thursday because that is the norm is not necessarily

a good enough reason to do it.

Instead, over the past year the editorial team at the foundation has adopted a new approach to its work that concentrates on storytelling first. Everything else – whether it be timing or filling a hole in a newsletter – comes second to the quality of stories produced. This is not to say that traditional journalism newsrooms cannot produce quality work within a set schedule or space. However, without those constraints a nontraditional newsroom team is able to focus on storytelling without a production deadline hanging over its head. Instead, the editorial team faces new constraints with its new editorial approach. Instead of being concerned about making deadlines, the editorial team is primarily concerned with who the stories they tell serve, and whether those audiences are interested and engaged in the topics and conversations the newsroom reports on.

This case study will explore, then, how adopting this story-first approach affects the news production process in a nontraditional newsroom such as the one at the Kauffman Foundation. To do this, this case study will use Tandoc and Vos' three facets of news production affected by audience feedback as a theoretical framework to guide the following research questions (2016):

- **RQ1:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected how public affairs practitioners think about audiences in their work?

- **RQ2:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected what public affairs practitioners decide to cover?

- **RQ3:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners place and/or distribute a story?

- **RQ4:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners evaluate a story's performance?

In this study, the researcher will conduct interviews with a range of storytellers on the Public Affairs team who play different but direct editorial roles in this process at the Kauffman Foundation. From these conversations, this study will help to answer some of these questions so in order to gain a better understanding of how this process affects all aspects of the news production process and its team members. Additionally, these interviews will delve into the perspectives of team members with experience spanning from less than two years to more than 20 years with the foundation. This range of experience will also provide insights into how this newsroom has adapted editorial approach and news production process within the past year, while still gleaning some understanding of how these changes relate to the newsroom's broader history and growth.

From these findings, this research will provide insights into how restructuring one's editorial approach might affect the processes that govern the day-to-day working of a newsroom. These insights may prove especially valuable to practitioners and academics alike as the definition of newsroom and the structure itself is expanded beyond the realm of journalism and into nonprofits, corporate brands and other nontraditional spaces. Before we can explore these new expansions, however, the next section will look at how the view of the press as institution has been discussed in previous studies, and how that discussion is evolving as news production is further affected by the audiences that newsrooms serve.

LITERATURE REVIEW & THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

One of the simplest ways to understand the purpose of studying news production is this: "What the news means depends on how the news gets made," (Sigal, 1973: p. 1). While other researchers like Lippmann historically have questioned the reality, we derive and craft within our minds based on the news we read (1922), others suggest that the reality is not so far outside the practitioners' own minds. Molotch and Lester wrote that the media do not reflect "a world out there," but rather a world influenced — if not created — by "the practices of those having the power to determine the experience of others," (1974: p. 206).

As such, to get a better understanding of our reality, we also have to look at how that reality gets made. To begin, we will explore and define media as an evolving institution which has processes that continue to shift as new technology and workflows are used to improve efficiency and work. Then, we will explore how the media

institution's wall have lowered. Finally, we will review how incorporating audience feedback in the news production process has changed how we may continue to study it altogether.

Media as an evolving institution

Although not all scholars believe the media serves as a singular institution or Fourth Estate to democracy (Lippmann, 1922; Gans, 1998), for the purpose of this study, this research will understand the media to be an institution following the definitions outlined by Cook (1998) and Giddens (1979). Cook saw the media as a single institution with an established, organized system that had the influence and power to both reinforce the dominant ideologies and political structures, as well as serve as a guide for the public's thoughts, actions and values (1998). Giddens, on the other hand, also believed that institutions like the media are evolutionary in nature (1979). As such, the practices an institution at one time considers to be traditional are often replaced by other practices, which in turn create new routines.

