



REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDY

Commissioned by RPH Australia
The peak body for the national RPH Network

Maria Issaris Walsh April 2017

Access to broadcast media allows communities access to the mainstream conversation.....

This is achieved through strengthened communities that arise from authentic conversations catalysed by fair and meaningful access to broadcast media.

(Excerpt from the Community Broadcasting Sector mission statement)

Credits

Research and writing

Maria Issaris Walsh

+61 422827913

Maraiissaris@icloud.com

Administration, Design and Layout

Siobhan Wakely

Siobhan_wakely@hotmail.com

Danny Chifley

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	6
OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	6
BACKGROUND ISSUES	7
How the RPH Network Operates.....	7
How RPH Protocols Work	8
RPH Network Funding.....	8
APPROACH TO THE STUDY	10
2. NOTES ON INTERPRETING THIS REPORT	11
History of RPH Content Funding	11
Policy Changes to RPH Content Grant 2008, and National Sponsorship Scheme (NSS).	12
Diminution of RPH Content Grant Applicants – Assumptions	13
Range Of Stations Included in the Study	14
Accuracy of Records	15
3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
4. STATISTICAL DATA AND TABLES	19
Description of Table 1 - CBF Grants for RPH 1999-2016	19
Description of Table 2 - RPH Content Funding By Year and Station.....	21
Description of Table 3 - RPH Funding, Programming and NSS Earnings.....	22
5. QUALITATIVE DATA - INTERVIEWS WITH STATIONS	26
High Response Rate and Interest in Relating RPH Stories	26
RPH Programming Highly Valued As a Community Radio Service	26
Local RPH Audience Identified and Served	27

RPH Protocols Open to Interpretation	28
RPH Programming 'Resource Hungry' and Requiring High Levels of Management	28
RPH Programming Valued As a Local News Service	29
Relationship with Local Newspapers an Issue in Regional Australia	30
Funding Anomalies.....	30
Interest Shown In Further RPH and Disability Related Programming	30
Readers for RPH Programming – ‘A Different Type of Radio Person’	31
6. SUMMARY OF STATION INTERVIEWS	33
Papers Read (List of Papers Read From Around the Country).....	33
Training/RPH Communication Received	34
Adherence to RPH Protocols -	34
Reason For RPH Program - What Role Does It Play In Your Programming?.....	35
Who Is Listening – Local Audiences	36
Would You Always Include It or Is It Expendable?.....	37
Problems with Running RPH Programming	38
Relationship with Local Newspaper?	39
Other Disability Related Programs	39
Value of NSS Sponsorship	40
7. SUMMARY OF CBF GRANTS FOR RPH CONTENT	41
8. ATTACHMENTS	47
1. RPH AUSTRALIA	
Protocol for RPH Broadcasting (RPH Protocol)	47
RPH Programming Allied Documents	50
2. STATION INTERVIEW TEMPLATE	54

Glossary of terms

ACMA	Australian Communications and Media Authority
CBAA	Community Broadcasting Association of Australia – peak body for the community broadcasting sector
CBF	Community Broadcasting Foundation – Funding body for the community broadcasting sector
CDF	Content Development Fund (Community Radio)
CMTO	Community Media Training Organisation
CRN	Community Radio Network
NSS	National Sponsorship Scheme
RPH Australia	Peak body for RPH Radio Reading Network
RPHGAC	RPH Grants Advisory Committee (CBF)
SRO	Sector Representative Organisation
VA	VA – Vision Australia - RPH Network partner organisation which manages several RPH Stations

Station Call Signs

Call sign	Preferred name	Website
2BLU/2RBM	Radio Blue Mountains	www.rbm.org.au
2GLF	89.3FM 2GLF	www.893fm.com.au
2MCE	2MCE FM	www.2mce.org
2NUR	2NUR FM	www.2nurfm.com
3BBB	Voice FM	voicefm.com.au
3CH	Highlands FM	www.highlandsfm.org.au
3GCR	Gippsland FM	www.gippslandfm.org.au
3MCR	Radio Mansfield 99.7	www.radiomansfield.org.au
3MFM	3MFM	3mfm.com.au
3OCR	OCR FM	www.ocrfm.org.au
3OKR	OKR FM Mitchell Community Radio	www.okrfm.com.au
3RUM	Radio Upper Murray	www.radiouppermurray.com
3UGE	UG FM	www.ugfm.org
3VKV	Alpine Radio	www.alpineradio.com.au
3YYR	94.7 The Pulse	www.947thepulse.com
4CCR	Cairns FM 89.1	www.cairnsfm891.org.au
4DDB	102.7FM	www.102point7fm.com.au
4MIG	Rhema FM Mt Isa	
4NAG	NAG Radio	www.4nag.org.au
7LTN	City Park Radio	www.cityparkradio.com
8CCC	8CCC Community Radio	www.8ccc.com.au

1. Introduction

Since 1998 the RPH Radio Reading Network has accorded a proportion of its own annual funding to encourage and establish RPH programming to general community broadcasting stations in regional areas. The purpose of this decision has been to more widely serve the needs of its own community of interest i.e. people in the community with disabilities which limit their access to critical print media. In particular it was considered important to reach communities that were outside the broadcast range of the network itself.

In the period of time that the Content Funding for RPH programs has been available for non-RPH stations, (almost 20 years), there has also been a marked diminution in applications from general stations, resulting in no applications being received in 2016.

In 2016 the Community Broadcasting Foundation (CBF) granted funding to the RPH sector representative body - RPH Australia - to undertake a body of research which would assist in clarifying the current situation by reviewing the experience of the stations that have adopted RPH programs at some stage in their programming history.

The commissioning of this report is an effort by RPH Australia and the CBF to understand the diminution in applications for RPH grants, define what has worked for stations which have been successful in developing and maintaining an RPH program, and delineating any process that may encourage regional stations to adapt RPH programming.

The findings of the Study will also contribute to decisions being made about new policies regarding the granting of funds for RPH Content Development in the context of new processes being put in place by both the CBF and the RPH Network.

Objectives and Scope

The main objectives of the project are to:

- Undertake a Study to discover the number, location and funding status of RPH programs serving regional areas from within the broader community broadcasting sector.

- Gather information which describes the range of programs being categorised and broadcast as RPH programs, as a basis for determining the adherence to current protocols.
- Gather information regarding the degree to which program makers believe the content is useful to listeners, and suggestions for content improvement.
- Discover and describe the degree to which stations and communities support the programs.
- Produce a written report to RPH Australia that will act as an informative basis for further decision-making regarding development of content in regional areas, introduction of training and national standards for future RPH program makers, and other funding matters.
- Make recommendations based on the findings of the Study.

Background Issues

i) How the RPH Network Operates

The RPH Radio Reading Service is unique in the community broadcasting sector for the following reasons:

- It is a dedicated network of 18 radio stations, with a combined reach of 70% of the Australian population via its satellite system and transmission services.
- The network has one purpose - to provide a reading service for people with disabilities. It's main 'community of interest' is people with a disability which limits their access to published material, and therefore their access to information which facilitates full participation in Australian society. The key element of this service is reading from newspapers which are local to the broadcasting station.
- Secondary target listeners are those unable to access published material due to their circumstances (isolation, carer status, poverty etc.). A third category is comprised of people who are 'eyes busy' - that is, engaged in occupations which limit their opportunities to read - e.g. truck and cab drivers, tradespeople, farmers etc.
- Membership to the RPH Australia board (the peak body for the Network), is comprised of members of the Network only. It is therefore self-regulating and self-managing.
- The RPH Network is the only network of stations in the community broadcasting sector whose primary purpose is to serve people with a disability. It therefore

bridges the gap between the disability sector and the community broadcasting sector.

A recent study commissioned by RPH Australia estimates that there are almost 5 million people in Australia who have what is referred to as a 'print disability' ie a disability which inhibits access to published material. The range of conditions is very wide and includes dyslexia, attention deficit issues, literacy, vision impairment, arthritis, muscular dystrophy, English-as-a-second-language etc. (*Secondary Research to determine size of the national print disabled audience*, IPSOS, 2014).

ii) How RPH Protocols work

The RPH Network has a set of Protocols which defines the importance of providing a reading service with integrity i.e. reading articles without political comment by way of opinion or emphasis. These Protocols are the premise for qualification as an RPH station in that they provide an unbiased 'reading' of material and therefore accord to the listener equal access to information as a reader of the same material, and unfiltered by views, editing, or commentary (neither overt nor covert). These Protocols are published on the RPH Australia website and are adhered to by all RPH stations. (Refer Attachment 1)

The main objectives of the Protocols are to:

- Ensure that the RPH network's community of interest (those with a print disability) are optimally served
- Define and characterise RPH programming and
- Establish the basis for RPH community broadcast licensing

iii) RPH Network Funding

An important premise for reading this report is an understanding of how RPH funding works within the community broadcasting sector.

