

Strategic plan for social media for the
Georgia Civil War Commission & the Atlanta Pregnancy Resource Center
Inger Eberhart
Kennesaw State University

Georgia Civil War Commission (GCWC) SWOT analysis

Synopsis

The Georgia Civil War Commission (GCWC) is an organization created by the Georgia State Legislature in 1993; it is a state agency. Georgia was a central location in the American Civil War. In an effort to preserve the land, artifacts and history of the era, the GCWC is tasked with the following mission according to its website: "...to coordinate planning, preservation and promotion of structures, buildings, sites and battlefields associated with this significant period of our common heritage."

The GCWC is under the Georgia Department of Economic Development and is composed of 15 members. The Georgia Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Speaker of the House appoint five members each to serve. The budget for the GCWC comes from the Georgia General Assembly and has been \$20,000 or \$25,000 for the past three years. There is a Chief of Staff that handles much of the administrative duties of the Commission. Many members of the GCWC are very knowledgeable of aspects of the Civil War and are Civil War re-enactors.

The Commission has conducted symposiums and has relationships with battlefields and museums throughout the state. However, the challenge exists in popularizing the Commission, sharing knowledge about the Civil War, reaching non-traditional audiences and formalizing the social media outreach. Currently, the Commission has a Facebook account with over 3800 likes and a Twitter account, which was established in 2014, has over 100 followers.

The Chief of Staff monitors the Facebook page while this author handles the Twitter account. The Chief of Staff posts items and serves as a moderator for Facebook and this author often reposts items from Facebook to Twitter. Because of the volume of activity on the Facebook page, the Chief of Staff has had to block some users because of the offensive comments posted on the page. She also must seek Civil War related items to post on Facebook; several items have

been reposted multiple times. The goal is to establish a social media policy and content calendar that can be used to consistently post content and keep it relevant and timely.

SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats)

Strengths:

- Individual commissioners are very knowledgeable of Civil War history. This is useful for those who want to learn about the Civil War in general and those who are interested in the stories of the soldiers and times that are not necessarily in history books.
- The diversity of individuals on the board ranging from age to gender to race to knowledge-level represents a cross-section of the state on the board. This is important because older board members with a high level of knowledge may not engage in social media. The younger members can help share this knowledge on social platforms.
- There is not dissention among the Commissioners. They have a jovial relationship with one another and are welcoming of new Commissioners because of the need for Commissioners, the diversity of skills, the knowledge of the Civil War and interests among the Commissioners.
- The information provided by the GCWC is factual. Commissioners are authors of books related to the Civil War and leaders in organizations (e.g., Sons of Confederate Veterans) that have existed since the end of the Civil War. This keeps the Commission credible.

Weaknesses:

- There is no leadership/succession planning. If the Chief of Staff were unable to fulfill her duties, the Commission's Facebook page would suffer severely.
- The lack of consistent budgeting from the state hampers the Commission's ability to provide grants to preserve the state's Civil War history sites. A foundational goal of the Commission is to grant monies to those who preserve Civil War heritage.
- Individual commissioners lack of knowledge of social media. Duties must be shared to prevent any one commissioner or the Chief of Staff from becoming overwhelmed or suffer from "burn out."
- The Facebook and Twitter content is only updated when there is availability in a Commissioner or the Chief of Staff's schedule to update the content.
- Only one Commissioner and the Chief of Staff are comfortable with social media.
- The knowledge level about the Civil War is high with the Chief of Staff but not the Commissioner that covers the Twitter account.
- There is a low engagement rate on Twitter. However, Facebook has a higher engagement rate because the page has been active longer and is updated more often.

Opportunities:

- The Commission can learn from preservation organizations in the US and Great Britain about

establishing a heritage plan and promoting the plan. As more people become aware of the plan, they can engage with the Commission.

