The VIEWS Print Survey was shared with RID membership on Oct 31st, 2017. Responses were collected through Nov 21st, 2017. For this survey report, we analyzed both the multiple choice responses and the open-ended/optional responses from the VIEWS Print Survey.

This analysis is divided into three sections: 1) **Weaknesses of the survey**, which explains shortcomings in our methodology which may influence results; 2) **Results**, which shows the data broken down into categories and visualized to compare and analyze responses; 3) **Implementations**, which provides more information on the status of RID’s budget for publications and explains how the RID Communications Staff plans to address many of the concerns from the respondents about member benefits.

1) **Weaknesses of the survey:**
- The survey did not collect respondents’ membership number, meaning some participants could have taken the survey twice or not had current membership.
- The survey attracted participants with inherent bias, as they are those with hyper-attention to and strong feelings about the issue of VIEWS being available in print format.
- The survey platform collected responses from incomplete surveys. This means that while 555 surveys were opened TO BE taken, 441 surveys were actually completed in their entirety (81%).
- Question 8 from the survey was not clear to many respondents - mixed and irrelevant responses were collected. Thus the report for that question is solely a textual analysis.
2) Results:

Q1: What type of member are you?
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Summary: More than half of the respondents maintain previously offered certifications. This gives us an idea of the respondent demographic since many of these certifications were not offered after 1988. Those with CI/CT-only represent a demographic who received certification between 1988 and 2008. Further in this report, we cross-reference the data by categorizing respondents based on their earliest-offered certification. By doing this, we can approximate how long each group has been involved with RID. Those with older certifications have a longer history with RID and its publications, including VIEWS as a black and white, print copy that was mailed to the entire membership. This demographic information is relevant because a participant’s history with the organization may shape their responses to the survey.
Q2: Do you feel that the digital publication VIEWS meets your needs as a reader/interpreter/stakeholder?

Summary: 59% of participants said that VIEWS did not meet their needs. In the open response, these comments broke down into several categories, including: digital VIEWS was harder to read on screen or access through our publishing platform Issuu, the VIEWS release was often lost in their inbox, and the printed VIEWS was simply preferable. A significant number (41%) did feel that VIEWS met their needs, and the supporting reasons given were that VIEWS is bilingual and so available in ASL, and that VIEWS is “green”, having a positive environmental/economical impact.
Q3: Rate the significance of VIEWS and its content as a valuable membership benefit.

Summary: The majority of respondents feel that VIEWS is “very” or “rather” significant as a membership benefit. These responses may pertain to the publication as it is currently or to its potential for providing content. In other words, this gauge allows RID to determine the worth of VIEWS publication efforts now and in the future in the eyes of the membership, which remains strong.
Q4: Would you be more excited for the release of the quarterly publication VIEWS if there was an option to have it in print as well as online?

Summary: In total, 64.7% of survey respondents answered that they would prefer a printed version of VIEWS. However, 78% of these indicated their preference “only if no additional cost to me”. A quarter of respondents said they would not prefer a printed version of VIEWS. The cross-reference with certification types shows that both NIC and CI/CT certified members were twice as likely to say they prefer a print VIEWS if it was no additional cost.
Q5: Were you aware of the PDF download option available from the Issuu app?

Summary: There was a fairly even split between those who were and were not aware of being able to download the PDF of VIEWS from the Issuu platform. In the open response for this question, the strong majority of those who did know about the PDF option said they had not printed it either because they did not have a printer or because they did not want to use the paper/ink.
Q6: Rank these potential formats for a print version of VIEWS from most preferred to least preferred

Summary: When ranking their most preferred method of reading VIEWS, approximately 50% of respondents stated full-color bound magazine, followed by PDF at 30%. However, of all the respondents who weighed in on the option to print the PDF version, 40% said it was not preferred. Spiral-bound economy print and black & white print were both preferred or somewhat preferred in the 30-40% range. Of those who gave an open response, 36% gave their support for black & white print and 30% advocated for staying digital.
Q7: If the individuals who wish to have a more formal version of the printed VIEWS (not in the printable PDF form currently available) were asked to defray the cost of printing, which option would you find the most acceptable?

