

NASIG Newsletter

Vol. 25, no. 3

September 2010

eISSN 1542-3417

25th Conference (2010) Wrap-Up

NASIG Executive Board Wrap-up Notes

Date, Time: June 6, 2010, 7:38 a.m.-8:56 a.m.

Place: Rancho Las Palmas Hotel, Palm Springs, California

Attending:

Rick Anderson, President

Katy Ginanni, Vice President/President-Elect

Jill Emery, Past President

Carol Ann Borchert, Secretary

Lisa Blackwell, Treasurer-Elect

Members-At-Large:

Bob Boissy

Patrick Carr

Steve Kelley

Christine Stamison

Virginia Taffurelli

Sarah George Wessel

Ex Officio:

Kathryn Wesley

Guests:

Steve Shadle, incoming Vice President

Clint Chamberlain, incoming Member-At-Large

Buddy Pennington, incoming Member-At-Large

Jenni Wilson, incoming Member-At-Large

Joyce Tenney, Site Selection

Angela Dresselhaus, incoming Ex-Officio

Regrets:

Peter Whiting, Treasurer

Session Feedback and Suggestions

Two heavily attended sessions noted were the e-books and OCLC research, each with close to or over 100 people.

Panelists need to minimize time giving background of organization when their time is limited to start with, except when relevant to topic. PPC could add to list of speaker resources about giving a good presentation.

There were a couple of sessions from vendors that turned into sales sessions. Maybe it is time to just let folks present what they want? Attendees can leave and go to a different session if they don't want to listen to it. Keep the no disparaging policy.

Should we do another speed dating session? The session at a previous conference was very popular, but we figured vendor expo would replace it. Do we want to have both? The speed dating session only reached about 75 people versus the vendor expo, which reached a much broader audience.

The suggestion arose that we might eventually want to do away with the conference program tracks.

Regarding the vendor presentation issue, we could try a track of product services as an experiment and see how it works.

Vendor Expo

The Vendor Expo generated overwhelmingly positive feedback, except one or two persons. Emery will be following up with vendors for their feedback.

Awards

When awards were handed out, sponsors for the awards were not mentioned, nor were they in the brochure about the awards. This needs to be corrected for next year.

The Merriman Award was awarded to two people (one NASIG and one UKSG), but we only acknowledged the NASIG half. Anderson reported that was done at the UKSG award recipient's request.

When announcing the Rose Robischon award winner, we need better euphemism for them when we publicly announce, rather than saying that they don't have any money. We don't need to change the award description, but the wording on the announcement at the conference should be changed.

Business Meeting & Brainstorming Session

During the "Meet the Board" section of business meeting, Board members should line up so folks can see us.

There was some feedback from the brainstorming session about not staying on topic, since we strayed from the original topic. Some folks felt that we should have stayed with the original topic; others were glad the NASIG name issue came up and was discussed.

The Board needs to revise the invitation to the parliamentarian to make requirements more clear. Do we need to continue to have a specific brainstorming topic if we're rolling it in with the business meeting? Or explain very clearly that new business is a time to discuss anything on one's mind? Should we separate parliamentarian duties from brainstorming session

facilitator? Should we send a call for old and new business before the meeting to add to the agenda?

Communication

Non-member registrants were not receiving the conference blasts; they only received one message. CPC and PPC manuals should be updated to make sure non-member registrants are included in all conference communication. ECC has already added information to wiki regarding sending blasts to registrants, including non-members.

There was an issue of a tweet that was derogatory toward an individual from the conference. The Board does not wish to censor communication about the conference, but we would like to remind people to be respectful and civil, particularly in public discussions, whether live or virtual. Board members will mull this issue and discuss in a future board meeting.

A question arose if we should have a social networking task force. ECC might already find this within their purview, but if they feel we need separate task force, we could appoint one. As for the task force on new technologies, it should evolve naturally. These technologies are really bottom up not top down.

Do we need more reminders about the committee meetings? This should not come from Board liaisons, but rather from committee chairs; the meeting is for the incoming committee.

It is okay to announce Nashville in 2012; contracts are signed. Announce that we are considering a Canadian location in the next 3-5 years and to get passports, etc. So far, we haven't quite been able to get conference room rate that we need from some Canadian locations.

Speaker Travel Arrangements

PPC travel arrangements will need to match reimbursement policy. Generally, if there are things in the manual that they don't do, they need to be removed at discretion of the committee. We need to

review the reimbursement policy in light of current airfares and methods of booking flights.

Future Possibilities and Projects

There is the possibility of co-sponsoring a session with ER&L at their conference and ours. This would be a marketing opportunity for both ER&L and NASIG. We could capture one ER&L program and brand it, broadcast as a streaming file, send it to listservs, and add it to the NASIG site. Then ER&L would do the reverse with a NASIG program. ER&L can bring the technology to St. Louis for us.

The topic of the NASIG internship came up. This could be a spring program to help a committee with a project. The Board would agree on the project at the fall board meeting. More details will be forthcoming to the Board in a formal proposal. The intern will need to have a mentor assigned. Internship will need to be assigned before other awards. We will need to advertise heavily with schools, with the project finalized by the end of

summer and awarded by November so they can register for credit. SOC will develop this and let A&R do the administration. We need a project list from committees by the end of summer, and the Board can review. Also, we should have a mechanism for students to propose ideas as well, such as student award winners who have some familiarity with NASIG. Review the job description for the administrative assistant position to see if Board wants to submit a proposal. We can substitute one of the student grant awards with the internship. If there are two interns, there would be two fewer student grants that year. Same financial benefit at conference would apply to both. Maybe have them do a poster session on their experience?

Submitted by:
Carol Ann Borchert
NASIG Secretary
June 14, 2010

Minutes approved by NASIG Executive Board July 23, 2010.