

Item 9.1.3 Attachment

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

Membership Committee

Delivery Systems, Communications and Technology Task Force

FINAL REPORT

12/20/12

Executive Summary

The following report details the work done by the Delivery Systems, Communications and Technology (“DCT”) Task Force. The task force was created by NSPE President Dan Witliff and the NSPE Board of Directors at the 2012 NSPE Annual Conference. The DCT is one of six Task Forces to study the NSPE organization in accordance with the Race for Relevance.

Members of the DCT are:

Tim Austin, PE, F.NSPE, Chairman (KS)
Kerry Cooley, PE (MN)
Roch Larochelle, PE (NH)
Martha Darnton, PE (MI)
Gabriel Guzman, PE (PR)
James Powell, PE (CA)
Dixon Tucker, PE (VA)
David James, PE (NV)
Britt Smith, PE (MO)
Nancy McClain, Exec Dir, Michigan Society

Stephen Loop, PE, F.NSPE (ID)
Fred Groth, PE (WI)
Kathryn Gray, PE, F.NSPE (IL)
Lowell Dolney, PE (NE)
Michel Sadaka, PE, F.NSPE (PA)
Steve Bassett, PE, F.NSPE (FL)
Alan Werner, PE, F.NSPE (WA)
Hardy Will, PE (NC)
Candy Toler, Exec Dir, Tennessee Society

The mission of the DCT was to:

Review the relevancy of NSPE’s current communication program(s); develop recommendations for a tailored, customized communications campaign as a means to target the recruitment, retention, and education of the various generational members of NSPE, i.e. millennial younger engineers on licensure track; validate content and message of communications; determine the most cost effective means including the use of technology and social media; and investigate and develop recommendations for ways to track membership

The DCT evaluated the various means and manners in which NSPE communicates with its membership including content, cost, etc. Consideration was given to NSPE communications with non-members and the general public. Several subcommittees were created in order to more closely study Social Media, Emails, PE Magazine, NSPE Website, Meetings and Seminars. In some cases, surveys were undertaken to evaluate the efficacy of the communications. Consideration was also given to the work product of the other Race for Relevance Task Forces.

Based upon the Task Force research, various recommendations were developed to provide guidance to the NSPE Board of Directors and NSPE staff consistent with the mission of the DCT Task Force. The recommendations are as follows and have been listed sequentially with priority, i.e. first recommendation having the highest priority and so forth.

Recommendation #1. Consider reorganizing NSPE staff to include Public Relations and PE magazine under the same umbrella department – maybe Communications – for integration and consistency in the development and distribution of NSPE’s communication content and messaging.

Recommendation #2. Beginning with all new members joining on or after January 1, 2013, send only the digital version of *PE* magazine.

Recommendation #3. Beginning with the Jan/Feb edition, remove the “Digital Rights Management” restrictions from the electronic magazine so that nonmembers may view the entire magazine; consider emailing the magazine as a PDF in-house (the DRM, as it is currently setup, restricts the ability of a non NSPE member to fully view the magazine, and prompts the viewer to join NSPE).

Recommendation #4. Make the assumption that everyone will receive *PE* magazine electronically beginning with the January/February 2014 issue – implementation recommendations:

- Charge a nominal amount extra for those who want to opt in and receive a printed version of *PE* magazine (possibly \$5-\$25, to cover the cost of publication);
- Continue to send complementary hard copies to state licensing boards, engineering deans, and overseas recipients;
- Reduce the current staff time (5.5 FTEs) dedicated to production of *PE* magazine by half to allow a reallocation of resources to other methods of communication. One possible way to do this would be to reduce the size of the magazine by half (from 40 to 20 pages);

Recommendation #5. Develop a mobile or smart phone application for a mobile version of the NSPE website. Further study should be given to identifying and prioritizing the information needed for the mobile application, i.e. Board member contact information, state society contact information, dues structure, etc.

Recommendation #6. Develop an official NSPE LinkedIn discussion group either as a stand alone group or in partnership with one of the existing discussion groups. Increase the use of LinkedIn as a platform to communicate with the NSPE members and others who follow the discussion group on various issues that are important to the Society.

Recommendation #7. Consider developing an integrated communications approach utilizing LinkedIn along with the daily and periodic emails to help drive traffic to the NSPE website or LinkedIn. Increased traffic to either of the websites may increase advertising revenue and opportunities. Investigate the ability to advertise on the LinkedIn website.

Recommendation #8. Change the front page to be the “About NSPE” page. Continue further study and work with staff to restructure the website to be more easily navigated and to identify a hierarchy or priority of the information infrastructure.

Recommendation #9. Maintain our current email push communications in the near term. Perform additional research on the industry emails to get statistically valid data.