- Organizations such as the Sons of Confederate Veterans are actively involved with individual commissioners. The Commission could re-post and re-tweet their information as a point of engagement and awareness of the GCWC.
- The GCWC can strengthen relationships with schools. Many schools have Twitter and Facebook accounts. In order to keep the history of the Civil War relevant, we must communicate the knowledge in a format the younger generations can relate to.
- To enhance the presence of the GCWC statewide, regionally and nationally, the GCWC must promote itself in affiliate venues such as Civil War roundtables, universities, tourism associations, etc. The capability to promote the GCWC in affiliate venues opens the Commission to new audiences. With new audiences come new opportunities to expand the GCWC's reach.
- The GCWC can share pictures of Georgia's Civil War sites across social media. There can be cross-sharing of Facebook pictures via not only Twitter but also Instagram. This would open the GCWC to another channel of the social media population but also teach about the Civil War.
- The GCWC can promote the sites, properties and organizations to which it grants funding. This would promote the properties, GCWC, Civil War history and organizations that teach about this event in American history.
- The GCWC can develop a content calendar around events leading up to the Civil War, events that occurred during and after the Civil War and the people, cultures and attitudes of the time period. Content can also be created around proclamations and recognitions that the local, state and national governments acknowledge. Providing this information, would grant social media followers a well-rounded view of the Civil War.

Threats:

- The variable funding from the state means the GCWC does not have the recognition needed among state legislators. The lack of recognition means there are fewer resources to fulfill the mission and activities of the GCWC.
- The GCWC is in competition for audience attention with other Civil War sites, blogs, and organizations. As a state agency, we must insure the information shared is accurate. Other more popular sites may spread misinformation.
- There are those who consider themselves Civil War experts and are willing to challenge the information posted by the GCWC.
- The lack of time to have a continuing conversation with those who comment means that if a commenter posts negative, inaccurate or even positive information, the GCWC does not have the resources to respond in a timely manner and appropriately. The actions of the commenter and the lack of a prompt action could reflect badly on the GCWC.

Atlanta Pregnancy Resource Center (APRC) SWOT analysis

Synopsis

The Atlanta Pregnancy Resource Center (APRC) was launched in 2005, and by March of 2007 the Center opened its doors on Lavista Road in the Northlake area. The Center serves as a mission outpost to reach the many women and families in the community who may face pressures, fears and uncertainties in pregnancy-related circumstances. The APRC is a non-profit, charitable organization governed by a Board of Directors and is a ministry of the Atlanta Association of Southern Baptist Churches (AASBC). The Center is funded through the gifts and contributions of individuals, churches and foundations. APRC affiliations include Care Net, National Institute of Family and Life Advocates (NIFLA) and the North American Mission Board (NAMB) (APRC, About APRC).

The mission of the APRC “is to share the truth and compassion of Jesus Christ, support-life-affirming choices and promote healthy relationships by serving and caring for women and families in pregnancy-related circumstances.” The purpose of APRC is to promote the sanctity, dignity and worth of all human lives. The foundation of APRC rests upon Biblical principles in educating individuals who are making decisions related to pregnancy, family and relationships. As we provide spiritual truth, emotional support and tangible assistance, APRC encounters opportunities for sharing the grace and Gospel of Jesus Christ (APRC, About APRC).

The Board of the APRC consists of eight members from churches that are a part of the AASBC. The Board meets once every two months. Board members along with other volunteers serve on or chair committees. There is the finance committee, human resources (HR) committee, nominating committee and the research and development (RD) committee. As of 2015, this author chairs the RD committee which is responsible for leading the fundraising and public relations efforts. The APRC currently has over 300 likes on Facebook and 27 followers on Twitter.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats (SWOT)**Strengths:**