In terms of federal funding, the RPH network has a proportion of funding preserved from the pool of total funding received from the appropriate federal body governing community broadcasting. Once the decision is made at CBF Board level as to the proportion of total funds that RPH Network will be allocated, each of the RPH member stations applies for grants to cover a variety of appropriate operational, transmission and management projects for that year.

A separate application is made by the 'sector representative organisation' (SRO) the peak body RPH Australia. Factored into the allocations for each station, is the proportion of funds which are to be granted to non-RPH stations which are wanting to support, develop or initiate an RPH-type program. Each successful application in this category is deducted from the overall amount preserved for the RPH Network.

For the period being covered by this Study, advice for the allocation of grants to both RPH and non-RPH stations was provided by a standing committee of the CBF Board, the RPH Grants Advisory Committee (RPHGAC), members of which were nominated by RPH Australia.

Following a major review of the CBF in 2016, the processes for allocations has changed. However, for the purposes of this Report the processes in place covering the period being considered in the Study will be referred to.

Table 1 describes the pattern of RPH grant allocations over the period 1998 to 2016.

Each station in the Network is responsible for obtaining funds from other sources - a mix of local and state sponsorship and grants cover actual costs, ensure sustainability and fulfil strategic objectives.

In addition, **since 2005 RPH Australia has negotiated and managed a centralised sponsorship arrangement with the federal government advertising agencies (primarily Mitchell's), referred to as the National Sponsorship Scheme (NSS).**

These are comprised of government messages directed towards people with disabilities. Messaging and related earnings are distributed to RPH stations in accordance with factors such as frequency of advertising and size/density of licensing area. RPH Australia included select generalist stations which were broadcasting RPH programs in the Scheme - a mutually beneficial arrangement providing the general stations with additional income, and the RPH Network with a greater reach.

It is important to note that **in 2010/11 an additional specific allocation of content funding was made by the government to specialised community radio services** as follows:

'The 2011/12 Federal Budget announced \$3 million per annum in additional content funding to the Community Broadcasting Foundation (CBF). The funding is distributed with \$1.5 million allocated to the Community Radio Content Development Fund

(CDF) and \$1.5 million allocated to support content for Ethnic, Indigenous and Radio for the Print Handicapped (RPH) programs each year.' (Review of Content Development Funding Report, July 2014, referred to as CDF Review).

Initially, 25% of the \$1.5 million was granted to the RPH Network. Table 1 maps the distribution of extra funding directly to the RPH Network over the ensuing years. This is mentioned as it places a context for the Tables below and also for the development of policies relating to grants for stations outside the RPH Network.

Approach to the Study

i) The majority of the objectives for this Report are prescribed by the need to analyse two sets of data:

- Financial and historic data available over almost 20 years of running the program
- Experiential data to be derived from qualitative analysis of interviews with relevant stations and people in the sector

ii) The following components constituted the research methodology:

- Review of documentation and Reports available from CBF and RPH Australia relating to management and policy structure of the RPH Content Development Grants
- Site visits to the five major non-RPH regional stations involved in the NSS - which had long-standing RPH programming in place
- Telephone interviews with 11 stations which had received RPH grants in the past and willing/able to participate
- Interviews with key people involved in the delivery, management or shaping of the RPH Grants
- Web search for RPH programs being delivered by regional stations (analysis of station programs)

A questionnaire was developed which formed the basis of interviews for participating stations which is included in this report (Attachment 2)

2. Notes on interpreting this Report

i) History of RPH Content Funding

Over the 20-year period that content funding for RPH programming has been in place, the sector itself, including the RPH Network has grown, changed and evolved. A number of factors have impacted on the distribution of funds to 'seed' RPH programming in regional areas outside the reach of the Network of 18 stations dedicated to RPH content.

An unchanged feature however has been that the funding system in place has required all 'seed funding' to be extracted from the RPH dedicated pool of funds, meaning that any funds provided for non-RPH stations would diminish the amount made available to the Network itself.

Inherent therefore has been the tension caused by the conflicting imperatives to extend RPH programming to the growing demographic who would benefit (nearly 5 million Australians), and to maximise the sustainability and effectiveness of the Network itself.

This scenario changed slightly when an extra component of Content Development specifically for RPH content was provided by the federal government in 2011/12. By this time however policy had been put in place to minimise the impact of the 'seed funding' on the Network by way of placing caps on time (2 years maximum for any one station), and annual amounts (each station capped at \$2600 funds per annum, and each year capped at a maximum of \$15,000 from total RPH funds). Stations which had been frequently on the RPH Grants system were rendered ineligible. These ineligible stations were compensated by being included on the National Sponsorship Scheme (NSS) which reaped a greater level of earnings for participating stations than the RPH Grants (this is apparent in Table 3).

As a final element, the RPH Network preserved its funding and resources by retreating from providing support and training to non-RPH stations. These were provided as a matter of policy until about 2000, after which such training and support was ad hoc, and successful RPH grant applicants were provided with declining levels of communication with RPH.

Currently, stations appear to be provided with limited amounts of literature regarding RPH, and guidelines on program presentation. Where support has been provided in recent years (in the case of regional Victoria), it was at the discretion of an associated local RPH station independently of the Network. This support was quickly withdrawn when the resource drain was identified by the larger metropolitan RPH body.

ii) Policy Changes to RPH Content Grant 2008, and National Sponsorship Scheme (NSS).

A background issue of importance for understanding this Report is the policy change in 2008 regarding allocation of RPH content funds to non-RPH stations. From 1998 until 2007, non-RPH stations could apply for RPH grant funding via the CBF on a continuous basis. That is, once they had established the RPH programming, further grants could be applied for, to assist in sustaining the program. There was no cap set as to the degree of support or number of stations to be supported this way.

Concurrently, RPH Australia had negotiated positive terms for dissemination of Australian government messages to the RPH community via the Network ie paid sponsorship that would utilise the broadcasting services of the national network. Included in this offering were a selection of regional general stations which filled the broadcasting gaps (initially 2MCE, 2BLU, 4DDB, 4CCR and 8CCC - and subsequently with 3BBB and 4MIG added to the mix).

In 2006, RPH Australia initiated discussions with the CBF and its standing committee, the RPHGAC, regarding the policy for grant allocations to non-metropolitan generalist stations seeking RPH content funding.

By 2008 the following recommendations were adopted:

- RPH Grants for 'seeding' RPH programming in general regional stations were capped at \$2600 per annum and limited to 2 years.
- An invitation to join the NSS would be offered to stations which had adapted RPH programming as part of their schedule for 2 years.
- Stations which were part of the NSS were rendered ineligible for RPH content Grants
- RPH Grants in this category would be capped overall at an annual limit of \$15,000.

The rationale for these changes was based on maximising the use of the funds for

'seeding' new programs rather than supporting existing programs. It was pointed out that earnings from the NSS far exceeded the RPH content Grants, and would in effect support the continuation of the RPH program.

'The committee felt that these proposed changes would result in both a greater level of funding being available to generalist stations broadcasting RPH programming, and encourage increased levels of RPH programming on stations in areas where a dedicated RPH service does not exist.' (Excerpt from CBF Board paper recommendations, as advised by the RPHGAC).

The implementation of these policies rendered most RPH applications in that year (2007/8) ineligible (refer Table 2).

By 2010/11 the following measures had been put in place:

- Tightening of conditions for application for RPH content funding
- Limits placed on annual funding for non-RPH stations
- Bundling of non-RPH stations successfully producing RPH programming into the NSS (i.e. not appearing in CBF Reports etc.)
- Withdrawal/non-offer of support and training for successful RPH grant applicants

The combined effect of these actions seemingly rendered the RPH content development funding as unattainable and less visible to the rest of the community broadcasting sector. The number of applicants diminished markedly after that point (having been transferred to the NSS); their names and the RPH component of grant applications were not on record in the CBF Reports. By 2010/11 there were no applications received, and this position was not recovered despite a letter of invitation from the Chair, RPH Australia in April 2012 to all non-metropolitan stations outside of the RPH Network reach, and despite efforts made by the CBF to highlight the very few successful applicants in the CBF Annual Reports.

The fact that the NSS is an internal process that is not made apparent to the sector, contributes to this apparent 'invisibility' of RPH Program-producing general stations.

iii) Diminution of RPH Content Grant Applicants – Assumptions

Both CBF and RPH representatives have separately surmised that the reasons for this diminution have been a combination of:

- The 'need' for RPH content in the community broadcasting sector has been saturated (all the stations which were desiring or had capacity to produce RPH programming have done so)
- The cap on the amount available for funding (currently about \$568 per annum) is not an incentive unless a station is intent on producing RPH programming for its own sake. Prior to 2008, stations were commonly applying for up to \$2600 per annum.

The main 'drivers' for RPH content funding were considered to be:

- Prior to 2008 - the funding available was an incentive.
- A sense of equity (serve people with disabilities)
- Provision of a local news service in a way which did not require 'reportage', editing skills etc.