Recommendation #10. Continue further study to see if resources should be programmed for long-term development of other social media and online tools such as collaboration programs to increase the efficacy of the organizational structure.

Recommendation #11. Work with our third-party vendor to tweak the structure of the Daily Designs pursuant to the survey results on email structure.

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the DCT was to evaluate the various means and manners in which NSPE communicates with its membership including content, cost, etc. Further consideration was given to NSPE communications with non-members and the general public. The DCT concluded that in order to properly evaluate the various communication programs, several subcommittees would be necessary. Subcommittees were created to more closely study the following areas: Social Media, Emails, PE Magazine, NSPE Website, Meetings and Seminars. Our activities are summarized below and the actions the DCT undertook to accomplish its goals so that the NSPE Board understands the general direction undertaken.

Social Media

The social media subcommittee was tasked with analyzing the different social media platforms available and how NSPE and potential new members can be reached using the various platforms. Members assigned to this subcommittee were Kerry Cooley, Martha Darnton, Roch Larochelle, Alan Werner and James Powell.

Study Methodology. The main platforms that were considered are Facebook, Linked-In, Twitter, Blogs, NSPE daily/weekly emails, and the potential for a new NSPE app for smart phones. Items that were initially considered or discussed are as follows:

1. The committee examined if Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, blogs and other social media opportunities should be or can be effectively utilized to communicate with the membership.
2. Consideration was given to whether advertising opportunities exist.
3. NSPE has Facebook and LinkedIn pages but they do not appear to be utilized effectively. LinkedIn is not “owned” by NSPE but is managed by individuals who have created discussion groups within LinkedIn.
4. What other social media opportunities are there?
5. Are there smartphone application opportunities?
6. How do we address this on both state and national level?
7. Ideas:
 - a. There is a need for daily updating through social media, are there resources to do that?
 - b. Who does that?
 - c. Do we focus our efforts in one format of social media? Or multiple formats?
 - d. Is there a reason that we have multiple sites for one source of social media?
 - e. Blogs... why so many? Can we consolidate?
 - f. What would be a valid sample of people?
8. Should we survey people as to what way they like being communicated with?
 - a. NSPE staff will generate a list for people to survey.
 - b. 8-10 questions
 - c. Which forms of social media do you use most?
 - i. Twitter
 - ii. Facebook
 - iii. Linked In
 - d. Send it to one non-member?

Research was undertaken to evaluate the various social media opportunities. The research included individual evaluation of the platforms and discussions with fellow engineers and others. Lastly, a survey was developed that to gather further information about how our members use the social media platforms. The survey and its results can be found in the appendix attached to this report.

Observations/Analysis. The background research and survey provided some interesting information and results. Some general observations:

1. Surprisingly, the majority of respondents to the survey are 60+ years of age.
2. A number of respondents that “don’t know” what NSPE has to offer in the way of social media.

3. The results appear to indicate that there is significant potential to increase the use of social media as a means to communicate within the organization. Opportunities exist to increase the effectiveness of communications between NSPE and the individual member, increasing both the upward and downward communications within the organizational structure.
4. Professional interest appears to be generally focused on using LinkedIn instead of Twitter, Facebook, YouTube or other social media means. LinkedIn provides an excellent forum or clearinghouse for the exchange of information. However, the LinkedIn discussion groups are “owned” by individuals and are not officially sponsored by NSPE even though the NSPE name and logo are associated with the groups. NSPE staff (Stacey Ober) periodically participates in the discussion groups.

Participation with the discussion groups is far greater than the NSPE blogs that are found on the NSPE website because of the interactive nature of LinkedIn. All communications and updates to the discussion forum can be instantaneous with notifications sent to individual users upon request. There are over 4,000 “followers” under the largest construction group. The discussion groups allow upward feedback to NSPE.

5. The most frequent use is of the NSPE website; however, the NSPE blogs do not appear to be a resource that is utilized. The use of the state societies’ websites also appears to be the most frequently used social media
6. There is interest on developing a smart phone mobile application to access the NSPE website and make the website usable to the mobile user.

Recommendations. The following recommendations are made:

1. Develop a mobile or smart phone application for a mobile version of the NSPE website. Further study should be given to identifying and prioritizing the information needed for the mobile application, i.e. Board member contact information, state society contact information, dues structure, etc.
2. Develop an official NSPE LinkedIn discussion group either as a stand alone group or in partnership with one of the existing discussion groups. Increase the use of LinkedIn as a platform to communicate with the NSPE members and others who follow the discussion group on various issues that are important to the Society.
3. Consider developing an integrated communications approach utilizing LinkedIn along with the daily and periodic emails to help drive traffic to the NSPE website or LinkedIn. Increased traffic to either of the websites may increase advertising revenue and opportunities. Investigate the ability to advertise on the LinkedIn website.
4. Continue further study to see if resources should be programmed for long-term development of other social media as an integrated approach to communications.

