



Corporation
for Public
Broadcasting

Board of Directors

Cheryl F. Halpern
Chair

Gay Hart Gaines
Vice Chair

Katherine M. Anderson
Elizabeth Courtney

Frank Cruz

Claudia Puig

Ernest J. Wilson III

January 31, 2006

The President
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

In accordance with Section 19 of the Public Telecommunications Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-356), the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) is pleased to submit to you, for transmittal to Congress, a report summarizing CPB's efforts in 2005 pursuant to Section 19, subparagraph (1) and (2) of that Act. These sections require CPB to gather public comment to assess quality, objectivity and balance in national public broadcasting programming, and to factor this information into its grant decision-making process. This report contains the information gathered through this effort, which we call "Open to the Public."

Looking back at 2005, we witnessed a sharp increase in public discussion about public broadcasting's efforts to meet the balance required by law and the highest standards of journalism in programming. The CPB board engaged in this debate and redoubled our efforts to ensure that programming on public broadcasting reflect the balance and diversity required by law. We believe we have made substantial progress toward this goal, and look forward to noting further progress in future reports.

Respectfully yours,

Cheryl F. Halpern
Chair, Board of Directors
Corporation for Public Broadcasting

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

**A report to Congress on steps taken
by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting
in response to Section 19 of the Public Telecommunications Act of 1992
(Public Law No. 102-356)**

**for the period
January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005**



**Corporation
for Public
Broadcasting**

Introduction

From its establishment in 1967, public broadcasting has sought to bring the American public radio and television programming that enlightens, inspires, and entertains – and also that presents ideas and information in a balanced, trustworthy way. In 2005, research by Harris Interactive found that Americans trusted the news they received from public broadcasting more than that offered by the commercial networks and major newspapers. And our own research showed that we met the public’s high expectations by presenting balanced points of view, allowing viewers to decide among competing bodies of evidence, and respecting the viewers’ intelligence.

This is the kind of programming envisioned by the Public Broadcasting Act, the 1967 statute that established the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It sets out CPB’s goals, purposes and authorities, including both:

- facilitating the availability of “programs of high quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, and innovation, which are obtained from diverse sources, . . . with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature,” and
- assuring “maximum freedom of the public telecommunications entities and systems from interference with, or control of, program content or other activities.”

In carrying out these goals, CPB has periodically reviewed its procedures for ensuring high quality, objective, and balanced programming.

Since 1992, CPB, as required by Congress, has also implemented measures to gather public comment to assess the quality of national public broadcasting programming, and to factor this information into its grant decision-making process. Specifically, Section 19 of the Public Telecommunications Act of 1992 (Public Law No. 102-356) directs the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to:

1. Review CPB’s efforts to meet its responsibilities to "facilitate the full development of public telecommunications in which programs of high quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, and innovation, which are obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to public telecommunications entities, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature." (Section 396(g)(1)(A))
2. Solicit the views of the public before establishing a policy and a set of procedures to:
 - (a) Provide reasonable opportunity for members of the public to present comments to the Board regarding the programming attributes specified above;
 - (b) Regularly review national public broadcasting programming for those programming attributes, and for any unmet needs;

- (c) On the basis of information received through such comments and review, take whatever steps in awarding programming grants that it finds necessary to meet the Corporation's responsibility under 396(g)(1)(a); and
 - (d) Disseminate information about CPB's efforts so that public broadcasting entities can use the Corporation's experience in addressing concerns relating to objectivity and balance within their own operations.
3. Submit, by January 31 of each year, a report to Congress summarizing its efforts pursuant to these directives.

To carry out these responsibilities under the statute, CPB designed the *Open to the Public* initiative to “make public broadcasting more accessible, more open to the public it serves.” Since 1993, the *Open to the Public* initiative has sought and gathered public comment on the quality, objectivity, and balance of public broadcasting’s programming.

This is CPB’s 13th report to Congress under the Act. It covers CPB’s activities with respect to programming and public access from January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005.

A Renewed Focus on Quality Programming

Public broadcasters receive public funds and hold a public trust. Public opinion research – both what CPB itself has commissioned and what others have conducted independently – consistently shows that the American public holds public broadcasters to a higher standard than they do other, for-profit communications media. They are right to do so, and CPB seeks to strengthen its commitment to ensuring that public broadcasting’s programming meets the highest standards of quality and editorial integrity.

During 2005, CPB encouraged the work of an independent review board charged by the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) with updating its editorial standards. In June, the PBS board of directors adopted the findings and recommendations of this independent panel, including, for the first time, references to CPB’s roles with respect to programming, as defined by statute. In September, CPB accepted these PBS actions in satisfaction of the requirements of its \$22.5 million Fiscal Year 2005 National Programming Service contract with PBS. (The revised editorial standards are included in this report as Attachment 6.) CPB expects that PBS will continue its ongoing development of policies and procedures, both to apply these editorial standards consistently and rigorously, and to redress whatever programming shortcomings they themselves identify in the course of applying these standards to programs.

While we have encouraged PBS’s efforts to apply rigorous editorial standards to programming before it is broadcast, CPB has also taken steps to strengthen its own, **post-broadcast** response, including the creation in April 2005 of an Office of the Ombudsmen to ensure that the standards by which it assesses programming are as high as the public expects. The primary goal of this office is to act as an evaluator of journalistic integrity, balance, and objectivity; to review comprehensively public complaints of bias; and to assist CPB in fulfilling its statutory “objectivity and balance” obligations. Two

ombudsmen were engaged to act independently under the terms of a charter that spells out the scope of their duties.

We look forward to working with the public broadcasting community and Congress to ensure that the programming on public broadcasting meets the high standards the American people rightly expect.

Open to the Public Initiative

Open to the Public seeks to make public broadcasting more accessible to the public it serves. Through *Open to the Public*, viewers and listeners are able to voice their opinions about public broadcasting's services directly to CPB's board of directors and management, and to the broader public broadcasting community, as well. To receive comments, CPB maintains a dedicated e-mail address (comments@cpb.org), a form for submitting comments and queries on the CPB Web site, and voicemail facilities that support a dedicated, toll-free, 24-hour telephone line (1-800-272-2190). We also accept letters and postcards mailed to CPB and fax messages sent directly to CPB. The addresses and telephone numbers are posted on our Web site.

CPB has encouraged greater public participation in past years by requiring or encouraging program producers and broadcast stations to publicize the *Open to the Public* initiative, as well as the telephone numbers and e-mail addresses by which CPB receives most comments. In 2005, CPB continued to work with the public television and public radio communities to expand public discussion of these issues. We devote a section of our Web site to objectivity and balance, providing users convenient access to the CPB comment facilities, the Office of the CPB Ombudsmen, and previous editions of this report.

CPB also held an open public forum to discuss objectivity and balance, as well as other issues, in Washington, D.C. on September 26, 2005, at which members of the public came to express their views about public broadcasting. This forum is discussed in detail later in this report.

On October 14 and 15, the American Cinema Foundation convened (with financial support from CPB) a symposium in Los Angeles at which program producers could air their criticisms of public television.

2005 Open to the Public Comments

In 2005, CPB received more than 2,700 messages from the public through its *Open to the Public* initiative. This reverses a two-year trend in which the numbers of such comments declined slightly. The overwhelming majority of these comments were received through e-mail.

Not included in this total are e-mail messages, telephone calls, and faxes that:

- lodged no comment on programming, but were purely neutral viewer- or listener-service queries, such as those about program scheduling or about how to obtain tapes or transcripts of programs, or
- were the product of write-in or phone-in campaigns promoted by various entities or interest groups such as:
 - a July proposal that CPB balance its production funding grant for *Journal Editorial Report* with a grant to *The Nation* for production of a similar program, but from a progressive rather than a conservative ideological stance, and
 - pre-broadcast demands by RADAR (Respecting Accuracy in Domestic Abuse Reporting) that PBS withdraw *Breaking the Silence: Children's Stories* from distribution before its scheduled October 20 airdate.

The modest volume of comments may seem surprising, especially in a time of war and heated political debate. Most viewers and listeners, however, contact their local broadcast stations (or program distributors like PBS, National Public Radio, or Public Radio International) directly to comment on the programming they have seen or heard. In fact, a majority of the messages that CPB received were not comments on the programming, but viewer- or listener-service inquiries or queries seeking advice on how to obtain grant funding for program production.

Comments Relating to Public Broadcasting Generally

A House Appropriations subcommittee's efforts during 2005 to reduce substantially federal funding for public broadcasting sparked an outpouring of comment in support of, and against, federal funding, with the overwhelming majority supporting continued funding, generally at or exceeding the levels appropriated in recent years.

This year, CPB found itself in the middle of a media storm as the press reported that its then-chairman, Kenneth Y. Tomlinson, had engaged a consultant to review the political affiliations of guests on *NOW With Bill Moyers* and other shows, and had strongly urged CPB and PBS to fund conservative-oriented shows such as *Tucker Carlson: Unfiltered* and *Journal Editorial Report*. Some of the comments that we received in the wake of those reports were quite supportive of actions or statements by CPB leaders, but many more were highly critical of those actions and statements, or of various reported efforts to identify, gauge, or (especially) to redress alleged bias or imbalance.

Some examples of the kinds of comments received:

I just heard on the news that some congressmen are suggesting eliminating funding for the CPB as part of a plan to reduce government spending. Considering the fact that we are talking trillions of dollars in our national budget, \$390M is hardly a scratch. Moreover, the CPB helps to support quality television, the content of which is not dependent upon the whims of

advertisers looking for the sensationalistic sale. I will write my congressmen and urge them to keep funding for the CPB.

from a resident of an unknown state, September 27

It has recently become clear to me that, disappointingly, the rightward creep of this nation's institutions has found its way into the halls of public broadcasting. All too evident from the sudden, conservative programming emphasis and acceptance of President Bush's attempt to "conservatize" your board, this trend fills me with dismay at what you have become. While I have never been a huge contributor, I have been a consistent one, over many years, to my local public television station. While I'd recently been considering making a small increase in my monthly donation, I now feel, regrettably, that I cannot continue to support public television at all. I can't contribute any portion of increasingly limited resources to an institution that is willing to sacrifice its hard-earned integrity and longstanding journalistic reputation under political duress. I sincerely hope that these recent events are not based on a presumption that "hardcore" conservative programming will garner more new viewers that it will lose. I wish I could express to PBS and CPB the depth of the disappointment I feel at your turn toward "Foxdom," but words fail. I will contact KPBS in San Diego tomorrow to cancel my longstanding financial support.

from a California resident, January 5

I'm a recent returnee to PBS, after being so disgusted with the extreme left of many of its shows. Presently PBS seems to me to be more in line with the general public thinking of just what the "PUBLIC BROADCASTING SYSTEM" should be. Not controlled by the normal and mostly left-leaning media, but rather a compilation of shows showing just what general public, including this writer, view as an unbiased and true presentation of the facts of any issue. Thank you.

from a New York resident, October 31

It appears that the liberals are mounting an effort to discredit the current director of CPB as a conservative who is attempting to bring "balance" to PBS. Liberals apparently don't like balance very much. I have been listening to/watching PBS for many years and have been deeply impressed by their consistent marked liberal bias which is all-pervasive. I support the CPB chairman's efforts to transform the PBS system from a liberal advocacy group into a balanced and objective organization which treats the news fairly.

from a Massachusetts resident, August 8

[The CPB chairman]'s job should be to strengthen public broadcasting, not to tear it down vis à vis searching for liberal bias. Public broadcasting is one of the few places where we may hear both sides of an issue. He acts more like a political hack than an effective leader. I strongly object to his politicism in an area where the original mandate was to be protected from outside interference.

from a Colorado resident, August 4

Comments Relating to Public Radio

Among the comments about public radio programming that were received this year, most concerned NPR's coverage of the Middle East, with many of them alleging a pro-Palestinian bias in coverage of relations between Israel and an emerging Palestinian state. An example of the kinds of comments received:

Dear Ms. Rehm,

Your program this morning was another example of why I cannot support NPR. The topic was Tuesday's meeting between Ariel Sharon and Mahmoud Abbas with the leaders of Egypt and Jordan. Your guests were Martin Indyk and Shibley Telhami.

Mr. Telhami was born in Haifa. While he may attempt to be neutral, his job requires that he present the Palestinian position. Mr. Indyk, born in England and lived in Australia, served as the United States Ambassador to Israel. His job requires that he present America's position. Yet you did not invite a person to offer and defend Israel's position.

The callers were uniformly anti-Israel, using code words such as "occupied territories" instead of "disputed territories." They presented many of the usual distortions about Israel and the Palestinians (everything is Israel's fault) yet neither you nor your guest made much, if any, effort to correct them.

The first caller complained about Israel and was responded to by Mr. Telhami. Mr. Indyk did not have an opportunity to respond. Mr. Indyk did respond to the second caller, but you interrupted him, which you did not do to Mr. Telhami during his extended response. When the female caller complained about all the difficulties faced by the Palestinians, no one stated the reasons for their situation (safety for Israel, corruption by Palestinian leaders). She was not reminded that the Palestinians were in control of Gaza and most of the West Bank even after the current intifada began, until the Pesach massacre in Natanya in 2001.

You, Ms. Rehm, are such a good interviewer and host for so many subjects. I don't understand why you allow so much anti-Israel bias to pollute your program whenever this issue is discussed.

from an Ohio resident, February 10

Comments Relating to Public Television

Among the comments concerning public television programming that were received this year, topics frequently addressed included:

Postcards from Buster. In January, shortly before a scheduled airdate, the US Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings, sharply criticized an episode of the children's program for its portrayal of a family with two lesbian parents, and requested that PBS refund to the Department funds used to produce the episode. When PBS withdrew the episode from its national distribution schedule, but the producer made it available to local stations for airing at their own discretion, 29 comments defended the controversial episode, many of them criticizing both the federal government and public television – the former for "censorship" and the latter for "caving in to censorship" – while 14 comments agreed with Secretary Spellings' criticisms of the episode and/or with public television's response to it. Some examples of the kinds of comments received:

As a parent, I thought the *Postcards from Buster* series would introduce my children to various aspects of geography and culture. I DO NOT consider the homosexual lifestyle preference to be an example of either. It is my right as a parent to choose when and how to discuss this topic with my child, based on our family's values. I do not expect to have the topic of lesbian relationships introduced to them by an animated bunny!