These issues have been factored into the interview questionnaire to test their validity (Attachment 2).

iv) Range of stations included in the Study

At the time of embarking on the study the only stations of which it was certain there were regular and continuous RPH programming were those which were members of the NSS (as these stations were required to affirm the number of hours per week of RPH programming in order to receive earnings). It was not known how many or which of the remaining stations still had active RPH programming emanating from the RPH grants, nor the degree to which these programs, if any, adhered to RPH protocols.

It was considered equally important to understand the reasons why RPH programming was not maintained, as it was to understand the reasons why it was maintained. Therefore, it was decided that contact would be attempted with every relevant station which was willing to participate.

An attempt was made to contact each of the stations considered relevant to this study by telephone and email ie all stations provided with an RPH grant since 1998.

5 stations were visited for face-to face interviews (2BLU, 2MCE, 3BBB, 3OCR and 4DDB).

A further 11 stations were interviewed by phone (2GLF, 2NUR, 3GCR, 3VKV, 3MFM, 3OKR, 3RUM, 3UGE, 4CCR, 7LTN, 8CCC.)

4 stations of the 20 contacted were unable to be interviewed: 4NAG, 4MIG and 3MCR did not respond to either email or phone messages. 3CH did not have any contact details online or on the CBAA website. 4MIG had ceased operations. 4 NAG did not respond, however had a program called *Mid Week Magazine* listed on their online schedule of programs, which was a reading of the local paper. This program was reviewed by streaming and a summation of the program added to this Study. All stations not able to be contacted had any online content reviewed.

v) Accuracy of records

This Report is based on available documentation and one-on-one interviews. Differing accounts and records are evident, however these have been considered to be relatively minor, or are not considered to deflect from the general trend indicated by the results

3. Executive Summary and Recommendations

Below is a summary of key issues resulting from an analysis of the statistical and interview-based research carried out during January to March 2017, and recommendations made in response to those issues.

The key element underpinning these findings and recommendations is the highly positive feedback regarding RPH programming. Station interviewees included current Station Managers, long-term administrators and presenters of RPH programming. It was widely considered that RPH programming had a beneficial effect on the radio station (its reputation in the community), on the volunteer base, the RPH presenters (who were considered 'different and special' amongst the 'normal' broadcasters), and on the community it served.

The premise of this Study has been to create a platform of information for RPH Australia and the CBF to use as a way of better serving the needs of Australians with disabilities in regional areas via RPH programming.

RPH Australia believes it has set up a successful Network of stations and protocols that benefit this growing proportion of the Australian population. The challenge has been:

- to reach further into regional areas not currently covered by RPH stations,
- to extend its services into general stations which can also promote a better understanding of the way RPH programming affects and improves the lives of the very wide range of people affected by print disabilities

Of concern to both the CBF and RPH Australia has been the diminution of applications for the grant offered to produce and broadcast regular RPH programs in general community broadcasting stations. In the 20-year period since RPH Content Grants have been offered to general community stations, 21 stations have accepted the Grant and made efforts to implement RPH programming. 11 of those stations still currently run a version of RPH programming as an integral part of their schedule. 16 stations agreed to be interviewed about this programming.

The aim of the Study has been to discuss the experiences of these stations interviews and sort the information derived in a way which will contribute to policy making within RPH Australia and the CBF regarding the future implementation of an RPH Content Grant.

The recommendations below are based on the findings of this Study and address the issues that have been identified as being of concern to all participants in the RPH Content Grant process:

- RPH Content Grant system be promoted and encouraged by RPH Australia in tandem with CBF (similar language and elements of encouragement) presenting a combined approach and information systems. Elements of promotion would reflect the positive aspects highlighted by general stations programming RPH content.
- RPH Grant system be shaped to involve training, information systems, management systems and advice on how funding is to be used (equipment such as large screen monitors etc.).
- A page on CBF and RPH websites describe elements of grant (part funding, part training and systems development to facilitate RPH programming)
- CMTO or RPH Australia to provide trainers for implementation of RPH programs.
- Review the Protocols and decide on allowances for latitude and modification for use of RPH programming in non-RPH stations
- Address issues of communication and more properly describe the nature of alliance with stations providing RPH programming
- More clearly describe and reinforce the process of participation in NSS with non-RPH stations
- Permit funding to stations within RPH licensed areas that program different local news as a mix in their general program: prescribing conditions for this allowance (eg reading of different local papers to licensed RPH station) and requiring cross-promotional information and news so that RPH creates a web of connectivity with a large range and span of stations (thereby improving education on RPH mission and services). A requirement to promote the available RPH Station would also be a condition of the funding and programming.
- Consider a level of membership and associated fees for stations wishing to participate in developing and delivering RPH programming. (Levels - Certified RPH programming/Approved RPH programming/Approved disability programming etc). The fee would cover training costs and management systems for auditioning, advertising, rostering, protocol management etc). Funding for fees could be covered by RPH Content Grant
- Advice given by CBAA and RPH Australia on fostering good relationship with local newspaper (eg providing examples of SMH, The Age, current good

relationships with local appears and how they work for the benefit of both forms of media when collaboration occurs). RPH Australia/CBF could send communications to local publications advising them of RPH programming - the RPH mission and positive stories of collaborations between local papers and community radio/RPH programming (CBAA involvement

- Promote and deliver a series of RPH programs via RPH satellite - to interested stations wishing to provide services to people with disabilities (book-readings, national news etc). Alternatively a collaboration with CBAA regarding transfer of these programs onto the CRN.
- Establish a transparent process by which general RPH program broadcasters can possibly apply for participation in the National Sponsorship Scheme. This would create an element of competing for inclusion on the basis of adherence to the Protocols, and quality of programming.
- Establish a process by which RPH Australia reports on NSS sponsorship in CBF Reporting (in order to highlight RPH Network as a disability messaging provider).
- Inform and educate participating general stations of RPH developments and protocols. (E.g. proper terminology for people with disabilities, the non-use of the term Radio for Print Handicapped, etc.)
- RPH Grant system be reviewed by the CBF and RPH Australia with the purpose of putting in place policies and provisos reflecting these recommendations

4. STATISTICAL DATA AND TABLES

- **21 non-RPH regional stations have received RPH content funding** in the period 1998 to 2016 (inclusive), receiving a total of \$142K
- Half the stations (11 of the 21) have RPH type programs currently being broadcast as a result of RPH Grants.
- The highest amount granted in any one year has been \$18,460 (in 2002/3 financial year), providing grants for 8 stations and the lowest has been nil (2004/5; 2011/12, and 2016/17).
- The stations which have received the highest amount of support via the RPH Grant system have been 2MCE (9 grants totalling \$23,400 between 1998 and 2008), and 4DDB (9 grants totalling \$23,400 between 1998 and 2008), and 8CCC (7 grants totalling \$21,080 between 1999 and 2011)
- An additional (approximate minimum) \$220,643 was earned by regional stations participating in the NSS over that period of time
- The highest amount earned by a non-RPH Station included in the NSS is \$90,000 (2MCE, included since 2005), followed by 4DDB (\$40,297). The lowest is 3OCR (\$1,108).

Description of Table 1- CBF Funding to RPH 1999-2106

This Table shows the amount of funding distributed to the RPH Network via the CBF over the period of the Study, to place in context the amounts applied to non-RPH stations year by year.

Overall the RPH Network has received between 2% and 6.5% of total CBF funding. This proportion did not change with the influx of funds in 2011/12. The actual amounts however have tripled in that period of time, particularly after the 2011/12 funding attribution from the federal government for specialised sector organisations (Indigenous, RPH and Ethnic).

The proportion of funds provided to non-RPH stations from the RPH Network Funds has reduced markedly since 2008 and the introduction of new policies regarding RPH Content Development Grants. Since 2008 the percentage granted to non-RPH stations has ranged between 1% and 0.01% (average of 0.6%). The amount accorded to RPH Content Development to non-metropolitan general stations can be seen to be in inverse proportion to the increase in actual amounts provided to the Network.

Table 1: CBF Grants for RPH Radio Reading Network 1999-2016

Year	Total RPH funding by year	Total CBF Funding for year	RPH funding as proportions of total CBF Funding for year	Funding allocated to non-RPH stations	Non-RPH Station Funding as proportion of total RPH Funding for Year
1998/99	\$275,179	\$5,146,294	5.5%	\$10,920	4%
1999/2000	\$272,621	\$5,061,861	6.5%	\$12,220	4.5%
2000/01	\$271,040	\$5,476,870	5.0%	\$10,140	3.75%
2001/02	\$275,894	\$5,706,000	5.0%	\$9,620	3.5%
2002/03	\$289,110	\$5,762,253	5.0%	\$18,460	6.5%
2003/04	\$291,870	\$5,819,953	5.0%	\$16,120	5.5%
2004/05	\$302,525	\$6,732,340	4.5%	0	0
2005/06	\$308,010	\$8,877,050	3.5%	\$14,040	4.5%
2006/07	\$315,480	\$8,429,931	4.0%	\$14,040	4.5%
2007/08	\$322,540	\$10,218,052	3.0%	\$14,040	4.25%
2008/09	\$332,125	\$9,463,263	3.5%	\$3,250	1%
2009/10	\$347,065	\$14,084,065	2.5%	\$1,950	0.5%
2010/11	\$335,405	\$11,600,225	3.0%	\$6,900	2%
2011/12	\$344,485	\$15,719,563.00	2.0%	0	0
2012/13	\$722,740	\$13,556,515	5.5%	\$5,850	1%
2013/14	\$731,922	\$16,777,307	4.5%	\$3,838	0.5%
2014/15	\$704,914	\$17,607,547	4.0%	\$625	0.01%
2015/16	\$807,685	\$15,882,792	5%	\$650	0.08%

Description of Table 2 - RPH content funding by year and station

Table 2 provides an account of RPH Content Funding between 1998 and 2016 showing the pattern of distribution of amounts and recipients of funding for each year. The pattern shows a clear diminution in funds and stations following 2008 to the present day. The last column shows the proportion which RPH Content Funding represented of total RPH Funding from the CBF.