Emails

The Emails subcommittee was tasked with analyzing the different email communications sent periodically by NSPE. Members assigned to this subcommittee were Dixon Tucker, David James, Kathryn Gray, Stephen Loop, and Lowell Dolney.

Study Methodology. The emails are a daily point of contact between NSPE and the individual member; however, not all members are believed to be receiving the emails. Items that were initially considered or discussed are as follows:

1. What emails such as Daily Design, Engineering Press Review, and practice division emails are currently being used?
2. Consideration should be given of content, effectiveness, frequency, staff cost, advertising, etc.

3. What data is available for hot links that are embedded?
4. DD (Daily Design), EPR (Engineering Press Review), NSPE Update and Interest Group(s)
 - a. Are these perceived as valuable?
 - b. Are they relevant?
 - c. Are they cost effective?
 - d. Is the content reused?
 - e. Breadth of distribution?
5. Advertising
6. Frequency
7. Links to further information (deeper details, original source)
8. Platform dependant or targeted (how does it fare on a tablet or smart phone)
9. What metrics should we use for continue / drop for each media venue? Is a third good enough? Should it be compared on a \$/viewing to the PE magazine?
10. A third of what: Members? Members reading the media per those receiving each publication?
11. For ease and consistency of base numbers, suggest going with members as a denominator. It is advantageous for NSPE if those items are shared with other members, but member number is something that should be verifiable.
12. And, does this go to ALL or a sample of members, how large a distribution?
13. What I've been hearing is that it would go to a sampling of the membership (National indicated that they have numbers for various confidence levels).
14. There is one question about how they prefer to receive the data, but no question on relevancy: what do they want the data to contain/address, or how often they would prefer to get the publication for it to be effective. The first two, DD and EPR are daily or regularly publicized, but Interest Groups are intermittent depending on the group.
15. I am a government regulator in the potable water industry and get most of my technical stuff from other organizations. I don't feel that NSPE should try to address technical issues of each market sector. NSPE does have practice sectors and should continue to show us how to play nice together. Example in building a water treatment plant, NSPE members from PEI (possible suppliers of equipment or possible operators of the completed facility), PEC (those building the facility or doing a value review), PEG (the local government wanting the water, the various permitting agencies) interact with each other and many other groups. Of general interest might be that x county is proposing/building a treatment facility. Once the level of detail gets down to treatment units – those would probably be best handled in other trade publications.
16. Since subscribing to these items is done online and is part of the database, would it be simple to get statistics on what % of NSPE members subscribe to each of these? I think this would be important information to consider as well. For example, if this survey is being sent out to NSPE members regardless of subscription status and only 30% subscribe to Daily Designs, then results that only 30% of members regularly read it would help keep things in perspective.
17. What the net losses/gains for each of these? For example, if advertising revenue causes the net cost to balance to be around \$0 then if anyone is seeing a benefit with these it might as well stay as an option.
18. Would it be worth having an extra question to rate the importance of each of these on a scale from 1 to 5? While someone may not read every article in the Daily Designs, it sounds like many skim the headlines and if they are like me have found some good engineering-related news items.
19. Demographics (who is responding to the survey as well as their opinions)

Research was undertaken to evaluate the various emails. The research included individual evaluation of the email communications and discussions with fellow engineers and others including staff. Lastly, a survey was developed that to gather further information about the effectiveness and value of the emails. The survey and its results can be found in the appendix attached to this report.

Observations/Analysis. The background research and survey provided some interesting information and results. Some general observations:

1. Surprisingly, the majority of respondents to the survey are 50+ years of age.
2. A significant number of respondents do not know apparently know the extent of the available email

communications such as the Daily Designs.

3. For those who receive the three most commonly distributed e-publications, Daily Designs, Engineering Press Review and NSPE Update, a strong majority opens them, reads some portion of them, finds at least one relevant article in them and consider them to be of some value.
4. Distribution of the interest group emails is much more limited than Daily Designs, Engineering Press Review and NSPE Update. However, those who received them appear to open them and find something of value in them.
5. The results appear to indicate that generally the emails are viewed as a valuable communication tool between NSPE and the individual member. Opportunities exist to increase the effectiveness of communications between NSPE and the individual member.
6. There is some apparent redundancy of the emails, meaning there may be too many emails.
7. The structure of the emails is also important. The survey indicates that the preferred method of delivery is a headline summary with a hot link to the more detailed content.
8. Daily Designs is provided by a third party vendor. The email is “customized” for the individual. Not all NSPE members are aware of the email or how to change or edit the customized settings. Also, NSPE members are generally not aware that the Daily Design emails are archived and can be searched.