- The Executive Director has a passion for the ministry and is very engaged. She is receptive to ideas and activities that enhance the awareness of the APRC and she remains cutting-edge for advances in pro-life advocacy and education.
- There is a cross-section of expertise and diversity on the Board. Members of the Board have expertise in law, fundraising, finance, government, human resources and public relations. The APRC can access this expertise without a need to pay for it except in extraordinary circumstances.
- The Board members are varied in age and are at different life stages (e.g., married ladies and gentlemen, single ladies, parents, non-parents, millennials, black, white, etc.) The diversity of the Board ensures the Board remains current on donor, client and organizational needs.
- The Board, staff and volunteers are committed to the mission of the ministry. Their commitment means they are supportive of APRC's events and goals.
- The Executive Director and the Board are eager to expand the social media presence of the APRC. This eagerness signifies less resistance to exploring the Center's possibilities using social media.
- The Board possesses the skill set to maintain the social media presence; the responsibilities would not fall on one person.
- The average age of the Board is the late 30s to early 40s; the benefit is that the Board members are not intimidated or fearful of social media.

Weaknesses:

- The Executive Director is doing the job of three people. She does not have the spare time to keep the social media accounts updated.
- The APRC is only visible on Facebook and Twitter. Clients in crisis pregnancies are likely on social media. If the APRC were to engage Facebook and Twitter more often, we have the opportunity to establish a relationship with those women considering abortion.
- The Center does not promote its events, milestones and successes as often as it should. The lack of promotion makes it more difficult to fulfill the APRC's mission, raise funds, recruit volunteers and engage pro-life and pro-choice communities on social media.
- The APRC's social media efforts do not directly address misinformation about the pro-life argument. As a result, misinformation is spread and presented as fact.
- The lack of an enhanced presence on social media means that the APRC is not as active in engaging voters for pro-life advocacy. The APRC misses the opportunity to support partner organizations such as Georgia Right to Life (GRTL) in their legislative advocacy efforts.
- Although Facebook and Twitter are popular social media outlets, the APRC may miss opportunities to engage audiences by not having a presence on other platforms such as

Instagram.

Opportunities:

- Other pregnancy resource centers have mobile ultrasound units. They can visit locations where the clients are more likely located. Without a mobile unit, the APRC is limited to only those clients who visit the center.
- The Center should have more outreach events. The community events would garner public support for the Center. For example, a Diaper Day event would engage the community and help with supplies needed for the APRC.
- The APRC could cross-promote across social media with other pregnancy centers not only in the southeastern US but across the country and around the world. The opportunity to cross-promote would enhance the relationship between pregnancy centers and pro-life organizations; we would seem more like a network instead of stand-alone/one-off facilities.
- An enhanced social media presence would be an opportunity to tout the success stories of the APRC. Others could see and share in the success of the Center.
- Social media provides opportunities to share Bible scriptures about life. The mission of the APRC is to share the message of Jesus which can provide comfort to ladies in crisis pregnancies.
- The APRC should develop evergreen (general information) about the Center and the pro-life movement that can be used during those times when there is a slow news day or for weekend postings.

Threats:

- There is a plethora of misinformation about the pro-life vs. pro-choice arguments. A position is taken and supported or refuted without knowing the facts.
- Pro-choice advocates have framed the pro-life argument. There is more pro-choice information on social media (through sites such as Planned Parenthood) than pro-life arguments which can impact the decision of a lady in a crisis pregnancy.
- Pro-choice advocates have a larger social media presence; therefore, they have more opportunities to influence. The pro-choice influence affects donations, voter preferences and advocacy efforts which pushes the pro-life argument further away from the national conversation about the effects of abortion.
- With more use of social media, the APRC becomes open to trolls (those who post negative comments to incite controversy) or simply those who disagree. The trolls or those who disagree can negatively affect the APRC's social media outreach efforts.
- Negative comments from those who have interacted with the Center can affect the Center's online reputation. Others may view the APRC negatively based upon the comments.
- Cross-promotion of items from other pro-life or pro-choice sources may contain inaccurate information. The inaccuracies may affect the credibility of the APRC.