Somehow, the producers of the show think promoting acceptance of homosexual lifestyles to my 7-year-old is part of their show's "educational purpose." I urge you to deny them that opportunity, and I am urging my Senators and Congressmen to revoke public funding until they can stick to providing CHILDREN'S programming.

from a Connecticut resident, January 31

Just wanted to thank you in advance for the *Buster* episode scheduled for Feb 2nd featuring a family with two moms. As an educator, I think it is so important for children to have exposure to diverse families so that the next generation will be more informed (and perhaps more tolerant). I'm sure you will get some heat (or have already), so thank you for the courage it takes to do the right thing!

from a Connecticut resident, January 26

I was very upset that the US Department of Education advised PBS to remove the *Buster* episode about the Vermont maple syrup farm because it had a gay couple in it. As a parent, I feel I can decide for myself whether the subject matter is appropriate. Also, I feel my child will lose out by not being able to view this episode. Parents come in all shapes and sizes. And like it or not, many children are parented by gay couples. It is not against the law. I wonder how these children are made to feel by the USDE stance? A group of children are essentially being excluded. That is discrimination, which is illegal. Please air this *Buster* episode on Maine PBS. Thank you.

from a Maine resident, February 1

NOW. The departure of Bill Moyers as program host, and the reduction of *NOW*'s scheduled airtime from an hour to a half-hour, generated a significant number of comments – nearly all negative – during the early months of 2005. An example of the kinds of comments received:

As a faithful watcher of *NOW*, shown at 9 Friday nights in this area, I was disappointed that this program has been reduced to only half an hour. Of course it's also sad to see Bill Moyers retire from *NOW*. This program, I feel, gives an important viewpoint not shown very often in the media. Investigative reporting seems at a low ebb and fewer and fewer voices challenge the policies of this administration and the power of corporations. If public radio and television, because of budget problems or intimidation or whatever reasons, won't provide needed information, highlight world events, and tackle controversial issues, where can we turn?

from an Ohio resident, January 22

Tucker Carlson: Unfiltered and ***Journal Editorial Report***. The addition of *Tucker Carlson: Unfiltered* to the PBS National Program Service in June 2004, and of *Journal Editorial Report* three months later, continued to spark a significant number of comments in 2005 – nearly all of them negative. An example of the kinds of comments received:

What motivated PBS to reduce an outstanding program (*NOW*) to one half hour and introduce Tucker Carlson as late-inning relief for Bill Moyers? Tucker Carlson does not measure up to PBS standards and is the kind of programming I would expect from Fox or Christian broadcasting! I have been a PBS contributor for nearly 30 years and hoped that I would not see this one island of TV excellence undermined by conservative dogma. What program will be abbreviated or edited next to satisfy the right wing? *Nova*? *Frontline*? If I want to hear arrogant conservatives I will tune in to AM radio!

from a Michigan resident, January 28

Breaking the Silence: Children's Stories. Before the initial broadcasts on October 20 of this documentary about the treatment of abused children in divorce courts, a preponderance of comments focused on anticipated editorial shortcomings (which had been touted for weeks in newsletters and weblogs allied with or sympathetic to “men’s rights” interest groups). These comments urged CPB, which did not have a financial stake in the production, to depart from established policy and intervene and direct PBS to pull the program from distribution *before* its broadcast. Following the initial broadcasts – and publication of critical reviews of the program by CPB and PBS ombudsmen – the comments remained generally critical of the program, with many including praise for the ombudsman’s review. Some examples of the kinds of comments received:

As an attorney in the state of Connecticut for over 20 years, who has long included the representation of children in my practice, it was with great anticipation I tuned into CPTV’s airing of *Breaking the Silence...* on October 27, 2005. What an utter disappointment! There is a fine line between a documentary, with its patina of disinterested reporting of a story, and propaganda, with a clear agenda of “don’t confuse me with facts, my mind is made up”. This film crosses that line and never looks back. Unfortunately, in the meantime, an opportunity to assist our most vulnerable citizens, our children, and “break the silence” was squandered. To know that CPB and CPTV had a hand in the making of this polemic masquerading as a documentary made it all the more disturbing.

from a Connecticut resident, November 8

Just a note to thank you so very much for the upcoming broadcast of *Breaking the Silence: Children's Stories*. The issues raised in this important and incisive documentary are indeed occurring within our family court system. I am sure you have received many negative responses as there is a current campaign to mass-mail the PBS stations; however, this documentary raises issues which are indeed happening to children and abused families throughout the country. I commend PBS for its commitment to education, political and social issues that affect us all. Again, thank you so much for maintaining your resolve to bring forth topics that affect each and every one of us.

from a Massachusetts resident, October 20

Responding to Comments and Sharing Concerns

Consistent with congressional intent, CPB shares substantive comments both within CPB and with the public broadcasting community. Although we are not able to answer each

comment individually, each is read and shared throughout CPB as appropriate. With the addition in 2006 of a staff position dedicated to the *Open to the Public* program, we will be expanding our capacity for responding individually to comments received from the general public.

After creating the Office of Ombudsmen, CPB developed policies specifying *which* of the comments received in its *Open to the Public* program would be forwarded to the CPB ombudsmen (those pertaining to programs, as opposed to, for example, personnel matters or federal government appropriations for public broadcasting), and *when* (after broadcast of the program or programs discussed). This is a formal, arm's-length relationship, in which CPB staff members do not consult or collaborate with the ombudsmen. Nor is it a reciprocal relationship: comments received directly by the CPB ombudsmen are not forwarded to or shared with CPB staff members.

CPB staff members may share *Open to the Public* comments on controversial programs with appropriate producers and programmers and may seek further information or clarification from them, if appropriate. In cases of pre-broadcast controversy, CPB will often seek information from the presenting station, producer, and distributor of any controversial program, including the number of stations expected to air the program; whether the presenting entity's plan encourages community dialogue; and whether the presenter conducts special outreach through which other perspectives can be heard.

It is important to note that public broadcasting is highly decentralized, with local stations exercising complete autonomy over the programming that is aired. (A discussion of the sources from which programming is obtained is included at Attachment 1.) For this reason, virtually all of the nation's more than 1,150 CPB-funded public radio and television stations maintain similar audience-response services, as do program distributors like PBS, NPR, and PRI.

CPB's Commitment to Objectivity and Balance

In addition to its *Open to the Public* activities, CPB worked to ensure objectivity and balance in a number of other ways:

- **Office of the Ombudsmen.** After exploring various options for engagement of an ombudsman "to ensure that our standards are as high as the public expects," CPB created an Office of the Ombudsmen and engaged two seasoned former journalists in April.* At that time, CPB published a charter for the office, which charged the ombudsmen with "encourag[ing] public dialogue aimed at achieving high standards of excellence and balance in public broadcasting" and gave them a significant (but not exclusive) role in fulfilling CPB's statutory duty to establish policy and procedures for reviewing national public broadcasting programming for "strict adherence to objectivity and balance." We have included with this report – and posted on CPB's Web site – the charter of the Office of the Ombudsmen (Attachment 2) and a list of the reports published by the ombudsmen

* William Schulz, one of the ombudsmen initially engaged by CPB, resigned his post at the end of 2005.

during 2005 (Attachment 3). The full texts of those reports are also posted on the Web site.

- **Meeting with the Public.** On September 26, 2005, the CPB board of directors held an open forum to provide members of the public the opportunity to comment directly on public broadcasting's content and services. Representatives from the following organizations made statements: Free Press, Common Cause, CAMERA, Center for Digital Democracy, and the United Church of Christ. We have included the meeting transcript in this report as Attachment 4.
- **Reviewing Programming.** The Public Broadcasting Act requires us periodically to review national public broadcasting programming for a range of characteristics (including high quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, innovation, and objectivity and balance) and to identify unmet needs. As part of this statutorily-required review, we conduct extensive program and audience research designed to understand better the needs, expectations, and behaviors of primetime public television audiences.

During 2005, this research – the most comprehensive ever undertaken by public television – concentrated on qualitative, focus-group research with audiences for two program genres, history and the performing arts, concerning which data were somewhat ambiguous in the analysis of results from the initial national quantitative study two years ago.

Particularly with respect to history programs, the research subjects this year emphasized their high expectations for the role that they expect public television to play. Trust continued to be a strong theme, including programs that:

- present balanced points of view on topics that are contested by scholars or controversial among the general public
- let viewers decide among competing bodies of evidence or contrasting viewpoints, and
- respect viewers' intelligence and their competence to make up their own minds about contested issues.

Research participants also continued to express the view that for-profit media are subjected to mounting commercial pressures to transgress on each of these aspects of trustworthiness.

Public television programmers are currently weighing how to adjust their agreed-upon strategic priorities for program investments in light of both what has already been accomplished and new considerations revealed in the qualitative research undertaken this year. Early in 2006, CPB will again field a major quantitative study of the public television primetime audience, with an eye to re-verifying the strategic opportunities that were identified in the quantitative research two years ago.

We continue to work with PBS and the major producing stations, as well as with representatives of local stations, to apply these principles of programming and production decisions.

Other Voices, Other Views

Important as public comment is, it is only one source of information available to us, and we do not rely on it exclusively. We are also mindful of the views of broadcasting and journalism professionals, public officials, commentators, activists, artists and critics, among others. These opinions may be expressed in the public press, in private conversations with CPB board members and other officials, or even in congressional hearings. We value them all, because each helps us build a fuller picture of the diversity of American opinion and the needs of the public we seek to serve.

CPB defines “press” broadly to include mainstream print and broadcast entities, as well as many issue-oriented newsletters and Web sites that closely follow news coverage and analysis. During the last year, a number of issues involving public broadcasting programming attracted press attention:

- From May through November, controversy over the actions and statements of CPB’s chairman Kenneth Y. Tomlinson generated frequent and extensive coverage (particularly by *The New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, Bloomberg.com, the Associated Press, and *The Washington Post*) as well as considerable comment on editorial and opinion pages.
- Throughout the year, NPR’s coverage of Israel and the emerging Palestinian state continued to spark considerable commentary, particularly in media sympathetic to a government, political party, or other group vying for control or influence in the changing – and sometimes unstable – situation. Although allegations of a pro-Palestinian or anti-Israeli bias predominate, Arab- or Palestinian-sympathetic groups occasionally publish charges of the opposite kinds of bias. After PBS broadcast *The Elusive Peace*, a BBC documentary on the history of Arab-Israeli conflict, a number of these reciprocal criticisms that are typically leveled at NPR were published concerning PBS.
- Throughout the fall, PBS distribution of *Breaking the Silence: Children’s Stories*, a documentary about the treatment of abused children in divorce courts, generated coverage in media – especially on Web sites – that are sympathetic to the “men’s rights” movement. This coverage was amplified considerably after charges that the documentary was seriously lacking in balance and had misrepresented some significant facts were substantially validated in reviews published by ombudsmen for both CPB and PBS.
- At the end of November, *The Wall Street Journal*’s decision to switch distribution of its television program *Journal Editorial Report* from public television to Fox News Channel in January triggered considerable coverage, in part because the

Journal published its own account of negotiations with PBS and CPB on its own editorial page and posted additional supporting documents on its Web site.

- Again this year, a number of news stories explored the issue of perceived bias or lack of objectivity not only in public broadcasting, but with comparable measurements of perceived bias in other media, as well.

Some of these stories focused on a public opinion survey study conducted by Harris Interactive for the Public Relations Society of America that found people trust newspapers like *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *The New York Times* more than commercial broadcast news but less than public television and public radio. The survey (a summary is included here as Attachment 7) found that 61% of the sample generally trusted news on PBS and NPR, 56% trusted major newspapers, and 53% trusted commercial broadcasts and cable news channels.

Others stories focused on a scholarly paper published in December in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, reporting (on the basis of a highly controversial technique for measuring the “liberalness” of a media organization) that nearly all of the major media outlets studied “lean to the left” although their purported ideological skew is generally much more moderate than that of many Members of Congress.

From time to time, Members of Congress also expressed opinions about public broadcasting’s objectivity and balance in correspondence addressed to CPB leaders. During both a February 17 hearing of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, and a July 11 hearing of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, members also made a number of comments concerning CPB’s activities with respect to objectivity and balance in programming. A digest of these congressional comments, both in correspondence and in the hearings, is attached (Attachment 5).

We are pleased that programs broadcast on public television and radio have received so much critical praise, as well as overwhelming recognition from various awards juries. For the fifth year in a row, PBS received more nominations for the 26th Annual News and Documentary Emmys than other network – 31, including 4 of the 5 nominations for Best Documentary. Winners of the 64th Annual George Foster Peabody Awards included four public radio programs, NPR’s coverage of the continuing war in Iraq, and a documentary that was aired as part of WGBH’s *American Experience* series. A list of public broadcasting’s award-winning productions is attached (Attachment 8). We have also attached a list of all CPB-funded programming (Attachment 9).

A Tradition of Openness

The *Open to the Public* initiative builds on CPB's 37-year tradition of openness regarding its stewardship of the annual federal appropriation to public broadcasting, as well as its own internal policies and practices.

In addition to this report, CPB provides Congress with an annual report containing audited financial statements, an annual report on public broadcasting activities with regard to racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved audiences, an annual report on the Independent Television Service, and a semi-annual report from the Inspector General. These reports, as well as other information on our activities and programs are available at the CPB Web site, www.cpb.org.

CPB's Continuing Commitment

Every year, CPB's 174 public television grantees and 390 radio grantees across the country air thousands of hours of programming. Each week, 85 million Americans watch public television and 26 million listen to public radio. The broadcast services of public radio and television stations are available over-the-air in 91 and 99 percent of American homes respectively. The broadcast services of some stations, as well as other public broadcasting program services, are also available via cable television, direct satellite broadcast services, and over the Internet.

We will continue our efforts to ensure that public broadcasting remains "open to the public," and continues to reflect the diversity of both the American public and American public opinion.

Attachments

1. How Public Broadcasters Obtain Programming
2. Charter of the Office of the Ombudsmen for the CPB
3. List of Reports Published by the Office of the Ombudsmen for the CPB, 2005
4. Minutes of Public Comments Session at September 26, 2005 Meeting of CPB Board of Directors
5. Digest of Congressional Comments, 2005
6. PBS Editorial Standards and Policies, revised June 14, 2005
7. Summary of Harris Interactive Survey of Public Trust for the News Media, June 17 – August 17, 2005
8. List of Public Broadcasting Awards, 2005
9. List of CPB-Funded Programs, 2005

Attachment 1

HOW PUBLIC BROADCASTERS OBTAIN PROGRAMMING

In contrast to commercial broadcasting, which is increasingly centralized, the public broadcasting system remains very decentralized. Every public broadcasting outlet is under local control or ownership; increasingly, they are the only locally owned and operated media outlets in their communities. With local governing boards, community advisors, volunteers, and partnerships with local organizations, stations work to provide programs and services responsive to the needs of their communities. Each local station maintains sole authority and responsibility for selecting, presenting, and scheduling the programs that it airs.

Congress placed control of programming with local stations rather than CPB. It ensured this autonomy by prohibiting CPB from owning or operating any television or radio station, system or network, and barring it from producing, scheduling or disseminating programs to the public.

Instead, CPB operates within congressionally prescribed guidelines to provide financial support and services to 560 licensees operating more than 1,000 television and radio stations that deliver educational services and programming to virtually every household in the country. Congress has mandated that a majority of CPB's appropriation be allocated for direct station support. Our obligation to Congress and the American people is to ensure that this money is spent wisely and efficiently in support of balanced and objective programming. Our obligation to stations is to insulate them from the political process, and to ensure that their receipt of federal support in no way interferes with their ability to operate as free and independent broadcasters, as prescribed by law.

In addition to our financial support of stations, CPB complies with the statutory requirement of providing funds to producing entities and independent producers to help them develop a wide range of programming that is then made available to local stations. As encouraged by Congress, CPB provides direct program support to PBS through a high-profile national program service, which includes series such as *Nova*, *American Experience*, *Sesame Street* and *NewsHour with Jim Lehrer*. CPB does not provide direct program support to NPR, which competes with other producers for CPB radio program funds on a program-by-program basis. CPB also provides programming dollars to entities such as the Independent Television Service (ITVS), five separate entities collectively known as the National Minority Consortia, and many independent producers and producing organizations, all of which are entirely independent of CPB. This enables stations to acquire programming independently from a wide variety of sources.

Public television stations choose their programs from the following sources, among others:

- PBS, which provides more than 1,200 hours a year of children's, primetime, educational and cultural programming from which its member stations can choose. This includes programming produced by stations such as WGBH, WETA, and WNET.
- American Public Television, which acquires programs that may be purchased by stations on a title-by-title basis. APT also maintains the largest source of free programming available to U.S. public television stations.
- The Independent Television Service, which funds, distributes and promotes independently produced television programs.

- The National Educational Telecommunications Association, which annually distributes about 2,000 hours of programming produced by public television stations, other entities and independent producers via satellite to stations nationwide.

Public radio stations also get their programming from a wide variety of sources:

- Each station typically produces about half of its own programming.
- 36 percent is from NPR, including news and information, cultural and entertainment programming.
- 10 percent is obtained from Public Radio International, which produces and distributes programming.
- 5 percent is from other producers, including programs produced by other public radio stations.

Congress determined a statutory formula for allocating CPB's federal appropriation, including funds for programming. Applying this formula, CPB in FY 2005 budgeted \$94.3 million for programming, \$67.5 million for television and \$26.8 million for radio. A list of CPB-funded projects for 2003 can be found at Attachment 9.

