

Report of the LAUNC-CH Conference Committee, 2009-2010

Creating a User Centered Library,

Submitted by Emily King and Kim Vassiliadis (co-chairs)

Committee Members

Angela Bardeen, Emily King (co-chair), Jacqueline Solis, Kirill Tolpygo, Kim Vassiliadis (co-chair), Alice Whiteside

Summary:

During the summer co-chairs, Emily King and Kim Vassiliadis met with the incoming president, Jason Tomberlin, to establish a broad conference theme that could appeal to a wide audience. At the time, the university's budget was uncertain and cuts were being proposed. Also, specific units in the University library had embarked on a massive restructuring process in both Special Collections and various Public Services units. The group thought that a conference focused on defining user services and needs might help set the tone for the upcoming changes ahead. When the conference committee convened in the fall, we discussed the theme and brainstormed about potential topic ideas. The committee decided that instead of approaching colleagues to present, we would establish specific conference topics and do a call for proposals. We established the conference title "Creating a User Centered Library" The themes chosen were Assessment, Collaboration, Emerging Technologies, New Services, and Physical Spaces. We received 26 proposals and selected 12. One proposal served as the keynote address. We ended the day with a panel discussion made up of students and a faculty member.

Budget:

As in past years, this year, the committee decided to fold the cost of lunch into the general registration cost. We also decided to provide a reduced conference cost for library school students. The cost for participants was \$30 for full registration and \$15 for student registration. The actual cost per participant was \$49.13. The extra cost per attendees was paid by donations from Sarah Michalak, the SILS Alumni Association, and EBSCO. The LAUNC-CH underwrote some of the registration costs for the speakers. The break down of the costs and income are below:

Conference expenses

<u>Keynote Expenses</u>	
Keynote Hotel	\$474.33
Dinner	\$117.44
<u>Conference Packages</u>	
Folders/nametags	\$174.56
Printing	\$190.60
Miscellaneous	\$30.00
Friday Center Total	\$8,840.00
Total Expenses	\$9,826.93
Expenses per attendee	\$49.13

Conference Income

Registration	\$4,455.00
<u>Conference Sponsorship</u>	
UNC Library	\$4,475.00
LAUNC-CH – Underwriting	\$551.93
LAUNC-CH – Undergraduate Scholarship	\$50.00
SILS Alumni Association	\$100.00
EBSCO	\$75
Total Income	\$9,826.93

The conference committee made several changes to the conference that resulted in budgetary changes from the previous conference. First, the committee called for nominations instead of inviting presenters. This resulted in a large pool of potential presenters with a wide array of different perspectives. After talking to the LAUNC-CH Executive board, the conference committee decided to expand the number of break sessions from four to six. This resulted in the need to reserve another room at the Friday Center.

The committee also felt that with the extra breakout sessions the number of attendees could be increased. We increased the number of attendees from 180 to 200. That number includes the speakers and committee members.

In addition to costs incurred by the programming changes, the Friday Center has increased their fees. We recommend that next year's committee increase the registration cost of the conference for 2011 to cover the additional cost of the Friday Center and consider limiting the number of speakers if they do a call for proposals again.

We continued some cost saving measures adopted last year to offset the additional costs incurred with this conference. We opted for keynote speakers who were in the state and therefore cut down on the travel costs they would incur. We also opted to forgo printing brochures to send out to LAUNC-CH members; instead we emailed a PDF version of the brochure out. We also limited the dinner prior to the conference to only the keynote speakers, the committee chairs, and the current LAUNC-CH president.

With the current budget climate, next year's committee should determine early in the planning process whether Sarah will still be able to contribute money to the LAUNC-CH conference.

Facilities

The committee chose the Friday Center again this year because of its parking availability and past good experiences with the facility and its staff. The Friday Center was booked for the Monday of UNC's Spring Break. Last year's committee received feedback via the evaluations that the Mountain Laurel room was too small and some attendees had to stand for the sessions because there were not enough seats. They recommended that the committee look into booking another larger room instead. Because this year's conference had roughly the same number of attendees spread out between three simultaneous sessions

in the morning and afternoon, the committee was less concerned about the room sizes. We booked the Azalea, Dogwood and Mountain Laurel rooms. We saved money by bringing in library-owned laptops for speaker presentations rather than renting laptops from the Friday center.

