———————————————————————————————————

- [Sally Lehrman](), chief executive officer, **Trust Project**

———————————————————————————————————

Mallary Tenore Hi, everyone, and welcome to the fourth day of ISOJ online. I'm Mallary Tenore, associate director of the Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas, and I'm so glad that you're here today for this exciting workshop that we have planned.

Now, before we get started, I just want to share a few housekeeping notes with you. And if you've been joining us all along, you've probably heard these before, but they're always helpful reminders. And the first is that I want to mention that this workshop, along with all the rest of our workshops, and panels, and keynotes, is going to be interpreted into Spanish. So if you'd like to join and watch the Spanish, click the language channel. And from there, you'll be able to listen to it in Spanish. And please note that we're also live streaming this workshop on YouTube, both in English and in Spanish. So if at any point you have any trouble with Zoom and you're running into any technical issues, you can always join the YouTube stream. And there will be links to those YouTube channels in the chat feature within Zoom.

And lastly, I want to remind you to use the hashtag #ISOJ2020 to share highlights from this workshop and to just post on social media. And if you have questions at any point for a workshop instructor, please feel free to put them in the chat feature in Zoom, and we'll do our best to respond to them.

So now I would like to introduce our brunch workshop, where we'll delve into best practices to improve engagement through transparency, inclusion and ethics. And I want to give a big shout out and thanks to the Trust Project for helping to make this workshop possible. So now I'm happy to introduce you to our workshop instructor, the wonderful Sally Lehrman, who is chief executive officer of the Trust Project. Thank you, Sally.

Sally Lehrman Well, thank you, Mallary. I am just delighted to be here today and wanted to get started by just saying a little bit here about who I am. I'm a journalist and I founded the Trust Project, oh, maybe five years ago. And so what I would like to do is speak with you today about, again, building trust and best practices to improve engagement through transparency, ethics and inclusion. And I'd like to talk a little bit first about the Trust Project and some context, and then dive into these questions about how trust can help you build engagement, can actually build some ways for you to improve your business model. And then we can get into some of the practices, and I'd like to have some discussion around that. So what I would like to do then is go ahead and share my screen and get started with some slides.

So here we go. OK, so we sit right now at what I see as a really important opportunity, and this is why I'm excited to talk about trust in the news with you right now. I mean, I always am, but in particular now. Because what we see is if you look at this chart and look, particularly at that black line, this is an Edelman public relations report on trust, they do it every year, and what we see is trust in news has been declining for about 20 years. But

then we start to see an uptick in about 2018, when journalists really started to pay attention and try to start building trust. And then you see even more of a leap here between January and May 2020. And why is that? Well, I think it's because people have recognized that they really can turn to journalists in a time of crisis, that we are a source that they know will not be trying to sell them something, an idea or anything else, but that we really are committed to accuracy.

So this is the time in which we have an opportunity to really build that relationship of trust. And I think we really should take advantage of that, because even as we are building attention and confidence on the part of the public, we also are under attack, as you all know.

So what are the underpinnings of trust, and how do we build that? Well, if you think about it, trust really is a relationship. If you think about institutions and individuals you trust, it is because you have a relationship with them. And there are some components that we find repeated in the academic literature around what builds trust in journalism, and what builds trust in the digital space. And they are, you know that this individual institution is reliable, is consistent. You feel they are confident. You feel that they have positive intentions. And then above all, there's a feeling that you share integrity and ethics. So these are the fundamentals.

And what the Trust Project tries to do is show these fundamentals to the public and also show what is distinct about journalism. So the theory is, if you think about the public kind of as a float on the sea of information, everything in the digital environment looks alike. It's very difficult to tell, more and more so, the difference between real journalism and information that's designed to maybe sell you something, a pair of shoes, sell you an idea, or even incite you to violence. So can we now show how journalism is different. Well we can show that to the public on our pages and we can show this also to the technology platforms that are kind of shepherding people from this bit of information to that bit of information, like a cruise ship. We can show it to them through machine readable signals. And this information that we're providing not only shows how journalism is distinct, but also those features like reliability, integrity, positive intentions and competency behind journalism.

We're now in 200 news sites in all these places in the world. And you can see we have quite good coverage in lots of different areas. And the lighter font locations are ones that we'll be in, in our next couple of rounds.

And one of the things that I'll say is that in order to come up with these trust indicators to really think about how do we rebuild trust? I thought we need to talk to the public because we've talked among ourselves as journalists for a long time. We've talked about, you know, what do we do about this decline in trust? What do we do about this digital space? And we didn't really consult the public. So I was inspired by this user-centered design concept that I learned as an alum of the Knight Fellowship program at Stanford. And so that's what we did. We went out and talked to people about what do they value in the news, when do they trust it and when don't they? And then we took that to workshops with senior news executives to think about how do we marry what people are looking for in the news with journalistic values to create a stronger communication around who we are that resonates with the public and then kind of helps us close out all this misinformation that's flowing into this environment and a lack of trust?