Recommendations.

1. Consider developing an integrated communications approach utilizing LinkedIn along with the daily and periodic emails to help drive traffic to the NSPE website or LinkedIn. Increased traffic to either of the websites may increase advertising revenue and opportunities. Investigate the ability to advertise on the LinkedIn website.
2. Maintain our current email push communications in the near term. Perform additional research on the industry emails to get statistically valid data.
3. Work with our third-party vendor to tweak the structure of the Daily Designs pursuant to the survey results on email structure.

PE Magazine

The task of this sub-committee was to review the relevance of the PE magazine as a communication program and as a recruitment and retention tool. Members assigned to this subcommittee were Michel Sadaka, Candy Toler, Steve Bassett and Hardy Willis.

Study Methodology: Research was undertaken with the assistance of NSPE staff. Items that were initially considered or discussed are as follows:

1. This committee will examine the current use of PE magazine. Should it be distributed electronically? Is the content appropriate? Who is receiving the magazine? Who should but isn't? What are the associated costs with the PE magazine? What benefits can be gained by digital distribution versus a hard copy publication?

The subcommittee also became aware that NSPE staff had previously surveyed the membership on this matter and that a staff recommendation was being forwarded to the NSPE Board for consideration at the October 2012 Board meeting. This information was also reviewed and discussed. The NSPE Staff survey and recommendation to the NSPE Board are included in the appendix attached to this report.

Observations/Analysis: One of the first issues that was encountered is that P.E. magazine is accessible only to members and its' content exclusive. While it is important to preserve membership value, it is difficult to use that same content as part of a recruitment tool - thus the idea is to reduce the amount of content that would be exclusive to PE Magazine and increase the amount of the shared and generated content that can be made available via other media.

Based upon the subcommittee's research, a substantial amount of savings could be realized. Assuming a TOTAL loss of advertising revenue (which we don't believe will happen), NSPE will realize net annual savings estimated to be \$170,000 in switching from a printed to an electronic magazine because the current cost of electronic distribution is 10 cents/email and \$700 for conversion (based on a reduction in printing and mailing 2,000 copies of the magazine, the savings would be \$1,280 – equal to 64 cents/copy

Recommendations: The following recommendations are made:

1. Reallocate NSPE staff resources so as not be exclusive to members, and use social media sites when applicable.
2. Beginnings with all new members joining on or after January 1, 2013, send only the digital version of *PE* magazine.
3. Beginning with the Jan/Feb edition, remove the “Digital Rights Management” restrictions from the electronic magazine so that nonmembers may view the entire magazine; consider emailing the magazine as a PDF in-house (the DRM, as it is currently setup, restricts the ability of a non NSPE member to fully view the magazine, and prompts the viewer to join NSPE).
4. Make the assumption that everyone will receive *PE* magazine electronically beginning with the January/February 2014 issue – implementation recommendations:
 - Charge a nominal amount extra for those who want to opt in and receive a printed version of *PE* magazine (possibly \$5-\$25, to cover the cost of publication);
 - Continue to send complementary hard copies to state licensing boards, engineering deans, and overseas recipients;
 - Reduce the current staff time (5.5 FTEs) dedicated to production of *PE* magazine by half to allow a reallocation of resources to other methods of communication. One possible way to do this would be to reduce the size of the magazine by half (from 40 to 20 pages);
5. Consider reorganizing NSPE staff to include Public Relations and *PE* magazine under the same umbrella department – maybe Communications? Establish a department in charge of developing and distributing NSPE's communication content and message.

NSPE Website

The NSPE Website subcommittee was tasked with evaluating the NSPE website to determine its user friendliness and effectiveness. Members assigned to this subcommittee are Tim Austin, Britt Smith, David James, Nancy McClain, Fred Groth, and Gabriel Guzman.

Study Methodology. Research was undertaken. The website was evaluated by a number of individuals and feedback was obtained. Items considered/discussed:

1. This committee will examine NSPE's website. The website was reorganized several years ago. Is the website user friendly? Does the website effectively serve the membership? Others?
2. Should we survey membership about the NSPE Website?
3. General agreement is that the website is difficult to navigate and information is hard to find.
4. The NSPE website is a good repository of information but does not serve as a good portal for outside

interests to understand NSPE.

5. Should the website be a tool for only members or should it be viewed as a marketing opportunity?
6. The information does not appear to be current on the front page.
7. What information is available to determine which web pages are being used?

Observations/Analysis. The website was updated a number of years ago. The subcommittee did not feel that a survey was necessary as the website was unanimously viewed as being difficult to navigate. The subcommittee also felt that the “About NSPE” was a better front page than the one currently being used.