Vender Contacts

Jill solicited conference donations from a selection of the library vendors from the 2006/2007 vendor contact list. Copies of the letters can be found in H:\Launcch\Conferences\2010\Vendor contacts.doc. Letters were sent in January 2010. EBSCO was the only vendor to respond with a donation. Given the economic climate there really did not seem to be much rush to ask for monies; nevertheless, conference committee members probably should send solicitations earlier than this next year. The SILS Alumni Association donated money to the Conference, so it is recommended that they be contacted again for donations for the 2011 Conference. A thank you note was sent after the conference. Donors (Sarah Michalak, SILS Alumni Association and EBSCO) were publicly acknowledged in a flier in every conference folder.

Speaker Coordination

Emily King and Kim Vassiliadis contacted each person who had submitted a proposal with an acceptance or rejection letter. The acceptance letter can be found:

H:\LAUNCCH\Conferences\2010\acceptance.doc and the rejection letter is available at:

H:\LAUNCCH\Conferences\2010\rejection.doc. Although some of the speakers requested an entire session, we asked most of the speakers if they would be willing to pare down their presentation to just 45minutes. They all agreed, and this allowed us to accept more proposals. Based on last year's recommendation, all accepted contacts were asked to confirm their acceptance by email. In December Emily contacted the individual speakers to let them know what time they would be presenting and if there were other presenters sharing their session. Each contact person was asked to submit short bios for each of the presenters, a short presentation description and any AV requests. Emily also created a speaker listserv to communicate with everyone and assist with information sharing. This worked really well.

Kim was in direct contact with the three keynote speakers throughout the process. She arranged their lodging (3 rooms) at the Courtyard by Marriott for one night. This proved to be an ideal location because of its close proximity to the Friday Center. The co-chairs and LAUNC-CH president took the candidates to dinner at Panzanella in Carrboro the night before the conference.

Brochures

The brochures from this year's conference were created using the saved file from last year. The committee again decided not to print and mail out brochures. Because perspective attendees have email and can easily print an attachment, we felt that the cost of sending the brochures and the ecological impact of printing the brochure outweighed any convenience for the attendees.

The brochures were sent out as PDFs and attached to emails. The brochure was designed to fit a letter size paper and extended to three pages. The first two pages were the informational part of the brochure and the 3rd page was a printable registration form.

Publicity

The conference was publicized on the LAUNC-CH website, Library Line, and across the campus and state via various local and state listservs. Promotional emails also were sent directly to many colleges, universities, and community college libraries. A contacts list can be found in H:\Launcch\Conferences\2010\contacts_2010.doc. Since a good amount of conference attendees came from non-UNC Libraries, and evaluation results from last year's conference showed that approximately 2/3 of attendees found out about the Conference via email announcements, it is recommended that LAUNC-CH continue to use email as the primary means of promotion and publicity for next year's conference.

Program

When the committee sent out a call for proposals, we received a submission from three UNC-Charlotte librarians entitled: "What Do You Do?": User-Centered Ethnography at UNC Charlotte's Atkins Library. Their proposal focused on many of the issues related to the conference's theme and the committee thought that their presentation could set the tone for the day's discussions. We invited them to present the keynote address, and they accepted.