Attachment 2

CHARTER OF THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMEN

The Office of the Ombudsmen for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is independent and reports to the Board of Directors and the President of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The Office of Ombudsmen will encourage public dialogue aimed at achieving high standards of excellence and balance in public broadcasting.

This Charter establishes the Office comprised of two ombudsmen. Their terms will be for two years and may be renewed by the CPB Board.

The ombudsmen, respected journalists, will write on issues related to journalistic integrity, balance and objectivity.

The ombudsmen will initiate their own reports as well as respond to program issues raised by the public and government officials and the public broadcasting community. All decisions to review programming – and all reports on broadcasts – will be made by the ombudsmen.

The ombudsmen will be bound by the traditions that govern journalistic excellence.

The ombudsmen will confine their writing to material that has been broadcast on the public airwaves and will not engage in pre-broadcast commentaries.

CPB will [receive comments](#) from the public at large on their website, and reports from the ombudsmen will be posted on the website.

In keeping with the highest ethical standards, the ombudsmen will adhere to the ombudsmen's Code of Ethics for CPB. They will be paid by CPB, and the work will be facilitated by CPB staff.

Attachment 3

REPORTS PUBLISHED BY THE OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMEN – 2005

The views expressed in the following reports are solely those of the author and are not to be regarded as those of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, its board of directors, officers, or employees.

"Breaking the Silence" Redux

Ken Bode December 19, 2005

"Hank Williams: Honky Tonk Blues"

William Schulz December 1, 2005

"Breaking the Silence: Children's Stories"

Ken Bode November 29, 2005

"No Direction Home: Bob Dylan"

Ken Bode October 19, 2005

"Richard Rodgers: The Sweetest of Sounds"

William Schulz October 19, 2005

The "Assault" on Public Broadcasting

William Schulz September 13, 2005

The Question Of "Balance"

Ken Bode September 1, 2005

"The Appalachians"

William Schulz July 6, 2005

Kudos for Mississippi Public TV

Ken Bode June 21, 2005

Ombudsman Operating Manual

Ken Bode June 13, 2005

NPR on Mosul

Ken Bode April 26, 2005

NPR on Mosul

William Schulz April 26, 2005

Attachment 4

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC COMMENTS SESSION

Monday, September 26, 2005

**The Board of Directors
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
401 Ninth Street, NW
Washington, D.C.**

Opening

Chair Halpern opened the meeting at 5:03 p.m. and introduced Don Rheem, who would act as moderator.

Mr. Rheem explained the process which would guide the session: each organization having requested time in advance in writing would receive five minutes and Mr. Rheem would alert the presenter when he or she had one minute remaining.

First Presentation – Ben Scott, Free Press

I appreciate the opportunity to speak before the Board today. I guess it was youngest-first in the order of speakers. As you can see, I represent a young group, both in age and in membership. Free Press is a national organization dedicated to increasing public participation in media policy in Washington, DC, as well as in the states and at the local level. We represent nearly one-quarter of a million people and our average age, I dare say, is quite a bit below the average age of viewers of public broadcasting and listeners of National Public Radio, which is both an opportunity and a challenge, because I believe that it is my generation that most needs to engage in public broadcasting and it brings me before you today.

As we've heard in the meeting this afternoon, public broadcasting faces great challenges in the coming years. Recently, we faced political turmoil and fiscal crisis and now natural disaster. Now, more than ever, we need competent, judicious, and trusted leadership here at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I'm not here primarily to criticize the Board, but rather to encourage it. For, like you, I believe in public broadcasting and so do the members of Free Press.

In July, Free Press joined nine other public interest organizations in calling on the Corporation to increase the openness and transparency of its activities. We asked for relatively simple and straightforward assurances. We asked that all the meetings of the Board be open to the public, that the public be allowed to speak, that they broadcast on the internet. We requested that all future contracts made by CPB should be approved by the full Board and be available for public review. And finally, we requested that any future CPB studies of programming should be made available to the public and launched only after notifying PBS, NPR and the local stations.

In reply, our concerns were brushed aside, I'm sorry to say. And we were told that the CPB is already committed to transparency and openness. Well, this is somewhat

of a troubling response, given the difficulties faced by the CPB leadership this last year. The actions of the Board to intervene in programming decisions have very publicly and very unfortunately politicized the public broadcasting system—a result that is unwelcome to any friend of public media, regardless of party affiliation. We need only witness the millions of Americans who spoke up against this effort to put a partisan stamp on public resources.

I recently spoke to an old friend of mine who is a station manager in the Midwest and my former employer. I asked him how he felt about the recent difficulties faced by public broadcasting, both fiscally and politically. He's an old-hand in public broadcasting and he said, "Well, I don't like it, but I don't dare let it go, because what we've got here is too important to my community." That really struck me as a singularly important statement to remember: the decisions made right here in this room ripple down through the system to the local level. Good decisions strengthen the stations. Bad decisions weaken them and the publics that they serve.

Those who seek to impose a political litmus test on all programming do so at considerable risk. We'll eagerly await the Inspector General's finding and urge the CPB to take quick action to remedy any of the problems the IG uncovers. Had the CPB adopted our resolutions on transparency put forward in our letter, an investigation would never have been necessary. Now is a critical moment for the CPB to put its house in order and take the first steps on a tough road back to realizing the original vision of public media as a cornerstone of American culture and democracy. Reforming rules of governance and procedure for the CPB Board should not be viewed as small changes that have little bearing on the broader scope of public broadcasting's activities. Rather, a Board commitment to openness and transparency should be used as a means to address and correct the problems of the past. The Board should redouble its commitment to the real priorities of public media, which I think we all share: local programming, children's programming, and public service to all sectors of our society. As the Board makes leadership changes, I invite everyone to reflect once again upon the statements of goals and objections to which this Board recommitted itself unanimously in a June resolution.

Step one in the reform process must be to hold firm to the principles to which you are already pledged. Let me read it out. The first goal of the CPB, according to its goals and objectives...

[Mr. Rheem announced 10 seconds left.]

In that case, I'll read another resolution...

[Someone from the audience pointed out that Mr. Rheem was to give a one minute warning and requested that he follow this guideline.]

That's all right. To regroup, a June resolution passed by this Board called "A Commitment to Cooperation and Consultation throughout the Public Broadcasting System":

The public broadcasting system is dedicated to producing the highest quality radio and television in America to the benefit of all Americans. The Corporation is firmly committed to continuing the collaborative and productive relationships

with the American people as well as with all members of our community, including our national partners and local partners throughout America. The Board resolves to work together to promote consultation and cooperation with all parties in the continuation of the public broadcasting system, which is a true American treasure.

It is in this spirit of cooperation that Free Press and these other public interest organizations have come before you today. We bring the urgent message that the relationship with the core of public broadcasting, the trust between the national leadership and the American people is...

[Mr. Rheem called an end to the five minutes.]

Mr. Scott thanked the Board for its time and patience and for hearing from the public.

Second Presentation – Celia Viggo Wexler, Common Cause

I'm Celia Viggo Wexler. I'm Vice President for Advocacy for Common Cause and I'm standing on my tiptoes. I appreciate having this opportunity to address the Board today. As we all know, this is a time of turmoil for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. We know, once again, some members of Congress, in Katrina's wake, are considering zeroing out federal support for public broadcasting. As you're well aware, the CPB is the subject of an investigation by its own Inspector General and all the intense focus on balance in public broadcasting has jeopardized serious reporting, according to those who have been in the public broadcasting family for many years.

This summer we heard from some of those and we've heard that the environment of fear is worse than in the days of Nixon when the President did all he could to eliminate all news and public affairs programs from the public television lineup. We hope that environment has improved since people talked to us this summer, but we're not sure it has. Particularly in these perilous times, the public has a right to know how each of you reach the decisions you make to spend our money.

We've called for process reforms because we believe that too much of the real work of the CPB gets done in private, behind closed doors. Public broadcasting is known for its fine mystery programs; the workings of the CPB should not be one of them. What you do and how you decide matters--it has an impact on the programs public broadcasting airs or fails to air. It also affects the morale of public broadcasting's journalists and their level of confidence about engaging in substantive fact-based reporting that may break some eggs in pursuit of the truth.

We at Common Cause and our 300,000 members and supporters--almost all of whom rely primarily on public broadcasting as their source of news--believe that your primary and most important mission is to protect public broadcasting from government meddling and to safeguard its editorial integrity. But do you? And if not, what do you perceive as the CPB's overarching purpose? How do you debate that mission? How do you decide which programs and program concepts are worthy of CPB funds? Do you have differing views on what it means to be balanced and objective, and how do you as a

group resolve those views? Why did you decide to hire two outside ombudsmen to review programs aired on National Public Radio and the Public Broadcasting Service for bias? These are some of the questions the viewers and listeners of public broadcasting have a right to know.

I just want to conclude with this observation. A few days ago I had the opportunity to view a new film, “Good Night, and Good Luck,” about the career of journalist Edward R. Murrow. After the film, which focused on Murrow’s exposé of former Senator McCarthy and his red-baiting tactics, I asked myself, would Murrow find a home in public broadcasting today? Certainly not at the commercial networks, driven by ratings and inclined to view new shows merely as profit centers, but I’m not sure that public broadcasting would welcome him either. After all, didn’t Murrow weigh the factual evidence and then come to a conclusion? Didn’t he offer commentary and not just neutral reporting? Didn’t he eschew the “on one hand..., but on the other hand...” approach to journalism?

Over the decades the best reporting on public broadcasting has offended both political parties and viewers of all ideological stripes. Journalism is supposed to do that; to offer fact-based critiques of government and other institutions to help viewers understand and participate in their democracy. If we cannot rely on public broadcasting to speak truth to power, where do we turn?

Thank you.

Third Presentation -- Eric Rozenman, CAMERA

Thank you. Chairman Tomlinson, members of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting Board, thank you for this opportunity. On behalf of CAMERA, the Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America, I would like to share some results from a new survey about public broadcasting. CAMERA, as you may recall, is a non-partisan national organization with more than 50,000 members who monitor coverage of the Middle East in general, the Arab-Israeli reporting in particular. You might recall at our presentation last year we stressed: 1) CPB’s legal obligation to monitor recipients for strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of controversial nature; 2) CAMERA’s numerous analyses showing that National Public Radio, a CPB recipient, violates the objectivity and balance requirements in its Arab-Israeli coverage (this bias is manifested by, among other things, segments weighted with anti-Israel speakers rather than balanced with representative, informed sources, and quoting speakers critical of Israel leveling serious charges, then presenting substantially briefer counter-points); and 3) we urged CPB to formalize its review of substantive complaints to properly uphold the objectivity and balance standard.

Since then you’ve created the post of ombudsman to review complaints. Allegations of partisanship and censorship—some made by beneficiaries of CPB funding—threaten to obscure the Corporation’s legal obligation to exercise oversight on behalf of the Congressional funders and the public. Those labeling oversight as interference sometimes cite public opinion polls showing high levels of trust in public broadcasting. In fact, there are high levels of trust, but there are also very high expectations, as a summer poll by Luntz, Maslanksy Strategic Research shows.

Among the results, the general public and NPR daily listeners both expect NPR to be held to a higher standard of balance and objectivity because it receives tax dollars-- 51% of daily NPR listeners strongly agree and another 19% somewhat agree, or 70%. Among the general public, 48% strongly agree, 25% somewhat agree, or 73%. Asked if those who oversee NPR, that is CPB and Congress, have the responsibility to guarantee that news isn't biased toward any side, 82% of daily NPR listeners agree, and for the general public it's 85%. So there is a broad consensus for objectivity and balance and for oversight to ensure it. Then what is unobjective and imbalanced? Asked about unnamed news sources that airs programs from speakers with a preponderance from one side, 61% of daily NPR listeners say that is biased; for the general public, 68% say that is biased. Asked about an unnamed news source that covers armed conflicts around the world and refers to deadly strikes against civilians usually as acts of terror, perpetrated by terrorists, but that this unnamed source makes an exception for one country, and then rarely, if ever, uses the terms terror or terrorists, 74% of NPR daily listeners find that very biased, 72% of the general public find it very biased. Yet those two, among many other practices, are exactly what year's worth of CAMERA studies have documented as NPR's practice in its coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Luntz, Maslanksy survey's findings, especially regarding the public's high expectations for balance and objectivity from public broadcasting, and that those responsible guarantee it, reemphasizes that...

[Mr. Rheem announced one minute left.]

CPB must: a) conduct post-broadcast review and point out that post-broadcast review is not pre-broadcast censorship; b) conduct post-broadcast review on a non-partisan basis; c) this review, on which the ombudsmen can play an important part, should be conducted according to accepted journalistic criteria—these are outlined by the Society for Professional Journalists, they're in their code of ethics, and include: accuracy, objectivity, balance, fairness and comprehensiveness; and finally, that no recipient of CPB funds, including National Public Radio, is exempt from review. Clarifying this should help with the objectivity and balance standard at the center of CPB activities, where the public expects it to be. Thank you.

Fourth Presentation – Jeffrey Chester, Center for Digital Democracy

I want to thank you for inviting me here, allowing me to speak today. I have been involved with public broadcasting now for more than 20 years. More than 20 years ago, I was an independent producer; there was also a board that was unresponsive to the public. There was also a similar campaign to pressure the journalism going on inside public broadcasting. And I and others led a campaign to get Congress to fix it in part by establishing the Independent Television Service.

Recently, my organization has been involved in following and exposing the practices of this Board to the press and to others. We wait with interest the impending report of Ken Konz, the Inspector General of CPB; whether or not officials of CPB, including board members, violated the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, which prohibits

interference by officials over the content and distribution of public programming, and which also forbids political or other tests being used in CPB hiring practices.

Over the last several years, we witnessed intense pressure from this board, on public broadcasting; the goal of this pressure has been and is to undermine the editorial independence of PBS, especially in the area of news and public affairs. Through a variety of tactics, including control over the federal programming dollars, you have worked to shape a programming environment that suited the political perspectives of the board's majority. Recently, for example, CPB demanded that PBS agree to editorial oversight before CPB approved the annual national service. Members of the board also put on a highly personal basis Pat Mitchell under tremendous pressure. You have kept your own surveys, until we leak them to the press, your own surveys on objectivity and balance a secret, which show over and over again that there is no public perception of problems with balance or objectivity.

We urge you to become transparent and more accountable. Therefore we urge the CPB Board to approve policy reforms to ensure that: a) contracts approved by the board have the support of the majority of the board and the awareness of the entire board; and b) that public broadcasting organizations such as PBS and NPR are informed of any plans by CPB to undertake studies or reports on their programming; c) that CPB meetings are made available to the public via real-time online video and audio. The FCC is a huge bureaucracy, Ken Ferree can tell you, but they are streaming their meetings. Their records are available to be downloaded. You don't see the meetings of CPB; you don't have access to the files. The community is not even allowed to look at the resolutions so we understand if you change, for example, public radio's CSGs. What that really means: you are not transparent and you must become more accountable. Conflict of interest statements, filed by board members, must be made available to the public online. You have refused to do this.

Unfortunately, it is evident that CPB, and several board members in particular, lack a clear understanding of the foundations and directions of electronic journalism. Mr. Tomlinson repeatedly has asserted his concerns about so-called liberal bias—I don't think it's a food fight, Ken—it's what you were quoted as saying in Variety. You and the Corporation have confused the traditions and ethos of investigative reporting with such a bias. Their problem with public television is that it does not offer enough of such hard-hitting criticisms of the political, economic and social institutions that comprise our global society. You can fall over the fact that the British public is paying for Sherlock Holmes and we're getting to see it, but where is the board's call for the production of serious news, public affairs and dramatic content? You were established by the Carnegie Corporation and the public...

[Mr. Rheem announced one minute left.]

...to have a vision about the future—that is sadly lacking. PBS itself strives to be safe. The reckless remarks of some of the board members have created a further chilling effect, dimming the possibility that PBS will break out of its self-imposed restraints and serve as a media alternative it was meant to be. In addition, calls by the board for a greater public television world with children's programming, who at the local station level must not be construed as an excuse to further weaken public broadcasting's ability

to offer serious network fare. Thank you for letting me present. We will be following the board's actions closely.