In the past and in our present, new technology and media channels have played a role in altering the media's "missions, routines and relationships with its audiences," (Robinson, 2017: p. 307). For example, as the internet and social media platforms have led to a more continuous news cycle, many newsrooms have adapted not just the news process but the "news engine," (Bro, Hansen & Andersson, 2016). In their 2016 study, Bro, Hansen & Andersson explored how the news production process at DR, the Danish Broadcasting Corporation, was affected after attempting to improve efficiency by eliminating unnecessary steps and wasted energy on the part of journalists. In the end, the study found that all of the 20 or more employees interviewed in the survey agreed that the

"news engine" workflow has "significantly improved the utilization of resources" and "is capable of collecting substantially more content to each of the individual stories," (Bro, Hansen & Andersson, 2016: p. 1011).

At the same time, almost half (45 percent) of those surveyed during the study felt the quality of their work had been reduced, and roughly one-third (37 percent) of survey respondents felt they had seen a decline in the quality of the news produced. (1012). Attempts to create more news and faster is certainly a change in news production that many newsrooms seek to make, even at the cost of journalists' sense of value in their work (Bro, Hansen & Andersson, 1016: p. 1006). However, it is obviously not the only change occurring in news production.

Looking beyond the media's walls

In discussing news production, Sigal wrote that "routine is closely linked to tradition in the sense that tradition underwrites the continuity of practice in the elapsing of time," (1973: p. 220). In traditional journalistic tradition, the news media's mission has been to keep a critical eye on those in power, tell stories that inform the public, lead discussions and provide truthful, trustworthy, accurate and interesting accounts of the day's events (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2014). With the inception and incorporation of the internet into the media, however, who plays a role in that mission is disrupting the routines that have long shaped the media's action as well as those who practice it.

While Cook may have pushed for seeing the media as a singular institution in 1998, in 2006 Cook began to rethink this position, partly because of the internet. In 2006, Cook wrote, "I argue here that we need to approach the news media with attention to the institutional walls surrounding them and the ways the newsmaking process includes

actors on both sides of that wall," (p. 161). This provides a significant shift in thinking, as we have to consider that news production considers and also involves more than journalists, given the participatory and democratic nature of the internet. Where the media once held the institutional influence and power to create news and meaning as gatekeepers, now the readers that institution serves also hold the power to influence the media institution and even create news in some situations.

Audience feedback and news production

Audience feedback not only guides journalists as to "what to report and how to report it, but also tells news readers what to read, how to read, and how to respond to it," (Lee & Tandoc, 2017: p. 445). The sheer abundance and ease with which audience feedback in the form of clicks, likes, shares, comments and other metrics can be gathered has led to the creation of new tasks and entirely new roles devoted to monitoring the activity and engagement of audiences online (Tandoc & Vos, 2016).

Several studies have already begun to show the influence audience feedback has had over news coverage and decision-making. Tandoc found that stories with photos or videos or other visual content tended to draw more engagement in the form of clicks, motivating editors to ensure that articles had some visual content (2014). In the same study, content that appeared to be more popular with viewers was more likely to be shared by editors across social media platforms in order to drive more traffic to a news publication's website. Additionally, topics that appear to be trending with lots of clicks, likes, comments and other measures of engagement tend to be more likely to be covered (Welbers, Van Atteveldt, Kleinnijenhuis, Schaper, & Ruigrok). But what is popular may not always be what needs promoting, as scholars like Boczkowski have shown that

audiences tend to prefer to click on stories about celebrities or sports (2010). Other forms of audience feedback have helped newsrooms to determine not only what information is popular, but what information is sought, as search query data have been shown to subsequently affect news coverage (Ragas, Tran & Martin, 2014).

While it may be comforting to some to know newsrooms are paying attention to what information audiences seek, allowing audiences' desires to heavily influence news coverage may drastically shift the foundation and focus of gatekeeping and agenda setting theories (Chaffee & Metzger). In the same vein, focusing too much on giving audiences the information they want instead of the information they need may put the media's mission of informing the public and bringing communities together at risk (Tandoc & Thomas, 2015).