Summary: Given the premise that members would defray the cost of printing VIEWS, an annual subscription option was most acceptable at 45% of respondents, followed by the option to print the PDF from home (25%). Print on demand was not an acceptable option, with only 6% of respondents. 22% of respondents suggested another option. Of these, the large majority (60%) expressed that printed VIEWS should be covered by membership dues - this write-in response factored out to 13% of total respondents. Almost 50% of those who said they wanted VIEWS included in dues had CI/CT certifications. Where approximately half the number of Older certifications and CI/CT respondents wanted VIEWS included in dues as opposed to PDF, only one-fourth of NIC respondents wanted VIEWS included in dues versus PDF.
Q8: If VIEWS were to be a printed item, the ASL version would no longer be available simultaneously alongside the English text. The videos would still be available via the electronic edition, and on Youtube. Do you feel that having the printed VIEWS would in any way take away from the ASL component? How could we resolve the problem that a printed VIEWS would ultimately take away from the ASL bilingual component?

Summary: This question was entirely open ended. The responses proved problematic because about 15% of participants did not seem to understand the question. They supposed that by offering printed VIEWS, the ASL component would be discontinued, or vice versa. However, 53% of the coded responses expressed that they did not feel there was a conflict in offering print if the ASL component was available online. Additional responses to this question and to other open-ended questions in the survey were analyzed for suggestions, solutions, or insightful perspectives offered by members. These responses are represented in the sections below.

3) Implementations: What’s Next?

This section offers more detailed explanation about the VIEWS digital transition (namely, Finances, Statistics, and Bilingualism) and Solutions that are in place or in process to facilitate member engagement with VIEWS.

Finances - When VIEWS was printed, nearly $100K per year was delegated to printing costs - that’s equivalent to the entire dues of 500 members.

*Information provided by Jennifer Apple, Director of Finance and Operations*

In FY15, the last year of printed VIEWS, printing for four issues was budgeted at $55,000, while postage was budgeted at $38,000. The total cost and net revenue from VIEWS can be seen in the FY15 annual report:

| VIEWS Advertising and Subscriptions | Income 7,892 | Expenses 131,536 | Net (123,644) |

The loss shown above is primarily due to a loss of VIEWS revenue (advertising) and inconsistent publishing schedules, coupled with ongoing staffing and overhead costs. This loss was absorbed by the larger organizational budget thanks to member dues. In
the following year, FY16, these budget items for printed VIEWS were zeroed out as we went digital, freeing up resources for other programs. FY16 was the NOLA conference and RID had a sizeable loss that year to cover as a result ($197,301). Regardless, RID was able to end FY16 with a net profit of $48,893, due in part to the many cutbacks made in spending, including VIEWS.

Here is the calculated program-level performance from VIEWS since 2015: a loss of ($123,644) in FY15, a loss of ($18,582) in FY16, and a loss of ($60,814) in FY17. Note that FY16 only produced one issue of VIEWS, which was the first digital issue. The chart below shows advertising income from VIEWS.

The zero-based budgeting approach implemented in FY17 calls for programs like VIEWS to be self-sustaining and cost effective. This new budget makes programs “earn their keep” and is complimented by active budget management, which makes specific allocations from programs with a surplus to programs that may operate with a deficit out of necessity. Zero-based budgeting ultimately increases the total organizational value to stakeholders.

The decision to stop printing VIEWS allowed resources to free up at a time when RID was in financial transition. It also allowed staff an opportunity to focus on providing a more interactive, responsive, and member-focused platform for the publication. In order to help VIEWS become self-sustaining, staff are implementing strategies to increase revenue by advertising more creatively and are rebuilding partnerships with stakeholders in the community. The digital transition of VIEWS coincided with the 2015
member motion for the bilingual publication of VIEWS and the JOI, and has put VIEWS in a position to be more relevant to readers and deliver long-term results in the fast-changing technology landscape.