Recommendations. The following recommendations are made:

1. Develop a mobile or smart phone application for a mobile version of the NSPE website. Further study should be given to identifying and prioritizing the information needed for the mobile application, i.e. Board member contact information, state society contact information, dues structure, etc.
2. Change the front page to be the “About NSPE” page.
3. Continue further study and work with staff to restructure the website to be more easily navigated and to identify a hierarchy or priority of the information infrastructure.

Meetings and Seminars

The Meetings and Seminars subcommittee was tasked with evaluating the NSPE annual conference and also to ascertain whether or not additional meetings should be conducted. Members assigned to this subcommittee are Tim Austin, Britt Smith, Nancy McClain, Fred Groth, and Gabriel Guzman.

Study Methodology. Items considered/discussed:

1. This committee reviewed the post conference survey for the annual conference.
2. The committee discussed the regional conferences and whether or not

Observations/Analysis. As the annual meeting is currently being reviewed by other task forces in more depth, the committee felt that no further action or research was necessary on this matter by this subcommittee.

Recommendations. The following recommendations are made:

The subcommittee did feel that NSPE should hold additional meetings or work in cooperation with the regions to co-host meetings. NSPE could increase its presence and visibility to the individual members if it increased attendance. Additionally, the time and expense associated with officer travel could possibly be reduced as the number of individual state visits would be reduced and consolidated with the regional meetings.



Digital Delivery of PE October 2012

Action Item: *Provide guidance to NSPE [board] on future distribution of electronic PE Magazine.*

Background

- NSPE began digital delivery of PE magazine to only student members beginning with the May 2012 issue.
- To date, student members have shown little interest in the publication. Approximately 2,800 student members receive digital PE at a cost of about \$1,000 per issue. Each issue averages about 174 visitors and approximately 1,800 total page views. The low open rates may be due to the fact the launch of digital PE coincided with final exams at the end of the school year followed by summer vacation. The low open rates may also reflect student members' lack of interest in the publication and the Society's activities.

Who Wants Digital PE?

- Last year's survey of members showed the following: 1) 30% said they would prefer to receive the digital edition only, 2) 31% said they would like to receive both print and digital, 3) 34% said they would like to receive the print edition only.
- It is unknown how many members would actually request the digital edition once it is offered to them. Anecdotal reports from other association publications suggest that many people still prefer hard copy over digital; however, each association is unique and we won't know for sure until we actually offer digital to all members.

Advertising

- The digital edition of PE is very unlikely to generate advertising revenue on its own—that is, advertisers are not likely to purchase advertising that will appear only in the digital edition. This has been the general experience across associations.
- The approach of our ad sales team is to offer digital advertising options only as a value-add to print advertising campaigns. (All ads that appear in the print edition of PE also appear in the digital edition.)

Converting members to digital format comes with two risks: 1) a decline in hard copy readership, if large enough, could result in a decline in advertising revenue. It is unclear where the tipping point is, and 2) Digital delivery is a much weaker connection to members than hard copy. Open

rates for digital are low, as is the amount of time members spend with digital. According to the 2012 PE Reader Survey, 62% of members read all four of the last four issues of PE (print version) and 13% read three of the last four issues. Additionally, 68% of members spend at least a half hour reading or looking through a typical issue of PE.

Recommendation

Beginning with the January/February 2013 PE, offer all non-student members the opportunity to receive a digital edition in addition to the hard copy. (Student members would continue receiving digital only.) This would:

- Allow NSPE to respond to the member desire for a digital option;
- Increase costs associated with digital delivery, but the increase could be managed within the existing FY 12-13 PE budget;
- Help NSPE get a more accurate picture of member interest in digital; and
- Limit the risk of losing hard-copy subscribers to the detriment of ad sales. (We would not offer to unsubscribe members from the hard-copy version and would unsubscribe them only if they specifically asked.)

Timeline

November: Contact all non-student members via e-mail, asking them to reply if they would like to add digital delivery to their hard-copy subscription.

December: Input member preferences in Net Forum

January 15: print edition of Jan/Feb PE is delivered to printer

January 30: Hard copy of Jan/Feb PE mails to members

February 2: Jan/Feb digital edition is e-mailed to members

Additional Background on PE Magazine Delivery

What We Know About PE Magazine (Printed Edition)

- The vast majority of members like the printed version of PE. 62% of members read all four of the last four issues and 13% read three of the last four issues. (2012 PE Reader Survey)
- 68% of members spend at least a half hour reading or looking through a typical issue of PE. (2012 PE Reader Survey)
- PE was rated as the most important member benefit, according to the 2006 Member Survey.
- 65% of members said they would still want to continue receiving the printed edition of PE even if a digital option were offered to them. (2011 survey)
- Advertisers are interested in PE magazine. In 2012, PE will generate about \$70,000 in advertising revenue. PE also gives NSPE credibility in the eyes of advertisers, who spend money on other NSPE advertising opportunities, such as Web site and e-newsletters ads.