Fifth Presentation – Gloria Tristani, United Church of Christ

Good afternoon, my name is Gloria Tristani and I am the Managing Director of the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ and a former Federal Communications Commission commissioner from 1997 to 2001.

The United Church of Christ consists of almost 1.3 million members in close to 6,000 congregations in every state and in Puerto Rico. Formed in 1957 as a union of Congregational Christian, Evangelical and Reform churches, its roots date back to the pilgrims. The UCC's Office of Communication was formed in 1959 to advocate on behalf of the public interest in broadcasting. This work grows out of the church's historic commitment to civil rights and is best known for its successful challenge of the license renewal of Jackson Mississippi's WLBT television station for its blatantly racist programming in the 1960s. Since then, we have continued to champion the rights of those historically underrepresented communities in the media, both in their representation on air and in ownership issues, employment and decision-making positions. Public radio and television give voice to diversity on the airwaves and so it is natural that we address their continued service on behalf of us all.

Today, I would like to talk about issues of transparency and public accountability at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I appreciate the opportunity to address this open public session of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's board meeting, but I am very concerned about the many discussions and decisions that take place behind closed doors in the board's executive sessions. The CPB is funded by 400 million worth of taxpayer dollars and thus has a responsibility to listen to public input and conduct its business in full public view. For example, questions have been raised about whether investigations into the content of programming on PBS and NPR—investigations that were secretly initiated by CPB Chairman Ken Tomlinson—were an attempt to interfere with the editorial discretion of public broadcasting stations. Never, in its nearly half-century of existence, has the Corporation for Public Broadcasting acted to curtail PBS's or NPR's editorial independence. In fact, protecting public broadcasting from political influence is at the core of the CPB mission. Editorial independence is critical to the health and future of the public broadcasting system and indeed to our democracy.

The public already thinks that the commercial media are too motivated by profit margins and partisan politics. Public broadcasting can, should and must operate among such questions. It should be the best representation of the marketplace of ideas. Threats to the editorial independence of public broadcasting are also threats to the educational, innovative and culturally diverse programming that has for so long distinguished public broadcasting from other media. Similarly, the actions of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is the largest single source of funding for public television and radio programming, must be fully above board and publicly disclosed.

That is why the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ has joined with a dozen other media reform groups calling for the CPB Board to adopt a serious of resolutions to ensure the CPB operates as transparently and openly as possible.

I strongly urge the Board of Directors, and its new Chair and its new Vice Chair, to reconsider adopting policies that will make sure that the American public has a voice in, or at the very least, has a clear view of how CPB makes its decisions. The American public is entitled to no less.

[Mr. Rheem thanked the presenters and turned the floor over to Chair Halpern.]

Closing

Chair Halpern thanked Don Rheem for his assistance and the speakers for their participation. She stated that the public's views are important and that she hoped that the speakers would continue to watch, listen and share views on public broadcasting.

Attachment 5

DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMENTS – 2005

House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Programs, February 17, 2005 hearing

Asking about criticism by Margaret Spellings, the U.S. Secretary of Education, of the public television children's program *Postcards from Buster*, Chairman Ralph Regula (R-OH) emphasized that public broadcasters have a responsibility that transcends that of the private sector and must be careful to maintain their influence and credibility with audiences, especially children and their families.

Rep. James T. Walsh (R-NY) described National Public Radio as "a wonderful service" but said that NPR presents what he called "a slanted story, a biased, more liberal story" of events and issues that he experiences serving in Congress. He cautioned that a group of his constituents "felt there was a very strong anti-Israeli bias in the reporting of news on NPR." Mr. Walsh added that listeners must "feel comfortable . . . that these very important issues are dealt with thoroughly and honestly and in a balanced way."

Rep. Dave Weldon (R-FL) said that public television's *NewsHour with Jim Lehrer* does a better job of projecting balance than "some of the NPR reporting." He added that NPR lacks balance in its commentary in particular.

Rep. John E. Peterson (R-PA) focused attention on rural concerns, including health care and access to higher education, and he praised NPR for having hired a rural reporter.

Chairman Regula underscored the importance of the independence of local stations in choosing the programming that they broadcast.

Rep. David Obey (D-WI), the ranking minority member, sharply criticized the news operations of large commercial media corporations, but added that he thinks the difference between the performance of private sector media and that of public broadcasting "is narrowing rather than widening." He referred unfavorably to both *Tucker Carlson Unfiltered* and *Journal Editorial Report*, and described public broadcasting programming as "much less sharp-edged, much less balanced" than it used to be. Mr. Obey said that public broadcasters have "an obligation to provide counterbalance to the private profit motive that drives everybody else in this society," but added: "I just don't see you able to do that that much anymore and so I'm really wondering whether we should continue to support funding for it.

Chairman Regula re-emphasized public broadcasters' responsibility to the public: "You are public broadcasting and you have a responsibility to bring to the message and the viewing an unbiased and factual kind of reporting and the programs that you fund in the educational field should be designed to achieve that goal."

Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, July 11, 2005 hearing

Chairman Arlen Specter (R-PA) said the hearing was convened to address “some concern about bias and some concern about excessive response to allegations of bias.” Senator Specter later asked David Boaz, executive vice president of the Cato Institute and a witness at the hearing, about whether the public television program *Frontline* had ever aired a documentary on various issues that Boaz had earlier cited as evidence of unbalanced selection of topics. Boaz said he had confirmed that the program had not ever aired documentaries on the topics he identified.

Sen. Ted Stevens (R-AK) said that he sees signs that “there are unfortunate trends in some places to take on political issues in a way that demonstrates a bias. It is my judgment that there should be no bias, no leaning to the right or to the left by management or by those who operate these stations.” Senator Stevens added that the CPB board of directors' task is to “restore the balance that existed in the past in the system and really not look to the left, to the right, but just look wherever there is bias going either direction.” He said that CPB should “set the record straight” so that public broadcasting would not face the sort of challenge to federal funding that actions in the House of Representatives had posed shortly before the hearing.

Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-IL) asked: “Are we going through some effort now to politicize this, to change the nature and philosophy of something that we value very much in this country?” He cited public opinion surveys in which 55 percent of the respondent said PBS programming is fair and balanced, and 79 percent said NPR is fair and balanced. Senator Durbin questioned Kenneth Y. Tomlinson, then the chairman of CPB’s board of directors, about his actions concerning *NOW with Bill Moyers* (which he called “a balanced program”) and *Journal Editorial Report*, as well as about his hiring of a consultant to review certain programs for alleged political bias. Senator Durbin concluded: “The people . . . already decided. They thought that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was presenting balance. . . . You have perceived a problem here which the American people obviously don't perceive.”

Senator Stevens rejoined that he thinks Bill Moyers is biased and applauded efforts to recognize and counterbalance that bias.

Representative Bob Inglis letter to CPB President & CEO Patricia deStacy Harrison dated December 7, 2005

Representative Inglis (R-4th C.D., SC) expressed dismay about “unbalanced reporting” that he perceived in the September 30 edition of *NOW*, in segments concerning the performance of the Federal Emergency Management Agency in the wake of Gulf Coast hurricanes and the indictment of Representative Tom DeLay. Mr. Inglis cited three excerpts from what he said was a transcript of the program (including two statements by the program host and one by a correspondent), as well as the selection of interview subjects. Ms. Harrison referred Mr. Inglis’s letter to the CPB ombudsmen for review.

On January 3, 2006, Ken A. Bode, one of the ombudsmen, published a report on his review, complementing the producers of *NOW* for coverage of issues relating to Hurricane Katrina that Mr. Inglis had questioned, but finding shortcomings in the program’s account of alleged political motivations for FEMA actions in the Miami-Dade area after a storm in 2004. Mr. Bode criticized and questioned the program’s report about Representative DeLay.

Attachment 6

PUBLIC BROADCASTING SERVICE EDITORIAL STANDARDS AND POLICIES

I. Introduction

This document is an update of the Public Broadcasting Service ("PBS") program policies adopted in 1971/72 and updated in 1987. While the principles embodied in those policies are enduring and remain as valid today as when they were first adopted, changes in technology, in public television, in journalism, and experience with the current guidelines necessitate, as the original program policies themselves anticipated, "periodic review of procedures to establish and implement program standards and practices, and a revision of the statement as required."

In reviewing the PBS Program Policies adopted in 1987 (the "Policies"), the Editorial Standards Review Committee convened by PBS found the document was well conceived and remarkably contemporary, and further concluded PBS should continue to operate according to the overall principles it articulates. What was needed, generally, was to make the Policies less exclusively concerned with television programming and more platform neutral. It was essential to recognize the ways in which new delivery systems, such as the Web, have affected and will continue to affect the production, distribution, and consumption of content, and the editorial implications of these changes. In that regard, the Committee believed that a hallmark for PBS in its approach and its content going forward should be transparency.

II. Guiding Principles

The Public Broadcasting Service is a nonprofit membership corporation whose members are licensees of noncommercial educational (or "public") television stations and is governed by a board comprised largely of representatives of its member stations. PBS operates in the public interest by serving the needs of its member stations. Four fundamental principles shape the content service that PBS provides to its member stations: editorial integrity, quality, diversity, and local station autonomy.

A. Editorial Integrity

PBS's reputation for quality reflects the public's trust in the editorial integrity of PBS content and the process by which it is produced and distributed. To maintain that trust, PBS and its member stations are responsible for shielding the creative and editorial processes from political pressure or improper influence from funders or other sources. PBS also must make every effort to ensure that the content it distributes satisfies those editorial standards designed to assure integrity.

B. Quality

In selecting programs and other content for its services, PBS seeks the highest quality available. Selection decisions require professional judgments about many different aspects of content quality, including but not limited to excellence, creativity, artistry, accuracy, balance, fairness, timeliness, innovation, boldness, thoroughness, credibility, and technical virtuosity. Similar judgments must be made about the content's ability to stimulate, enlighten, educate, inform, challenge, entertain, and amuse.

C. Diversity

To enhance each member station's ability to meet its local needs, PBS strives to offer a wide choice of quality content. Content diversity furthers the goals of a democratic society by enhancing public access to the full range of ideas, information, subject matter, and perspectives required to make informed judgments about the issues of our time. It also furthers public television's special mandate to serve many different and discrete audiences. The goal of diversity also requires continuing efforts to assure that PBS content fully reflects the pluralism of our society, including, for example, appropriate representation of women and minorities. The diversity of public television producers and funders helps to assure that content distributed by PBS is not dominated by any single point of view.

D. Local Station Autonomy

PBS believes that public broadcasting's greatest potential is realized when it serves the unique needs of the local community, and that there are wide variations in local needs and tastes. No one is better qualified to determine and respond to those local needs than the public television station licensed to that community.

PBS's role is to assist each station in the exercise of its independent responsibilities by: giving its member stations the broadest possible range of content options, consistent with these Public Broadcasting Service Editorial Standards and Policies; providing stations with timely information necessary to make informed judgments about a program's suitability for local broadcast; and making PBS's content selection process responsive to stations' needs.

III. Roles and Responsibilities

Producers, PBS, local public television stations, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting ("CPB") play essential and distinct roles in the public broadcasting content development and distribution process. PBS distributes television programming to member stations and other parties (e.g., cable and satellite operators) for distribution to the public via over-the-air broadcast, cablecast, and other means ("Program Content"). In addition, PBS sometimes publishes content directly to the public via digital platforms such as its Web site, www.pbs.org ("Online Content"). The respective roles and responsibilities of producers, PBS, local public television stations, and CPB may differ in each context. For example, while PBS is responsible for reviewing, acquiring, commissioning, funding, scheduling, promoting, and distributing Program Content, PBS does not itself produce any Program Content. By contrast, PBS occasionally does produce Online Content.

A. Producers

PBS content is produced by a diverse group that includes public television stations and organizations, independent producers (ranging from individual filmmakers to major studios), foreign producers and broadcast organizations, individuals or organizations not normally in the content production business, and, occasionally, in the case of Online Content, PBS itself.

Primary responsibility for content necessarily rests with the producer because it is the producer who creates the content and is uniquely in a position to control all of its elements. Not only would it be impractical for PBS to second-guess the producer's decisions at each step of the production process, but respect for that process demands that producers be allowed the freedom required for creativity to flourish. Thus, in selecting content for distribution, PBS must rely heavily on the producer's honesty, integrity, talent, skill, and good faith.

Producers of content for PBS have an obligation to inform themselves about and adhere to these Standards and Policies and all applicable PBS production and funding guidelines.

B. PBS

PBS is actively involved in encouraging and otherwise fostering the production of quality content. PBS does not itself produce any Program Content. Instead, Program Content and most other content distributed by PBS is produced by people who are not employed by PBS and over whom PBS exercises no direct authority. While producers bear responsibility for content production decisions, PBS bears responsibility and discretion for deciding whether to accept and distribute content, as well as deciding when to schedule it for national distribution. In that role, PBS is the arbiter of whether content meets these Standards and Policies and whether it is appropriate for distribution as part of PBS's national services. PBS performs this function on behalf of member stations and ultimately the audience. Acceptance of Program Content by PBS is signified by the placement of the PBS logo at the conclusion of a program, while acceptance of Online Content by PBS is signified by the availability of the content on www.pbs.org.

Before accepting and distributing content, PBS evaluates it to determine whether it meets these Standards and Policies. To that end, PBS and the producer have a mutual obligation to maintain effective liaison during the production process. The goal of this liaison is to provide opportunities for early notice and resolution of problems. Thus, PBS has a responsibility to make these Standards and Policies, as well as all applicable PBS production and funding guidelines, known to producers.

The final authority for the decision to distribute content as part of any PBS service rests with PBS. PBS makes its overall decisions about which content to accept and distribute with a view towards assuring, over time, a diversity of subjects, viewpoints, formats, techniques, and content sources.

C. Local Public Television Stations

As a licensee of the Federal Communications Commission, each public television licensee bears a non-delegable duty to assure that its broadcast program services fulfill its statutory obligations as a broadcaster. While other entities, including PBS, may assist the local station in fulfilling those obligations, final responsibility for the quality and integrity of its broadcast services rests with each individual station. Thus, even though PBS has accepted Program Content and made it available to the local station, that station has sole discretion to decide whether and when to broadcast it.

In addition to broadcasting PBS Program Content, public television stations produce their own programs and obtain programs - including some rejected by PBS - from suppliers other than PBS. Thus, denying PBS distribution to a program does not prevent the program from being broadcast on local public television stations. There are many alternative means of distributing programs to public television stations, including the statutorily mandated alternative of distribution over the public television satellite interconnection system. PBS, however, makes no judgment as to the suitability for broadcast of programs distributed by parties other than PBS.

Program Content distributed by PBS carries the PBS logo at the conclusion of each program, identifying the program as one accepted and distributed by PBS as distinct from other program distributors. As the symbol of acceptance by PBS, the PBS logo conveys important information to viewers, and a station may not remove the PBS logo from the end of a program without PBS's consent. By contrast, use of the PBS logo in conjunction with the station's own logo (e.g., use of an on-screen identifier or a print logo that includes both logos) serves only to identify the station

as a PBS member station and does not signify PBS approval of the underlying content.

Although PBS strives to provide balanced program services, member stations often choose not to carry the Program Content offered by PBS in its entirety, and each station makes different decisions about how best to supplement PBS's programs. Therefore, each station is ultimately responsible for assuring an appropriate balance of subjects and viewpoints across its broadcast schedule and for complying with all applicable federal statutes and regulations.

While PBS distributes Program Content through its member stations (which retain discretion to broadcast such Program Content or not), PBS distributes Online Content directly to the public, at all times and on a worldwide basis, through its Web site, www.pbs.org. Although pbs.org includes functionality that allows stations to associate their local brands with Online Content, a station cannot choose to limit its association to some but not all of the Online Content available on pbs.org. [Pbs.org](http://pbs.org) also provides access to local station information. PBS member stations make their own online content available to the public through their own independently operated Web sites.