Table 2: RPH Content Funding by Year and Station

Year of Funding	Stations Funded	Total Amount funded for year	Percentage of Total RPH Funding for year
1998/99	2MCE, 2NUR, 3MCR, 3YYR, 4DDB	\$10,920	4% of \$275,179
1999/2000	2MCE, 3RUM, 3UGE, 4DDB, 7LTN, 8CCC	\$12,220	4.5% of \$272,621
2000/1	2BLU, 2MCE, 3MCR, 4DDB, 7LTN, 8CCC	\$10,140	3.75% of \$271,000
2001/2	2BLU, 2MCE, 3OCR, 4DDB, 7LTN	\$9,620	3.5% of \$275,894
2002/3	2MCE, 3CH, 3OCR, 3RUM, 4CCR, 4DDB, 7LTN, 8CCC	\$18,460	6.5% of \$289,110
2003/4	2BLU, 2MCE, 3BBB, 3OCR, 4CCR, 4DDB, 8CCC	\$16,120	5.5% of \$291,870
2004/5	No grants due to change in CBF allocation periods		0% of \$302,525
2005/6	2BLU, 2MCE, 3BBB, 4CCR, 4DDB, 4MIG, 8CCC	\$14,040	4.5% of \$308,010
2006/7	2BLU, 2MCE, 3BBB, 4CCR, 4DDB, 4MIG, 8CCC	\$14,040	4.5% of \$315,480
2007/8	2BLU, 2MCE, 3BBB, 3RUM, 4CCR, 4DDB, 4MIG	\$14,040	4.25% of \$322,540
2008/9	8CCC	\$3,250	1% of \$332,125
2009/10	3OCR	\$1,950	0.5% of \$347,065
2010/11	2GLF, 3MFM, 3OCR, 3RUM, 8CCC	\$6,900	2% of \$335,405
2011/12	No applications received	0	0% of \$720,485
2012/13	3CH, 3OKR, 3VKV, 4NAG	\$5,850	0.8% of \$722,740
2013/14	3VKV, 3MFM, 3CH	\$3,838	0.5% of \$731,922
2014/15	3GCR	\$625	0.08% of \$704,914
2015/16	3GCR	\$650	0.08% of \$807,685
2016/17	No applications received	0	0
	Total	\$142,663	

Description of Table 3 - RPH Funding, Programming and NSS earnings

Table 3 is an analysis of RPH programming, funding and sponsorships status of participating stations. Information has been sorted by Station showing number and monetary total of RPH Content Grants. In addition, the current status and brief history of the RPH program is shown (where this information was available). The last column provides known earnings for those stations which have participated in the National Sponsorship Scheme (NSS). Please note that these latter amounts are approximate only, as differing records exist.

The Table is meant to serve as a quick reference guide for the research findings in this report.

Table 3: Frequency of funding per station and NSS earnings					
	Station	Number of years funded	Total Monies Funded 1998 to 2016 (Inclusive)	RPH Programming status	National Sponsorship Scheme Earnings to date
1	2RBM (2BLU, Katoomba)	6	2000/01: \$520 2001/02: \$520 2003/04: \$520 2005/06: \$520 2006/07: \$520 2007/08: \$520 Total: \$3,120	Bi-weekly RPH programming RPH Programming per week since 2001 <i>Talking Newspaper</i> Team of 6	\$35,623.64
2	2MCE (Charles Sturt University, Bathurst)	9	1998/99: \$2600 1999/2000: \$2600 2000/01: \$2600 2001/02: \$2600 2002/03: \$2600 2003/04: \$2600 2005/06: \$2600 2006/07: \$2600 2007/08: \$2600 Total: \$23,400	Daily (Mon-Fri)RPH Programming <i>Talking Newspaper</i> program has run continuously since 1999. Team of 10	\$90,847
3	Voice FM	4	2003/04: \$2600 2005/06: \$2600 2006/07: \$2600	Daily (Mon-Friday) RPH Programming <i>RPH Hour</i> has run continuously	\$19,603.66

	(3BBB, Ballarat)		2007/08: \$2600 Total: \$10,400	since 2003. Team of almost 40.	
4	3OCR (Colac Community Radio)	5	2001/02: \$2600 2002/03: \$2600 2003/04: \$2600 2009/10: \$1950 2010/11: \$1950 Total: \$11,700	Bi-weekly RPH programming Biweekly RPH program. <i>Talking Newspaper</i> has run continuously since 2002. Team of 1-2.	\$1,108.29
5	4DDB (4DDB Toowoomba)	9	1998/99: \$2600 1999/2000: \$2600 2000/01: \$2600 2001/02: \$2600 2003/03: \$2600 2003/04: \$2600 2005/06: \$2600 2006/07: \$2600 2007/08: \$2600 Total: \$23,400	Daily RPH Programming Daily (Mon-Fri) RPH program has run continuously since 1999. <i>Morning News Hour</i> Team of 10.	\$40,297.25
6	4MIG (Mt Isa)	3	2005/06: \$520 2006/07: \$520 2007/08: \$520 Total: \$1,560	No current RPH programming Station ceased operations 2017. It is assumed to have had weekly readings of local paper for period of 11 years 2006-2017.	\$33,163.75
7	2GLF (Liverpool)	1	2010/11: \$650 Total: \$650	No current RPH programming Grant seeded RPH program which ran biweekly for three years ceasing in 2013/4. Ceased due to overlap with 2RPH license area rendering them ineligible for funding.	
8	2NUR	1	1998/99: \$2600 Total: \$2600	No current RPH programming. Grant received in 1999 and reading program in place for next 10 years approx. Ceased when 2RPH started covering Newcastle.	
9	3CH (Central Highlands previously 3RAM)	3	2002/03: \$2600 2012/13: \$1950 2013/14: \$588 Total: \$5,138	Not interviewed Unable to be contacted - no website or online program.	
10	3GCR (Gippsland Community Radio)	2	2014/15: \$625 2015/16: \$650 Total: \$1275	Weekly RPH programming. Grants supported RPH program instigated in 2011/12 by 3RPX (RPH Station Warragul). Currently broadcasting once a week <i>Red 2 U</i> . Team of 10	

11	3VKV (Alpine Radio)	3	2012/13: \$1300 2013/14: \$1300 Total: \$2,600	Bi-weekly RPH programming. Grants in 2012 and 2013 seeded news reading program ' <i>Radio for the Print Handicapped</i> ' scheduled bi-weekly and run continuously to present time.	
12	3MCR (Mansfield Community Radio)	2	1998/99: \$2600 2000/01: \$520 Total: \$3,120	Not interviewed. Grants received 1999 and 2001. Contact attempted via email. No news reading service evident from program.	
13	3MFM (South Gippsland)	2	2010/11: \$650 2013/14: 1950, Total: \$2,600	No current RPH programming. Grants received 2011 and 2014 supporting regular bi-weekly news reading program at instigation of Vision Australia (3RPX) Warragul. Ceased program in 2014 due to withdrawal of support from 3RPX.	
14	3OKR (Kilmore/Mitchell Community Station)	1	2012/13: \$650 Total: \$650	Weekly RPH program - Since 2012 have broadcast weekly news reading as part of ' <i>Brunch</i> ' program.	
15	3RUM (Upper Murray Community Radio)	4	1999/2000: \$2600 2002/03: \$2080 2007/08: \$2600 2010/11: \$900, Total: \$8180	Weekly RPH programming. Grants received between 2000 and 2011 supporting weekly news reading program continuously to present time. <i>Radio for Print Handicapped</i>	\$547.50 (to 2010)
16	3UGE	1	1999/2000: \$520 Total: \$520	Weekly RPH. programming ' <i>Vision Australia</i> ' has run continuously since 20007. Team of 5	
17	3YYR	1	1998/99: \$520 Total: \$520	Not interviewed. Geelong area covered by RPH stations. No apparent RPH programs.	
18	4CCR (Cairns Community Radio)	5	2002/03: \$2600 2003/04: \$2600 2005/06: \$2600 2006/07: \$2600 2007/08: \$2600 Total: \$ 13,000	No current RPH programming Grants seeded RPH program which ran continuously for 12 years. Dropped program in 2015 due to rostering problems.	\$16,715 (to 2012)
19	4NAG (Yeppoon)	1	2012/13: \$1,950 Total: \$1950	Weekly RPH-type programming Grant received 2013. Unable to be contacted however a news reading/commentary/music program – <i>Mid-Week Magazine</i> - is	

				broadcast weekly.	
20	7LTN (City Park Radio, Launceston)	4	1999/2000: \$1300 2000/01: \$1300 2001/02: \$1300 2002/03: \$1300 Total: \$5,200	Daily (Mon-Fri) RPH programming has run continuously since 1998 . Grants supported the program until 2003, when they were rendered ineligible by formation of 7RPH.	\$7,092 (to 2008)
21	8CCC (Alice Springs)	8	1999/2000: \$2600 2000/01: \$2600 2002/03: \$2080 2003/04: \$2600 2005/06: \$2600 2006/07: \$2600 2008/09: \$3250 2010/11: \$2750 Total: \$21,080	No current RPH programming. Grants supported RPH program for 12 years. Program dropped due to insufficient management resources to sustain.	\$5,439 (to 2009)
			Total Grants: \$142,663		\$250,437.09

.