Three facets of audience-influenced news production

Despite these fears, Tandoc and Vos have outlined three facets of news production that have been affected by audience feedback: topic selection, story placement and performance evaluation (2016). These three facets can help up to breakdown how news production may be altered by the influence of audience feedback in a newsroom. The first facet, topic selection, refers to the process of determining whether an event, issue or piece of information will be reported," (Lee & Tandoc, 2017: p. 438). Traditionally, scholars like Gans explained that topic selection was a process that journalists often kept closed off from the public in attempts to maintain the authority and autonomy of the media institution (1979). Now, audiences often help guide the story selection process, as likes, shares and other measures of an audience's level of

engagement and interest in a topic may play into whether it is deemed newsworthy enough for a journalist to cover.

The second facet, story placement, is the process of determining where a story is placed within a publication (Lee & Tandoc, 2017). This may refer to where a story appears on a publication's home page, or where and how often it is shared across other media channels, like email newsletters, Facebook and Twitter. Finally, the third facet is performance evaluation, or the process of determining how success is measured in a journalist's day-to-day work. For some news media, clicks are king where pay-per-click structures may lead to additional pay given to reporters who produce stories that exceed a certain number of views or other levels of engagement (Fischer, 2014). In other cases, time spent on page, shares on social media or other aggregated audience feedback on individual posts and stories may serve as measures of success.

Applying the three facets as a framework

While Tandoc and Vos derived these three facets from case studies conducted in three online newsrooms, the framework they have provided may have applications outside of traditional newsrooms. In order to better test this framework, these three facets will be employed to guide this study into exploring how adopting a story-first editorial approach has affected news production in a nontraditional newsroom. With the editorial newsroom at the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City, Missouri, as a significant case, this study can first question how adopting a new editorial approach has affected how the newsroom thinks about audiences before exploring how that approach and consideration of audiences further affects the three facets Tandoc and Vos define. To do this, the study will focus on the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected how public affairs practitioners think about audiences in their work?

- **RQ2:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected what public affairs practitioners decide to cover?

- **RQ3:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners place and/or distribute a story?

- **RQ4:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners evaluate a story's performance?

The next section will further explain how in-depth interviews will be conducted to explore these questions. Additionally, the following section will go over the participants included in the case study as well as how data will be gathered, analyzed and measured. Finally, the next section will discuss how data will be validated and reflect on what challenges the researcher may encounter through the study's duration.

METHODOLOGY

Method

In this study, the research will be conducted as a single, exploratory case. For the purpose of this study, cases will be understood following the definition provided by Thomas:

"Case studies are analyses of persons, events, decisions, periods, projects, policies, institutions, or other systems that are studied holistically by one or more methods. The case that is the subject of the inquiry will be an instance of a class of phenomena that provides an analytical frame—an object—within which the study is conducted and which the case illuminates and explicates," (2011: p. 513)

Following this definition, the Kauffman Foundation's Public Affairs editorial team will serve as the study's case, with the editorial team's news production process as its object, which will explore the research questions outlined following the theoretical framework provided by the three facets of news production affected by audience feedback that Tandoc and Lee have defined (2016). This framework will help to guide answering the following questions about how adopting a story-first editorial approach, influenced by audiences, has affected a nontraditional newsroom's news production:

- **RQ1:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected how public affairs practitioners think about audiences in their work?

- **RQ2:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected what public affairs practitioners decide to cover?

- **RQ3:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners place and/or distribute a story?

- **RQ4:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way public affairs practitioners evaluate a story's performance?

 With this theory as a guide, the researcher will have the opportunity to study real-life situations experienced by the editorial team that, as concrete and context-dependent experiences, are rich with nuance and detail, which Flyvbjerg highlights as a strength of case studies, (2013).