Statistics - With the transition to digital, we are now able to track our readers and find what makes them click!

   a. “I feel that VIEWS going digital has decreased the number of articles published.”
   b. “I know people used to contribute to Views because publication in a print edition carried prestige. Now, people don't care about contributing anymore.”
   c. “Is there data about how many people click through to the ASL version currently?”
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Articles per issue has seen a slight decrease from the beginning of 2012. There was a spike in activity in VIEWS during 2014, but this was coupled with less frequent publications. Overall, VIEWS had 18-20 articles in the issues that ran 5-6 years ago, and has about 13-15 articles in current issues. Some of the more recent published articles are rather content heavy, so the issue has a larger page count despite a lower number of articles, as you can see by the divergence of the two lines at the right side of the graph. You can also see severe dips in page and article counts during transitional periods in Headquarters Communications Staff. Our ultimate goal is to maintain at least
15 different pieces of interest with more regular updates from RID partners, member sections, and columnists, and to keep the publication around 40-50 pages.

This chart shows the engagement with VIEWS since being distributed through digital channels. The readership, or those who open the VIEWS release in Mailchimp, remains steady at about 5500, or just above one-third of the membership. The number of those who use the digital platform Issuu was very high in the first simultaneous release of VIEWS (Spring 2017) and has evened out to about 2500. While this digital platform is not ideal to many members, it allows for a more engaging interface should they want it, with highlighted links and embedded videos. In order to improve overall readership of the magazine, we are providing as many access points as possible, through online articles, Youtube playlists, and the PDF file.

**Bilingualism - We aren’t just meeting the status quo for ASL/English publishing - we’re magnifying the field!**

a. “I think it is nice to have the ASL and English right next to each other and I am more likely to watch the videos if they are right there in view.”

b. “Ideally, I would like to see an ASL only space developed. Similar to what is happening in the research and texts regarding academic ASL, I would like to see a space where people think and produce in ASL, not with a target of English, or a translation of the english text. What would happen, if native users were given the option of thinking and creating in an English free space? It could be pretty amazing.”
There is no other established publication in the world that is producing English and ASL. While there are numerous single articles and essays being produced, VIEWS is unique in that it compiles these resources thematically and regularly. We are working toward enriching the bilingual content by involving members of the Deaf community.

Solutions Taking Place:

1. We have included the direct PDF link in the Mailchimp release of VIEWS, so that members can download with one click.
   a. “It would nice if when it is published we receive a link to the latest Views to access it, as well as, info on how to access previous copies of the views.”
   b. “Difficult to access. Get emails from the publication company that never have anything to do with VIEWS.”

2. We have included the link to Issuu on your Member Portal, under the Subscriptions tab, where you can see each new issue of VIEWS.
   a. “It would be nice to have a icon to directly connect to VIEWS on our member login page-like where CEUs and other tabs are located.”

3. We have also included the direct link to the VIEWS archives in the Mailchimp release, and are working toward making the archives a better member benefit, including searchable issues and articles - stay tuned for these improvements!
   a. “I find the archives difficult to navigate.”
   b. “Is not easily accessible when conducting research.”

4. We are making select articles into PDFs and web articles that can be viewed online and shared through social media with students and colleagues.
   a. “I would like to see VIEWS shared publicly so that interested stakeholders can lead more about the interpreting field. I don't think VIEWS should only be for members.”
   b. “Instead of a whole magazine of content send more frequent member newsletters (w/ video ) like Street Leverage sends their articles.”

5. We have created hashtags for our individual articles so that we can continue the intellectual discourse of VIEWS on social media.
   a. “Readers should be encouraged to blog their videos in response to the printed articles on the RID Facebook page.”
6. We have curated a Youtube playlist with the full issue of VIEWS in ASL, and included that link in the Mailchimp release.

7. We are expanding our contributors and columns in VIEWS to include more diverse authors and perspectives, more research-based articles, more discussion of lived experiences, and more throwback articles to past issues of VIEWS.
   a. “I enjoy the articles more than updates of what’s going on, because I often get lost in the number of emails that I have coming in…”
   b. “I am more concerned about the content than I am about the format in which it is delivered. I would love to see more scholarly articles, innovative research, DATA (about anything interpreting related).”

8. We are implementing internal strategies to enhance tangible member benefits across all programs and services. You will see more member-focused campaigns coming to you in the coming year!