So I want to tell you a bit about what we learned from our users, because I think that is something I'd encourage you to think about. We found there were really four user types across all those different areas. What amazed me was the similarity in what people said. So first we have the avid news user. This is Alex. She lives in Detroit. She owns her own company, and she says, "I do not understand why people do not read the news. Might as well put your finger in a light socket." Like it's deadly not to know about news. Then we have, here's Alma, and she also happens to live in Detroit, and she's what I would call the engaged user. She works for the library, their assistant to the head librarian, and she thinks about it in that context. "Like I want news that's nutritionally fit. Every time I read an article, I have more questions." And that's good. She wants to be engaged by news, and she's subscribing to news. She's has read it all her life, but she feels a bit of overwhelmed and also underserved. And Alex, the avid news user, she's out there checking and crosschecking news, pushing it out through social media. Now, here's Wendy, who lives in Phenix, and she is a good example of an opportunistic user. These are users that are just seeing news when it washes over them. And yet, they still see the value in news. Wendy says, "News is there to tell us what's going on around the world, around the neighborhood." "It's not just promoting a viewpoint or person," she went on to say. And she also doesn't quite see herself in the news. And so right here is an example, she gets a news feed from a Latino law firm because she wants to really understand more what's going on in her community from that perspective. This group, the "angry disengaged," is a group that we often kind of obsess about, I would say, in the news. And we should be paying attention to them. They are the ones who maybe would be avid news users, but they've just turned off and they've become angry and disengaged. This is one quote, "I would trust a system that was as critical of institutions as I am." I believe this is an important group for us to reach out to, but these other areas are ones, especially the engaged opportunistic, are ones that we could be thinking about more as we think about building trust.

And in fact, this data from Edelman, again, this is from the year before the survey. They talk about this big rise in news engagement, and again, we see these amplifiers. The "avids" very much engaged with news. And then the "consumers," I would say, would be our "opportunistic" and "engaged." And these folks tend to be overlooked, and this is where we can build more trust.

So what did we learn from these individuals? What we found, as I said, a lot of commonalities in what people were looking for as they were trying to understand whether news was trustworthy. First thing they said and came out most often, the agenda. They said, we understand that journalists aim to be unbiased, but everyone has an agenda. So tell us your agenda. Diverse perspectives came up over and over. We want to hear from not just people at high levels of business and government. We want to hear from people who are like ourselves because we don't perhaps see ourselves in the news and also unlike ourselves. The journalists, getting back to that relationship. Who is this journalist? What do they know? Where they come from? What are their values? What am I looking at? People felt that even journalists didn't really understand the difference between news and opinion. It was blending, and so they were concerned about that. How do you know what you know, journalists? So a lot of more interest maybe than in the past of seeing, asking us to show our work. Is it locally sourced? So do you know me? Do you know my community? And let me participate, so lots of expectation to participate beyond just comments.

So this is the result of all those conversations that I told you about. We came up with eight trust indicators, and they respond to those questions. And we'll go into several of them in

more detail, as I said. So it's basically your policies and standards. Information about the journalists. Labeling. References and methods tell you how is the story built. Is it locally sourced? Diverse voices. And actionable feedback.

So now I'd like to hand it over to one of our news partners, Barbara Maushard, in this video, and she's senior VP of news at Hearst Television. Just to talk a little bit about the changes they made and the changes that they didn't make, and how overall really thinking about these trust indicators has affected their newsroom. (Plays video.)

"We operate from, it's a line I've used for a long time that my folks probably are tired of hearing, but I often say that, 'first is desired, but right is required.' So all of the things that the Trust Project stands for are things we're doing, things that we are aspiring to. No one's perfect, but I think all of the things, the transparency, the clarity to our audience, the expectation that we'll correct the mistakes, we'll be very honest and upfront about that, and that we'll take the time to check sources, to identify the right sources, to have a diverse voice and a collaborative team. All of those things are things that we have long been practicing. And I believe the Trust Project helps us to even put even more of a focus on it. A reminder, perhaps at times, that this is what we're doing, and this is why we're doing it. With regard to the indicators, I think what we wanted was to revisit what we were doing, and make it clear both internally for our viewers and externally. We were practicing all of the things that are expected. Right. Transparency, sourcing, you know, defining what type of journalism it is. But we weren't always putting it front and center. We weren't always maybe reminding our viewers that we were doing it. So the impact, I think, is for us to focus on that a little bit, and make sure that it is also part of our journalism, not just behind our journalism. And I think that has been the impact that we have seen. It is a good, constant reminder that this is what we do, and this is why we do it. So let's make sure our audience understands that. In the United States, local news is the number one trusted news source. We're very proud of that, but there comes a lot of responsibility with that. We have to ensure that we continue to be that trusted source by our actions. The indicators did not impact our journalism. Our journalism is reflective of the indicators. The indicators, though, as I've noted, have been a reminder for us on how to implement and showcase that to our audience to reinforce the trusted position that we hold. The Trust Project is a wonderful project, a wonderful effort. Anything we can do as journalists to reinforce the trusted sources of news, the respected sources of news, and to live up to the expectations of our consumers that we will be transparent, that we will check sources, that we will take our time to do it right, is incredibly valuable. And never probably more valuable than it is today as our audiences are hanging on for every piece of information that they can find in a pandemic, in a time of unrest. They need trusted sources to be able to keep their families safe, to understand what is happening in the world around them, and if they so choose, to participate in that. So having an organization like the Trust Project to help point to sources."

