Training

Markets

1. Media outlets who will pay for content we already create for TMC members

(test case: long form publishing lab)

CONTENT: “How it Works” and Innovation and Incubation Labs---same stuff we offer our members

COMPETITION: Mid--Free ONA workshops. Poynter?, one-off conferences, consultants

POTENTIAL REVENUE: Low—these outlets don’t have much money; if they did, they would hire experienced employees, consultants, would not need these seminars; Sponsorship opportunities limited due to type of content, number of participants, type of participant (low-value)

OTHER BENEFIT: Good recruitment tool; reminds current members of value (lower cost to them); higher visibility in field; mission-centric, strengthening the independent media sector.

COST: Low—requires staff time to create content/curricula, market to outlets, market to sponsors, run labs, send reminders, do followup, etc., but we would be doing this anyway as part of our regular service to members.

COST/BENEFIT: Pretty good if marketing to non-members is easy and doesn’t require a massive step up on staff time.

1. Bloggers, livestreamers and other citizen journalists/ traditional communications professionals who lack professional skillset or team.

CONTENT: Emphasis on social media training and integration—newest tools, analytics and engagement metrics, email marketing and audience/donor development, web cms and development,. The focus is, how do youyou’re your content out to as many people as possible, how do you engage those people in the content, and how do you measure what you’ve done so you can do it better?

COMPETITION: Mid—Conferences like Netroots, ONA; consultants; to a lesser extent NOI, SPIN and organizing/messaging training programs.

POTENTIAL REVENUE: unclear—depends how many bloggers want to do this, how much they are willing to spend. Not clear what sponsorship opps there are if any.

OTHER BENEFIT: Mission-centric, growing the independent media sector.

COST: Mid to High—requires staff time to create new content/curricula, market to outlets, market to sponsors—also would probably work best in person rather than as webinar. Note that this training could be combined with training in tools, i.e. best pracrices for livestreaming; why video/radio tools matter; etc.

COST/BENEFIT: Truly depends on demand

1. Non-Profits that need to better understand how to get their message out to independent media

CONTENT: Beyond the Press Release; How Journalists Think; What You Want vs What Media Can Give; Why You Should Get on Radio;

COMPETITION: SPIN Project, Women’s Media Center, ARC, consultants, etc.

POTENTIAL REVENUE: High—Not only will nonprofits themselves pay for this, but foundations will pay to train nonprofits. Best way to do this is as a full day intensive training with other training partners, i.e. Laura’s public speaking gig in am, then messaging to indie media, then messaging via social media. Or could be as a two day training with diversity, etc. elements.

OTHER BENEFIT: Better relationships between progressive media and progressive actors; mission-centric, creating impact.

COST: Mid to High, at least at first. Must create new content/curricula, market to a nonprofits and foundations, etc. Will probably need to hire assistant just to handle relationship building.

COST/BENEFIT: Excellent if we can break into the market.

1. Non-Profits that want to get their message out to mainstream media.

CONTENT: We would become a channel or manager for others, esp. members, already offering strategic communications services, i.e., bundling ARC-Diversity; PNS-Radio; Grit-TV; Deanna—social media.

COMPETITION: The folks we would bundle would have to think it was in their best interest

POTENTIAL REVENUE: Low, we would be taking a cut of a cut.

OTHER BENEFIT: Supporting members in creating their own revenue streams.

COST: A lot of infrastructure work, hand-holding, and marketing

COST/BENEFIT: Low.