

Report of the LAUNC-CH Conference Committee, 2011-2012

Engage, Innovate, Assess: Doing More with Less

Submitted by Lara Handler and Eileen Heeran (co-chairs)

Committee Members

Lara Handler (co-chair), Eileen Heeran (co-chair), Erin Carrillo, Michelle Cronquist, Angela Bardeen, Sarah Bankston, Anita Crescenzi

Summary:

During the fall the co-chairs reviewed the evaluations from the 2011 conference to identify tips and suggestions from the report of 2011 conference committee. The committee met and brainstormed to come up with a theme. The ideas of change and innovation, along with the ongoing budget woes in the economy, were present in many of the suggestions from the evaluations and from the committee. The committee chose a theme of: "Engage, Innovate, Assess: Doing More with Less." The committee decided that we would follow the previous year's model and do a call for proposals, and that we would make some changes to the format of the breakout sessions and the lightning talks. The format of the breakout sessions was changed to include a break between the two talks in each session, to allow participants to switch rooms if the other topic was of interest. We received 31 proposals and selected 8 for breakout sessions. We chose lightning talks from 8 additional speakers who had originally submitted proposals for the breakout sessions. We increased the number of lightning talks, but decreased the amount of time each talk was presented.

Budget:

As in past years, the committee decided to fold the cost of lunch into the general registration cost. The cost for participants was \$35 for full registration and \$15 for student registration. The actual cost per participant was \$47.99. The extra cost per attendees was paid by donations from Sarah Michalak, ACM, EBSCO, and Harrassowitz. 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>	
Speaker Honorarium	\$100
<u>Conference Packages</u>	
Folders/nametags	\$153.24
Printing	\$267.92
Friday Center Total	\$8,405.00
Total Expenses	\$ 8,926.16
Expenses per attendee	\$47.99

Conference Income

Registration	\$5100
<u>Conference Sponsorship</u>	
UNC Library	\$2300.00
LAUNC-CH – Underwriting	\$251.16
LAUNC-CH – Undergraduate Scholarship	\$0
ACM	\$1000.00
EBSCO	\$75
Harrassowitz	\$200
Total Income	\$8676.16

We followed last year's cost saving recommendation to limit the number of complimentary registrations to two speakers per group, and we continued emailing a PDF version of the brochure instead of sending printed copies. The speaker was local, so we didn't need to pay any travel costs. We did give a \$100 gift certificate to the Carolina Inn as an honorarium, since the keynote speaker had a prior engagement so there was no pre-conference dinner.

With the current budget climate, next year's committee should determine early in the planning process if 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. We booked the Azalea and Dogwood rooms at the Friday Center for the Monday of UNC's Spring Break. We saved money by bringing in library-owned laptops for speaker presentations rather than renting laptops from the Friday center. Our contact/liaison with the Friday Center was Gail Young, who assisted us last year as well. She was wonderful and very easy to work with throughout the planning process (Gail Young, Conference Services Coordinator, Friday Center, CB#1020, 100 Friday Center Drive, UNC-CH, Chapel Hill, NC 27517-9495, 919-962-2599, fax 919-962-2061, gpyoung@email.unc.edu)

Vendor Contacts

Eileen solicited conference donations from a selection of library vendors on an updated vendor contact list. She took the list of vendor contacts and updated the information wherever possible. In some instances the contact had changed for a company, so the most recent names and e-mails are on the list. She also annotated as she went along, so if a company needs the request a year in advance, she put that in red. There are a few companies that do not wish to be contacted, so Eileen also added that information. In the previous year, the committee decided that email may be a more effective means of contacting vendors, and we continued that choice. The committee also updated the letter that had been sent out in previous years. A list of the vendors' contact information and a copy of the email can be

found in <H:\Launcch\Conferences\2012\Report\VendorReport\LAUNC-CH Vendor Report 2012.docx>. Emails were sent in October 2011, and again in December 2011. Most vendors responded immediately to the email. ACM, EBSCO, and Harrassowitz all responded with donations. A thank you note was sent after the conference. Donors (Sarah Michalak, ACM, Harrassowitz, and EBSCO) were publicly acknowledged in a flier in every conference folder.

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 were also sent directly to many colleges, universities, community colleges, and public libraries. A contact list can be found in H:\Launcch\Conferences\2012\Contacts_2012.doc. Since over half of conference attendees came from non-UNC libraries, and evaluation results from the conference show that 65% of respondents found out about the conference via email, it is recommended that LAUNC-CH continue to use email as the primary means of promotion and publicity for next year's conference.