So I'll just end it there. And so what she's saying there is, I think, underpinning this concept that there may be things that you're already doing. I mean, there are many things that you are already doing that are just the foundation of quality journalism, but you may not be communicating that well. So this is what we try to do at the Trust Project, and this is what you can do there within your own newsrooms in various ways. And I said at the very beginning that this connects with engagement. So part of what we are seeing is that by talking more about what you do and how you do it and being more transparent, you can build a stronger sense of relationship, and then you can transform that into this subscription funnel, meaning you start with awareness, and then pull down people into engagement, eventually conversion, and retention. And we have data from our earliest

days even that show that this premise that trust, leads to loyalty, leads to monetization really does work.

So the Center for Media Engagement there at UT Austin did a study when we first came up with the trust indicators, and Talia Stroud there said, "If we do a study, they may not work." And we didn't know if they would work, but in fact they did an AB study. Twelve-hundred people saw the trust indicators on a site. Half did not. And they came up with statistically significant differences in perceptions of trust in the site and trust in the journalist. So evaluation of the news organization, people were more likely to say it could be trusted, reputable, tells the whole story, and has high reporting standards. There were less likely to think it was fake news, and they were more likely to evaluate the reporter as having carefully researched the story and were qualified to do it.

In addition to that, getting to the loyalty flows from the trust, 33% expressed a willingness "somewhat" to "much more willingness" to pay for more news from that site if it was involved in the Trust Project. Now, this is an experiment, so we wanted to know, well, how does this really work when the trust indicators are live? So Reach PLC did a study with The Mirror, which is a very large UK publication, and they got an 8% increase in trust. They did a survey before they had implemented the trust indicators, and then after.

So now what are these trust indicators, and how do they really operate in the wild? Here's an example from one of our Italian news partners, and this is their best practices page. And this is the one where I'd like to have some conversation with you about. So the best practices is the one that shows the guardrails around the news organization and how we keep our promise to serve the public and not to serve any other mission, really. Not a business, not a political agenda or anything else. So those are our best practices. And they're structured the same in every news organization that is part of the Trust Project, and I'll show you what are the components.

So the best practices include explaining who are your owners because owners, of course, ownership, can people go to that to try to understand what an agenda is? How are you funded? Similar thing. Mission and coverage. Priorities. Corrections. So what are your mission and coverage priorities? What do you focus on, and do you make corrections? Do you admit when you make mistakes?

So what I'd like to do is show you some examples, and we can talk a little bit about your perceptions of which ones are more effective.

Oh, sorry. And do you name your sources. So this is just a series of a number of items that are within the best practice. It's just a sampling. But I wanted to highlight today ownership and funding because of this kind of thing. We're seeing hundreds, just in the U.S. Alone, hundreds of hyper partisan sites masquerading as local news, as Nieman Lab showed through this article just earlier this month. So all those little red dots were hyper-partisan conservative and the blue left-leaning sites. And you see this around the world, as you know. So what we can do to try to help people understand the difference between a hyper-partisan site and a real journalism site is show those best practices.

So here are some examples, and I'm going to ask the team working with me, maybe you can, I'm not seeing the Google Doc with the Q&A, so maybe with the chat? So maybe you can send it to me another way? Maybe through WhatsApp, because I'm not able to see it.

And anyway. So here is the Globe and Mail, one of our news partners, and they talk about, like many of our partners do, they talk about the award-winning coverage, and how many readers they reach, and then getting to the ownership. "The Globe and Mail is owned by Woodbridge, the investment arm of the Thomson family." So I invite you to think about that, kind of hold it in your head. Now, Toronto Star, one of their competitors, but also part of the trust project. They also talk about awards. They also talk about reach. And then they explain about ownership. "We are a subsidiary of Torstar Corp., listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange. We have a long history in daily and community newspapers, book publishing and digital businesses. We have three operating segments, daily news brands, community brands and digital ventures." So that's the essence of what they say. So kind of think about that one in comparison to the one you just saw. And now we have Cambio 16, and it's a Spanish publication. Again, you'll see these same best practices. And here we have they are owned by Grupo EIG Multimedia in Spain. They have three publications in all. Forty-nine years of experience. They also offer branding, advertising, multimedia design, event production and custom publishing services. So they are in other businesses, and so in case you're wondering, these divisions are managed separately to avoid conflict of interest. So think about those three, and actually, if I stop share for a moment, I think we can be able to have that discussion.

