**Observational Section**

Analyzed 8 areas:

Some effect in abortion, reproductive health, immigration

Possible effect in fracking

**Attempt to predict when, where and under what conditions an intervention might have an effect.**

TMC ran an experiment during this time on repro health There was a slight positive effect increasing discussion on the number of tweets that were permissive. There was a bigger preventive effect on restrictive posts. It looks like you had a small positive effect on the number of posts that appeared and a bigger effect on slowing down other people from posting more on the same subject.

For example, during the Democratic convention, Republicans don’t talk as much. We seem to have had the same sort of effect here.

**Current theory:**

1. **Baseline issue salience**—people are willing to talk about things if others will be interested. It’s hard to get people to talk about an issue when no one else is talking.

2. **Partisan differences within the baseline**—different parties regard the issue as salient

3. **Who is winning?** –very little produces articles in support of fracking. If you are winning, you don’t need to talk about it. More people talk against Obamacare than for Obamacare.

**Collect Some More Issue Areas to Play Out Hypotheses**

Describing the state of play is very useful. Just to figure out what’s going on is good intelligence.

How do you create salience when it’s not there?

How do you influence salient events?

In a sense, the audience for independents is not social media generally, it’s the major media, which they get to via social media activists.

TMC wants different risk in the portfolio—

high risk= incendiary viral journalism which requires steady investigative effort

Moderate risk= There are some issues where people are not talking about it now, but they are ready to talk about it, and then they pay attention.

low risk= salient issue areas where we engage quickly, at a time when people will discuss a topic.

**Next Step: Experimental Stage**

When we do an intervention, we only get one observation. There isn’t really any way to break that down (vs. medical experiment). But the problem is that there is a lot of external noise that we can’t control.

Gary wants to see if we can intervene as many times as we can.

1. Put together a virtual issue of TMC today—collect best issues of all members on one topic, and put that up, and get everyone to tweet about it. (like a tumblr for stories or paper.li or storify for tweets)

2. Increase the diversity of what we do: virtual issues, tweeting, larger collaboration like whereisyourplanb? Or a very, very large collaboration.

**Media Impact Funders**

Ground Zero Presentation

**Media Philanthropy**—what results does media funding produce? We don’t fund media because we can’t figure out what it does.

**What is the proper media role?**

-Traditional Journalism-Media is a neutral entity, a mirror, and doesn’t shape anything; so the idea of influencing media for a purpose is a bad idea.

There should be a knowledge impact. The agenda can be a more informed public, or public conversation, with the sense that would lead to a better outcome, without a predisposition as to what the outcome might be.

In other cases, there is a defined agenda. So “you need plan b” turns into “a greater awareness of women’s health matters”. They worry about their 50c3 status.

**Methodology**

We would use the same methodology no matter what the goal is. This is a more rigorous evaluation system. We want to make sure that if we are wrong, we will know. We don’t have to fight the fight about media outlets.

Presumably if you have a media outlet, you are trying to change the world in some way, and this methodology will help you figure this out.

**Gains**

Admiration for tactics. Not typical for media outlets to engage in formal experimentation. Fact that progressive media are willing to subject themselves to experimental rigor and have found a journalistic way to do it is great.