D. CPB

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting ("CPB") is a private, nonprofit corporation created by Congress in 1967 to distribute federally appropriated funds to public broadcasting organizations nationwide. To that end, each year CPB distributes Congressionally appropriated funds to local public broadcasting stations, PBS, and other public television distributors and producers. CPB is a major source of funding for public broadcasting, and provides content funding directly to PBS.

The Public Broadcasting Act (47 U.S.C. § 396 *et seq.*) authorizes CPB to "facilitate the full development of public telecommunications in which programs of high quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, and innovation, which are obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to public telecommunications entities, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature." CPB is governed by a Board of Directors whose members are appointees selected by the President of the United States and confirmed for six-year terms by the U.S. Senate. To shield public television producers and distributors from political influence, the Public Broadcasting Act prohibits CPB from owning or operating public television stations and from producing or distributing public television programs. In addition, the Act requires CPB to "carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities . . . in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of [public television] from interference with, or control of, program content or other activities."

IV. Editorial Standards

Precision in editorial standards is especially difficult because it is impossible to articulate every criterion that might enter into the evaluation of the quality and integrity of particular content. Moreover, a criterion considered mandatory for straight news reporting may not always be appropriate for a documentary or dramatic program.

Content evaluation is an art, not a science, requiring professional judgments about the value of content in relation to a broad range of informational, aesthetic, technical, and other considerations. PBS's task, therefore, is to weigh the merits of the content submitted to it and assure that, viewed in its entirety, the content it distributes strikes the best balance among these considerations. These Standards and Policies embody the goals of integrity and quality to which PBS aspires, recognizing that judgments about how these standards apply may differ depending

on format or subject, and that not all content succeeds equally in satisfying all of these standards.

PBS recognizes that the producer of informational content deals neither in absolute truth nor in absolute objectivity. Information is by nature fragmentary; the honesty of a program, Web site, or other content can never be measured by a precise, scientifically verifiable formula. Therefore, content quality must depend, at bottom, on the producer's professionalism, independence, honesty, integrity, sound judgment, common sense, open mindedness, and intention to inform, not to propagandize.

By placing its logo at the end of a program or hosting a Web site, PBS makes itself accountable for the quality and integrity of the content. Editorial integrity encompasses not only the concerns addressed in these Standards and Policies, but also the concerns about improper funder influence and commercialism addressed in PBS's funding and production guidelines. If PBS concludes that content fails to satisfy PBS's overall standards of quality or any applicable journalistic standard or production practice, PBS may reject the content for distribution.

A. Fairness

Fairness to the audience implies several responsibilities. Producers must neither oversimplify complex situations nor camouflage straightforward facts. PBS may reject a program or other content if PBS believes that it contains any unfair or misleading presentation of facts, including inaccurate statements of material fact, undocumented statements of fact that appear questionable on their face, misleading juxtapositions, misrepresentations, or distortions.

To avoid misleading the public, producers also should adhere to the principles of transparency and honesty by providing appropriate labels, disclaimers, updates, or other information so that the public plainly understands what it is seeing. For example, content that includes commentary, points of view, or opinion should be appropriately identified, as should all sources of funding. Transparency also suggests producers maximize attribution of information and limit the use of anonymous sourcing to those cases when there is no alternative and the information is essential. Content that contains adult themes or other sensitive material should contain an appropriate disclosure.

Producers should treat the people who are the subjects of, who appear in, or who are referenced in the content they produce with fairness and respect. PBS will reject content if, in PBS's judgment, it unfairly treats the people or misrepresents their views. Fair treatment of individuals generally requires that a producer represent the words and actions of the people portrayed or identified in a way that presents their strongest case, and gives individuals or organizations that are the subject of attack or criticism an opportunity to respond. Fairness also requires that a producer be willing to consider all relevant information and points of view.

B. Accuracy

The honesty and integrity of informational content depends heavily upon its factual accuracy. Every effort must be made to assure that content is presented accurately and in context. Programs, Web sites, and other content containing editorials, analysis, commentary, and points of view must be held to the same standards of factual accuracy as news reports. A commitment to accuracy includes a willingness to correct the record if persuasive new information that warrants a correction comes to light, and to respond to feedback and questions from audiences.

PBS may undertake independent verification of the accuracy of content submitted to it. Producers of informational content must exercise extreme care in verifying information, especially as it may relate to accusations of wrongdoing, and be prepared to correct material errors. PBS will reject

content that, in its judgment, fails to meet PBS's standard of accuracy.

C. Objectivity

Along with fairness and accuracy, objectivity is the third basic standard to which journalists are held. While PBS holds all news and informational content to standards of objectivity, PBS recognizes that other types of content may not have the objective presentation of facts as their goal.

Objectivity, however, encompasses more than news and information presented in a neutral way. It also refers to the process by which a work was produced, including work that involves analysis or, as a result of reporting, arrives at conclusions. To begin with, journalists must enter into any inquiry with an open mind, not with the intent to present a predetermined point of view. Beyond that, for a work to be considered objective, it should reach a certain level of transparency. In a broad sense, this spirit of transparency means the audience should be able to understand the basics of how the producers put the material together. For example, the audience generally should be able to know not only who the sources of information are, but also why they were chosen and what their potential biases might be. As another example, if producers face particularly difficult editorial decisions that they know will be controversial, they should consider explaining why choices were made so the public can understand. Producers should similarly consider explaining to the audience why certain questions could not be answered, including why, if confidential sources are relied on, the producers agreed to allow the source to remain anonymous. And the spirit of transparency suggests that if the producers have arrived at certain conclusions or a point of view, the audience should be able to see the evidence so it can understand how that point of view was arrived at. One aspiration implicit in the idea of transparency is that an audience might appreciate and learn from content with which it also might disagree.

Opinion and commentary are different from news and analysis. When a program, segment, or other content is devoted to opinion or commentary, the principle of transparency requires that it be clearly labeled as such. Any content segment that presents only like-minded views without offering contrasting viewpoints should be considered opinion and should identify who is responsible for the views being presented.

No content distributed by PBS should permit conscious manipulation of selected facts in order to propagandize.

D. Balance

PBS seeks to present, over time, content that addresses a broad range of subjects from a variety of viewpoints. PBS may, however, choose to consider not only the extent to which the content contributes to balance overall, but also the extent to which specific content is fairly presented in light of available evidence.

Where appropriate, PBS may condition acceptance of content on the producer's willingness to further the goal of balance by deleting designated footage or by including other points of view on the issues presented or material from which the public might draw a conclusion different from that suggested by the content. Material to be added may range from a few words, to a complete content segment, to an added episode in a series of programs, to the production of an entirely separate, new program. Where PBS deems it appropriate, PBS may arrange for the production of additional content by a producer other than the producer of the original content material. For Online Content, links to credible, high-quality, related resources may be used to provide access to additional information or viewpoints.

E. Responsiveness to the Public

Producers must work with PBS to respond to and interact with the public. This may include providing an outlet for public feedback about content and helping to create material for the Web that allows audiences to learn more, seek background information, access documents alluded to in a program, answer questions that a program might not have been able to address, and even customize information. Accountability is a goal, including answering audience questions and responding to criticisms about programs or content. When public feedback is published by PBS it should be labeled as such, and standards for publication - such as those relating to obscenity or personal attacks - should be clearly communicated.

F. Courage and Controversy

PBS seeks content that provides courageous and responsible treatment of issues, and that reports and comments, with honesty and candor, on social, political, and economic tensions, disagreements, and divisions. The surest road to intellectual stagnation and social isolation is to stifle the expression of uncommon ideas; today's dissent may be tomorrow's orthodoxy. The ultimate task of weighing and judging information and viewpoints is, in a free and open society, the task of the audience. Therefore, PBS seeks to assure that its overall content offerings contain a broad range of opinions and points of view, including those from outside society's existing consensus, presented in a responsible manner and consistent with the standards set forth in these Standards and Policies.

G. Substance Over Technique

Advances in production technology carry with them the possibility that technique may overwhelm substance, distorting the information, making it technically inaccessible or distracting the public's attention from its central thrust. Neither people nor ideas ought to be victimized by technical trickery. PBS will reject content that, in its judgment, disserves the viewer or its subject matter by inappropriately pursuing technique at the expense of substance.

H. Experimentation and Innovation

PBS seeks content that is innovative in format, technique, or substance. The absence of commercial considerations accords PBS the freedom to experiment in ways not always tolerable in the commercial environment. The potential for innovation can be fully realized only if PBS is bold enough to take occasional risks.

I. Exploration of Significant Subjects

Unlike their commercial counterparts, public television stations do not sell time for profit and are, therefore, free from the constraints that compel commercial broadcasters to pursue the largest audience. PBS seeks programs that will enable its member stations to explore significant subjects even if those subjects or their treatment may not be expected to appeal to a large audience.

J. Unprofessional Conduct

PBS expects producers to adhere to the highest professional standards. PBS may reject content if PBS has reason to believe that a producer has violated basic standards of professional conduct. Examples of unprofessional conduct by a producer include such things as plagiarism, fabrication, obtaining information by bribery or coercion, insensitivity to tragedy or grief, and real or perceived conflicts of interest such as accepting gifts, favors, or compensation from those who might seek to influence the producer's work.

K. Unacceptable Production Practices

It is impossible to anticipate every situation with which a producer of informational content must

contend. Nevertheless, certain areas present such frequently encountered dangers that they merit explicit warning. In general, they would fall under two broad concepts:

- Never invent or add elements that were not originally there; and
- Never make choices that mislead or deceive the audience.

1. Staging. Producers of news content should not stage events or suggest that others stage events for the sake of media coverage.

2. Re-creations and Simulations. In instances where re-creations or simulations of actual events are necessary and desirable, they should be clearly identified if there is any possibility that the viewer would be confused or misled.

3. Distorted Editing. All producers face the necessity of selection - which material is to be left in, which is to be edited out. Reducing and organizing this information is part of the producer's craft. It is the objective of the editing process to collect and order information in a manner that fairly portrays reality. Producers must assure that edited material remains faithful in tone and substance to that reality. When editing, producers of informational content must not sensationalize events or create a misleading or unfair version of what actually occurred. When significant interruptions of time or changes of setting occur, they should be unambiguously identified for the viewer.

4. Deception. The credibility of content is jeopardized whenever the audience or a source is duped or feels duped. Deceiving the audience would include such examples as when time is conflated so that it appears that several interviews were actually one. Duping a source would include when a producer misleads an interviewee concerning the purpose of the interview. Honesty, candor, and common courtesy must govern producers' behavior.

5. Pre-trial Publicity. Our legal system presumes that criminal defendants are innocent until proven guilty. In reporting on crimes and related legal proceedings, producers must be sensitive to the rights of the accused to a fair trial and the effect of pre-trial publicity. Producers should be wary of self-serving statements from both prosecuting and defense attorneys. They should also remain cautious about using alleged evidence in any content to be made available to the public pre-trial.

6. Media Manipulation. Manipulation can be effected either by the media or by others seeking to use the media for their own purposes. Television is an extraordinarily powerful instrument; the mere presence of television cameras can change or influence events. Producers must minimize and, to the extent possible, eliminate this interference. In crowds, demonstrations, and riots, during terrorist incidents, and in other similar circumstances, camera crews and production teams should seek to be as inconspicuous as possible, and, as appropriate, cap lenses or withdraw completely when their presence might incite an extreme reaction or unduly influence the course of events.

7. Manipulation of the Audience. The use of music and sound effects, dramatic lighting or staging, or other artificial effects can subtly affect the impression left with the audience. Producers must exercise care not to use such techniques in a way that is unfairly manipulative by distorting the reality of what occurred.

PBS may reject and decline to distribute any content that, in its judgment, violates the production practices identified above or shows evidence of any other production practice that is not

consistent with accepted professional standards.

L. Objectionable Material

Responsible treatment of important issues may sometimes require the inclusion of controversial or sensitive material, but good taste must prevail in PBS content. Morbid or sensational details, or material that is gratuitously offensive to general taste or manners (e.g., extreme violence, racial epithets, strong language, nudity, sexism), should not be included unless it is necessary to an understanding of the matter at hand.

Questions of taste cannot be answered in the abstract, but when specific problems arise, they must be resolved in light of contemporary standards of taste, the state of the law, and the newsworthiness and overall value of the material. If PBS concludes that the exclusion of such material would distort an important reality or impair the content's artistic quality, PBS may accept the content provided it carries appropriate notice to the viewer. Conversely, PBS may reject content that, in its judgment, needlessly contains objectionable material that compromises the content's quality or integrity.

Adopted: June 14, 2005

Attachment 7



News Room

New Survey Shows Americans Trust Traditional News Sources Most

PRSA/Harris Interactive survey compares views of consumers, execs and congressional staffers

ROCHESTER, N.Y. and NEW YORK – November 10, 2005 – When it comes to Americans' reliance upon news, what's "new and hot" is *not* the choice for many consumers, business executives and Washington insiders, according to the findings of a groundbreaking survey developed jointly by Harris Interactive® and the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) Foundation.

The national survey, titled ***Executive, Congressional and Consumer Attitudes Toward Media, Marketing and the Public Relations Profession***, compares attitudes and opinions about media, marketing and public relations among American adult consumers, *Fortune* 1000 executives, and congressional staffers. And while there were marked differences among the three groups, one of the survey's major findings was that substantial majorities of each group are interested in the news and they tend to trust traditional news sources most.

Contrary to oft-repeated assessments that Americans are losing interest in the news, the survey found that majorities of all three groups polled say they use news, pay attention to it, want to keep up with it, and have a distinct set of news sources they depend on.

- At least seven in 10 general consumers (71%), congressional staffers (77%) and executives (87%) agree that they have a defined set of news sources that they trust to provide them with fair and balanced coverage and that they largely ignore other sources.
- Majorities (53% to 71%) of the three groups surveyed say they like to keep up with the news, but it's just one of the many ways they spend their leisure time. However, some (15% to 43%) say they are "news junkies," asserting that keeping up with the news is a favorite leisure time activity.
- Sixty-five percent of general consumers, 75 percent of executives and 80 percent of congressional staffers actively look for news and information that challenges their political opinions and social beliefs.
- Minorities (21% to 42%) of each of the groups surveyed rely heavily on independent sources like Internet chat rooms, blogs or other alternative media to get news and information.

Most Trusted: Tried and True Traditional Media

Despite some talk of a media landscape dominated by blogs and Internet chat rooms, the survey finds that the most trusted news sources are the tried and true -- public TV and radio programming, national newspapers and commercial broadcast news.

- Sixty-one percent of general consumers, along with 70 percent of congressional staffers and 75 percent of executives, trust news shows on public television or National Public Radio.
- More than half (56%) of general consumers and more than three-quarters of both executives and congressional staffers (78% each) say they trust national newspapers like *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post* or *The Wall Street Journal*.
- Majorities (53% to 62%) of the three groups surveyed say they trust commercial broadcast news, including network television, cable and commercial radio networks.

However, trusting news sources doesn't necessarily imply blind loyalty or a lack of skepticism as minorities of general consumers (43%), congressional staffers (33%) and executives (28%) agree that most of the news they see is accurate and unbiased.

There are a number of news sources that garner somewhat lower trust among respondents, including advocacy groups (18% to 44% of the three groups surveyed say they completely or somewhat trust this source), pollsters (37% to 51%) and elected or appointed government officials (31% to 53%). Interestingly, only about half (53%) of congressional staffers say they completely or somewhat trust public officials.

The least-trusted information sources among the 11 included in the survey are entertainers or celebrities who support particular causes (8% to 30% of the three groups surveyed say they completely or somewhat trust them), liberal (18% to 31%) and conservative (29% to 35%) talk radio hosts, and people who work in the advertising industry (20% to 25%).