Speaker Coordination

Proposal submission was advertised starting October 7th, and applications were due on November 4th, which was later extended to November 11th. We advertised via email, using the contact list given in the section above on Publicity. The text for the call for proposals can be seen here:

<H:\LAUNCCH\Conferences\2012\Call for proposals.doc>.

Lara Handler and Eileen Heeran contacted each person who had submitted a proposal with an acceptance or rejection letter by December 2nd. The acceptance letter can be found: <H:\LAUNCCH\Conferences\2012\acceptance letters.docx> and the rejection letter is available at: <H:\LAUNCCH\Conferences\2012\rejection letters.docx>. Although some of the speakers requested a breakout session, we asked eight of the speakers if they would be willing to pare down their presentation to a lightning talk of just five minutes (see <H:\LAUNCCH\Conferences\2012\lightning talk acceptance.docx>). All accepted contacts were asked to confirm their acceptance by email.

Once participants confirmed their acceptance and the initial schedule was set, Anita contacted speakers to tell them if their session was scheduled in the morning or afternoon breakout session or lightning talk and to confirm the title, speakers and abstract for the session. Participants were asked to send several items by Friday, January 20th: a short abstract (< 110 words), a short speaker bio, and any audiovisual or assistive technology requests. Participants were also asked to send their slides no later than Monday, February 27th.

A gmail account was created for speaker coordination for the conference (launcch2012@gmail.com) and access to the account was shared among committee members. Reminder emails were sent 2 days before each deadline and the day after for those who had not already met the deadline (as well as additional follow ups as necessary). See (<H:\LAUNCCH\Conferences\2012\AnnualConference-Speakers\SpeakerEmailTexts.docx>) for the text of emails and (<H:\LAUNCCH\Conferences\2012\AnnualConference->

[Speakers\SpeakerInfo-Title-Abstract-Bio-AVNeeds.xlsx](#)) for the Excel spreadsheet used to track speaker details and communications.

Slides were requested in .ppt format. Slides were emailed or, in cases where the file exceeded email size, an individual Dropbox folder was created and shared with the speaker to allow for the sharing of slides, but we were willing to work with speakers who used other formats. One speaker created their presentation in Prezi and we exported to have backups. Slides received were saved into a Dropbox folder shared with the conference committee, and slides were accessed and presented directly from Dropbox during the conference.

Brochures

The brochures from this year's conference were created using the saved file from last year. The brochures were sent out as PDFs and attached to emails, in addition to being linked on the conference website. 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. No features were removed from last year's design; however, this year the committee decided to include the Lightning Talk topics and presenters. This addition caused space issues for the Breakout Session abstracts, so when their topics were selected Breakout Session speakers were asked to submit a shorter abstract around 110 words. Since the format of the conference this year allowed for attendees to switch rooms after each Breakout Session, the brochure was altered to reflect the new breaks. This new structure seemed to work well, but future committees may want to experiment with the layout.

Program

The committee brainstormed possible keynote speakers who could effectively speak on our theme of "Engage, Innovate, Assess: Doing More With Less." We selected Chancellor Thorp as our first choice based on his work with the operations and future initiatives of UNC and his recent book, "Engines of Innovation: The Entrepreneurial University in the Twenty-First Century." When his secretary told us his schedule couldn't be confirmed until after New Year's, we then invited Chancellor Thorp's co-author of the book, Dr. Buck Goldstein of the Economics Department. Unfortunately, he said he'd be out of town for the conference date. Next, we asked R. David Lankes of Syracuse University, who also declined due to his wife's scheduled foot surgery. Finally, in mid-November we asked Dr. Richard (Dick) Blackburn of UNC's Business School, due to his focus on creativity, organizational behavior and teamwork, and the fact that he had received praise for his recent presentation at the TRLN Management Academy. Happily, he accepted our invitation to speak.

Breakout session speakers included: Marian Fragola and Genya O'Gara, NC State University; Diane Harvey and Emily Daly, Duke; Eileen McGrath and Linda Jacobson, UNC-Chapel Hill; Lisa Coats, Anne Pemberton, and Laura Wiegand, UNC-Wilmington; Chris Bates and Everett Blackmon, Charlotte Mecklenburg Public Library; Angela Duncan, Methodist University; Kristina Spurgin, UNC-Chapel Hill; Suchi Mohanty and Kim Vassiliadis, UNC-Chapel Hill.

We ended the day with a series of lightning talks, in which each speaker had 5 minutes to present their innovative project or idea. Lightning talks were given by Jill Ellern, Western Carolina University; April Everett and Julia Obst, Central Piedmont Community College; Gwen Exner, NCknows; Katy Kavanagh, East Carolina University; Mellanye Lackey, UNC-Chapel Hill; Adrienne Lai and Anne Burke, NC State University; Kim Vassiliadis and Emily King, UNC-Chapel Hill; and Kam Woods and Cal Lee, UNC-Chapel Hill.