So I'm curious what you think about those different versions of best practices. So any comments about that?

OK, here's one. "Due to revenue generation, through subscriptions, advertisements or contributions, it seems media provide news stories could attract viewers most. Other facts in the stories stay in the background." So I think what we're saying, it kind of gets to that example that I just showed you, that news company may be in other types of news distribution businesses, but it's important to be able to share that with the public, to explain that this is what we're doing. And maybe even talk about the different revenue sources that you're using, so they can understand what is your commitment to independent news.

So I don't see any other comments right now. "How do you manage conflicts?" All right. Yes, thank you. That's a very important point a commenter raises. "How do you manage conflict of interest is important to mention after talking about the company, as audiences will think of potential conflicts themselves." And I think you are absolutely right. We see that, and people do jump to their own conclusions. This is what we heard in our interviews. So we really want to have always in that description of business, and you saw that in the last one from Cambio 16, saying that these businesses are separate. And as the commenter is saying, we could expand that even further and say not only are they managed separately, but we avoid conflict of interest, just spelling it out. And of course, that's important to mention in your ethics codes as well. So thanks. This is a really great comment.

So now if there aren't any further comments on that, we'll go to the next one that I wanted to share. So conflict of interest, great segway. So conflict of interest. How are you mentioning that? Are you talking about whether you accept gifts? If you don't say you don't, the public might assume that you do. Do you ever pay sources? If you don't say you don't, the public may assume that you do. What about sponsored links? These are becoming more and more in use, where you have a news story and some of the links may, especially in a travel article or something like that, might actually go to something that you get paid for or they may be links that don't get paid for. Typically, the journalists get to decide anyway which links to use. It's not tied to funding. But do you explain that to users? Do you show that they're sponsored links? How do you show that? And now, especially in

light of all the discussions about Black Lives Matter and kind of this reckoning within journalism about how do we remain inclusive? How do we get more inclusive? And how do we make sure that our inclusive practices enable journalists within the news organizations to retain their whole identity and operate with that whole identity? What are your social media rules for that? And how do you ensure that they are able to have their whole identity on Twitter? And in all these cases, does the public know about these rules? So here's one example for Toronto Star. "Toronto Star journalists are always Toronto Star journalists. Journalists are encouraged to be themselves and find their own voices on social media. But it's important to remember that the content they post and the way they conduct themselves have an impact on reader trust, the journalistic reputation of our newsroom, our brands and the company's public standing." So I'll stop share for a moment and just give you an opportunity to comment a little on what you think about that, how maybe you've been thinking about some of your policies? Are they changing now that we've really been called by the public to think more about what we do and how we do it?

So here's a couple of questions coming in. "As when there is conflict of interest and companies don't want these best practices, isn't it the responsibility of journalists to highlight and adapt these practices?" So I think that's a great point. So, yes, from the Trust Project's standpoint, part of what we're trying to do is ensure that these best practices that really characterize journalism are more clearly structured throughout our operations. So we are aiming for structural change and institutional change. However, that's not the only part of it. And as you rightly point out, we need to have individual journalists carry these out as well. And so if your organization isn't quite there yet with some of these things, then, yes, it's something that you can push, and you can perform, and demonstrate and promote with your news organization. That's one piece. The other piece is that, of course, there can be a policy. But as I always tell our news partners, the policy means nothing unless the journalists that work for this news organization are actually fulfilling them. So we have to think about in our day-to-day work and make those everyday decisions about conflict of interest, and that's where having an ethics code can make an enormous difference. And I really like the one that the Society of Professional Journalists has because it's translated in multiple languages, and it offers kind of a decision tree. Online News Association also has one that's very good that way, too. So you can think about a particular issue you're facing and consider, well, what way the different effects that it may have and balance those effects out. So am I serving the public here? Am I hurting someone? Which is more important in this case?

Here's a question, "What do you do when your media is advertising a company that does not have the confidence of the public?" Yes, so that gets to even though we try to have separate advertising and news departments, sometimes one can reflect on the other. And now a lot of what I've been thinking about is kind of the opposite, where news brands, advertising brands that used to advertise in news have pretty much fled from news because they're afraid of accidentally landing next to misinformation, or landing next to news stories that they think are frightening or scary. And so they just completely pull their ads. And so one of the things we can do to draw advertising back in is show that we have these commitments and that we are, in essence, a safe environment in which to advertise. And I think you're right. There is a flip side to that. So maybe we want to be careful about what kinds of ads that we accept, so that we're not damaging perceptions of the journalism that we provide.