What We Know About Digital Delivery

- To date, student member interaction with the digital version of PE has been very low.
- Member interaction with digital magazines in general is often low, both in terms of the number of people who access the publication and the amount of time they spend looking at it, which often is a matter of minutes.
- Advertisers have shown little interest in association digital magazines, due at least partly to the above point. If the print version of PE were eliminated and replaced completely by digital, virtually all PE advertising would go with it, and advertising rates would have to be significantly decreased. It's possible that NSPE's ad sales firm would choose to end our agreement.
- NSPE members are interested in a digital option (30% say they want digital only and 31% say they want both print and digital).

What We Don't Know

- It is unclear how many members would choose digital if it were offered. It is also unclear whether members' stated interest in digital would translate into true, quantifiable interest.
- We don't know at what point advertisers will begin to lose interest in PE magazine due to the declining number of readers.

Digital certainly has its place in the mix of ways NSPE communicates with members, but it still is a new way of doing things. Advertisers have shown that they aren't yet comfortable with digital, and member use of and interest in digital still does not approach print.

Pushing members toward a digital-only option would erode the number of print subscribers and speed up the decline toward the tipping point where advertisers begin to lose interest in PE. Additionally, pushing members toward a digital-only option at this time would weaken the tangible connection NSPE has established with its members via the printed edition of PE over the past seven years.

Submitted by: David Siegel, Communications Director

Appendix-Email Survey Results

View Summary

[Filter Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)[Browse Responses »](#)**PAGE:**

1. Which category below includes your age?

	Response Percent	Response Count
20 or younger	0.0%	0
21-29	4.3%	7
30-39	9.3%	15
40-49	14.9%	24
50-59	29.2%	47
60 or older	42.2%	68
answered question		161
skipped question		0

2. Are you a member of NSPE?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	99.4%	160
No (If No, skip to question 5)	0.6%	1
answered question		161
skipped question		0

3. To which Interest Group(s) do you belong?

	Response Percent	Response Count
PEC - Professional Engineers in Construction	11.9%	19
PEG - Professional Engineers in Government	15.6%	25
PEHE - Professional Engineers in Higher Education	3.1%	5
PEI - Professional Engineers in Industry	21.3%	34
PEPP - Professional Engineers in Private Practice	26.9%	43
None of the above	29.4%	47
answered question		160
skipped question		1

4. What is your level of activity within the Society?

Member	Observer	Volunteer (committee work/event)	Officer (within the past	Response Count
answered question				160
skipped question				1

4. What is your level of activity within the Society?

				15 years)	
National	94.7% (142)	4.7% (7)	6.7% (10)	3.3% (5)	150
State	91.5% (129)	5.0% (7)	12.8% (18)	12.1% (17)	141
Chapter	84.5% (109)	6.2% (8)	12.4% (16)	27.1% (35)	129
Other (please specify what and level) Show replies					7
answered question					160
skipped question					1

5. Do you receive or know about any of the following electronic publications?

	Regularly	Occasionally	Do not receive, but am aware of	Do not receive, and unaware of	Not applicable	Respon Count
Daily Designs	65.8% (98)	7.4% (11)	7.4% (11)	17.4% (26)	2.0% (3)	
Engineering Press Review	35.1% (46)	14.5% (19)	13.0% (17)	35.9% (47)	1.5% (2)	
answered question						
skipped question						

NSPE Update	66.9% (101)	12.6% (19)	3.3% (5)	15.2% (23)	2.0% (3)
PEC Reporter	5.8% (7)	4.1% (5)	14.9% (18)	56.2% (68)	19.0% (23)
PEG E-News	7.3% (9)	6.5% (8)	11.3% (14)	57.3% (71)	17.7% (22)
PEI E-News	9.2% (11)	5.0% (6)	16.7% (20)	54.2% (65)	15.0% (18)
PEPP Talk	12.7% (16)	6.3% (8)	13.5% (17)	50.8% (64)	16.7% (21)
Young PE Quarterly (only offered to members under 35)	6.3% (7)	1.8% (2)	8.9% (10)	27.7% (31)	55.4% (62)

skipped question

[illegible]