- Because of the APRC's beliefs, the Center may receive online backlash (e.g., negative or inappropriate hashtagging relating to the APRC). The APRC must determine how to respond and what to say across social media to prevent damage to the Center's image.
- Pro-life organizations are often considered health organizations. Government regulations may further limit information that pregnancy centers can share across social media (e.g., stricter HIPAA requirements).

Competitive Analysis

Georgia Civil War Commission (GCWC)

The GCWC is unique in its purpose as it focuses on the preservation of Civil War history, heritage, artifacts, etc. This author reviewed states' websites that have touted Civil War history, looking specifically for state agencies. The goal was to compare organizations that are as closely aligned in purpose and structure as the GCWC. In a review of the sites, many states created a Civil War commission only in recognition of the 150th anniversary of the event. The commissions are slated to be disbanded by 2015 and, in some cases, 2016. With that, this author looked for state agencies that focused on history and heritage preservation. However, even then, there was not much use of social media.

The heritage preservation agencies did not fully engage in Facebook or Twitter. Those that did engage had only done so sporadically; there was no consistency in posting. This author is unsure if this is a function of the heritage preservation industry, heritage preservation state agencies or if it is not seen as necessary to engage in social media. To have social media examples to examine, this author looked into other Civil War heritage organizations such as the Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV) and the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War (SUVCW). These two groups have more of a presence on Facebook, over 27,000 likes and over 4,300 likes on Facebook, respectively. Neither group had an impactful presence on Twitter.

The Georgia Civil War Commission is the third most active in this category on Facebook with over 3,800 Facebook friends. There is an opportunity for more engagement on Twitter.

Atlanta Pregnancy Resource Center (APRC)

As the pro-choice versus pro-life debate is a constant in America, there is much more data to glean from this area of social media use. The primary competitors in this space are Planned Parenthood, National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL), CareNet and Heartbeat International.

Planned Parenthood and NARAL are pro-choice advocates while CareNet and Heartbeat International are pro-life organizations that support pregnancy resource centers and their staffs. Planned Parenthood is unique in this group as it is an organization that has an integrated online presence and a branded/brick-and-mortar offline presence (e.g., multiple offices and medical facilities). On the other hand, the other organizations do not have a branded/brick-and-mortar offline presence other than their single office facilities.

According to this author's cursory research, Planned Parenthood has structured their social media Facebook efforts into three pages (Planned Parenthood, Planned Parenthood Action and Planned Parenthood for Teens). The Planned Parenthood action page has over 130,000 likes, the Planned Parenthood Action page contains over 547,000 likes and Planned Parenthood Info for Teens has over 45,000 likes. In the preliminary evaluation of the Planned Parenthood pages, the posts that received the most feedback were those that featured celebrities and/or pop culture and attacked pro-life advocates.

Over the nine days of postings that were on the pages, the one post that received the most Likes (21,906) featured Patricia Arquette, Meryl Streep and Jennifer Lopez on the subject of pay equality. There was a video shared via BuzzFeed showing Meryl Streep and Jennifer Lopez's reaction to Patricia Arquette's position on the subject while she received an Academy Award. Planned Parenthood Action leveraged a well-known event to tout their pro-choice position. The series of posts that received a combined 27, 913 likes concerned an Idaho state rep's stance against abortion and his questions about female anatomy. Planned Parenthood Action leveraged

this story four times and linked to different sources reporting of the news. The sources used were Jezebel.com and Huffington Post. Additionally, Planned Parenthood Action created a branded meme around the subject.

The pregnancy resource centers do not take this approach. They offer inspirational quotes, post pictures of events and center needs. However, they do not go directly after the pro-choice arguments. For example, Planned Parenthood posted an article about a pro-life state legislator that was confused regarding a woman's anatomy. Pro-life advocates did not mention pro-life legislation in any of the states, they did not leverage events such as the Oscars and are not aggressive when defending their positions.