Let's see. "Is there ever a time when paying a source is not considered a conflict of interest?" So I think there probably will be varying opinions on that in the audience today, and there are in newsrooms. So in many newsrooms, in many countries, paying a source

is just completely forbidden, like you just would never do that. There are places where I mean, I'm thinking about some news publications in the U.K. where you see it occasionally. So this is something where if you do it, you should disclose it. And I think in general that it is frowned upon. But I don't want to pass judgment on anyone. I mean, this is something that if we were alive, we could have a great discussion about it. I would love to hear what folks in the room think. Our commitment really is to being transparent about what it is you do and why you do it.

So let me continue, and I will try to get to some of these other questions as we go. But I'm going to go ahead and move on in our presentation to talk about conflict of interest and diverse voices. So I mentioned a little bit regarding social media. We're in this moment where, and it showed up in our research too, where people are calling upon journalism to be more reflective of the public and to really recognize that there are diverse voices that we need to be seeing in our coverage, that we need to be giving voice to. And also that journalism has a role, a very important role, in helping constituent groups of society understand one another. So diverse voices is one of our trust indicators. And this is one that, as I mentioned, came up in our research over and over. And so I would ask you to think about how inclusive are your reporting practices? Have you intentionally thought about broadening your source list, or do you kind of take source lists that are handed down, reported to reporter. And maybe even more so over time, they become narrower. They look more like the people in the newsroom. They also look more like people who are high levels of business and government, which often do not represent the diversity of any particular society, no matter which one it is. Do you have a policy or incentives in place? So do you have an actual policy that says at the very top of the news organization, this matters to us, we want to have inclusive reporting, and this is why. We know inclusive reporting brings us more accurate coverage. It brings us more relevant coverage. So are there policies in place? Do you have incentives to help make that happen?

Are you committed to inclusive staffing? So it's well understood that, for example, when you talk about racial diversity, a white journalist can report well on communities of color, but they're going to do a much better job if they're in an environment where they're working with other people who are from those communities, or maybe who speak those languages. So are you committed to inclusive staffing? And we also know that an inclusive staff is a more effective staff overall just across every level. And in order to get to that inclusive staff, do you measure progress? So we also know that in order to really get to an inclusive staff, to a diverse staff, you have to have policies in place. You have to have incentives in place, and you have to check how well you're doing.

So these are things that are built into our trust indicators. And I'm going to show you some examples. So here's Nexo from Brazil, and they talk about coverage here and a policy diversity across race and color and class and gender is fundamental to quality, pluralistic journalism that engages with the issues of the world. So they're saying we have to do this in order to really do a good job to cover the issues that we care about. And they also here acknowledge they're not quite where they would like to be in terms of their staff. So they say Nexo is improving hiring processes with this in mind. So think about this set of disclosures, and how well that works. And then we have this one, this is just the Voice of Orange County, a U.S. paper in California, and they talk about their policies on reporting. "Inclusiveness is at the heart of thinking and acting as journalists." And remember, this is how we're communicating to the public about inclusive reporting. We're also communicating to our own staff. "The complex issues we face as a society require respect for different viewpoints race, class, gender, generation, geography, all effect, point of view." And I'll just give a nod to the Maynard Institute. Those are the Maynard Institute

fault lines of how to think about inclusive coverage. "Reflecting the differences in our reporting lead to better, more nuanced stories and better informed community. We seek diverse voices on our staff. We are interested in hearing from diverse ethnic, civic and business groups in the communities we serve."

So this is signaling to the public, too, that we care about the diverse public, and we're going to make an effort to really hear you, to go out and hear your stories, and include your voices. And then they show this diversity report. And here it explains like who speaks the language other than English, how many are women, how many are not white, LGBTQ-identifying, ethnicity, gender and age. So they lay it all out here. That transparency, I think, really contributes to building trust and recognizing that just as before in the other example, perhaps we're not where we'd love to be, but we're we're really committed to being there. Getting to that structural change I was talking about.

Now, here's another one I want to show you. And this is one I'm not giving you the name of publication, because they're right now, in the process of implementing. So they talk about inclusiveness is at the heart of thinking and acting as journalists. And then they get to the staffing, and they say, "We seek diverse pools of candidates for all positions, but will always seek to hire the most qualified candidate." So I want to stop there. I'm going to share, and I'd love to hear what you think about those various ways of describing your commitment to diverse voices, to diverse staffing. What kind of messages does that language convey?