To best explore this nuance and detail, the research will use in-depth interviews as its method for data collection. In-depth interviews offer researchers the opportunity to capture individual experiences, which closely aligns with the aims of this study to better understand how adopting a new editorial approach has affected news production — which the interview subjects perform in their daily work. Additionally, because the researcher has already spent more than 8 months embedded with the interview subjects, the researcher will have already established access and rapport with subjects, so as best to "study sideways" as both a coworker and researcher (Plesner, 2011: p. 471), instead of solely as an outsider in a position of authority to dominate or subordinate one's relationship to the subject.

With this in mind, this study assumes the conception of a romantic interview, as per Roulston's research (2010). The research proposed will best fit the 'romantic' conception of an interview for a number of reasons. In this approach, it is understood that through developed rapport, the interviewer is able to access the interviewed subject's beliefs, experiences, opinions, attitudes or perspectives on a topic. As a coworker to the

interview subjects proposed in this study and delineated in **Appendix B**, this rapport has already been established in one social setting and may be a strength when conducting interviews that are more conversational in nature.

Subjects & Data

Data will be collected and analyzed from transcripts made from audio-recorded interviews. These transcripts will be created by a third-party contractor hired and paid by the Kauffman Foundation. These interviews will last roughly an hour and will be conducted with core members of the Kauffman Foundation's editorial team. These interview subjects will include the 12 editorial team members outlined in **Appendix B**. The 12 interview subjects reflect a diversity of skills, roles, level of education and gender as well as race. Additionally, the 12 interview subjects have varying levels of experience in their professional career and have worked for the Kauffman Foundation for a range of time spanning from less than one year to more than 20 years among the subjects. This diversity of experience and background will allow for a wider range of perspectives with different nuances to enrich the data. These interview subjects were selected based on their diversity of experience and roles on the editorial team.

While the researcher fully anticipates that the 12 interviews should provide sufficient data to reach theoretical saturation, or a point where little to no new information is gleaned from additional interviews (Small, 2009; Yin, 2002), in the event that more interviews are needed to be conducted, subsequent interviews may be conducted with these 12 subjects. More interviews may be conducted with others on the editorial team who serve in more peripheral roles, but still have an understanding of the news production and work performed at the foundation.

Interview Procedure

In this study, the researcher will conduct at least 12 hourlong in-depth interviews, or as many interviews as needed to reach theoretical saturation. The interviews will follow a semi-structured interview guide, which can be found in **Appendix A**. While the research questions outlined within this study will provide guidance to the questions asked in the interviews, a semi-structured guide will allow for conversations to flow with more flexibility. Additionally, following a semi-structured format will allow interview subjects to explore other avenues of thought that may not have been directly addressed in the researcher's questions. This will also allow the researcher to ask follow-up questions that may provide more clarity on interview subject responses and flexibility in exploring different viewpoints in more depth.

Measure

Once the interviews have been completed and the conversations have been fully transcribed, the researcher will then work to analyze the data collected following the protocol outlined by Dey (1993). When analyzing, the researcher will start by conducting a vertical reading of the transcripts, which will allow the researcher to soak in the data. Then, the researcher will conduct horizontal readings of each transcript and begin coding the data that is most salient to the research questions posed. During this time, the researcher will be coding "like with like" (Dey, 1993: p. 95), or looking for patterns that emerge from the data. These patterns will help to create chunks of data organized by those data points that share a category (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

Once all of the data has been coded in this way, the researcher will move on to linking data together. Unlike the initial round of coding, this second round will focus on

how data interact, not on how they are like one another. This process of linking will help

the researcher to make sense of the data in order to understand the relationships between

data points (Dey, 1993). These connections will help the researcher to infer meaning

from the data, which will then be reflected on in the study's findings. Returning to

Tandoc and Vos' theoretical framework will help the researcher explain and organize the

findings from this analysis.