Conference Packets

Conference packets contained a conference schedule, 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. This year, in an effort to reduce paper, we included the program instead of the detailed session descriptions. Most of the committee participated in stuffing folders, and assembling the nametags the Thursday before the conference. Per last year's recommendation, the committee left several days between the registration cutoff date and the meeting to assemble the folders and nametags because the nametags and conference attendee documents cannot be printed until registration has been finalized.

Copies were made by the copy center at Kinko's FedEx in Chapel Hill (for a total of \$267.92). We purchased the folders and nametags from Discount Office Items [<http://www.discountofficeitems.com/>]. This website has lower prices than most office supply stores, and there was free shipping on orders over \$50. We order the [Sparco Simulated Leather Double Pocket Portfolio \(SPR71435\)](#) folders (for a total of \$54.72). We ordered the [Avery Insertable Name Badge kit \(AVE74459\)](#) per the recommendation of last year's committee (for a total of \$ 98.52). These badges worked out very well.

Undergraduate Scholarship

In an effort to encourage undergraduates to consider a career in librarianship, and in response to previous requests from the Library Diversity Committee, the LAUNC-CH board and Conference Committee again offered paid conference registration to two undergraduates who work in a library on campus to attend the LAUNC-CH conference. The Diversity Committee is especially interested in attracting to librarianship individuals from groups currently underrepresented in the profession, thereby diversifying the backgrounds, beliefs, and perspectives of the professional librarian workforce.

We sent an email to student employee supervisors asking for their help in publicizing the opportunity to undergraduate employees. 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? Unfortunately we did not receive any submissions for this scholarship.

Registration

Registration for the 2012 LAUNC-CH conference opened February 1, 2012, and closed February 27, 2012. There were 186 registrants for the conference, with the following breakdown by category:

Speakers	27
Staff	141
Students	11
CALAs	7

Breakdown by institution was as follows:

UNC-Chapel Hill	89
Other TRLN	28
Other	69

This was the first year that we made online registration and credit card payment available. We used UNC's event registration system (https://cfx.research.unc.edu/res_classreg/index.cfm). Dan Comeskey in Davis Library's Fiscal Services department handled the interaction with the system. Approximately every other day, he downloaded the registrants into a spreadsheet and sent it to the committee member who was in charge of registration, who entered them into a master registration spreadsheet. Conference registrants who used the online system could either pay by credit card or check. Credit card payments were deposited into a UNC Libraries account, and LAUNC-CH invoiced the library for that amount after the conference. Registrants who used the online system but paid by check were essentially just using the online system to reserve a spot for themselves, since they still had to mail a check for their registration cost. The option of using a paper form for registration was also still available. Approximately 75% of registrants chose to use the online system, and a little over half paid by credit card. The ability to pay by credit card was a very popular option and one that should be made available for future conferences if possible.

One glitch came up in using the online system. We set a cap on the number of registrations in the online system so that we wouldn't accept more registrants than the capacity of the Friday Center. On the last day of registration, the online system unexpectedly said that the event was full (even though it was not) and potential registrants were only able to put their names on a waiting list. The people on the waiting list were contacted and told that they could come to the conference, but there were presumably other potential attendees who missed out on the chance to attend because of this glitch. As it turned out, the problem was that if registrants start putting their information in the online system but don't finish their registration, they're counted toward the total number of registrants but do not show up in the list of registrants that is downloaded from the system. The person managing the event is supposed to monitor

the registrants and delete these “extras” but that was not possible because a non-committee member was doing the actual interaction with the system. In the future, it would be better if a LAUNC-CH conference committee member could work directly with the system instead of having to go through someone from Fiscal Services; if that is not possible, knowing better how the system works should help in future years.

As was done last year, registration receipts were scanned and sent as e-mail attachments to those registrants who paid by check.

Evaluation Results

What is your overall evaluation of the Conference?	4.47
Based on advance announcements, how well did the Conference meet your expectations?	4.5
Please rate the Conference location and its facilities.	4.75
What is your reaction to the number of concurrent breakout sessions?	3.5
What is your reaction to the topics of the breakout sessions?	4.06

How did you find out about the conference?	
LAUNC-CH website	11
Friend/colleague	17
E-mail	56
Other	2 (NCLA announcement)

What did you like best about the conference?