And while you're thinking I'll answer your question. "There's a possibility of treating it as a party when trying to get diverse voices, especially in conflict zones, areas where religious harmony is not present and elections are near. How do you see that?" I think that's really interesting. Because you're right, we face that in many places that having a commitment to diversity can be seen as a political commitment. I think we just, and I have thought about that, we have to think basically stand firm there and explain that when we talk about diversity, we're talking about diversity across all of these dimensions. So that means not just one political perspective, but all political perspectives that we're aware of, or that need to have a voice. And then, of course, as journalists, we are committed to lifting up underheard or the less-heard voices. The same with colorism, or with race, or with gender. It is our role to help constituent groups of society understand one another. So this is what we have to remain firm to, that this is what journalism is about. And it's kind of like as journalists, we are not advocates, but we do commit to free speech. We commit to free press, and we do everything we can to defend that. And we defend the safety and security of journalists. So along those lines, we also defend our commitment to being inclusive in our reporting to bring in all the sides into communication with one another and to greater understanding of one another.

So I want to go back. No one's commenting on that specific aspect. Actually, there is a question here that I think I should respond to. "What is the borderline between diversity and discrimination?" So diversity means, maybe a way to explain it is we're aiming to pay more attention to people and voices that we may typically, just in our everyday way of living, or in our history, or personal stories, may not have had a lot of exposure to personally. So it does take added effort to do that, particularly if we're not of that community, if we don't have a diverse staff. So, number one, we want to try to have a diverse staff so that we have the skills and the expertize, and we can learn that to go out and listen to intercultural reporting, really listen to what people have to say with open ears, with some humility. That's very different from discrimination, which would mean that maybe

we're intentionally trying to leave out certain voices. And that's completely the opposite of what diversity is about.

"Does inclusivity include the immigrant voice?" Absolutely. So absolutely those are voices that we want to ensure we bring in and that have an opportunity to share their perspective and their experience.

What I wanted to point out here is the language in this statement. "We will seek diverse pools of candidates for all positions, but will always seek to hire the most qualified candidate." This is an example where good intentions can go awry. So as a woman, I might read this and it will say, we seek women for all positions, just like we seek men, but we'll always seek to hire the most qualified candidate. It's almost like saying, well, we kind of expect you not to be the most qualified or we expect diverse candidates not to be the most qualified, but we're going to include them in our search. So I highlight this, and we brought it up to the news organization because that "but" carries a lot of significance, probably some unintended significance.

So let's continue a bit. I just want to close out with these labels, and then I'll open it up for more discussion. So labels. I mentioned that members of the public were saying, "We don't think journalists really are separating news from opinion, and we're not even sure they really understand the difference." So all of our news partners agreed to show clear labels across news, opinion, analysis. So news analysis that isn't the same as opinion. And funded content, various types of funded content. And there are studies that show that labels alone don't really build trust. That's why we do it as part of this whole set of trust indicators. I think part of what we need to do is make these labels more clear, more obvious on the page. And I'll show you some examples of how we are moving in that direction, and what I think we could do better. And also advertiser content. So funded content, let's say a nonprofit foundation is funding some of your content. So being very clear that they're funding it, and what kind of influence do they have over the content itself. Do they have no influence? Do they have some influence? Are they able to suggest sources? Are they able to check it? Advertiser content would be different, where they're actually paying for the whole, maybe like a native content that looks like news but isn't really. So you want to describe that. And then funded content, you want to explain this is funded, so it's affecting our news agenda, even if it's not affecting the particular story.

So here we have some examples. They are a little bit small. But this one, two Italian newspapers, this one's showing that this is analysis and explaining in a definition what that means. Its interpretation of news based on facts, evidence, with data, and also possibly into anticipating how events might unfold. And then here we have Corriere della Sera showing opinion, and they describe what is opinion. And you can see a key difference between opinion and analysis is that it's interpretation of facts based on the opinion of the author. So not just based on facts, but interpreting facts based on the perspective of the author.

So this is one way that we can help show and start to build awareness on the part of the public of the differences between these two things, which may be a bit nuanced. The other thing I think we can do is make these labels much bigger, much more prominent. And then here we assume that news is kind of the default, so we don't ask organizations to label things as news. We don't ask them to describe it, but we do have a definition. And so I was pleased to see the San Jose Mercury News, that's a California newspaper, use a definition for news to label it, and say, "News is based on facts either observed and verified directly by the reporter or reported and verified by knowledgeable sources." So you can see the

difference between this definition and the other two. And if we continue to show these repeatedly then we can continue to, one, educate the public and, two, educate ourselves. Because in conversations with our news partners in the process of developing these trust indicators, what we're finding is that there is some fuzziness in the difference between news, especially news and opinion, and maybe news and analysis, too. There's a bit of fuzziness even internally we don't necessarily have clear distinctions. And we also found these definitions that you see here are definitions that we came up through a collaborative working group with people in Europe, in the U.S. I'm trying to think if there were folks from Latin America. There may have been. And Canada. We were trying to come to a conclusion about how can we define these things in ways that we can all agree on? In that conversation, we came up with some really good definitions, I think, that everyone agrees on, and we continue to work with them. We're finding, and we're doing some user research right now, we're finding that we could be more clear about this. So, again, we will continue to discuss them.