Validity

Following the romantic conception of interviewing will best allow the researcher

to ensure validity in a number of ways (Roulston, 2011). As Roulston suggests,

interviewers using the romantic conception of interview need to demonstrate the

established rapport, often through a longevity of fieldwork. As a fellow with the

Kauffman Foundation's Public Affairs department, the researcher has already worked

with the interview subjects with for more than 8 months at the time of this proposal, thus

creating an established rapport that will in all likelihood carry into the interview space.

This, along with the proposed method of conducting 12 hourlong in-depth interviews

demonstrate both longevity and rigor of work to improve the validity of this study.

Validity will also be ensured upon the study's completion by making the

transcripts and interview guide accessible and replicable for others. Additionally, the

researcher is aware of the sensitive nature an interview and discussing one's work may

pose for the subjects being interviewed. As such, the researcher will take care to sequence

and adjust my questioning pattern as needed to help establish greater rapport, comfort and

conversation flow in the interviews.

Roulston also writes that the validity and quality in interviews following the romantic conception are often supported by triangulation of methods or data to improve validity. Because the research will involve interviewing different people on the same team within a social setting, the Kauffman Foundation, the data will include multiple viewpoints, which the researcher may use to validate, clarify and support details from prior interviews as they are conducted in succession until saturation is met.

To further support the validity and credibility of the study, the researcher will write weekly memos throughout the study. These will be sent to the committee overseeing this study for the completion of graduate studies. In these memos, the researcher will discuss what progress is being made in the study, as well as provide reflections on any biases or preconceived thoughts the researcher may find is influencing their thinking throughout the course of the study.

This reflexivity through weekly memos will also be supported with low inference descriptors included from the interview transcripts throughout the study's final report. By including direct responses from interview subjects, this will allow the researcher to show the progression from research question to participant response to the researcher's analysis. Additionally, these low inference descriptors will provide direct, dense description throughout that supports and deepens the researcher's analysis.

Reflection & Challenges

Despite these validity checks, the researcher still anticipates there will be some challenges in conducting this study. First, the researcher anticipates that there will be some challenges to recruiting participants. While the researcher is not concerned about securing interviews, there may at first be some tension around the study's potential for

publication. As such, carefully writing questions in the interview guide to create a conversational interview space, as well as clearly outlining the study's intentions in a consent form (see **Appendix C**) may alleviate these concerns for study participants.

Secondly, the researcher's unique situation as both an employed fellow of the Kauffman Foundation and researcher for the University of Missouri may prove to complicate the reflexivity shown in this study. As a fellow, the researcher has been privy and engaged in prior conversations about changes in editorial approach that will be explored in this study. With this in mind, weekly logs may help the researcher to explore what conflicting biases and preconceived thoughts may come to mind during interviews or analysis. That being said, the dual positions the researcher holds may provide a strength, as the case study has strong proximity to the researcher's local knowledge and experience (Thomas, 2011).

PUBLICATION POSSIBILITIES

Based on the topic of this study, as well as the literature reviewed within it, this research may have the potential to be published in the following relevant publications:

- *Journalism Practice*
- *New Media and Society*
- *Mass Communication & Society*

For publication, the researcher has identified the followed key terms that help highlight concepts covered in or related to this research:

- News production
- Newsroom
- Practice
- Institution
- Audience

REFERENCES

Boczkowski, P. J., & Mitchelstein, E. (2012). How Users Take Advantage of Different Forms of Interactivity on Online News Sites: Clicking, E-Mailing, and Commenting. *Human Communication Research*, *38*(1), 1–22. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2011.01418.x

Bro, P., Hansen, K. R., & Andersson, R. (2016). Improving Productivity in the Newsroom? *Journalism Practice*, *10*(8), 1005–1018. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/17512786.2015.1090883

Chaffee, S. H., & Metzger, M. J. (2001). The End of Mass Communication? *Mass Communication & Society*, *4*(4), 365–379. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1207/S15327825MCS0404pass:[_]3