"All of this is important information for professionals who daily are challenged about which channels and sources they should use to reach consumers and business/political decision-makers," said Judith T. Phair, president and CEO of the Public Relations Society of America. "It's easy to read the headlines in trade and business press about all of the hot 'new' media channels and start to believe that the traditional press is passé, but this survey confirms that despite some new entrants, Americans still use news, seek news and place their trust in the traditional sources."

TABLE 1

ATTITUDES TOWARD MEDIA

"To what extent do you personally agree or disagree with the following statements?"

Base: All Respondents

		<u>Agree</u> <u>(Net)</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u> <u>(Net)</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
You have a defined set of news sources that you trust to provide you with fair and balanced coverage, other sources you largely ignore.							
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	71	28	43	25	16	9
Total Executives (n=150)	%	87	58	29	13	9	5
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	77	49	28	23	16	7
You actively look for news and information that challenges your political opinions and social beliefs.							
Total U.S. Adults 18 + (n=1,015)	%	65	25	40	33	21	12
Total Executives (n=150)	%	75	40	35	25	15	10
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	80	34	46	20	14	6
You believe that most of the news you see is accurate and unbiased.							
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	43	10	33	56	28	28
Total Executives (n=150)	%	28	4	24	72	41	31
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	33	3	31	66	40	26
You rely heavily on independent sources like Internet chat rooms, blogs or other alternative media to get news and information.							
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	42	16	26	54	24	30
Total Executives (n=150)	%	21	3	17	79	28	51
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	30	9	21	70	27	43

TABLE 2

NEWS INTEREST

"Which of these statements best describes you personally?"

Base: All Respondents

	%
You like to keep up with the news, but it's just one of many ways that you spend your leisure time	
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	66
Total Executives (n=150)	71
Total Congressional (n=150)	53
You are a news junky – it's a favorite leisure time activity	
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	15
Total Executives (n=150)	23
Total Congressional (n=150)	43
You are not really interested in the news – there are other ways that you prefer to spend your leisure time	
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	15
Total Executives (n=150)	5
Total Congressional (n=150)	4
None of these	
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	4
Total Executives (n=150)	1
Total Congressional (n=150)	-

TABLE 3

TRUST IN NEWS SOURCES

"How much do you trust the following types of information sources to provide accurate and unbiased news and information?"

Base: All Respondents

		<u>Trust (Net)</u>	<u>Trust Completely</u>	<u>Trust Somewhat</u>	<u>Distrust (Net)</u>	<u>Distrust Somewhat</u>	<u>Distrust Completely</u>	<u>Depends on the source</u>
News shows on public television or National Public Radio								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	61	10	51	18	14	4	20
Total Executives (n=150)	%	75	11	64	16	14	2	9
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	70	18	52	17	13	3	13
National newspapers like The New York Times, The Washington Post or The Wall Street Journal								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	56	13	43	21	15	7	15
Total Executives (n=150)	%	78	16	62	11	9	1	11
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	78	22	56	10	9	1	11
Commercial broadcast news including network television, cable and commercial radio networks								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	53	4	49	26	20	6	21
Total Executives (n=150)	%	59	2	57	31	29	2	10
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	62	5	57	21	19	1	17
Advocacy groups like the NRA, AARP, and the ACLU								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	44	8	36	33	19	14	18
Total Executives (n=150)	%	18	1	17	61	43	19	21
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	39	-	39	35	31	4	27

		<u>Trust (Net)</u>	<u>Trust Completely</u>	<u>Trust Somewhat</u>	<u>Distrust (Net)</u>	<u>Distrust Somewhat</u>	<u>Distrust Completely</u>	<u>Depends on the source</u>
Elected or appointed government officials								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	38	2	36	36	26	10	25
Total Executives (n=150)	%	31	1	30	47	40	7	22
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	53	2	51	19	17	1	27
Public opinion pollsters								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	37	4	33	38	27	11	22
Total Executives (n=150)	%	45	1	43	35	29	6	19
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	51	2	49	24	21	3	25
People who work in the public relations industry								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	37	3	33	40	27	13	21
Total Executives (n=150)	%	29	2	27	45	38	7	25
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	29	1	27	49	41	8	22
Conservative talk radio hosts								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	35	4	31	39	21	18	22
Total Executives (n=150)	%	29	1	28	57	33	23	14
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	34	1	33	51	27	23	15
Liberal talk radio hosts								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	31	2	29	42	22	20	22
Total Executives (n=150)	%	18	-	18	67	41	26	15
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	31	1	30	51	31	20	16
Entertainers or celebrities who support particular causes or issues								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	30	2	28	45	22	24	22
Total Executives (n=150)	%	8	1	7	77	39	38	15
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	13	-	13	71	33	39	15

		<u>Trust (Net)</u>	<u>Trust Completely</u>	<u>Trust Somewhat</u>	<u>Distrust (Net)</u>	<u>Distrust Somewhat</u>	<u>Distrust Completely</u>	<u>Depends on the source</u>
People who work in the advertising industry								
Total U.S. Adults 18+ (n=1,015)	%	25	2	23	54	33	22	20
Total Executives (n=150)	%	24	-	24	60	49	11	15
Total Congressional (n=150)	%	20	-	20	62	49	13	17

Methodology

General Public

Harris Interactive conducted the telephone survey, jointly developed with the PRSA Foundation, between June 7 and 12, 2005 among a nationwide cross section of 1,015 U.S. adults ages 18 and over. Figures for age, sex, race, education, number of adults, number of voice/telephone lines in the household, region and size of place were weighted where necessary to align them with their actual proportions in the population. In theory, with a probability sample of this size, one can say with 95 percent certainty that the results for the overall sample have a sampling error of plus or minus 3 percentage points of what they would be if the entire U.S. adult population had been polled with complete accuracy.

Executives

Harris Interactive conducted this survey, jointly developed with the PRSA Foundation, using its *Executive Omnibus™*, a nationwide telephone survey of 150 leading executives in *Fortune* 1000 companies. The survey was conducted between June 10 and July 14, 2005. Executives from a broad range of industries, services, locales, and sizes of companies were interviewed. Data from this sample are not weighted and are representative only of the body of individuals surveyed. In theory, with a probability sample of this size, one can say with 95 percent certainty that the results for the overall sample have a sampling error of plus or minus 8 percentage points.

Congressional Staffers

Harris Interactive conducted this survey, jointly developed with the PRSA Foundation, using its *Congressional Omnibus™*, a unique bipartisan survey which provides an in-depth, scientific analysis of what Congress thinks. From among Hill offices, 150 senior staff members and aides were interviewed via telephone and stratified according to party, chamber, years in office, and title. The survey was conducted between June 7 and August 17, 2005. Data from this sample are not weighted and are representative only of the body of individuals surveyed. In theory, with a probability sample of this size, one can say with 95 percent certainty that the results for the overall sample have a sampling error of plus or minus 8 percentage points.

About the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) Foundation

Founded in 1990, the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) Foundation supports the advancement of research, education, scholarship and professional development in the public relations profession ensuring quality life-long learning opportunities that will advance the profession and the professional.

About the Public Relations Society of America (PRSA)

The Public Relations Society of America (www.prsa.org), based in New York City, is the world's largest organization for public relations professionals. The Society has more than 28,000 professional and student members. PRSA is organized into 114 Chapters nationwide, 19 Professional Interest Sections along with Affinity Groups, which represent business and industry, counseling firms, independent practitioners, military, government, associations,

hospitals, schools, professional services firms and nonprofit organizations. The Public Relations Student Society of America (PRSSA) has 270 Chapters at colleges and universities throughout the United States.

About Harris Interactive®

Harris Interactive Inc. (www.harrisinteractive.com), based in Rochester, New York, is the 13th largest and the fastest-growing market research firm in the world, most widely known for *The Harris Poll*® and for its pioneering leadership in the online market research industry. Long recognized by its clients for delivering insights that enable confident business decisions, the Company blends the science of innovative research with the art of strategic consulting to deliver knowledge that leads to measurable and enduring value.

Harris Interactive serves clients worldwide through its United States, Europe (www.harrisinteractive.com/europe) and Asia offices, its wholly-owned subsidiary Novatris in Paris, France (www.novatris.com), and through an independent global network of affiliate market research companies. EOE M/F/D/V

To become a member of the Harris Poll OnlineSM and be invited to participate in future online surveys, go to www.harrispollonline.com

For more information about the survey please visit the online media kit at http://media.prsa.org/press_kit_index.cfm

Harris Interactive Contact:

Nancy Wong
585-214-7316

PRSA Contact:

Cedric Bess

212-460-1495

Attachment 8

MAJOR AWARDS RECEIVED BY PUBLIC BROADCASTING PROGRAMS – 2005

57th ANNUAL EMMY AWARDS (11)

Broadway: The American Musical (Michael Kantor and WNET)

- Outstanding Nonfiction Series
- Outstanding Writing for Nonfiction Programming
- Outstanding Sound Mixing for Nonfiction Programming (Single or Multi-Camera)

Great Performances “Eric Clapton Crossroads Guitar Festival” (WNET)

- Outstanding Picture Editing for a Special

Masterpiece Theatre “The Lost Prince” (BBC and WGBH)

- Outstanding Art Direction for a Miniseries or Movie
- Outstanding Costumes for a Miniseries, Movie or Special
- Outstanding Miniseries
- Outstanding Nonfiction Series

Live from Lincoln Center “Stephen Sondheim’s ‘Passion’” (WNET)

- Outstanding Special Class Program

Unforgivable Blackness: The Rise and Fall of Jack Johnson (Florentine Films and WETA)

- Outstanding Nonfiction Special
- Outstanding Voice-over Performance

26th ANNUAL NEWS AND DOCUMENTARY EMMY AWARDS (6)

American Experience “The Fight” (Barak Goodman, Director)

- Outstanding Individual Achievement in a Craft: Direction

DNA: The Human Race (WNET)

- Outstanding Science, Technology and Nature Programming

Frontline “The Secret History of the Credit Card” (WGBH)

- Outstanding Investigative Journalism – Long Form

National Geographic Specials “Arlington: Field of Honor” (John Bredar, Director)

- Outstanding Individual Achievement in a Craft: Direction

Nature “Pale Male” (Janet Hess, Writer)

- Outstanding Individual Achievement in a Craft: Writing

Wide Angle “Ladies First” (Deborah Schaffer and WNET)

- Outstanding Continuing Coverage of a News Story – Long Form

3rd ANNUAL BUSINESS & FINANCIAL REPORTING EMMY AWARDS (2)

The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer “The Price of Oil: Winners and Losers” (MacNeil/Lehrer Productions and WETA)

Outstanding Interpretation and/or Analysis of a Business News Story – Newsmagazines & Long Form

Nightly Business Report “China’s Emergence as an International Economic Power” (NBR Enterprises/WPBT)

Outstanding Extended Coverage of a Business Story

32nd ANNUAL DAYTIME EMMY AWARDS (11)

Clifford's Puppy Days (Scholastic Entertainment, Inc.)

Outstanding Performer in an Animated Program (Henry Winkler, as Norville)

Jakers! The Adventures of Piggley Winks (Entara Ltd.)

Outstanding Achievement in Music Direction and Composition

Outstanding Individual Achievement in Animation (Ellen Jin Over, Color Director)

Reading Rainbow (Great Plains National Instructional Television Library)

Outstanding Children's Series

Outstanding Achievement in Single Camera Photography (Film or Electronic)

Outstanding Achievement in Single Camera Editing

Outstanding Writing in a Children's Series

Sesame Street (Sesame Workshop)

Outstanding Pre-School Children's Series (for the 11th consecutive year)

Outstanding Directing in a Children's Series

Outstanding Performer in a Children's Series (Kevin Clash, as Elmo)

Outstanding Achievement in Art Direction/Set Decoration/Scenic Design

64th ANNUAL GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY AWARDS (7)

American Experience “Tupperware!” (Filmmakers Collaborative and Blueberry Hill Productions)

Coverage of the war in Iraq (National Public Radio)

Leonard Bernstein: An American Life (CultureWorks and the WFMT Radio Network)

Let the Good Times Roll (The Rhythm and Blues Foundation and Public Radio International)

On the Media (WNYC Radio and National Public Radio)

Studio 360 “American Icons: Melville’s Moby Dick” (WNYC Radio and Public Radio International)

To the Best of Our Knowledge (Wisconsin Public Radio and Public Radio International)

ALFRED I. DUPONT-COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AWARDS (4)

Hoxie: The First Stand (David Appleby and the University of Memphis)

Frontline “The Ghosts of Rwanda” (WGBH)

Frontline “Truth, War and Consequences” (WGBH)

Mandela: An Audio History (Radio Diaries Inc. and National Public Radio)

Attachment 9

CPB-FUNDED PROGRAMMING AND RELATED PROJECTS – 2005

Television Programming and Related Projects

AFI Digital Content Lab 2005 (\$350,000)

American Film Institute, Los Angeles, CA

A year-round digital content lab with rolling selection of proposals and project production; expanded R&D with a focus on prototype production; expanded digital content fellowships and scholarships; and collaboration on the CPB American History & Civics Initiative, including outreach at public events and seminars.

Art:21 – Art in the Twenty-First Century (\$200,000)

Art:21, New York, NY

An education and outreach project supporting Season Three of the Emmy-nominated PBS program *Art:21 – Art in the Twenty-First Century*, using innovative online resources, teacher workshops, public screenings, discussion forums, and specially designed local public television station support to inform students, teachers and general audiences about contemporary visual artists and their work.

Auschwitz: Inside the Nazi State DVD/DVD-ROM (\$150,000)

KCET-TV, Los Angeles, CA

Community outreach activities based on the six-hour public television series, including a companion DVD/DVD-ROM that will be distributed to schools, libraries, museums, and other community organizations throughout the country.

Boys in Focus: Raising Cain (\$150,000)

Powderhouse Productions, Somerville, MA

An outreach campaign that seeks to raise awareness among pre-school to adolescent boys about the importance of making positive changes to negative attitudes and behaviors, and works with youth service providers and care takers to better understand the boys they work and live with.

Bringing *Wide Angle* into High School Classrooms (\$200,000)

Thirteen/WNET, New York, NY

An outreach initiative that will move content developed for the *Wide Angle* series into high school classrooms nationwide and train teachers to use new media with lesson plans and activities for students studying global history and geography courses.

CPB/PBS WGBH Producers Academy 2005 (\$86,000)

PBS, Alexandria, VA

To reach out and nurture public television producers, provide a production skills workshop that focuses on one-on-one reviews with experts, and other programs designed to educate and elevate producers.

Diverse Voices Project II (\$650,000)

American Documentary Inc., New York, NY

To meet the needs of underserved communities through multicultural programming, compete for new titles by identifying promising work at the early stages of production, and mentor new producing talent who will bring diversity to the public television system.

INPUT 2005 Producer Fellowship Grants (\$20,000)

South Carolina ETV, Columbia, SC

To provide fellowship grants to independent producers and public television station managers to participate in the INPUT 2005 professional development conference.

***Journal Editorial Report* (\$746,684)**

Dow Jones Co., New York, NY

The second season of the twenty-six week series (thirty minutes per episode) hosted by Paul Gigot, Pulitzer Prize-winner, editor of *The Wall Street Journal* editorial page and former NewsHour correspondent, featuring panel discussions with members of the *Journal's* editorial board and opinion leaders representing a diverse range of expertise, interests and backgrounds.

Katrina Webcast Project (\$105,050)

National Black Programming Consortium (NBPC), New York, NY

The project combines community access, outreach and a native filmmaker's take on post-Katrina New Orleans as it transitions from a city underwater to a city reborn. The 5-minute films will be streamed on NBPC's web site and repackaged as a 90-minute documentary to be shown on *Independent Lens*.

***Making Schools Work* (\$210,100)**

Hedrick Smith Productions Inc., Chevy Chase, MD

An outreach initiative supporting a two-hour documentary profiling different approaches to educational reform in American elementary, middle and high schools, distribute educational materials in specific broadcast cities, award station grants and other activities.