So I'll just close out, and then I'll open up for comments. But a couple of trust indicators. So I talked about the relationship that we build with our audiences, and one of those key components is the reporter herself. So just some examples of the journalist pages that our news partners are developing. So National Observer, and you see she has her name. She also says her title, where she's from, the languages that she speaks and her areas of expertise. And then they talk a little bit about her bio. And then further down you would see other news stories. And then here's David McKie, also a National Observer, with his experience. And then you can see a little tail end here of some of his other work. And then here's a person from Sky News, and her areas of expertise, and so on, how to reach her, languages spoken. And so the idea here is to provide information in response to what people were asked for, what they really wanted to know about this journalist. And there's some structured information that's shared across all of our various participating news sites. Whether or not you're part of the Trust Project, you can do that, too.

And then here's one I said, references. So how is the story built? This is an example of showing the sources behind a more controversial story that was in The Economist, they are a news partner. They did a story about refugees. So they gave all their sources here, and people can click through. They can also see what year it was written. They can see where it was published. All at a glance.

So that's it. This is just an example of a variety of trust indicators on a variety of our news partners pages. And I thank you for going through that with me, and I encourage you to be in touch. I didn't put the URL for the Trust Project here, but it's just thetrustproject.org. And so I'm going to stop sharing and open it up for discussion because we have a little bit more time here.

OK, so. "Funded content for campaigns during elections seem to be designed to convince audiences, isn't that buying support to gain votes instead of the Democratic way?" So if you're talking about funded content within journalism, then I think the key is, you really have to consider, is this actually advertising content? Is it paid content? Is it advertorial, as we call it? If so, it needs to be labeled that way. If it's funded to call attention to a particular issue, let's say infectious disease funded by the Gates Foundation, then in that case, and they have no say, perhaps let's just stipulate they have no say over the content itself. That in our lexicon would be supported by, and you would use that language. "Supported by." And so there's a very clear distinction and you would offer the definitions, so it's very clear to the public. The other thing we do is on our advertising content, we do not provide those other trust indicators. So there's a very clear visual difference between a piece of work that

is paid for by any kind of advertiser or funder where they have a say over content and an article that is true journalism. And I cannot impress on you enough how important that is today when we see all these "news sites" that are pretending to be journalism, but in fact are not. We really have to be very clear about the foundations of journalism, communicating that, sticking to it and being very clear about not allowing advertisers to have more of a say than they should in our content.

So there's a question here about the Trust Project. "How do we evaluate, monitor, or hold news partners accountable to the best practices once they join the Trust Project?" So the way we work, we are a consortium of news organizations. We really see ourselves as kind of rising up in response to this crisis in news, and in trust in news, and rising misinformation to that vacuum. And we're rising up in response to public needs. So the way we ensure that those trust indicators really mean something, and that they're not just empty, well, one, that they actually say something, rather than just, "We're ethical, so trust us to be ethical." We go through a whole process of training with each news organization that participates to show the trust indicators. Before that, we have an application process. So any organization that wants to be part of this and use that trustmark logo, which I don't know if I showed it to you, but it's actually on the pages of news partners. It's a little T-mark logo, kind of like the one that you saw at the beginning of this presentation that you see on the slide here. They have to go through an application process. And so they answer a series of questions that are meant to help us understand whether they're actually a journalism organization, as all the journalists on this call would agree. And we found that these trust indicators do hold up across all the countries we go into, and we can adapt them and adjust them a little bit. But in essence, the fundamentals are true. So do they produce original journalism? Do they adhere to accountability, to accuracy? Do the correct their mistakes? All those things. And then when they go through a review process with a group of our news partners that are already in the Trust Project. They get approved or not approved. If they're not approved, then we'd say why and try to explain how they could come in, and what they might need to change. Or if they're really just not eligible, we explain that, too. And then after we go through this whole process of implementation, then we check for compliance. And we check like are all these pieces on the page? And I want to emphasize, too, that this is about transparency. It's not like a black box where its meant to signify like you can't see inside. It's transparency where we don't say we're not approving. Like the site is trustworthy. This site is not trustworthy. We're saying with that trust mark that this site has committed to the fundamentals of socially responsible journalism, and they've also committed to being transparent about all these factors. And we have checked that they actually are. And it's up to the public. You can also think of it as kind of a public empowerment effort. Like journalists, we don't tell people how to vote. We don't tell people whether to do this or do that. We tell them all the information they need to know in order to make a decision, and that's the fundamentals behind the Trust Project. We provide, all of our news sites, provide this information, and that enables an individual member of the public to say, "OK, ethics matter to me, or diverse voices matters to me, or knowing who this reporter is matters to me. If they know my language, that matters to me." So there may be different things that matter more to some than to others. And I think that's a key thing to consider as you dive more deeply into being transparent about what you do, more deeply into engagement.