Cook, T. E. (1998). *Governing with the news: the news media as a political institution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b5790448&site=eds-live&scope=site

Cook, T. E. (2006). The News Media as a Political Institution: Looking Backward and Looking Forward. *Political Communication*, *23*(2), 159–171. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/10584600600629711

Fischer, M. C. (2014). The pay-per-visit debate: Is chasing viral traffic hurting journalism? *American Journalism Review*. http://ajr.org/2014/03/27/pay-per-visitdebate-chasing-viral-traffic-hurting-journalism

Flyvbjerg, B. (2013). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363

Gans, H. J. (1979). *Deciding what's news: a study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1979. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b1119985&site=eds-live&scope=site

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b1129329&site=eds-live&scope=site

Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2014). *The elements of journalism: what newspeople should know and the public should expect*. New York: Three Rivers Press, [2014]. Retrieved from

http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b10438513&site=eds-live&scope=site

Lee, E., & Tandoc, E. C. (2017). When News Meets the Audience: How Audience Feedback Online Affects News Production and Consumption. *Human Communication Research, 43*(4), 436–449. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12123

Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, [©1922]. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b1432384&site=eds-live&scope=site

Molotch, H. & Lester, M. (1974). News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents, and Scandals. *American Sociological Review, 39*(1), 101. http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.2094279&site=eds-live&scope=site

Plesner, U. (2011). "Studying Sideways: Displacing the Problem of Power in Research Interviews with Sociologists and Journalists," *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(2011): 471-482.

Ragas, M. W., Tran, H. L., & Martin, J. A. (2014). Media-induced or search-driven? A study of online agenda-setting effects during the BP oil disaster. *Journalism Studies*, *15*(1), 48–63. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/1461670X.2013.793509

Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, *10*(2), 199–228. https://doiorg.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1177/1468794109356739

Robinson, S. (2007). "Someone's Gotta Be in Control Here." *Journalism Practice*, *1*(3), 305–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512780701504856

Sigal, L. V. (1973). *Reporters and officials: the organization and politics of newsmaking*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b1689248&site=eds-live&scope=site

Small, M. L. (2009). "How many cases do I need?" On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research. *Ethnography*, *10*(1), 5. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.24047975&site=eds-live&scope=site

Tandoc, E. C. (2014). Journalism is twerking? How web analytics is changing the process of gatekeeping. *New Media and Society*, *16*(4), 559–575. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1177/1461444814530541

Tandoc, E. C., & Thomas, R. J. (2015). The Ethics of Web Analytics: Implications of using audience metrics in news construction. *Digital Journalism*, *3*(2), 243–258. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/21670811.2014.909122

Tandoc, E. C., & Vos, T.P. (2016). The Journalist is Marketing the News: Social media in the gatekeeping process. *Journalism Practice*, *10*(8), 950–966. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1080/17512786.2015.1087811

Thomas, G. (2011). A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse, and structure. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*(6), 511–521. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1177/1077800411409884

Welbers, K., Van Atteveldt, W., Kleinnijenhuis, J., Schaper, J., & Ruigrok, N. (2016). News selection criteria in the digital age: Professional norms versus online audience metrics. *Journalism*, *17*(8), 1037–1053. https://doi-org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1177/1464884915595474

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods*. Los Angeles: SAGE, [2014]. Retrieved from http://proxy.mul.missouri.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat04885a&AN=merlin.b9740874&site=eds-live&scope=site