.

5. Qualitative data – Interviews with Stations

- High response rate and interest in relating RPH stories

16 of the 21 stations in the Study were able to be contacted and details of these interviews form the basis of this Study. Most were keen to talk about the programming and the role it played in their program schedule. Of interest is that stations which did not continue with the programming were keen to express their views of the program. Of the five stations which had not continued, 4 expressed the desire to re-introduce the programs if they were given some form of support (e.g. training in protocols, auditions, rostering, administration etc.)

Three stations had ceased RPH programming due to conflict with licensing areas of RPH dedicated stations (7LTN in Launceston, 2NUR in Newcastle, and 2GLF in the outskirts of Sydney). Two of these stations were aggrieved that they received no support to continue their RPH programming. 7LTN has continued to provide Monday-Friday RPH programming (last grant received 2002/3) despite ineligibility for RPH grants or support being provided (due to introduction of the 7RPH station in Hobart). 2GLF continued producing an RPH program for 3 years before retiring the program due to lack of support for its administration.

8CCC and 4CCR had ceased RPH programming after many years of servicing the community with local newspaper reading (14 years and 12 years respectively) due to internal station issues unrelated to the popularity of the RPH programs, and more to do with the lack of resources to manage the programming. The notion of 'resource hungry' has been a common theme regarding RPH programming.

When contacted, stations were pleased to discuss RPH programming, and relate their experiences of the impact the programming has had on their volunteer base and community.

- RPH Programming highly valued as a community radio service

Half the stations which had received funding had maintained the program

regardless of funding, support or contact with RPH. The main reasons given were the understanding that the RPH programming was a vital community service. In half the cases, an indication was given that the true community value of the RPH services became apparent only after the broadcasting began.

Three of the stations had had programs reading the local newspaper prior to the RPH grant (prior to 1998). They originally applied for the grant to obtain support for what already existed. However the RPH grant provided them with training and a format in which to read, and the other stations seemed to echo a type of common theme.

Comments ranged from:

'Very important'

'We would never dare take it off air'.

'We keep it because our community wants it'

'We do it because it provides a service - it gives a voice to those who are under-represented'

'We consider it an important component of our programming'

'Always has been, always will be part of our programming'.

'This is definitely part of our programming! It is reaching different elements of our community.'

'It would always be part of our scheduling.'

Only one station would not reintroduce RPH programming - 2NUR after having broadcast the program for over 10 years - for very specific reasons: an RPH service in Sydney covered the Newcastle region and read the local paper; students at Newcastle University produced over 2000 news bulletins per annum exclusively for the station.

By broadcasting RPH programming, Stations became aware of how the service benefits the community, and had themselves become educated about different elements of their community which require the service (ie those with a disability or disadvantage).

- Local RPH audience identified and served

Most stations recognised who was listening to their RPH programs and were able to vary programming times and content to suit the needs of their listeners for RPH programming. For example two stations mentioned that they responded to requests from local nursing homes to change the time schedule to suit the residents' timetables.

The smaller communities in particular had ample feedback on listenership of RPH programming. This varied with each community but broadly fell into the RPH range in a regional context: those with disabilities (physical and mental), in nursing homes, housebound carers, elderly or disabled, and also those who 'could not afford a local paper'. It was also known that local businesses kept the station 'on' at the RPH programming slot (cafes, trade workshops etc) as well as those who were 'eyes busy' (drivers, farmers etc).

Non-metropolitan stations broadcasting RPH programs were in general able to obtain feedback from their communities in a very direct way (either calling in, or more typically, being stopped in the street and informed).

- RPH Protocols open to interpretation

Only two of the 16 stations interviewed/reviewed had kept to the strict RPH protocols. When questioned on the reasons for variation, most were not specifically aware of RPH protocols. The major variations were about editing journalism in local papers (to correct grammar, or censor language, or to 'make it readable'), and dealing with managing the information in a small town context (i.e. providing occasional commentary after each article). The most diverse interpretation of the Protocols were Stations which made the news reading as part of a 'magazine' format - i.e. playing music and giving commentary between reading of articles.

None of the stations interviewed showed an aversion to adhering more closely to the Protocols if they were known, and if they were given training as to the importance of the Protocols. However, there was a defence for providing commentary where it was not political in nature (ie encouraging or applauding some effort made in the community as highlighted in an article).

The minimal communication, training and support from RPH has resulted in a local adaptation and interpretation of the Protocols of the reading service.

- RPH Programming 'resource hungry' and requiring high levels of management

It was recognised by most stations in the study that **an RPH program required resources and good management systems in place to operate effectively.** 'Resource hungry', 'intense' and 'highly demanding of time and effort', were terms used to describe the process of putting in place the RPH program, and undertaking a

rostering system of readers.

In an ideal situation, a reading service program requires two readers, a producer and preparation time to select and cut-out articles so that they are read as a whole. Stations such as 3BBB for example, have a five-day-a-week reading service of the local news, which is undertaken by a team of 40 volunteers, has a team leader, training manual and its own rostering system within the station.

Most of the larger stations in the study were equipped to undertake the rostering system and the number of volunteers required to keep the program running according to the protocols. The smaller the station however, the more difficulties were experienced. In some cases, smaller stations relied on the interest and talents of one or two people to keep the program running (3OCR and 3OKR). In these cases, the Protocols were varied to the degree that it would be feasible for the small number involved to keep the program running.

Several stations expressed **disappointment that they were forced to drop the program when the logistics of keeping the program running strained their resources** (management, volunteer, administrative). An interesting case in point is 3GCR (Gippsland) and 3MFM (South Gippsland), both of which had an RPH program instigated by an RPH volunteer coordinator from the adjoining area of Warrigal. The RPH coordinator provided training and support in rostering systems. Once this support was removed by RPH (which was proving a drain on their own resources) the program at 3GCR was dropped. The program in 3MFM was continued on a reduced basis.

RPH programming is not considered 'expensive' to run in dollar terms, but is considered costly in terms of requiring a high level of administrative, volunteer and management resources.

- **RPH programming valued as a local News Service**

Most stations valued the opportunity to provide local news to their area, and highlight local stories. Articles were selected on a priority basis of 'local first' and state, national and global last. Many had a news service from CRN, and this did not replace news, but was an adjunct. It was also seen as a 'point of difference' to the commercial and ABC stations which did not deal so closely with local issues.

RPH programming provided local focus of news to supplement other news bulletins during the day. It was seen as providing a unique service to the community.

- **Relationship with local newspapers an issue in regional Australia**

An issue that became an additional element of the questionnaire after the first couple of interviews was the relationship between the station and the local papers. All but three of the stations interviewed experienced tension if not outright opposition from the local papers that were being read. The most common reason given for this was that the reading of the paper was seen as 'competition'. The three stations which enjoyed a good relationship with the papers worked with them collaboratively (providing cross-promotion of each other).

In most cases the stations were aware they were not providing a threat to the newspaper itself - their listeners were mostly not in a position to read it or access it for all the reasons that the service existed – some form of disability or disadvantage. The quality of journalism in regional papers however was a topic that arose in almost every interview. This impacted on the application of the Protocols (where they were known), and the ability of regional stations in general to abide strictly by the Protocols.

The relationship of local stations to their local newspapers was raised as an issue which affected the station's RPH programming.

- **Funding Anomalies**

Most stations, including the long term contributors in the NSS, were not entirely aware of the relationship between associated funding and the RPH program. Only recent recipients of RPH grants associated money with their RPH programming, and in these cases it was pointed out that the paucity of funds the RPH program offered was not an incentive.

RPH programs were initiated and sustained for reasons to do with serving the full spectrum of the community.

Monetary support of RPH programs was neither a major factor nor driver in initiating or sustaining RPH programs.