6. If you receive the publication, how often do you open it?

Daily Designs	46.5% (66)	19.0% (27)	11.3% (16)	3.5% (5)	20.4% (29)	142
Engineering Press Review	24.0% (29)	19.8% (24)	13.2% (16)	9.9% (12)	34.7% (42)	121
NSPE Update	46.2% (67)	25.5% (37)	9.0% (13)	6.9% (10)	13.8% (20)	145
PEC Reporter	8.6% (9)	3.8% (4)	2.9% (3)	8.6% (9)	76.2% (80)	105
PEG E-News	10.8% (12)	3.6% (4)	1.8% (2)	9.9% (11)	73.9% (82)	111
PEI E-News	12.5% (13)	3.8% (4)	1.0% (1)	12.5% (13)	70.2% (73)	104
PEPP Talk	8.1% (9)	9.9% (11)	2.7% (3)	11.7% (13)	67.6% (75)	111
Young PE Quarterly	4.9% (5)	1.9% (2)	2.9% (3)	3.9% (4)	86.4% (89)	103
answered question						160
skipped question						1

7. If you open the emails, how often do you find and read at least one interesting article?

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Rarely/Never	Not applicable	Response Count
Daily Designs	25.7% (36)	30.0% (42)	20.0% (28)	5.0% (7)	20.7% (29)	
answered question						
skipped question						

7. If you open the emails, how often do you find and read at least one interesting article?

Engineering Press Review	8.4% (10)	28.6% (34)	19.3% (23)	9.2% (11)	35.3% (42)
NSPE Update	21.0% (30)	35.7% (51)	21.0% (30)	8.4% (12)	14.0% (20)
PEC Reporter	3.7% (4)	6.5% (7)	3.7% (4)	9.3% (10)	76.6% (82)
PEG E-News	3.6% (4)	7.3% (8)	5.5% (6)	9.1% (10)	74.5% (82)
PEI E-News	6.5% (7)	6.5% (7)	3.7% (4)	9.3% (10)	73.8% (79)
PEPP Talk	4.5% (5)	7.2% (8)	9.0% (10)	9.9% (11)	69.4% (77)
Young PE Quarterly	3.9% (4)	0.0% (0)	4.9% (5)	4.9% (5)	86.3% (88)

answered question

skipped question

8. What percentage of each publication do you read?

	<30%	31-65%	>66%	Not applicable	Response Count
Daily Designs	23.4% (33)	27.0% (38)	29.1% (41)	20.6% (29)	141
Engineering Press Review	28.3% (34)	20.8% (25)	17.5% (21)	33.3% (40)	120
answered question					160
skipped question					1

8. What percentage of each publication do you read?

NSPE Update	25.0% (36)	31.9% (46)	27.8% (40)	15.3% (22)	144
PEC Reporter	17.6% (19)	2.8% (3)	3.7% (4)	75.9% (82)	108
PEG E-News	16.5% (18)	8.3% (9)	2.8% (3)	72.5% (79)	109
PEI E-News	17.9% (19)	5.7% (6)	4.7% (5)	71.7% (76)	106
PEPP Talk	21.1% (23)	7.3% (8)	4.6% (5)	67.0% (73)	109
Young PE Quarterly	10.1% (10)	3.0% (3)	2.0% (2)	84.8% (84)	99
answered question					160
skipped question					1

9. What format do you prefer for receiving electronic newsletters?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Full newsletter content emailed to you.	31.6%	50
Short descriptions of newsletter content e-mailed to you with links to complete content.	63.9%	101
answered question		158
skipped question		3

9. What format do you prefer for receiving electronic newsletters?

E-mail notification that a new newsletter is available for you to access from the web.

4.4%

7

answered question 158

skipped question 3

10. Were you aware that archives are available for all NSPE electronic publications (including Daily Designs and NSPE Update?)

Response

Response

Percent

Count

Yes

27.7%

44

No

72.3%

115

answered question 159

skipped question 2

11. Please rank the value/relevancy of the following publications.

Not

Very

Some

Not

familiar

Response

valuable

value

valuable

with the

Count

publication

answered question 160

skipped question 1

11. Please rank the value/relevancy of the following publications.

Daily Designs	29.6% (42)	49.3% (70)	3.5% (5)	17.6% (25)	142
Engineering Press Review	13.6% (18)	47.7% (63)	4.5% (6)	34.1% (45)	132
NSPE Update	26.7% (40)	55.3% (83)	4.0% (6)	14.0% (21)	150
PEC Reporter	2.6% (3)	11.4% (13)	11.4% (13)	74.6% (85)	114
PEG E-News	6.0% (7)	11.1% (13)	11.1% (13)	71.8% (84)	117
PEI E-News	5.2% (6)	13.9% (16)	9.6% (11)	71.3% (82)	115
PEPP Talk	7.6% (9)	11.8% (14)	10.9% (13)	69.7% (83)	119
Young PE Quarterly	2.7% (3)	6.3% (7)	9.9% (11)	81.1% (90)	111
Other (what additional topics would you like to see in the publications) Show replies					3

answered question 160

skipped question 1

12. Would you add or change anything to any of the following electronic publications?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Daily Design Show replies	68.8%	11
answered question		16
skipped question		145