Breakout session speakers included: Francesca Allegri, UNC-Chapel Hill; Kristin Antelman, NCSU, Yvonne Belanger, Duke; Adam Berenbak, NCSU; Lynne Bisko, Elon; Leesa Brieger, UNC-Chapel Hill; Suzanne Cadwell, UNC-Chapel Hill; Kathy Crowe, UNC-Greensboro; Emily Daly, Duke; Linda Daniel, Duke; Brian Dietz, NCSU; Leah McGinnis Dunn, Guilford College; Samantha Earp, Duke; Diane Harvey, Duke; Jean Ferguson, Duke; Chris Fulkerson, Elon; Barrie Hayes, UNC-Chapel Hill, Michele Hayslett, UNC-Chapel Hill; Biff Hollingsworth, UNC-Chapel Hill; Dawn Hubbs, UNC Charlotte; Barbara Ilie, UNC-Chapel Hill; Nathaniel King, Guilford College; Todd Kosmerick, NCSU; Susan Mikkelsen, University of California, Merced; Shawn J. Miller, Duke University; Jeffrey M. Mortimore, Bennett College for Women; Mike Olson, UNC Charlotte; Erin O'Meara, UNC-Chapel Hill; Rebecca Pope-Ruark, Elon; Cate Putirskis NCSU; Jason Ronallo, NCSU; Patrick Rudd, Elon; Roger Russell, ECU; Catherine Shreve, Duke; Holly Smith, UNC-Chapel Hill; Barbara Tierney, UNC Charlotte, Amanda Wall, UNC-Greensboro. We ended the day with a panel discussion, entitled: "What do our users say?" Panelists included: two graduate students, two undergraduate students and a faculty member from Art History. Jean Ferguson from Duke University moderated.

Conference Packets

Conference packets contained a conference schedule and a map of the Friday Center, a list of conference attendees, an evaluation form, and speaker biographies. We also included a half-sheet recognizing and thanking our sponsors, and recognizing the 2 recipients of the LAUNC-CH undergraduate scholarship. We also included a flier soliciting proposals for the LAUNC-CH Research Forum. The entire committee participated in stuffing folders, and assembling the nametags the week before the conference.

Undergraduate Scholarship

In an effort to encourage undergraduates to consider a career in librarianship, the Library Diversity Committee once again approached our committee about sponsoring two scholarships to outstanding undergraduates who work in a library on campus to attend the LAUNC-CH conference. The Diversity Committee is especially interested in attracting individuals with diverse backgrounds, beliefs, and

perspectives to the profession. The LAUNC-CH board agreed to sponsor the scholarship, and we put out an announcement in late January seeking nominations for the award. The award was advertised through a flyer that was sent to student employee supervisors. The supervisors were asked to post the flyer in their work area, as well as to personally encourage undergraduate employees to apply for the award. Interested students had to submit a short essay addressing the following questions: 1) Why are you interested in librarianship as a profession? 2) How do you hope to contribute to the diversity of the profession? We received only two submissions this year, both from students interested in pursuing an MLS. The fact that the conference was held during Spring Break is a likely reason that more students had not applied for this award. The scholarships were awarded to Hannah Love, from the Sloane Art library and to Karen Kuntarich, from the Rare Book Collection.

Registration

Registration for the 2010 LAUNC-CH Conference opened at the end of January and closed February 26, 2010. We continued to receive registrations after the close, but had to return them as we reached capacity on February 25th.

Several recommendations have been made for next year including emailing registrants immediately after their registration is received, and having the email serve as a receipt. Additionally, when the person in charge of registration transfers checks or cash to the LAUNC-CH treasurer, he or she should include a list of the names of the registrants that correspond with the money being transferred (and he/she should keep a copy of the list and the date those checks/cash were transferred).

There were 201 registrants for the LAUNCCH conference. 9 did not show up. (One registrant's colleagues let us know her husband had passed away, another let us know she was sick).

2 Diversity Scholarship Winners

12 CALAS

17 Students

34 Speakers (there were 4 additional Speakers who did not attend the full conference)

136 Librarians

By Institution

89 UNC-Chapel Hill	3 Greensboro College
4 App State	1 Strayer University
1 Beaufort Community College	1 University of California, Merced
2 Bennett College for Women	3 University of North Carolina, Charlotte
1 Charlotte AHEC	8 University of North Carolina, Greensboro
2 Charlotte School of Law	4 University of North Carolina, Pembroke
1 Chowan University	4 University of North Carolina, Wilmington
1 Coastal Carolina University	2 Wake Forest University
14 Duke University	1 Wilkes Community College
3 Durham Technical Community College	9 Winston-salem State University
1 East Carolina University	1 YBP
4 Elon University	1 – No Institution, Librarian from Winston-Salem
2 Fayetteville State University	