- **Interest shown in further RPH and Disability related programming**

Almost all the stations interviewed showed a moderate to high degree of interest in

other RPH programming including a daily national news service via satellite. Almost all stations would welcome a greater degree of information and communication with the RPH Network, and **more programs to serve people with a disability in their community.**

- Readers for RPH programming – ‘a different type of radio person’

Almost all the stations interviewed mentioned the fact that the ‘readers’ for the RPH programming were a distinct group amongst their general broadcasters (‘a tribe unto themselves’ as one interviewee put it). The qualities required of a ‘reader’ seemed to be similar amongst all the relevant stations: a very good reading voice that was easy to listen to for long periods, and who was able to read interestingly without adding too much intonation. Readers were generally admired for their specific qualities in their local radio communities.

In situations where the RPH program was eventually cancelled, the RPH reading ‘team’ would cease being volunteers for the station, as this program was where they saw themselves best serving the needs of the station and community. It was also clear from the responses that the readers became ‘attached’ to the programming and enjoyed specialising in being RPH Readers.

As one interviewee put it: *‘most of our readers are not presenters, they are a different type of radio person.’*

The information regarding this element of the RPH programming experience can be summarised as follows:

- The RPH reader was different to a normal broadcaster in personality, approach and skills
- RPH readers did not generally cross over to other broadcasting programs and vice versa.
- Mostly the RPH Readers formed a team-bond because of the amount of negotiation and rostering management that was required. In one case, the RPH group had its own newsletter and social club.
- In some cases the RPH reading team was a good way of giving volunteers a ‘taste’ of what it was like to be on radio without taking too many risks (learning how to use the equipment, managing microphone/headsets etc).
- Auditions were rarely held (as is commonly the case in RPH stations). They self-selected according to ability and stamina and received feedback and advice from other readers.

One of the advantages identified by stations for having an RPH Program was the fact that it brought different elements of the community into the volunteer mix – members who would not normally aspire nor want to run a general radio program.

6. Summary of Station Interviews

This section provides a summary of responses to the Questionnaire used to interview each station. The information is parcelled into the subjects covered by the Questionnaire (Addendum 2) in order to afford confidentiality to the station representatives who generously gave their time and effort to participate. A full transcript of the interviews has been made available to RPH Australia and the CBF.

i) Papers Read (List of papers read from around the country)

- *The Chronicle (Toowoomba)*
- ***Brisbane Courier Mail***
- *Colac Herald*
- ***Orange Central Western Daily***
- *The Western Advocate (covering Bathurst and Orange)*
- ***The Ballarat CourierNorth Central Review***
- *The Mountain Monthly*
- ***The Standard (Goulburn)***
- *The Chronicle (Goulburn)*
- ***Sentinel Times***
- *Local Courier.*
- ***Blue Mountains Gazette***
- *The Alpine Observer*
- ***The Examiner (Launceston)***
- *The Launceston Daily*
- ***La Trobe Valley Express***
- *The Courier Mail (Wodonga)*

ii) Training/RPH communication received

- **Initial training received (unsure), and Protocols received in writing.**
- *We got letters from RPH with instructions on how to do it. I also did a radio training course (with CMTO?). We were told to cut out articles etc., but that would require buying two papers. Now I just read the paper at home first to prepare then page by page at the studio.*
- **None specifically that can be recollected. Talking News acts as a training ground for presenters who can sometimes progress to other programs.**
- *Two-hour training is provided with the Team Leader using a comprehensive booklet. Involves protocols, practical timing issues, 'etiquette', and voice training (breathing technique, pacing, pronunciation etc.). The Manual has been modified over the years to suit the local community. Auditions used to be run, but now readers are sought via informal networks and advertising and readers inducted via training. Initial formal training was provided by VA circa 2003/4?*
- **Training provided on reading the news, funded by CBF.**
- *Received training from CMTO on appropriate protocols.*
- **Received training from Vision Australia in Warrigal.**
- *Received written information from RPH regarding Protocols at time of grant.*
- **All internal but based on original RPH training covering RPH protocols, legal issues, etc. Auditions also in place.**
- *Our model is developed by one of our volunteers who used to read for an RPH station before moving here*
- **Originally given training but now all word of mouth**
- *Our initial training was really good – they helped us put systems in place.*
- **Would RPH consider providing training?**

iii) Adherence to Protocols

- **We don't editorialise what we read - nor do we give comments on any article. It's a 'straight read' so that the listener can listen to it as if they were reading it.**
- *Read page by page (rather than article by article) as not enough funds to buy 2 papers and prepare cut-out of articles.*

- ***It's hard not to comment or be in the moment for some of the articles – it is local news and people we know or have met***
- *We sometimes now make comments and vary it (the program) since we are doing it without funding.*
- ***We are not breaking too many rules – just making it more interesting.***
- *Our readers bring their own articles from local or national newspapers and magazines.*
- ***Observed as far as we can recall.....***
- *Not known. Relationship 'non existent with RPH - only through sponsorship'.*
- ***The reading has evolved over the years to suit the station and the community. Editorialising makes up for poor journalistic quality.***
- *As interpreted over the years - have a non-editorialising and non-censoring policy except in the case of incorrect grammar being used by a journalist, or expletives/offensive language at the reader's discretion. We describe photographs and read out captions.*
- ***She reads article by article – but she does select a bit, so that we are not reading about murders etc. We lean a bit to personal interest stories.***
- *The program is a mixture of reading and a bit of commentary*
- ***We keep to the RPH Protocols – we are in close contact with local RPH/Vision Australia station***
- *No commentary on any stories, no editorialising nor providing opinions.*
- ***Generally we read the whole article and don't embellish. But we do chat about it afterwards. We don't get into politics.***
- *Not aware of them. Would be happy to adhere to them if they were communicated.*

iv) Reason for RPH Program - what role does it play in your programming?

- ***The station has read the daily newspaper on-air as part of programming since it started. Started to apply for grants to support this effort.***
- *Seems to fit in with what we are offering to the full range of the community,*

which is highly multicultural.

- ***Unaware of any grants in our history, or available now. We just continued on with it because it was worthwhile and a vital part of what we do (as a community radio station).***
- *Initially it was an impulse to apply for the grant, and thought why not. However in the meantime we have learnt how it really helps the community. Our thinking evolved.*
- ***We had a News Reading service well before the grant was provided (since the 90's)- it was part of our schedule. The grant reinforced and provided some funding for what we already did.***
- *Has always been part of our programming (as far as can be recollected). It is one of our longest running programs.*
- ***A representative of a local publication approached us and we collaborated to read it on the radio, and applied for funding to do so.***
- *Unsure of its history.*
- ***We consider it an essential service to the community.***
- *The program gives us the opportunity to provide local news.*
- ***An essential service to the local community.***
- *We are a proper true community radio station with very diverse programming (indigenous, lesbian, gay etc.), and this programming fits into that.*
- ***It is about access and equity.***
- *There is a desire and need to have this type of program – there is a gap in service to that spectrum of the population.*
- ***It's a news program and a lot more – it has become a really important part of our programming.***

v) Who is listening - Local RPH Audiences

- ***Many of the non-English-speaking background groups; international students who study here at the university***
- *Young mothers who don't have time or energy to read the paper*
- ***Pensioners who can't afford to buy the paper every day***
- *Mechanics*
- ***Those with vision impairment***

- Older migrants
- **Conditions such as vertigo (can't read print)**
- People on the road; council workers, etc.
- **Many cannot afford internet to get news on line - many papers are closing down or just online.**
- There is low literacy rate in this area and a high level of people living with a disability. We have a housing estate where there are people being cared for with disabilities, and 3 nursing homes. I get stopped in the streets and given positive feedback - they don't have to buy a paper because they can listen.
- **A wide range of people - farmers (on tractors), visually impaired, elderly, those with a disability, foreign students. We get a lot of farmers and workmen listening and giving feedback.**
- All those members of the community who can't access print - a lot of disabilities in this area.
- **Nursing homes and retirement homes. Some of our people have done a 'live' RPH program in nursing homes. We changed our time-slot for reading the RPH program when the Retirement Homes said that we were being aired during 'nap' time and residents were complaining about missing it.**
- People learning English (Chinese community mentioned).
- **People in cars - they have commented.**
- People who would not buy the Courier or not every day maybe - for cost reasons. Business people listen at lunch-time because they can hear the local news in depth.
- **Deaths and Funerals is a big, important segment for the community. We read all notices (one per person) - and funeral notices of every person - it is an important part of the program.**
- Retirement homes give us feedback. Apart from the expected community of people with disabilities, we see it as reaching all the layers of our community.
- **A wide cross-section of our community listen, including mums at home, and the nursing and retirement homes (they consider it a 'weekly event' at the Homes).**
- The readers love it and most of the community listens to it

vi) Would you always include RPH or is it expendable?

- **Always has been and always would be part of schedule**
- No! (not expendable) - this is definitely part of our programming! It is reaching

different elements of our community.