***Masterpiece Theatre* (\$2,224,000)**

WGBH, Boston, MA

Funding for the first two years of a three-year strategic plan to increase the number of new programs, reinforce relationships between the show and local stations and their members, and tie the show into local fundraising strategies. The project implements recommendations from audience research in the *Framework for a Public Television Primetime Strategy*.

***Memorial Day and Capitol Fourth Concerts 2005* (\$500,000)**

Capitol Concerts Inc., Washington, DC

Two live, 90-minute performance specials originating from the U.S. Capitol grounds featuring the National Symphony Orchestra conducted by Erich Kunzel.

***Moneywise PBS/DOD Financial Literacy Initiative* (\$150,000)**

New River Media, Washington, DC

An outreach initiative built around a forthcoming national public television special "Who's Afraid to be a Millionaire?" presented by host Kelvin Boston. The project partners local PTV stations with military bases to hold financial literacy events for military families, with a particular focus on spouses who are often the money managers during deployments.

***Museum of Television and Radio Video Archiving 2005* (\$50,000)**

Museum of Television and Radio, New York, NY, and Los Angeles, CA

Support the Museum of Television and Radio's efforts to archive and catalogue 40 new hours of public television programming and 35 hours from archived programming to add to the permanent collection.

My City Now (\$100,000)

City Projects, Los Angeles, CA

An outreach program focusing on creating awareness and new audiences for PBS rebroadcasts of *Los Angeles Now* during Hispanic Heritage Month that will bring high school students and senior citizens together in selected cities to talk about the past, present and future of where they live using clips from the film and future filmmaker workshops.

Religion & Ethics NewsWeekly (\$200,000)

Thirteen/WNET, New York, NY

Season IX and X of the 30-minute weekly program covering America's diverse religious landscape and reports on religious news and trends from around the world.

Roadtrip Nation (\$217,878)

Roadtrip Productions, Costa Mesa, CA

A local and national outreach campaign combining grassroots on-campus community building efforts with off-campus national outreach partners, including public television stations, to provide a new resource to the collegiate demographic at 4-year and junior college campuses.

Silverdocs 2005 (\$100,000)

American Film Institute, Silver Spring, MD

Third-year support for the competitive Silverdocs festival, created by AFI and Discovery to showcase documentaries from around the world, as well as focus on CPB and public television content development.

The Story in History: Engaging Youth in African American Lives (\$249,774)

Thirteen/WNET, New York, NY

An outreach initiative that utilizes the structure and reach of the after-school programs offered by the Boys & Girls Clubs of America and local public television stations' broadcast of the series *African American Lives* to engage teenagers in discovering their history by using the science of DNA and the power of the Internet, and then telling their stories with multimedia productions as a way to understand the broader heritage of African-Americans.

Sweet Honey in the Rock: Raise Your Voice (\$50,000)

Firelight Media Inc., New York, NY

National outreach campaign to help educators, cultural institutions and community organizers use the feature-length documentary about the award-winning, African-American female *a cappella* vocal ensemble in classroom and other educational settings.

Take One Step (wt) (\$600,000)

WGBH, Boston, MA and TPT, Minneapolis, MN

A community engagement and outreach initiative to accompany four health specials emphasizing themes central to the four programs: the effectiveness of prevention; the potential positive impact of lifestyle changes; the importance of accurate early diagnosis and treatment; and the role of support networks for patients and families.

Washington Week Bridge Funding and R&D (\$700,000)

WETA, Arlington, VA

Provides bridge funding for *Washington Week*, the longest-running public affairs program on PBS, while research is conducted on how to make the show more relevant to viewers and potential corporate sponsors.

WETA News Academy Spring 2006 (\$170,610)

WETA, Arlington, VA

A news and public affairs production skills workshop for public television producers who have at least two years experience in local news and public affairs programming.

Workshop/Panels '05 (\$50,000)

American Cinema Foundation, Los Angeles, CA

A documentary-focused workshop, outreach, and conference event exploring certain aspects of how diversity of ideas can be further encouraged in public broadcasting.

America at a Crossroads Initiative

African Americans and Islam (\$69,640 R&D)

Chamba Mediaworks Inc., Santa Monica, CA

An R&D project examining the effects of 9/11 on African-American Muslims and the emotions and tensions surrounding issues of national and religious identification.

The Anti-Americans (\$69,013 R&D)

Center for New American Media, New York, NY

An R&D project examining the history of anti-American sentiment in Europe, combining present day attitudes with excerpts from past and contemporary European political, cultural and intellectual figures, as well as print and broadcast media.

Arabic Music in America (\$552,774 Production)

Firststars, Sherman Oaks, CA

A documentary chronicling a group of top Arab singers on their first visit to the United States and the musicians' hopes and dreams, but also their fears of leaving their home countries to travel to a post-9/11 America. The film will pair up Middle Eastern and popular American music stars in joint performances that demonstrate Arab music as an important way to help bridge differences by showing Arab and American performance stars and audiences demonstrating mutual respect for one another's cultures.

Arabic Music Succeeding in America (\$96,503 R&D)

Firststars, Sherman Oaks, CA

An R&D project following a group of top Arab singers touring the United States for the first time and on the musicians' hopes and dreams, as well as their the fears of leaving their home countries to travel to post-9/11 America.

The Arab Democrats (\$86,450 R&D)

New River Media, Washington, DC

An R&D project profiling committed democrats found in every Arab country who believe in the possibility for change.

The Arab Predicament (\$86,680 R&D)

WGBH, Boston, MA

An R&D project examining the economies of the Middle East, and the political, legal, social and other forces affecting the region's efforts to develop and compete globally.

Behind the Veil in Iran: The Pink Revolution (\$87,775 R&D)

Mannes Productions Inc., New York, NY

An R&D project examining the world of women in Iran through strong personal stories and presented by Azadeh Moaveni, daughter of the Iranian exile community, *Time* journalist and author of *Lipstick Jihad*.

By All Means Necessary (\$85,000 R&D)

Washington Media Associates, Washington, DC

An R&D project looking at President Bush's approach to foreign policy in the post-9/11 world that has proven persuasive to Americans but divided America's friends.

By All Means Necessary (\$799,910 Production)

Washington Media Associates, Washington, DC

A program that will take a critical look at how and why America came to deal with the rest of the world in the ways that it did during the administration of George W. Bush, investigating the foreign and military policies the world's lone superpower has pursued in the months and years since September 11, 2001 and the origins of what some have labeled the Bush Doctrine: America, pre-eminent and without rivals, ensuring peace by pre-empting threats with military force, taking action with ad hoc "coalitions of the willing," or, if necessary, alone.

Campus Battleground (\$690,341 Production)

Argus Productions, Nevada City, CA

A film examining concerns that a new form of anti-Semitism may be emerging on American college campuses since 9/11. Some experts have voiced concern that student organizations and professors sympathetic with the Palestine Solidarity Movement are breaching the line between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism, harshly condemning and even threatening those who disagree with them.

The Case for War (\$73,743 R&D)

Brook Lapping Productions Ltd., London, UK

An R&D project in which Richard Perle argues the case for pre-emptive war against terror and his position that America faces a moment in history no less significant than 1776.

The Case for War (\$1,003,840 Production)

Brook Lapping Productions Ltd., London, UK

A documentary in which Richard Perle argues the case for pre-emptive war against terror, provides background on the controversial "neo-con" and allows him to develop his argument that America faces a moment in history no less significant than 1776.

Citizen Soldiers (\$70,660 R&D)

Lumiere Productions, New York, NY

An R&D project exploring how the war on terror has stretched the American army, requiring more Reserve units to be called into active duty for longer terms of service, and the choices the U.S. military may have to make in the coming decade in order to pursue the war on terror.

Citizen Soldiers (\$600,000 Production)

Lumiere Productions, New York, NY

A documentary on the U.S. Army Reserves and their contribution to the war on terror during extended tours of duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, often fulfilling roles for which they feel unprepared. The film will tell the story of the Bravo Company of the 7th Battalion, 158th Aviation Regiment of the Reserves.

Danger Zone (\$89,698 R&D)

The Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, Washington, DC

An R&D project for a series and ancillary intellectual materials on the political development, funding and future of terrorism as told in a *cinéma vérité* style.

***The Day We Chose the Future (wt)* (\$87,110 R&D)**

WGBH, Boston, MA

An R&D project examining the areas of science and technology that are affected by the war on terror.

***Ex-Extremists: The Developing Story of the Movement of Former Militant Extremists to Non-Violence* (\$79,967 R&D)**

Stuart Television Productions Inc., Concord, MA

An R&D project investigating radical Muslims who have recanted their beliefs, becoming advocates for reform in the Islamic world.

***Feeling at Home in America* (\$51,600 R&D)**

Video Verite, LLC, Devon, PA

An R&D project profiling several teenagers from a large Arab American community in the United States and how their lives were changed by the events of 9/11.

***Homegrown: Religion in U.S. Prisons* (\$510,000 Production)**

Durrin Productions Inc., Washington, DC

A documentary investigation of the Folsom terror cell that asks whether the U.S. penal system is fostering "homegrown" terror cells composed of inmates who convert to Islam. The film explores Saudi funding of Wahhabi literature which is used in U.S. prisons and jails, and the large number of prison converts to Islam.

***The Ideology of Terror: Wages of Islamic Extremism* (\$79,500 R&D)**

ABG Films Inc., Wilmington, DE

An R&D project examining the way radical Muslims intimidate proponents of more moderate interpretations of the Koran and why Islamist beliefs have gained such popularity in the Muslim world.

***Indonesia: Battleground for the Soul of Islam* (\$87,050 R&D)**

New York Times Television, New York, NY

An R&D project examining the post-9/11 fight to control Indonesia and its fledgling democracy.

***Indonesia: Battleground for the Soul of Islam* (\$489,588 Production)**

New York Times Television, New York, NY

A film exploring Indonesian culture and government, and asks whether the world's most populous Muslim nation can serve as an example to other Muslim countries. With more Muslims residing in Indonesia than in all Arab countries combined and as a fledgling democracy, the film will examine how Indonesia has had to deal with several serious terrorist attacks and has faced extraordinary challenges to its ability to govern and fight terrorism.

***Inside the American Empire with Robert Kaplan* (\$86,391 R&D)**

WETA, Arlington, VA

An R&D project examining the numerous small-scale, low-intensity conflicts in which U.S. troops help local governments remain stable and resist the growth of terror cells.

***Inside the American Empire with Robert Kaplan* (\$600,000 Production)**

WETA, Arlington, VA

Author and *Atlantic Monthly* correspondent Robert Kaplan explores how the U.S. military is fighting the war on terror in hundreds of small-scale conflicts around the globe as he visits American servicemen involved in three small-scale, low-intensity conflicts which have received little media coverage and how these troops are helping local governments restrain the growth of local terror organizations in Africa, Latin America and Asia.

***In the Eye of the Beholder: News Coverage of the Middle East* (\$74,754 R&D)**

Mindfire Productions, LLC, Brooklyn, NY

An R&D project examining the differences in news coverage by following two TV news reporters, one from Al Jazeera and an American from a 24-hour news channel.

***Invasion!* (\$68,530 R&D)**

Docere Palace Studios LLC, Rowayton, CT

An R&D project examining the strategy of military invasion and occupation, using historical and contemporary examples of successes and failures, and the strategies likely to be effective in a post-9/11 world.

***Invasion!* (\$700,000 Production)**

Docere Palace Studios LLC, Rowayton, CT

A film examining the art and strategy of military invasion and occupation by looking at historic and contemporary examples of successes and failures with emphasis on the strategies likely to be effective in a post-9/11 world. It will also serve as a content platform for both DVD and a book version of the series, and will be produced by Docere Palace Studios, Inc. in association with Granada America and The Washington Post Company.

***Iran's Second Revolution* (\$75,140 R&D)**

The Ciesla Foundation, Washington, DC

An R&D project on the Iranian students' movement, its struggle to bring democracy to Iran and the support it receives from expatriates living in the United States.

***Islam vs. Islamists* (\$578,279 Production)**

ABG Films Inc., Wilmington, DE

A film about the war within the Muslim world, how moderate Muslims are voicing their objections to the teachings of radical Islam, and how they are being persecuted for doing so in Europe, North America and Africa, demonstrating Islamist persecution of moderate Muslims is a worldwide phenomenon.

***Jihad: The Untold Story of Islamist Terrorism* (\$83,213 R&D)**

Palladin Invision, London, UK

An R&D project examining the nature and causes of Islamic terrorism, radical Islam's relationship to violence, and related social and economic conditions.

***Jihad: The Untold Story of Islamist Terrorism* (\$1,518,917 Production)**

Palladin Invision, London, UK

A television history of Islamist terrorism that will investigate the nature of the movement by focusing on radical Islam's relationship to violence and the social and economic conditions that contribute to it, including a narrative of al Qaeda that focuses on key figures in the organization such as Sayyid Qutb, Abdullah Azzam, Sheikh Omar Abdul Rahman, Osama bin Laden, and Ayman al Zawahiri, and how often accidental meetings gave birth to the most feared terrorist network in history.

The Mosque in Morgantown (\$55,050 R&D)

Version One Productions Inc., Cambridge, MA

An R&D project exploring the conflict that broke out between Muslim fundamentalists and moderates in a small West Virginia town.

The Mosque in Morgantown (\$538,250 Production)

Version One Productions Inc., Cambridge, MA

A film documenting the struggle between Muslim traditionalists and reformists in a West Virginia mosque with former *Wall Street Journal* reporter Asra Nomani, a Muslim feminist who is trying to reform Morgantown's traditionalist Islamic Center and faces substantial opposition from the Mosque leadership.

The Muslim Brotherhood (\$53,825 R&D)

Tiger/Tigress Productions, Bethesda, MD

An R&D project investigating the Muslim Brotherhood, a secret society that spawned modern Islamic terrorist groups from Al Qaeda to Abu Sayeff.

The Muslim Brotherhood (\$600,000 Production)

Tiger/Tigress Productions, Bethesda, MD

A film investigation of a network of terror financiers in the Muslim Brotherhood, a progenitor organization of many Islamist terror groups, the Swiss bank that serves as its principal backer, how the Muslim Brotherhood helped those that planned the 9/11 attacks and how its members are active in the United States today.

No Laughing Matter: Humor After 9/11 (\$66,850 R&D)

Azimuth Media, Washington, DC

An R&D project exploring the effect of 9/11 on Muslim- and Arab-American communities as seen through the perspective of Muslim- and Arab-American comics.

Operation Homecoming: Writing the Wartime Experience (\$55,920 R&D)

PJ Productions, New York, NY and WETA, Arlington, VA

An R&D project on recreating the wartime experience using the National Endowment of the Arts' collection of American soldiers' writing about their experiences in the war on terror.

Picture War: Photography in Times of Conflict (\$65,000 R&D)

Firelight Media, New York, NY

An R&D project exploring the power of photography to influence public opinion and foreign policy in wartime, and its contribution to the historical record of various conflicts.

Radical Islam in Prisons and Jails (\$60,600 R&D)

Durrin Productions Inc., Washington, DC

An R&D project examining the growth of radical Islam inside US prisons and jails, and the many Muslim prison clerics who trained in Saudi Arabia and are adherents of Wahhabi Islam.

The Road from Baghdad (\$21,396 R&D)

Rain Media Inc., New York, NY

An R&D project exploring whether democracy can succeed in the Middle East, and whether and how the United States should be involved in the transformation of the region.

Security Versus Liberty (\$479,420 Production)

WHUT, Washington, DC

A film examining the question: "Security or Liberty?" by taking a personal look at the people who work on either side of the question post-9/11. Using Portland, Oregon, as a microcosm of the national debate, the film will attempt to resolve the question – how can we protect our society without destroying its essential ideals?

Security Versus Liberty: The Other War (\$68,200 R&D)

WHUT, Washington, DC

An R&D project examining the question: "Security or Liberty?" by looking at the people who work on either side of the question post-9/11.