Planned Parenthood posted articles about health care, health insurance, birth control, etc. The pregnancy resource centers do not post ancillary topics to pregnancy such as general health, choosing the right doctor, pregnancy health, abstinence, sexually transmitted diseases/infections and domestic violence. There are missed opportunities to educate client and donor audiences and pro-choice advocates.

Further research must be done to analyze the frequency of posts, cross-posting across social media platforms, comment conversations between commenters and from the organization to the commenters, and the effects of videos versus memes versus pictures on the number of shares, likes and comments.

Problem statements

GCWC

The GCWC needs to use social media in order to create awareness of the organization and engage old and new audiences in this part of our history. The organization's problems on social media are the resources to post and respond to posters on social media, materials to post and the frequency of postings. This strategic plan will address those resource issues and propose

guidelines for posting on social media along with a sample one-week content calendar for posting.

APRC

The APRC needs to use social media to create awareness of the organization, provide counter arguments to the pro-choice advocates and engage clients, donors and voters to the APRC's mission. The organization's problems on social media are the resources to post frequently, the diversity of postings and the resources to respond to postings. This strategic plan will address the resources needed to post, the diversity in postings and a sample one-week content calendar.

Audiences

GCWC

The target audiences for the Georgia Civil War Commission are: a) men, women and children 13 years old and up, b) with an interest in history and/or preservation; c) American history buffs; d) Civil War bloggers, enthusiasts and re-enactors; e) history teachers; f) those with an interest in heritage tourism and history; and g) media outlets.

APRC

The target audiences for APRC clients are: a) women/girls 13-45; b) domestic violence/boyfriend abuse situations; c) husbands whose wives want to have an abortion; d) boyfriends whose girlfriends want to have an abortion; e) girlfriends whose boyfriends want her to have an abortion; f) wives whose husbands want her to have an abortion; g) women who have had an abortion; h) dads who want to be better fathers; i) families who want to learn how to become a better family; and/or; j) families in crisis pregnancies.

As a side note, the APRC serves clients in crisis. The question is how much those in crisis share across social media. Will the APRC reach out to these clients or must the APRC just be in such a pervasive position such that we are there and are a natural choice when these clients decide to reach out? Facebook contains many closed group and even secret groups. To ask to be a

member of these communities may appear disingenuous and agenda-driven. It is this author's recommendation that we do not implement that strategy. There is not any academic literature that explores the amount or type of sharing of this nature that occurs among users of social media.

Goals, objectives, strategies & tactics

GCWC

As a state agency, the GCWC receives funds from the state of Georgia. Therefore, the funds received are taxpayers' monies. Historically, the GCWC has not received grants from other organizations or donations of money from private citizens. It would be more prudent to increase the organization's awareness among its target audiences and have the audiences, for example, to ask their lawmakers to increase GCWC funding.

- Goal: To increase organization awareness
 - Objective: To increase engagement across all social media platforms by 20% by 2nd quarter 2016
 - Strategy: Use social media to share information about the Civil War
 - Tactic: Post Civil War info to Facebook and Twitter
 - Tactic: Cross-post from Facebook to Twitter
 - Tactic: Share postings from credible Civil War bloggers
 - Tactic: Post news from Georgia history organizations such as the Cyclorama, Atlanta History Center and national parks
 - Tactic: Post information about the Black Confederate soldiers
 - Tactic: Post information about Civil War child soldiers
 - Strategy: Use social media to share information about Civil War sites in Georgia
 - Tactic: Post Civil War marker information & GPS coordinates
 - Tactic: Post info about historical sites tangentially related to the Civil War
 - Strategy: Use social media to share news and events about the GCWC
 - Tactic: Post Commission quarterly meeting dates & events at least six times prior to the event
 - Tactic: Post GCWC updates about the event while at the event
 - Tactic: Share Commission grant success stories and make this content evergreen
 - Tactic: Post video of Commissioner presentations within one month