Evaluation Results

Speaker sessions	Presentation	Usefulness
Keynote Address	3.89	3.86
Historical State / African American Documentary Resources Portal	4.07	4
iPod Touch Tour / Ten Years of Collaboration	4.25	4.11
Encouragement as Service Philosophy / Our QEPeeps	4.45	4.29
Student Affairs Connections / In their own Words: What Liason		
Librarians Mean to Patrons	4.05	4.11
Models For Library Data Services / TUCASI Data Infrastructure Project	3.82	3.86
Duke Libraries User Studies Initiative	4.4	4.2
Panel discussion	4.38	4.25

Conference overall	
What is your overall evaluation of the Conference?	4.24
Based on advance announcements, how well did the Conference meet your expectations?	4.33
Please rate the Conference location and its facilities.	4.82
What is your reaction to the number of concurrent breakout sessions?	3.45
What is your reaction to the topics of the breakout sessions?	4

How did you find out about the conference?	
Magazine/newspaper	0
Friend/colleague	17
E-mail	79
Other	1 (twitter)

Suggestions:

The conference brochure should include information about which parking lot to use at the Friday Center.

Several attendees had to move their vehicles because they parked in the Park and Ride lot.

Several people mentioned that we should make sure all speakers have and use microphones, as it was often difficult to hear.

To quote a few responses:

“It was good to hear from a public services perspective...Also, the panel was a pleasant surprise – much more productive than most”

“Enjoyed seeing concrete examples of how new technologies are being used in the library (e.g. iPod session). Facility and food were excellent!”

“Very practical and very user-focused. Good to see practitioners in action!”

A few generalizations:

As usual, attendees enjoyed the Friday Center for its convenience, ease of parking, and the food. A common theme in the suggestions this year was that attendees felt that the breakout sessions were too long, and they disliked the pairing of presentations together in the separate breakout sessions. They would have preferred to split their attendance between multiple sessions. Next year's committee should take this into account when planning sessions. Several respondents noted that two of the students on the panel were library employees and felt it would have been more valuable to hear from typical library users—nevertheless, the panel was one of the better-reviewed sessions of the day.

Some suggested future topics:

Patron-driven acquisition;

Doing more with less (people, money, etc.);

Data Curation;

How are new technologies changing the publishing industry/changing library materials expenditures;

Info commons design concepts;

Assistive technology;

Successful models for integrating primary source materials in the classroom.

Recommendations

We highly recommend that next year's committee send out a call for proposals based on a broad conference theme. This approach was very successful. We received a wide array of submissions from libraries across the state and the country. The topics were diverse and interesting. This process made the programming much easier for the committee.

When sending out a call for proposals, limit the number of speakers per submission. We accepted a few proposals for a 45 minute session with upwards of 5 presenters. In the end, we had many more speakers this year than anticipated. Because LAUNC-CH absorbs the speaker's registration fee, our cost was much higher than anticipated.

Email registrants immediately after their registration is received, and having the email serve as a receipt.

When the person in charge of registration transfers checks or cash to the LAUNC-CH treasurer, he or she should include a list of the names of the registrants that correspond with the money being transferred (and he/she should keep a copy of the list and the date those checks/cash were transferred).

While the morning and afternoon sessions were scheduled for 1hr and a half, we often had two 45 minute presentations occurring in the same room. Many of the attendees had hoped to attend a 45 minute session in one room and then move on to another room to hear a different presentation. Because the session presentations were not listed by order of appearance nor was there a scheduled break between presentations, this caused some logistical issues unforeseen by the committee beforehand. If next year's committee decides to accept half-session proposals, we recommend adding in short 5-10min breaks and listing each presentation in order of appearance.

If the Friday Center is booked for next year's conference and the committee decides to scale back the number of accepted presentation, opt for two larger rooms instead of the Dogwood and the Mountain

Laurel Room. If there are enough presentations to warrant 3 rooms, then the Mountain Laurel, Dogwood and Azalea rooms are fine.

Continue the trend toward reducing the amount of printing and mailing for the conference. Rely instead on email and the LAUNC-CH website for publicity.

Include brief session descriptions in the online conference brochures

Continue to advertise conference actively at smaller local colleges and universities