Soldiers of the Future (\$68,560 R&D)

Goodhue Pictures Inc., New York, NY

An R&D project telling the story of the battle to reform the nation's military and the significant shift in military ideology since the onset of the Cold War more than a half century ago.

The Sound of the Guns (\$75,000 R&D)

Colby Films Inc., Washington, DC

An R&D project investigating U.S. covert operations around the world, as viewed through the prism of the life of William E. Colby, from the Office of Strategic Services through Vietnam, to the crucible of the Phoenix program, to Afghanistan and Iraq and into the terrorist wars of the future.

Spain's 9/11 (\$75,162 R&D)

Brook Lapping Ltd., London, UK

An R&D project investigating the two weeks that followed the bombing in Madrid.

Spain's 9/11 (\$866,675 Production)

Brook Lapping Ltd., London, UK

An investigative documentary that will focus on the two weeks that followed the train bombing in Madrid commonly referred to as "Spain's 9/11." The bombing itself, its impact on the Spanish election, the investigation that followed and a scarcely reported second bomb attempt foiled by Spanish authorities will be described by those closest to the action, including former President Jose Aznar, and how the bombing caused Europe to reassess the world's terror threat.

Stand Up (\$535,437 Production)

Azimuth Media, Washington, DC

A documentary on the response of American Arab and Muslim communities to events of September 11th and the war on terror, as told through the lives and humor of a small number of comics who are dealing with their fears and social unease through their work.

Studying Hatred (\$54,509 R&D)

Argus Productions, Nevada City, CA

An R&D project exploring increased anti-Semitism on U.S. college campuses and the extent to which proponents of radical Islam have supported this newest wave of anti-Semitic feeling.

The Transatlantic Paradox (\$651,178 Production)

Center for New American Media, New York, NY

A documentary on the history of anti-Americanism in Europe and the way European attitudes toward the United States have been affected by the war on terror, with comparison of popular and elitist views of the United States in Britain, France and Poland.

The Trial of Saddam Hussein (\$75,671 R&D)

Great Projects Film Company Inc., New York, NY

An R&D project following the trial of Saddam Hussein as it proceeds through and tests the formative Iraqi justice system under the watchful eyes of the international community.

The Trial of Saddam Hussein (\$817,120 Production)

Great Projects Film Company Inc., New York, NY

A film that follows the trial of Saddam Hussein as it proceeds through and tests the formative Iraqi justice system under the watchful eyes of the international community as Iraq and the world begins to reconcile the legacy of dictatorship, crime, war, occupation and justice.

The Trouble with Islam (\$62,172 R&D)

90th Parallel Film and Television Productions Ltd, Toronto, Canada

An R&D project on Canadian bestselling author Irshad Manji as she explores the lost tradition of "ijtihad," the 10th Century tradition of free-thinking by Moslem scholars.

The Trouble with Islam (\$393,003 Production)

90th Parallel Film and Television Productions Ltd, Toronto, Canada

A film loosely based on the best-selling book, *The Trouble with Islam*, by author Irshad Manji, an energetic and charismatic figure, who has concluded that the trouble with Islam is that it suppresses questions and debate about its traditions and doctrines. The film will follow Manji as she travels to a number of Muslim countries to explore whether the lost tradition of free-thinking, known as "ijtihad," can be revived. Manji is a controversial figure, whose life has been threatened as a result of her work. The film will follow her adventures as she meets with other Muslim reformers who now live in hiding, and confronts those who defend Sharia law.

The War at Home: The Domestic Fight Against Terrorism (\$23,981 R&D)

Great Projects Film Company, New York, NY

An R&D project examining how law enforcement has been transformed since the attacks of 9/11, and how agencies from the FBI and CIA, to the Secret Service and Coast Guard, have changed.

Warriors (\$85,938 R&D)

Karl Zinsmeister, Cazenovia, NY

An R&D project examining American soldiers currently engaged in military actions on behalf of the nation in the war on terror.

Warriors (\$489,300 Production)

Karl Zinsmeister, Cazenovia, NY

A film that will look closely at the American soldiers currently carrying out military actions on behalf of the nation in the war on terror by following several representative soldiers in combat and telling their stories so other Americans will better understand a volunteer military and what motivates them.

Primetime Programming Projects in Collaboration with PBS

Adoption: An American Revolution (\$200,000)

WGBH, Boston, MA

A two-hour documentary special exploring the transformation taking place in contemporary adoption and the far-reaching impact on American public and private life.

African Dreams (\$200,000)

Lion Television Inc., New York, NY

A two-hour film presented by scholar and history detective, Tukufu Zuberi, examining Africa's post-colonial era starting with the birth of the Independence Movement in 1945.

Andrew Jackson and the Shaping of America (\$150,000)

KCET-TV, Los Angeles, CA

A two-part series of one-hour shows examining one of the most important and controversial presidencies in American history and the issues which bitterly divided the nation during the tumultuous Jacksonian era.

Egalité for All: Human Rights and the Haitian Revolution (\$100,000)

OPB, Portland, OR

A one-hour documentary about the only successful slave revolution in history and the creation of the world's first Black republic: modern-day Haiti.

Health Initiative (\$900,000)

WGBH, Boston, MA

Four two-hour specials devoted to cancer, heart disease, obesity and depression with extensive related outreach, promotion and web resources that will form the cornerstone of a major PBS health initiative.

How Democracy Works Now (\$4,987 R&D)

The Epidavros Project, New York, NY

An R&D project for a proposed series exploring immigration reforms under consideration by Congress.

In Performance at the White House: The Congressional Picnic (\$400,000)

WETA, Arlington, VA

A one-hour special featuring a picnic on the South Lawn and performances with a Broadway Americana theme where the audience is taken behind the scenes as First Lady Laura Bush welcomes her congressional guests.

The Jewish Americans (\$400,000)

WETA, Arlington, VA / Thirteen/WNET, New York, NY

A four-part series of one-hour episodes telling the story of Jews in America in its entirety, beginning with the arrival of twenty-three Jews in 1654 New Amsterdam and spanning the next 350 years, and their centuries long effort to fully participate in American life.

The Kennedy Center Presents: Mark Twain Prize 2005 (\$342,885)

WETA, Arlington, VA

The Mark Twain Prize for American Humor annually recognizes an individual who creates humor from his or her uniquely American experience. The 2005 recipient was Steve Martin.

Latinos: Here and Now (\$125,000)

City Projects, Los Angeles, CA

A 60-minute program that surveys Latino life in America, using the themes Origins, Politics, Marketing and Media, and Assimilation, as explored by comic George Lopez.

Make 'Em Laugh: The Funny Business of America (\$600,000)

Thirteen/WNET, New York, NY

A six-part series of one-hour programs exploring how different types of comedy became popular, how they evolved over the course of the twentieth century, and, ultimately, what all these jokes tell us about America.

The Powder and the Glory: Elizabeth Arden and Helena Rubenstein (\$100,000)

Powderhouse Productions, S. Natick, MA

A 60-minute documentary on Helena Rubinstein and Elizabeth Arden, whose 50-year rivalry in the cosmetics business is a great American story that encompasses immigration, women's roles, reinvention and image-making, and a constantly changing culture.

Rathergate (\$200,000)

Brook Lapping Productions Ltd., London, UK

A 90-minute documentary investigating how CBS was involved in the middle of modern American political warfare, resulting in a shift in the balance of power between the old print and TV leviathans and the new Internet culture of instant fact-checking and spinning found on web-logs.

Roosevelt, Churchill & Stalin: Behind Closed Doors (wt) (\$600,000)

KCET-TV, Los Angeles, CA

A six-part series of one-hour programs co-produced with the BBC History Unit that brings history to life by dramatically recreating the key moments during World War II when the three most powerful men in the world exercised their judgment, made deals, and in the process decided the fate of millions.

Showstoppers (\$600,000)

Thirteen/WNET, New York, NY

A six-part reality series of one-hour programs examining the mystery and magic of Broadway as it inspires people throughout the U.S. at the local community level as demonstrated by a nationwide search to find talented hard-working performers to participate in a competition to find Broadway's newest star.

The Story of India (\$780,000)

Eaton Creative, New Windsor, MD

A series hosted by Michael Wood uncovering the sights and sounds, the dazzling achievements and the dramatic history of one of the world's oldest, richest and most influential civilization.

Wall Street (\$300,000)

WGBH, Boston, MA

A two-part series exploring how six blocks in lower Manhattan evolved from a small Dutch trading post to become the greatest financial center in the world and shaped the economic, political, and cultural character of the United States.

Warplane (\$300,000)

Thirteen/WNET, New York, NY

A four-part limited series of one-hour episodes exploring the remarkable stories and technological advances behind man's century-old quest to control the skies and how the airplane changed the course of military history, re-wrote the rules of engagement and made the unthinkable – death from above – a wartime reality.

PBS National Program Service (NPS)

CPB provides funding for the PBS National Program Service in support of children's and primetime television programming fed by satellite to member stations across the country. CPB investment in 2005 for NPS supported the following public television signature series and specials:

American Experience
American Masters
Cyberchase
Great Performances
Mister Rogers' Neighborhood
NewsHour with Jim Lehrer
Nova
Reading Rainbow
Sesame Street
Washington Week in Review
Zoom

Independent Television Service (ITVS) and Minority Consortia

CPB provides annual funding support to the Independent Television Service (ITVS), an organization that acquires, funds, and presents to public television independently-produced programs from a diversity of sources. CPB also funds the five minority programming consortia, which develop and fund programs of particular relevance to their communities, including African Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and Pacific Islanders.

Educational Programming and Services Projects

***Between the Lions - A Digital Literacy Initiative* (\$509,329)**

Mississippi Public Broadcasting, Jackson, MS

Mississippi Public Broadcasting, in partnership with WGBH, launched this initiative for preschool teachers and childcare providers with two components: an introductory component to model how to use *Between the Lions* segments to develop early literacy skills in young children, and a more advanced course to cover early literacy pedagogy and methods that incorporate digital media into preschool activities. This initiative also includes the Barksdale Reading Institute and the Early Childhood Institute at Mississippi State University as collaborators.

Extending the Education Value of National Programming (\$438,435)

Public Broadcasting Service, Alexandria, VA

Four educational Web sites associated with PBS programs are being re-designed and re-launched with new content to help bring public television into middle- and high-school classrooms: *Empires: The Romans*; *Empires: The Greeks*; *The U.S. Mexican War* and *A Science Odyssey*. These sites were selected because of their popularity among educators and for their relevance to middle- and high-school curricula across the nation.

Nate the Great (\$397,182)

Thirteen/WNET, New York, NY

Nate the Great is a children's book series that has been popular with first readers for 30 years. The series' educational goal of teaching kids critical thinking skills is very important and no other series on air attempts to accomplish this.

Radio Programming and Related Projects

Classical Advocates (\$330,000)

Classical Public Radio Network, Los Angeles, CA

Classical Advocates reinvents the presentation of classical music by weaving the perspectives of today's great artists into daily programming. Short comments from a small cadre of musicians, conductors and composers, including guitarist Sharon Isbin, conductor James Conlon and composer John Corigliano, will be used to introduce musical selections. The objective is to increase the vitality of the format and the loyalty of its listeners.

Curating Youth Voices for Public Radio (\$600,000)

Youth Radio, Berkeley, CA

Youth Radio will partner with existing and new youth media groups, local stations, and national networks and other organizations to increase the number of feature pieces by youth producers on network broadcasts. Youth Radio will also target minority youth groups to collaborate in this project to diversify further the voices heard on public radio's airwaves.

Day to Day (\$250,000)

National Public Radio, Washington, DC

CBP amended its contract with National Public Radio to extend the current production grant for *Day to Day*. The hour-long broadcast provides breaking news coverage, comprehensive domestic and international reporting and a mix of diverse voices and viewpoints in a daily exploration of American ideas, beliefs and behaviors. It originates from NPR West, NPR's west coast production facility located in Los Angeles.

Hidden Kitchens 2 (\$100,000)

Kitchen Sisters, San Francisco, CA

NASCAR cooking in the racing pits, the George Foreman grill as a street kitchen for homeless people, freighter food on Lake Erie – this series presents sound rich, evocative radio stories exploring how communities come together through the culture of food in America. The series will have a special hotline for listeners to tell their stories.

Hearing Voices (\$200,000)

Tundra Club, Bozeman, MT

Some of public radio's top producers weave first person narratives from everyday people into sound-portraits for established national programs. Their stories document an America not so much divided as diverse, able to understand multiple viewpoints. The project also includes efforts to develop new producers and bring new talent into the public radio system via a mentoring project.

News and Notes with Ed Gordon (\$500,000)

National Public Radio, Washington, DC

A one-year grant for a daily news/talk program that gives voice to issues that are important to black America. The program emphasizes news, trends, and topical issues in the African American community, presented in a balanced and objective manner. *News and Notes* serves as a window through which all Americans can examine the significant issues facing a diverse society. Ed

Gordon, one of the country's most respected broadcast journalists, interviews newsmakers, opinion leaders, and commentators on the important African American experiences of today.

Pavarotti at 70 (\$22,000)

WFMT Productions, Chicago, IL

A two-hour audio portrait of legendary performer Luciano Pavarotti on the occasion of his 70th birthday. The program brings new insights into the career and life of one of the greatest operatic singers of our time and features interviews with many outstanding artists who have worked with Pavarotti, including soprano Dame Joan Sutherland, soprano Renee Fleming and mezzo-soprano Marilyn Horne. It will serve as a lasting record of Pavarotti's contribution to the arts.

Poder Latino (\$315,270)

Hispanic Radio Network, Washington, DC

The grant is for a one-hour weekly current affairs discussion program produced in Spanish that focuses on issues of importance to Hispanic communities such as health, education, economics, civic participation, and business development. In addition to the Spanish broadcasts, a four part series will be available for English-language public radio stations to broadcast during Hispanic Heritage Month.

Powerpoint (\$246,285)

WCLK, Atlanta, GA

To continue the national production and distribution of *Powerpoint*, a weekly two-hour interview and call-in program that covers national issues of importance to African-Americans. Under this grant, *PowerPoint* will implement a new production strategy while at the same time developing fundraising efforts designed to secure a self-sustaining future.

Shared Weight: The Fall of Saigon (\$175,000)

WYPR, Baltimore, MD

WYPR will produce a radio project that reflects upon the 30th anniversary of the fall of Saigon. The program will be international in scope, focusing on the arts and literature of both the U.S. and Vietnam, in order to tell the story of the Vietnam War by the artists who lived through it.

This I Believe (\$500,000)

This I Believe, Inc, Louisville, KY

Based on 1950s radio program of the same name, *This I Believe* will engage well-known Americans and the listening public to share their personal beliefs with each other, on the national and local stage, so that a thorough picture of this nation's core values and philosophies will emerge. Project partners will set up an 800 line to solicit stories, the best of which will be recorded and broadcast during National Public Radio's *Morning Edition*, *All Things Considered*, and other programs. Public radio stations around the country will be assisted in recording members of their communities so that the national content can be buttressed by a strong local presence to the series.

Undercurrents (\$500,000)

Koahnic Broadcast Corporation, Anchorage, AK

This two-year grant is for an all-digital daily music service that is relevant to Native American audiences. The play lists include a free-spirited mix of blues, rock, contemporary Native, world beat, folk, traditional, alternative country, reggae, hip hop, techno Americana and AAA.

Weekend America II (\$1,600,000)

Minnesota Public Radio, St. Paul, MN

Continued funding for *Weekend America*, a national radio service designed for 21st century audiences, presenting news, information and entertainment with the same objectivity, intelligence and warmth as weekday programming, but produced in a style that is more in-tune and better suited to the weekend pace of life. This program service strives to reflect the diversity of America's populace and their weekend experiences.

William Shakespeare Phase I (\$350,000)

CultureWorks, Inc., Philadelphia, PA

This 13-part series by producer Steve Rowland will present a compelling view of Shakespeare's life and his continuing, and powerful, effect on contemporary culture. This first phase of the project will develop fundraising, marketing and production plans, raise money and gather content.