- after the event and make the content evergreen
- Strategy: Interact with social media users who follow, like, share, comment, re-tweet and mention the GCWC
 - Tactic: Implement a social media policy
 - Tactic: Randomly select users who like and share GCWC postings and tell them thank you
 - Tactic: Thank users who re-tweet or mention the GCWC
 - Tactic: Where appropriate, interact with commenters and followers

APRC

Fundraising is not included in this program because the organization needs to work on building relationships with their online audiences. The APRC's current audiences trust the Center but it do not have a pervasive presence within their Facebook and Twitter timelines. Currently, the APRC only reaches out when events are occurring or for fundraising efforts.

- Goal: To increase organization awareness
 - Objective: To double social media engagement with clients and supporters across all social media platforms by January 2016
 - Strategy: Use social media to provide updates about APRC events and services
 - Tactic: Post events at least six times prior to date of event (e.g., banquet, trainings, ED presentations, etc.)
 - Tactic: Post updates about the event while at the event
 - Tactic: Post pictures and info about APRC services and items needed and make this evergreen content
 - Tactic: Thank donors and post pictures of donations
 - Strategy: Use social media to share APRC client stories
 - Tactic: Remove identifying information & share story of how client kept her child
 - Tactic: Remove identifying information & share story of how couple kept their child
 - Strategy: Use social media to share information about pro-life vs. pro-choice arguments
 - Tactic: Post a pro-choice argument & a pro-life argument and ask the social media user what s/he thinks about it
 - Tactic: If Planned Parenthood shares a pro-choice argument, post a pro-life argument to counter it
 - Tactic: Post pro-life arguments from various news outlets not APRC only
 - Tactic: Post evergreen pro-choice vs. pro-life arguments

- Strategy: Use social media to share information about healthcare
 - Tactic: Post info from non-profit and government organizations about nutrition, eating properly, resting well, chronic ailments, pregnancy care, etc. This will be evergreen content
 - Tactic: Post stories about how to use a car seat properly, common child ailments, finding the best daycare, going home with your child, etc.
 - Tactic: Share stories about exercise after pregnancy, going back to work, etc.
- Strategy: Use social media to share information about pro-life legislation in Georgia & other states
 - Tactic: Share Georgia Right to Life (GRTL) pro-life news as they lobby at the Capitol during the legislative session
 - Tactic: Share news from about pro-life legislation in other states. The news does not need to only come from pro-life news sources
 - Tactic: Share news about pro-life legislators in Georgia and other states
- Strategy: Use social media to share information about domestic violence
 - Tactic: Share domestic violence and pregnancy statistics
 - Tactic: Share tips to help domestic violence victims
 - Tactic: Share domestic violence success stories from Georgia, US and globally
 - Tactic: Share statistics on the effects of domestic violence on children
- Strategy: Use social media to share information about fatherhood
 - Tactic: Share info about fathers who abandon their children
 - Tactic: Share info about the positive effects of having a father
 - Tactic: Share examples of good fathers
 - Tactic: Share statistics of fatherless homes
 - Tactic: Share tips on how good men become good fathers
 - Tactic: Provide tips to single dads on how to juggle work and home duties
- Strategy: Use social media to share information about abortion alternatives
 - Tactic: Post info on adoption statistics
 - Tactic: Post stories on the types of adoptions (open, closed, etc.)
 - Tactic: Post info on the effects of abortion on the family and mother's health
 - Tactic: Post stories of children adopted and the families that adopted them
 - Tactic: Post stories of children and adults saved from abortion
- Strategy: Interact with social media users who follow, like, share, comment, retweet and mention the APRC
 - Implement a social media policy
 - Tactic: Randomly select users who like and share APRC postings and tell them thank you

- Tactic: Thank users who retweet or mention the APRC
- Tactic: Where appropriate, interact with commenters

Barriers

The barriers to reaching the goals for the GCWC and APRC are similar. The resources to engage fully into social media which are the time to post frequently and respond to posters, the organizational policies for posting, the information to post and when to post it. However, this plan will provide social media policies for both organizations and a content calendar that suggests what content to post and how frequently.

