There are no Academy Awards for newsletters. At least, not that we know of. Yet, it’s important for a vehicle such as *Forum*, which plays such an important role in our professional community, to be accountable to our audience and determine if we are doing our jobs. It isn’t enough that we are liked. Are we relevant? Do we represent everyone in our community? Frankly, are we worth the time and effort to read?

Evaluation and feedback are keys to success and maintaining relevance. Among the diverse membership of SGIM, clinicians examine patients and follow-up on the results of laboratory tests and imaging, researchers study the efficacy and effectiveness of interventions and advance knowledge, and medical educators assess and evaluate their students’ and trainees’ progress and readiness to act independently. So it is true for *Forum*. A few months ago we asked you to fill out a readership survey to help us improve *Forum* as a source of news and scientific information for members. Our goal was to understand if we are hitting the mark on several variables important to our ability to communicate such as:

- How do readers interact with the newsletter either in print or online?
- What types of articles are readers most interested in reading?
- How does the newsletter rate in terms of design elements like article layout color length, etc?

In addition, members provided us some suggestions for improvement that we will use in our upcoming *Forum* “refresh” over the next several months. Overall, the survey confirmed that *Forum* is a widely read and well-regarded offering of SGIM (hence the Sally Filed quote). That being said, there is still plenty of room for improvement.

The *Forum* survey received a total of 164 responses (49% Clinicians, 46% Educators, 19% Researchers and 13% Administrators—survey total was more than 100% because of multiple roles). Ninety four percent of respondents read the *Forum* with 70% reading most to all of it. Seventy eight percent preferred to read it in print as opposed to the online version with 11% utilizing both platforms. Interestingly, if there were additional content on line and not in print, only 39% answered that they would visit the Web site to access it. The vast majority of the readership was interested or very interested in the different *Forum* content categories and rated the quality of that content mostly in the good to excellent range.

When asked to suggest new topics and other suggestions, respondents conveyed the desire for more content in a particular area previously not well covered by *Forum* (Perspectives, Board Review section, Cartoons, more applicable content for international members), in addition to formatting and accessibility (Pub Med searchability and better online indexing). No one was fond of the fragmentation of articles with the need to skip to two and three sections to read one article completely. Finally, the “left leaning” predisposition of *Forum* content was noted.

Without exception, all the comments and suggestions (and there were many) were constructive and thoughtful which reflects the diverse character of our members and their passion for what we do and for what they get and want to get from *Forum*.

Okay, so now what? With the help of *Forum*’s current cadre of associate editors, SGIM’s Director of Communication & Publication, Francine Jetton, Design Editor Howard Petlack and Managing Editor Frank Darmstadt we will be embarking on a refresh of *Forum* on both layout and features. We will also continue to explore innovative ways to deliver *Forum* through online media. Be on the lookout as we roll out some of these out in the next few issues. Let us know what you think of these innovations informally through e-mail and phone calls as well through our more formal survey solicitations.

As always, we have prepared a great issue this month with thoughtfull pieces on how technology and policy impact healthcare disparities, turning learner centered feedback on its head, an upfront discussion on finances from the Society and much more. Getting back to Sally Field’s quote, most people remember the quote as I stated it above. But this comment has been widely misquoted. The truth is, Ms. Field actually said, “You like me. Right now, you like me.” The award was the result of years of hard work honing her craft and gaining respect but she knew that popularity and recognition in Hollywood is often grudgingly given and fleeting at best. So, too, for *Forum*. We know you like us now—help us continue to grow our newsletter into something the GIM community can love.