And I want to say that everything you saw today is about engagement on the page. And there's, you know, we could do a whole additional session. And maybe there was one at this conference on engagement on the ground, and that is vital. So you need to put it on your page, but you also need to do it in practice. You need to go out and talk with people, bring them into your newsroom, find ways that they can suggest stories to you, find ways

that they can tell you when you've made a mistake, and make sure you open those lines of communication, because that's how we build that relationship. The trust project is meant to continue to build that relationship through showing to the public that we are reliable, that we have the integrity. We have the positive intentions. We're competent. You can see it right here in this digital space. Like you don't have to go beyond the digital space. And in the digital space where there is so much confusing information, there's so much that might be rumor or falsehood, that it's important to signal that very clearly to the public through trust indicators.

So let me just look and see. "The media business is run mostly from the upper class. What's your take?" I would say this is where diverse voices comes into play. Two things. Diverse voices and also ownership. So that's where declaring ownership and conflict of interest around ownership, like what are the guardrails around conflict of interest as relates to ownership, becomes important. Because sometimes you will have people at very high levels. Maybe they have strong business interests along with their news interests. And so that's where we have to explain that. That's part of what I wanted to show in the different types of disclosures around companies. One of them just said, "We're owned by Tompson family." They didn't explain who the Tompson family was. They didn't explain what kind of other things they might own. They don't say whether they're traded on the stock exchange. Probably not. If they're owned by this family, they're private. There was one that said we are traded on the Canadian Stock Exchange, so that tells us a little bit more about what it means to be owned by this organization. Others, the one from Cambio 16, they were owned by this other organizations, who are all in media. A bunch of media properties, and we keep strict lines between them. So that's where ownership and disclosures around ownership becomes very important. And then the other piece of it is having a diverse staff and kind of taking extra care to make sure that in your reporting, you're going beyond the elite cast by the upper more privileged aspects or members of society.

OK, question about, "how do you change that?" I think that as we're seeing what's happening around the world, we're seeing newsrooms kind of being much more clear from the bottom up about the kind of change they think is needed within their organization to ensure that they're able to report fairly and inclusively on all the different sectors of society. And so as individual journalists, we can hold our own news organizations accountable. And there's various ways to do that.

Yeah, and it's suggested here from the admin, please resend your question in case I missed it, and I'll keep an eye on that. We have a couple of minutes left, so maybe one or two more questions before I wrap up.

"So in terms of rebranding some tabloids, how do you try to give a better picture, a real picture, of a news brand? Do you change their policies?" So we, as I said, we operate as a consortium. We are a nonprofit. The Trust Project is a nonprofit. So we're serving these organizations. The organizations, we work with them to take the lead in thinking about policy and decision making. So what happens when a company comes in and they don't really completely fulfill the trust indicators? So first of all, as I mentioned, when they apply, they may not make it in. And so we may go back and say, your news does not meet the standard of the fundamentals of journalism with integrity that have been agreed upon by our consortium around the world and that have been agreed upon in response to the public. And then let's say they make some changes and come back to us. Most news organizations that work with us are not perfect across all those trust indicators, and so we work with them to improve their policies. Just like that example I showed you that would be offensive to many in their description of how they try to have a diverse staff. So we're

going to go back to them and say, "Here's what you need to change and consider thinking about. What is the thinking behind that language in the first place?" So there's a lot of conversations between the Trust Project and our news partners. There's also a lot of conversations that happen among these partners in these consortiums or in these working groups as they build the trust indicators on their pages.

So I think that we have to stop. Someone wanted to know how do we identify fake news? Well, through that approval process.

So thank you so much for listening. Thank you so much for your questions. You have my Twitter ID, and I will also just type in a way to reach me, if you would like. And the URL as well. You can find us at the trustproject.org. And there's lots of information on our pages as well as a place where you can actually apply to be part of the Trust Project, if you'd like.

So I should hand it over to Mallary to close this out. So thank you again.

Mallary Tenore Great. Thank you so much, Sally. That was wonderful. I think that trust and transparency are so integral to so many aspects of our work as journalists, and they're very top of mind at this moment in time. So I think that your workshop offered some great best practices in this area. And we're really grateful to have you here and so thankful for the Trust Project's support as an ISOJ sponsor. So thank you.

And I just want to remind everyone in attendance that we have two great panels coming up this afternoon. So our next one of the day will be at 1 p.m. Central, and it will be our annual research panel. This year, we're going to be meeting with a great group of scholars who will share their research on power, privilege and patriarchy in journalism. So you won't want to miss that. And then at 4 p.m., Central we'll have our last panel of the day, and that will focus on product management. So we'll look at how news organizations can become more audience oriented, data driven and product focused. So you won't want to miss either of these panels. Please stay tuned and you can visit ISOJ.org for more details. So thank you. We will see you soon.