

Item 9.1.3 Attachment

NSPE Membership Committee Delivery Systems, Communications and Technology Task Force Status Report 9/27/12

This status report is to summarize the work done to date by the Delivery Systems, Communications and Technology (“DCT”) Task Force to date. Members of the DCT are:

Tim Austin, PE, F.NSPE, Chairman (KS)	Stephen Loop, PE, F.NSPE (ID)
Kerry Cooley, PE (MN)	Fred Groth, PE (WI)
Roch Larochelle, PE (NH)	Kathryn Gray, PE, F.NSPE (IL)
Martha Darnton, PE (MI)	Lowell Dolney, PE (NE)
Gabriel Guzman, PE (PR)	Michel Sadaka, PE, F.NSPE (PA)
James Powell, PE (CA)	Steve Bassett, PE, F.NSPE (FL)
Dixon Tucker, PE (VA)	Alan Werner, PE, F.NSPE (WA)
David James, PE (NV)	Hardy Will, PE (NC)
Britt Smith, PE (MO)	Candy Toler, Exec Dir, Tennessee Society
Nancy McClain, Exec Dir, Michigan Society	

The mission of the DCT is 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 initial discussion 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. To date, there have been 3 conference calls with the DCT as a whole, and numerous conference calls of the various subcommittees.

Our activities are outlined below and the next actions we have identified for the DCT to take to accomplish its goals so that the board understands the general direction we are taking and can advise on any course corrections that may need to occur. Some of the subcommittees are progressing at a faster pace than others at this juncture, so final coordination and recommendations of the DCT have not been fully vetted and remain undeveloped.

Social Media. Members assigned to this subcommittee are Kerry Cooley, Martha Darnton, Roch Larochelle, Alan Werner and James Powell.

Items considered/discussed:

1. This committee will examine if Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, blogs and other social media opportunities should be or can be effectively utilized to communicate with the membership.
2. Consideration will also be given to whether advertising opportunities exist.
3. Currently NSPE has a facebook and LinkedIn pages but they don’t appear to be utilized effectively. LinkedIn is not “owned” by NSPE but is (sentence not completed).
4. Are there other social media opportunities?
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 you?
 - 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?

Summary:

The social media subcommittee was tasked with analyzing the different social media platforms available and how they can reach NSPE members and potential new members. 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. A survey was developed to gather further information about how our members use our social media platforms. In the coming weeks with the survey results, we are hoping to make a recommendation to the board for which websites we would like to put effort into as an organization, whether or not we would like to pursue an app and possible suggestions of changes to the NSPE website and blogs.

Emails Members assigned to this subcommittee are Dixon Tucker, Kathryn Gray, Stephen Loop, and Lowell Dolney.

Items considered/discussed:

1. What emails such as Daily Design, Engineering Press Review, NSPE Update, and Interest Group 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), PE Update and Interest Group(s)
 - a. Are these perceived as value
 - 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. Prepare a survey and determine 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 the survey go to ALL or a sample of members, how large a distribution?
13. It would go to a sampling of the membership (National staff indicated that they have numbers for various confidence levels).
14. There is one question about how members 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. As a government regulator in the potable water industry most technical stuff comes from other organizations. NSPE should not try to address 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 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? (Done) 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. (These numbers have been provided by staff.)
17. What are 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 may find some good engineering-related news items.
19. Demographics (who is responding to the survey as well as their opinions.)

Summary:

The Emails subcommittee was tasked with analyzing the different email communications sent periodically by NSPE. A survey was developed to gather further information about the effectiveness and value of the emails. 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. With the survey results, we are hoping to make a recommendation to the board for possible changes to the use of the daily emails.

PE Magazine. Members assigned to this subcommittee are Michel Sadaka, Candy Toler, Steve Bassett and Hardy Willis.

Items considered/discussed:

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?

Summary:

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. One of the first issues we encountered was 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. Reallocate resources, not be exclusive to members, and use social media sites.

That is the basis of the points listed below:

- Make the assumption that everyone will receive PE Magazine electronically;
- 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 a complementary hard copy to state licensing boards, engineering deans, and overseas

recipients;

- Even with assuming TOTAL loss of advertising revenue (which we don't believe will happen), NSPE will realize net savings of about \$200,000 in switching from a printed to an electronic magazine;
- 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);
- Consider reorganizing NSPE staff to include PR and PE Magazine under the same umbrella department – maybe Communications? Establish a Communications Department in charge of developing and distributing NSPE's communication content and message.

NSPE Website. Members assigned to this subcommittee are Tim Austin, Britt Smith, David James, Nancy McClain, Fred Groth, and Gabriel Guzman.

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?

Summary:

The NSPE Website subcommittee was tasked with evaluating the NSPE website to determine its user friendliness and effectiveness. 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.

Meetings and Seminars. Members assigned to this subcommittee are Tim Austin, Britt Smith, David James, Nancy McClain, Fred Groth, and Gabriel Guzman.

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 (sentence not completed).

Summary:

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. As the annual meeting is currently being reviewed by other task forces in more depth, the committee felt that no further action was necessary on this matter by this subcommittee. 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 be possibly be reduced as the number of individual state visits would be reduced and consolidated with the regional meetings.