- ***It is an area we would like to increase. Looking at other papers to cover as well. We would like to be the source of local information in the community.***
- *Very popular - we would be murdered if it was stopped*
- ***We would always keep the program going***
- *We intend to continue it – the readers really like doing the reading*
- ***'We do it because it provides a service - it gives a voice to those who are under-represented'***
- *It is an integral part of our programming and it won't disappear*
- ***We keep it because the community wants it. We made the conscious decision to keep it when the funding stopped.***
- *Our role is to meet the needs of the community and to give a voice to those who are under-represented.*
- ***We do it because it provides a service***
- *It allows these groups (those with a disability or disadvantage) to have greater connection with our community*
- ***Our funding was cut but we persisted....we had very good feedback.***
- *We would like to increase it.*

vii) Problems with running RPH programming?

- ***Quality of the journalism (see comments section below).***
- *Only one volunteer reader at present. Part of overall issue of volunteering for station.*
- ***Poor journalism.***
- *It is a huge commitment (to do it properly), because of the preparation involved, and the Protocols....getting the team together is a big task*
- ***Keeping up the volunteer numbers.***
- *The main challenge (and reason for stopping the program) was the lack of volunteers to run such an intensive program*
- ***It is a challenge to meet the high standards of the RPH Protocol***
- *Getting the readers rostered and managed is the most difficult task.*
- ***Lately the papers are getting thinner and thinner***

viii) Relationship with local newspaper?

- **Problematic with Chronicle - they consider our reading 'plagiaristic'. They find it threatening that people can listen without having to buy the paper.**
- *Strained. (They gave us permission to read from the paper - they won't advertise that we do it and they don't give us any special rates for advertising or buying the paper.)*
- **Has been tense - not fantastic. We get no contra deals, no discounts for advertising. Journalism quality has improved under new editor. The paper itself is not as big, not as much news. But they do supply us with free papers.**
- *Tense - unhelpful - they see us as competition.*
- **Very close relationship – they do a segment on the radio and they give us a little regular ad**
- *The local paper is very supportive – they advertise the (RPH) program in the paper free of charge.*
- **One of the local papers won't let us read it anymore, so we read the other local paper**
- *Excellent – they advertise our program for free – they see it as an asset*

ix) Other disability related programs

- **No, but interested in obtaining them if affordable. Concentrate on music and ethnic programs to serve community. We have people with disabilities working with us however.**
- *Other disability related programs*
- **None - have a number of Ethnic programs.**
- *We would be happy to collaborate with RPH and obtain more material we could air*
- **Talking Vision (from CRN), and local program 'Radio Active' (conducted by a team of people with disabilities).**
- *Weekly 'The Ability Hour'*
- **It would be brilliant to have a book reading or any other material suitable for people with disabilities**
- *We would definitely take on new programs from RPH Australia*

x) Value of NSS sponsorship

- **Not sure of mix of income derived from NSS and other sponsors.**
- *We are not aware of a relationship between RPH programming and NSS*
- **It is not much but it helps keep our heads above water - sponsorship difficult in this area.**
- *Yes - very much appreciated. However they (advertisers) get 'more bang for their buck' because messages are played more frequently than advised. Consider this a good way to indicate that station is a vehicle for important government messages. It gives us credibility. Messaging does not occur specifically during RPH programming.*
- **Very interested in increasing income from this source. However not aware entirely of direct connection between NSS income and RPH.**
- *Not entirely aware of a direct relationship between NSS income and sponsorship messages*
- **We miss the income (from NSS) when we stopped the RPH program.**

7. Summary of CBF Grants for RPH CONTENT

1998/99

- > Eight RPH stations were funded for equipment and administrative expenses.
- > Five general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming
 - 2MCE
 - 2NUR
 - 3MCR
 - 3YYR
 - 4DDB
- > RPH Australia was granted \$92,000 for sector co-ordination and development of a national sponsorship marketing scheme.

1999/2000

- > Eight RPH stations were funded for equipment and administrative expenses.
- > Six general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming.
 - 2MCE
 - 3RUM
 - 3UGE
 - 4DDB
 - 7LTN
 - 8CCC
- > RPH Australia received \$93,651 for sector co-ordination and marketing.

2000/01

- > Eleven RPH stations were funded for equipment and administrative expenses.
- > Six general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming
 - 2BLU
 - 2MCE
 - 3MCR
 - 4DDB
 - 7LTN

- 8CCC
- > RPH Australia received \$84,100 for sector co-ordination and strategic planning.

2001/02

- > Eleven RPH stations were funded for equipment and administrative expenses.
- > Five general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming.
 - 2BLU
 - 2MCE
 - 3OCR
 - 4DDB
 - 7LTN
- > RPH Australia received \$85,000 for sector co-ordination

2002/03

- > RPH grants assisted 7 metropolitan RPH community radio stations, 5 regional Victorian RPH community radio stations
- > 8 general community radio stations
 - 2MCE
 - 3CH
 - 3OCR
 - 3RUM
 - 4CCR
 - 4DDB
 - 7LTN
 - 8CCC
- > RPH Australia received \$88,000 for sector co-ordination, \$8,000 of which for broadband services for Digital Program Exchange

2003/04

- > \$175,000 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 7 regional Victorian stations.
- > Seven general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming.
 - 2BLU
 - 2MCE

- 3BBB
 - 3OCR
 - 4CCR
 - 4DDB
 - 8CCC
- > RPH Australia received \$80,000 for sector co-ordination, \$8,000 for broadband services for Digital Program Exchange and \$12,750 for a feasibility study for a new RPH service in the Northern Territory.

2004/05

- > \$207,625 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian RPH stations.
- > In 2004/05 no RPH program grants were allocated due to an adjustment in the timing of grant consideration. RPH programs broadcast in the 2004/05 financial year were therefore funded in advance from 2003/04 funds.
- > RPH Australia received \$82,000 for sector coordination and \$12,900 for a marketing initiative.

2005/06

- > \$210,740 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian RPH stations.
- > Seven general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming.
- 2BLU
 - 2MCE
 - 3BBB
 - 4CCR
 - 4DDB
 - 4MIG
 - 8CCC
- > RPH Australia received \$83,230 for sector coordination.

2006/07

- > \$216,050 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian RPH stations.
- > Seven general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming.
- 2BLU

- 2MCE
 - 3BBB
 - 4CCR
 - 4DDB
 - 4MIG
 - 8CCC
- > RPH Australia received \$85,390 for sector coordination.

2007/08

- > \$221,200 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian RPH stations.
- > Seven general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming.
- 2BLU
 - 2MCE
 - 3BBB
 - 3RUM
 - 4CCR
 - 4DDB
 - 4MIG
- > RPH Australia received \$87,300 for sector coordination.

2008/09

- > \$238,375 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian RPH stations.
- > Six non-RPH stations transitioned from RPH program grants to the RPH national sponsorship program.
- > RPH Australia received \$90,500 for sector coordination.

2009/10

- > \$251,515 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian RPH stations.
- > One program grant of \$1,950 was allocated to 3OCR.
- > RPH Australia received \$93,600 for sector coordination

2010/11

- > \$232,705 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian

RPH stations.

- > Five general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming.
 - 2GLF
 - 3MFM
 - 3OCR
 - 3RUM
 - 8CCC

- > RPH Australia received \$95,800 for sector coordination.

2011/12

- > \$245,785 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian RPH stations.
- > RPH Australia received \$98,700 for sector coordination.
- > \$265,600 for Content grants were allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 7 regional Victorian RPH stations. RPH Australia received \$110,400 for content coordination. No program grants were allocated in this funding period.

2012/13

- > \$345,908 was allocated for community broadcasting for people with a
- > Print disability and an additional \$376,832 for RPH content development. The funding for content development has not been included in the above table.
- > \$164,970 was allocated to 7 metropolitan RPH stations and 5 regional Victorian RPH stations.
- > Four general community radio stations were funded for RPH programming.
 - 3CH
 - Alpine Radio (3VKV)
 - 4NAG
 - Mitchell Community Radio (3OKR)

- > RPH Australia received \$180,938 for sector coordination.

2013/14

- > Service & Content Support \$546,584
- > Sector Coordination \$181,500
- > Programs \$3,838

2014/15

- > Service and content support at 13 RPH stations and 1 generalist community radio station: \$523,414
- > RPH Australia for sector coordination activities: \$181,5

8. Attachments

1. RPH Australia

PROTOCOL FOR RPH BROADCASTING (RPH Protocol)

1. Introduction

The RPH Australia Radio Reading Network (RPH Network) provides a unique broadcast Service that meets the needs of people with a “Print Disability” - people who through age, disability or lack of literacy skills are unable to effectively access published material.

On the basis of equity, people with a print disability have the same right to access to published information as other members of the Australian Community.

2. RPH Programming

2.1 RPH Services are provided through:

2.1.1 Dedicated RPH Stations

2.1.2 Independently-produced RPH programming broadcast on general community or other radio stations in blocks of at least one hour.