-Keynote, lightning talks, relevancy of topics, networking, location/pacing/food, Friday Center, liked the shorter breakout sessions

-“I liked the length of the sessions. Sometimes they can be too long and the length can make them exhausting. This conference was well planned and informative!”

-“I loved that you split up the breakout sessions this year.”

-“Local, inexpensive, relevant and interesting!”

-“Balance of tech services and research services.”

What did you like least about the conference?

-Description didn't quite describe adequately, disconnect, lightning talks too brief, acoustics in Azalea room, only 2 options per breakout session, would like more technical services addressed, more ways to networks, lightning talks too short, only one paraprofessional speaker and would like more (recruit from NCLA group?), wanted more non-UNC CH attendees

-A couple of sessions got complaints, but most were very well liked.

What topics would you like to see addressed at future conferences?

-Hands on active learning, small group discussions, community college librarians, e-learning/distance, e-resources, e-science and big data, learning styles, tech topics, collection development, ILS, tech services, innovative instruction techniques, how are library schools addressing the job market, procrastination and time management, leadership, marketing, statistics and budget, management, special libraries, ROI/assessment, learning outcomes assessment, transitioning between types of libraries, cross training, evaluating space, collections, training student employees or volunteers.

Other comments or suggestions:

-Online evaluation forms. Food, location, speakers great. Liked public library representation, lightning talks. Lots of “great work”s and “thanks.” Unconference idea. Two day or 1 ½ day conference. Hold questions during lightning might encourage more questions, maybe break up by subject?
-“Ask the presenters to use the microphones.”
-“How do we join the listserv and ways to be more active and volunteer?”
-“Please keep this program. Another good conference!”
-“Thanks for such an economical event.”

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 liked how we uncoupled the presentations during the breakout sessions, which allowed them to split their attendance between multiple sessions. The key note and lightning talk session were very well received, although of course there were some calls for longer lightning talks and some for shorter. Next year’s committee should consider continuing keeping the split sessions of breakouts and the lightning talks when planning the conference day.

Recommendations

We highly recommend that next year’s committee continue the pattern of sending 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. We also recommend limiting the number of speakers to two per submission, which prevents having to provide complimentary conference registration for numerous participants.

We broke with (recent) tradition and had a keynote speaker that was from outside the library profession, although he came well recommended from having spoken at the TRLN Management Academy. Dick Blackburn is Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior in UNC’s Business School, and he gave a well-received talk on “Doing More with Less.”

In past years, the breakout sessions were grouped together into four separate 1 ½ hour sessions. We split the morning and afternoon sessions into two shorter time periods, with a break in between. This allowed attendees to switch rooms if they desired, and which many people did. This got a lot of positive feedback, both verbally and on the conference evaluation forms.

The audiences sometimes couldn’t hear questions being asked of the speakers. We recommend next year’s committee make sure all of the microphones are working and passed around during Q&A. Of course, getting the people who ask questions in the audience to use the microphones is another challenge.

The lightning talks were shortened to five minutes this year and we had more of them, and although some people requested more or less, or shorter or longer, overall they were very well received and should be considered for next year’s Conference.

We recommend continuing the trend toward reducing the amount of printing and mailing for the conference. Rely instead on email and the LAUNC-CH website for publicity. In addition, the committee may want to consider “going green” next year. There is discussion of creating a mobile LAUNC-CH website, so attendees could easily view the schedule on their phone. Additionally, the committee could create a paper version of the schedule that could fit in the badges. This would save a considerable amount of money, time, and paper.

As usual, attendees were very satisfied with the venue. If next year’s committee uses the Friday Center we recommend keeping the link to parking information on the brochure. This seems to have helped with alleviating past issues with parking confusion and tickets.

Emailing the vendors proved successful, especially emailing them early in the year and emailing them again if they didn’t respond the first time, and the committee would recommend next year’s committee follow this approach.

The committee suggests that the following institutions be contacted for support as well, since they and their communities benefit and attend this conference:

1. North Carolina State University Library:

Vice Provost & Director of Libraries, Susan K. Nutter
3128 East Wing, D.H. Hill Library, Box 7111
Susan_nutter@ncsu.edu

2. Duke University Libraries:

Deborah Jakubs, University Librarian
112 Perkins
Box 90193 Durham, NC 27708-0193
919-660-5800
Deborah.jakubs@duke.edu

3. North Carolina Central University:

Dr. Theodosia Shields, Director of Library Services
1801 Fayetteville St., Durham, NC 27707
919-530-5233
tshields@ncsu.edu

4. UNC-CH SILS Program:

Gary Marchionini, Dean
919-962-8363
Manning Hall, Rm. 103
gary@ils.unc.edu