12. Would you add or change anything to any of the following electronic publications?

Engineer Press Review Show replies	31.3%	5
NSPE Update Show replies	56.3%	9
PEC Reporter Show replies	25.0%	4
PEG E-News Show replies	37.5%	6
PEI E-News Show replies	31.3%	5
PEPP Talk Show replies	31.3%	5
Young PE Quarterly (only offered to members under 35) Show replies	25.0%	4
answered question		16
skipped question		145

Appendix-Social Media Survey Results

PAGE:

1. Which category below includes your age?

	Response Percent	Response Count
20 or younger	0.7%	2
21-29	5.1%	15
30-39	11.8%	35
40-49	17.2%	51
50-59	27.3%	81
60 or older	38.0%	113
answered question		297
skipped question		1

2. Are you a member of NSPE?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	97.6%	289
No	2.4%	7
answered question		296
skipped question		2

3. Which of the following electronic communications tools do you use regularly?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Yearly	Less often	Response Count
NSPE Web site	4.8% (13)	11.4% (31)	34.3% (93)	31.0% (84)	18.5% (50)	271
Twitter	5.4% (12)	4.1% (9)	6.3% (14)	2.7% (6)	81.4% (180)	221
Facebook	29.8% (71)	18.5% (44)	8.8% (21)	1.3% (3)	41.6% (99)	238
LinkedIn	13.4% (33)	27.2% (67)	22.4% (55)	5.7% (14)	31.3% (77)	246
NSPE Blogs	3.0% (7)	5.6% (13)	15.4% (36)	8.5% (20)	67.5% (158)	234
YouTube	3.8% (9)	24.8% (59)	29.0% (69)	8.0% (19)	34.5% (82)	238
Other (Instagram, Foursquare, etc. - please specify) Show replies						24
answered question						287
skipped question						11

4. Are you aware NSPE has the following?

	Yes	Yes	No	No	Response Count
Facebook page	32.9% (97)	6.4% (19)	51.2% (151)	9.5% (28)	295
answered question					295
skipped question					3

4. Are you aware NSPE has the following?

Twitter account	20.1% (59)	4.8% (14)	62.1% (182)	13.0% (38)	293
YouTube channel	11.3% (33)	3.1% (9)	72.0% (211)	13.7% (40)	293
answered question					295
skipped question					3

5. Does the NSPE State Society that you belong to utilize any of the following?

	Yes, and it is very useful	Yes, but it isn't very useful	No	I don't know	Response Count
Twitter	1.1% (3)	1.4% (4)	9.9% (28)	87.7% (249)	284
LinkedIn	7.0% (20)	4.2% (12)	8.4% (24)	80.5% (231)	287
Facebook	5.9% (17)	6.6% (19)	5.9% (17)	81.6% (235)	288
YouTube	0.4% (1)	0.4% (1)	9.5% (27)	89.8% (254)	283
Blogs	3.5% (10)	2.8% (8)	8.5% (24)	85.2% (241)	283
Web site	49.6% (141)	13.4% (38)	1.8% (5)	35.2% (100)	284
Other (please specify) Show replies					12
answered question					291
skipped question					7

6. Which is your primary State Society?

	Response Percent	Response Count
State: Show replies	100.0%	286
answered question		286
skipped question		12

7. Check each Social Media tool that you feel is important & appropriate for use by working professionals?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Twitter	12.6%	28
Facebook	23.3%	52
LinkedIn	87.4%	195
Blogs	38.1%	85
	Other (please specify) Show replies	29
answered question		223
skipped question		75

8. Check each Social Media tool that you feel should be used purely for social purposes (not professional)

	Response Percent	Response Count
Twitter	72.0%	167
Facebook	83.2%	193
LinkedIn	11.6%	27
Blogs	22.8%	53
Other (please specify) Show replies		13
answered question		232
skipped question		66

9. Do you regularly receive Facebook and Twitter updates on your cell/smart phone?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	25.9%	76
No	74.1%	218
answered question		294
skipped question		4

10. If there was an app for NSPE which of the following would you like it to include?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Blogs	21.8%	50
News Feeds	56.8%	130
Daily Email Blast information	30.1%	69
Twitter Feeds	7.4%	17
Facebook Feeds	13.5%	31
NSPE Web site (Simpler User Interface)	62.0%	142
	Other (please specify) Show replies	26
	answered question	229
	skipped question	69