1.2 RPH programming comprises:

2.2.1 Reading of news and feature articles from daily, and other general circulation newspapers;

2.2.2 Subject based programs that feature readings in an identified topic area – from newspapers, magazines, and other publications.

2.2.3 Serialised book readings; and

2.2.4 Interviews, presentations and other features that relate to subjects that

are of particular relevance to an audience with a print disability (refer to Allied Document 3, paragraph 4.).

- 2.3 The Authority for determination of programming as “defined RPH material” is RPH Australia.

3. RPH Broadcasting/Programming Criteria

- 3.1 For programming/broadcasting to be considered “RPH”, the following criteria must be adhered to:
- 3.1.1 The “Core RPH Programming Period” is a 16-hour contiguous period between the hours of 6.00 a.m. and midnight. At least 75 per cent of material broadcast during the Core Period shall comprise defined RPH material – considered across an average weekly broadcasting period. Material such as sponsorship announcements, music (except program themes) and other items not specific to the needs of people with a print disability shall not be included when calculating ‘RPH time’.
 - 3.1.2 All published items utilised shall be read in full. Material shall be presented with appropriate identification of: the publication, edition, date of publication, page number, and Author’s name. In no circumstances shall the text be varied, or any editorial comment be offered in relation to an item.
 - 3.1.3 RPH program-makers and broadcasters shall engage in a process of ongoing consultation, in relation to programming with:
 - People with a print disability;
 - Organisations of people with a print disability;
 - Organisations that provide services to people with a print disability
 - 3.14 The Corporate Structure of dedicated RPH licensees shall ensure participation in the planning and delivery of the Service by people with a print disability, as appropriate, having regard to the spirit of the Broadcasting Services Act to involve the Community of Interest (Allied Document 2).
 - 3.1.4 RPH program-makers and broadcasters shall ensure that organisations of, or providing services to people with a print disability have

adequate access to RPH program time. However, the licence holder shall retain the right to ensure that all material broadcast complies with quality, legislative, and legal requirements.

- 3.1.5 RPH program makers and broadcasters shall commit themselves to the application of both the spirit and specific obligations expressed in the Community Broadcasting Codes of Practice (Allied Document 1).

4. Standards

Compliance with the Criteria for RPH Programming/Broadcasting will serve as a demonstration of the bona fides of an RPH program-maker or broadcaster, for the purposes of funding, licensing, and membership of RPH Australia.

The Determining Authority for all matters of standards in relation to this Protocol shall be RPH Australia

5. Review Date

This Protocol shall be reviewed no later than five (5) years from the Effective Date of Implementation.

- **Adopted** by the RPH Australia Board : **6 July 2013**
- **Effective date** of implementation : **1 August 2013**
- **Ratified** by RPH Australia Members :

Allied Documents:

1. Community Broadcasting Codes of Practice
2. Community of Interest Consultation
3. Protocols for “Other RPH Programming”
4. RPH Philosophy

RPH Programming allied documents

Allied Document 2

COMMUNITY OF INTEREST CONSULTATION

1. Introduction

1.1 RPH program-makers shall engage in a process of ongoing consultation, in relation to programming with:

1.1.1 People with a print disability

1.1.2 Organisations of people with a print disability

1.1.3 Organisations that provide services to people with a print disability.
(RPH Protocol 3.1.3)

1.2 As community broadcasters, each dedicated RPH station has a responsibility (defined in the RPH Protocol) to operate in accordance with the will of, and the participation of, its “community of interest”. For RPH stations that “community of interest” consists of people with a print disability. For that reason, each dedicated RPH station is required to take action, appropriate to its particular operating circumstances, to consult effectively with its community of interest.

2. Purpose of Consultation

As a matter of policy, and consistent with the qualification in the Introduction, RPH Australia recommends that each RPH station establish an ongoing program review process to provide:

2.1 Feedback regarding all current programs

2.2 Feedback regarding locally-produced and presented programs

2.3 Suggestions for change and innovation.

Allied Document 3

PROTOCOLS FOR “OTHER RPH PROGRAMMING”

“2.2 RPH programming” comprises:

2.2.4 Interviews, presentations and other features that relate to subjects that are of particular relevance to an audience with a print disability.”
(RPH protocol 2.2.4)

1. Each RPH station has a responsibility to provide RPH programming (as defined at item 2.2 in the RPH Protocol) during its “Core RPH Programming Period” (see item 3.1.1, RPH protocol). At least 75% of material broadcast during that Core period shall comprise defined RPH material.
2. Items 2.2.1 to 2.2.3 of the RPH Protocol provide clear definitions of material which can be chosen for broadcast by RPH stations.
3. Item 2.2.4 of the Protocol (see above) describes material which RPH stations may use in Core period broadcasts and which, for the purpose of determining compliance with the Protocol and because it often does not involve direct reading from “published” material, has been classified as “Other RPH programming”.
4. Dedicated RPH stations classify “Other RPH Programming” on a generally consistent basis. Programs which comply with the Protocol comprise;
 - 4.1 Information programs from material provided by organisations which provide services for people with a print disability (in some instances the material is drawn from newsletters published by those organisations – in others, the material comprises oral input from representatives of the organisations in either talk or interview formats)
 - 4.2 Information programs from government organisations which provide a variety of services including services available for, and required by, people with a print disability
 - 4.3 Programs featuring the activities of people with a print disability designed to highlight the achievements and abilities of those people
 - 4.4 Programs providing information about entertainment available for people with a print disability.

Allied Document 4

RPH PHILOSOPHY – A GUIDE

1. RPH Australia (RPHA) provides guidance to RPH broadcasters via the “Protocol for RPH Broadcasting”.
2. Included in the Protocol Document is a set of criteria for RPH broadcasting, to assist broadcasters in the selection of program content for RPH broadcasting (RPH Protocol 2.2).
3. While producers of "RPH programming" will need to exercise choice in the selection of material for broadcast, RPH broadcasters shall ensure that selected newspaper articles and other published material are read in full, except where, in unforeseen circumstances, to do so would significantly disrupt the broadcaster's program schedule.

Criterion 3.1.2 states:

“... Material shall be presented with appropriate identification of: the publication, edition, date of publication, page number, and author's name. In no circumstances shall the text be varied, or any editorial comment be offered in relation to an item.”

4. Some broadcasters have difficulty with this requirement for reasons which include:
 - 4.1 It can reduce the number of articles that can be broadcast
 - 4.2 They judge that listeners may be interested in the main message of the article but not the detail.
5. RPH Australia is strong in its view that there should be no departure from the direction expressed in this criterion. Reasons for this position include:
 - 5.1 It is important that broadcasters keep faith with the audience of people with a print disability, to the commitment to accurately and fully act as a conduit for accessing the print media
 - 5.2 The commitment to read in full as expressed in this criterion is a key feature of RPH which distinguishes it from other forms of broadcasting
 - 5.3 RPHA is mindful of the privileged position afforded to it by copyright regulations contained in S 47a of the Act, and would not be prepared to jeopardise this by producing what may be perceived as an

inaccurate or incomplete record of the printed source.

6. The overriding issue is that RPH occupies a special place for people with a print disability who wish to access the print media. It is important that RPH maintain its place apart from other electronic media, as a reliable and authoritative alternative access carrier of what people can normally read. Any compromise of this policy would in time consign RPH provision to the same status as alternate electronic media. It would be no longer seen as an impartial and reliable carrier of print content, but subject to the same editorial influences as other broadcasters. The adopted approach enables RPH broadcasters to demonstrate that any exclusion of content is solely related to practical timing considerations and not about an intent to influence the listener's view. RPHA is mindful there is no perfect resolution to this matter, but the adopted approach best preserves the integrity of RPH.

2. Station Interview Template

Background

- | |
|---------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>RPH Grant Recipient history</i> |
| 2. <i>NSS Participation (if any)</i> |

Station Interview Questions

- | |
|--|
| 3. <i>Name and roles of interviewees</i> |
| 4. <i>Current station challenges</i> |
| 5. <i>CBAA membership</i> |
| 6. <i>Number of paid staff</i> |
| 7. <i>Program name and timing</i> |
| 8. <i>RPH team size</i> |
| 9. <i>Preparation process for RPH</i> |
| 10. <i>Newspapers / articles</i> |
| 11. <i>Type of training for readers</i> |
| 12. <i>Awareness of RPH protocols</i> |
| 13. <i>Reasons / history of RPH Programming</i> |
| 14. <i>Would you always include (want to include) RPH programming or is it expendable?</i> |
| 15. <i>What role does it play in your programming?</i> |
| 16. <i>Other disability programs on schedule?</i> |
| 17. <i>Who listens?</i> |
| 18. <i>Problems with running RPH programs?</i> |
| 19. <i>Relationship with local papers?</i> |
| 20. <i>Interested in more RPH programming?</i> |
| 21. <i>Nss participants – Do the sponsorship earnings assist the station?</i> |
| 22. <i>Other comments</i> |