TIMELINE

Week	Objectives	Deadlines	Meetings
March 3-9	• Follow up on paperwork w/ K. Adams • Research literature • Draft proposal, appendices • Draft professional portion • Draft weekly reflections • Meet w/ EMKF supervisor to discuss topic, project logistics, transcription • Request supervisor evaluation	Drafted timeline 3/8 Drafted weekly reflections 3/8	• Initial committee call 03/04 • Mtg. w/ supervisor 03/05
March 10-16	• Present, approve proposal • Make edits to proposal • Flesh out interview questions for individuals • Clear proposal with IRB • Weekly reflection • Collect body of work samples • Send supervisor evaluation requirements • IRB exemption secured	Drafted proposal 3/12	Proposal review 3/14
March 17-23	• Proposal approved, submitted • Notify interviewees • Schedule, conduct interviews • Submit transcripts • Weekly reflection • Collect body of work samples	Updated timeline with interviews 3/23	
March 24-30	• Schedule, conduct interviews • Submit new transcripts • Code transcripts • Collect body of work samples • Weekly reflection		
March 30-April 6	• All interviews finished • All transcripts transcribed • Code transcripts • Weekly reflection		

April 7-13	• All transcripts coded • Supervisor evaluation complete • Write first draft of analysis • Weekly reflection	Supervisor evaluation 4/7	
April 14-20	• Complete edits to first draft • Weekly reflection		
April 21-27	• Final draft sent to committee • Final weekly reflection		
April 28-May 3		M3, all other materials submitted by 5/3* *Late submissions not accepted after 5/10	

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE

General questions
- What's your name, and how long have you been working for the Kauffman Foundation?
- Tell me a little bit about what kind of work you do here — either for the editorial team or another department you may serve in tandem with Public Affairs.

Background questions
- Can you give me an overview of the new editorial approach the Kauffman Foundation is adopting on your team?
    - How long has this change been worked on/talked about?
    - What do you feel are the primary goals of this change?

- **RQ1:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected how you think about audiences in your work?

    - **A)** What kinds of audiences or people does Kauffman look to engage with its content? Are these audiences different than those you engaged with before the change in editorial approach?

    - **B)** Can you give me a sense of how actively you are thinking about the people you are creating content for? Maybe give me an example of when audiences were or were not considered at some point in your work.

- **RQ2:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected what you decide to cover?
    - **A)** What kinds of topics is Kauffman interested in covering under this new approach? Are these different than before the change?

    - **B)** Under this new approach, who can pitch stories? Can you describe that process and how it has maybe changed?

    - **C)** Under this new approach, how do you decide what ultimately will get covered?

- **RQ3:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way you use different channels to tell stories?

    - **A)** Since adopting a new editorial approach that concentrates on stories, when does story placement across channels come into play in the editorial process? *E.g. The beginning, once a story is in production, after a story is written*

    - **B)** In this new approach, are some channels where stories are placed or shared more valued than others? Which? Why or why not?

- **RQ4:** How has adopting a new editorial approach affected the way you evaluate a story's performance?

    - **A)** Can you give me three words to describe what a successful story is under the new editorial approach? *Explain these choices.*

- o **B)** What sorts of measurements or responses are you looking for in what you would consider a successful story? Have these measurements changed or are they emphasized differently than before?

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW LIST

Larry Jacob
Vice President of Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Keith Mays
Director of Editorial in Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Julie Scheidegger
Senior Content Strategist in Public
Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Matt Pozel
Senior Multimedia Writer & Producer in
Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Matt Long
Senior Video Producer in Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Kim Wallace Carlson
Director of Engagement -
Entrepreneurship in Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Miles Sandler
Director of Engagement – Education in
Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Kim Farley
Digital Project Manager in Public
Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Lauren Aleshire
Senior Content Marketing Specialist in
Public Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Chris Newton
Digital Marketing Specialist in Public
Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Katey Stoetzel
Content Marketing Coordinator in Public
Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Kayla Smalley
Digital Content Coordinator in Public
Affairs
Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation

Appendix C: CONSENT FORM

*Rest in peace, press release: A case study exploring how adopting a
story-first editorial approach affects news production in a nontraditional newsroom*

Consent Form

I volunteer to participate in a research project conducted by Valerie Hellinghausen and overseen by the research director, Randall Smith, from the Missouri School of Journalism at the University of Missouri.