The author suggests using Hootsuite to automate posts. Because both organizations are limited on resources, a product such as Hootsuite will automate the postings and permit the social media managers to schedule and upload posts for a month as opposed to taking valuable time from their daily schedule to post on social media.

Managing risk

This is a separate document.

Measuring success

The objectives for both organizations are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timebound). When setting the objectives, this author accounted for the lack of resources in both organizations. As it stands, the author will need to gain approval from the boards of the APRC and GCWC prior to implementing the social media plans for both organizations. When the automation, training and policies are in place for the APRC, the social media activities will be handed off to the Executive Director. For the GCWC, this author will share social media responsibilities with the Chief of Staff until the duties can be shared among the Commissioners.

Awareness measurements will track the number of impressions/reach of the social media

postings. Engagement will be measured according to the number of followers, re-tweets, mentions, replies and hash tag mentions on Twitter and the number of likes the organizations receive on Facebook. Tools to measure Twitter performance include analytics.twitter.com, Followerwonk and Klout. Analytics.twitter.com provides running calculations of the impressions and engagement along with follower counts and tweet statistics. Followerwonk provides analysis of Twitter followers and Klout provides a score illustrating the organizations' overall social media influence.

Eventually, success measures for the APRC will include donations raised through social media. However, at this time, the Center will use social media to raise awareness of the organization. It is important to establish a relationship with the clients, donors and advocates prior to requesting monetary or material (e.g., diapers) donations.

The GCWC will add a success measure related to website traffic. However, currently, the website is very static and information cannot be easily added without a high level of technical expertise and to update the site would be expensive. The website will likely be transferred to a Weebly or Wix site that allows for more flexibility in the site's design, updates and tracking of visitors. When the new website is fully functional and traffic between social media and the website can be measured, traffic will become a social media success measure. The Commission hopes to have the website redesigned by 2016.

Content/editorial calendar

The content calendar will be for one week for each organization. This is a separate document.

Evaluations

This author is responsible for the social media outreach for the APRC and the GCWC. Initially, the plan will be re-evaluated monthly during APRC RD committee meetings and every

two months during board meetings. The GCWC meets quarterly. However, the GCWC plan will be evaluated every three weeks.

References

Atlanta Pregnancy Resource Center. Retrieved from: <http://www.atlantapregnancy.org/>

Atlanta Pregnancy Resource Center. About APRC. Retrieved from:

<http://www.atlantapregnancy.org/about.html>

Dresser, A. (n.d.) Social media policy template. *PandaDoc.com*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.pandadoc.com/social-media-policy-template>

Fairfax County Virginia Office of Public Affairs. (2014, July 7). Facebook comments policy.

Fairfax County Government. Retrieved from:

<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/opa/getfairfax/facebook-comments-policy.htm>

Georgia Civil War Commission. Retrieved from: <http://www.georgiacivilwar.org/>

Office of Environmental Information. EPA information procedures: Using social media to communicate with the public. (June 2014). *The Environmental Protection Agency*.

Retrieved from: http://www.epa.gov/irmpoli8/policies/comm_public.pdf

South Carolina Budget and Control Board. (n.d.) Social media policy. *South Carolina State*

Government. Retrieved from: <http://www.state.sc.us/dio/SocialMediaPolicy.pdf>

Sutter Health. (September 2011). Social media policy. *SutterHealth.org*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.sutterhealth.org/employees/sutter-health-social-media-policy.pdf>

Vanderbilt University Medical Center. (n.d.) VUMC social media policy. *Vanderbilt.edu*.

Retrieved from:

<http://www.mc.vanderbilt.edu/root/vumc.php?site=socialmediatoolkit&doc=26923>