1. What is the aim of the study?
This study aims to provide insights into how restructuring one's editorial approach might affect the processes that govern the day-to-day working of a newsroom. These insights may prove especially valuable to practitioners and academics alike as the definition of newsroom and the structure itself is expanded beyond the realm of journalism and into nonprofits, corporate brands and other nontraditional spaces. In the end, these findings may help fill a gap in literature exploring how adopting a new editorial approach may affect news production, especially in light of the influence of audience feedback.

 As a participant, I understand that this study is also being conducted for the completion of the researcher's professional project for the completion of a master's degree and may be submitted for publication.

2. What will be involved in participating?
My role involves participating in an audio-recorded interview. The interview will last between 30 and 60 minutes. During the interview, participants will be asked to respond to several questions relating to the study.

3. Will I be compensated for my participation?
I recognize that the researchers value my time, but I will not be monetarily compensated for my participation in the study. At no time during the study or its publication will I profit from my participation.

4. Who will know what I say?
Audio recordings and transcripts of the interviews will be made. Only the researcher and the research director will have access to the recording. Additionally, I recognize that the researcher will destroy the audio recording according to Institutional Review Board protocol. *Despite these protections, if I don't want to be recorded, I will not participate in the study.*

5. What are my rights as a participant?
I understand that my participation in this study is *voluntary*. If, however, I feel uncomfortable in any way during the interview, I maintain the right to decline to answer any question or to withdraw my participation in the study at any time, for any reason without penalty. If I have any questions regarding the research, they will be answered fully at any point in the study.

6. If I want more information about the study, whom can I contact?
This study has been reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Research Protections Program and Institutional Review Board at the University of Missouri. The board can be contacted through the Office of Research, Graduate Studies and Economic Development on campus, by phone at (573) 882-3181 or by email at irb@missouri.edu. Randall Smith, the research director, can be contacted by phone at (573) 882-9738 or by email at smithrandall@missouri.edu. Valerie Hellinghausen, the primary researcher, may be contacted by phone at (281) 840-8416 or by email at vhellinghausen@kauffman.org.

_____   _____
Printed respondent name   Respondent signature, date

_____   _____
Printed researcher name   Researcher signature, date

APPENDIX D: ON-SITE SUPERVISOR AGREEMENT

<u>University of Missouri School of Journalism - Professional Project Written Agreement</u>

Student Name: _____ Student Number: _____

Employer: _____

Employer phone: _____ Employer location: _____

Supervisor name: _____

Supervisor title _____

Supervisor email address: _____

Date professional project begins: (mm/dd/yy) _____ ends: (mm/dd/yy) _____

Days and hours student will work: _____

Detailed description of how the student will be supervised and the student's responsibilities:

Throughout the course of this professional project, the student will meet with the on-site supervisor on a biweekly basis to review progress on assigned tasks and projects. In these meetings, both the student and the supervisor will have the opportunity to discuss feedback on performance and address any concerns. In addition, the student will meet weekly with the supervisor and other team members to review priorities for the week and progress on Public Affairs and Entrepreneurship team projects.

During the timeframe outlined above, the student will be responsible for a number of tasks including but not limited to developing strategy for upcoming events, writing and editing marketing copy, and reporting on assigned stories for Kauffman Currents. The student will also be expected to attend regularly scheduled meetings as well as participate in foundation-wide opportunities for professional development and education. All of these responsibilities are in accordance with the outlined and approved goals the student and supervisor agreed to at the beginning of 2019 when the Kauffman Foundation media fellowship was extended.

The project committee chair will accept responsibility for coordination with the on-site supervisor. The faculty coordinator is expected to maintain regular contact with the student. The student is required to send weekly filed notes to her committee chair. These notes should summarize the activities, reflect on what has been learned and report any problems.

The below signed agree that the professional project regulations and the above responsibilities constitute a written agreement between the parties.

Student signature and date: _____

Supervisor signature and date: _____