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The 32nd annual NASIG conference was held in
Indianapolis, IN. The conference offered five pre-
conference workshops, three vision sessions, twenty-
ine concurrent sessions, one “great ideas” showcase
with seven sessions, four snapshot sessions, six student
spotlight sessions, and a vendor expo. Other events
included an opening reception, first-timers reception,
and informal discussion groups.

There were 119 surveys submitted from 289 conference
attendees. Survey respondents could enter a name and
e-mail address for a chance to win a $50 Amazon gift
card. Stacie Parillo from the US Naval War College was
the winner.

Below is a summary of the survey results.

Conference Rating

Respondents were asked to give ratings on a Likert scale
of one to five, with five being the highest. The overall
rating of the 2016 conference was 4.33. This was a
slight decrease from the overall rating of 4.48 in 2016.
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Facilities and Local Arrangements

The 2017 rating was 4.16, a slight decrease from the 2016 location of Albuquerque, NM, which rated a 4.35.

Forty-three comments were entered on the survey about local arrangements and facilities mentioning a variety of issues. Several comments suggested a need for more breakfast options. There were numerous praises of the hotel staff.
Seventy-nine percent of survey respondents brought a laptop or a tablet to the conference. Fifty-seven percent of respondents rated a high importance on wireless access availability in meeting rooms.

**Website, Blog and Schedule**

The majority of survey respondents rated the layout and explanation of programs as four or higher on the Likert scale with 50% assigning a rating of five.

The conference website received a weighted average of 4.11. The NASIG blog was rated less highly at 3.59. Many of the commenters noted they did not take advantage of the conference blog or knew of its existence.

**Pre-Conference Workshops**

The five pre-conference workshops received a weighted average of 3.0 to 4.67. Comments were generally positive.

**Vision Sessions**

Three vision sessions were a part of the 2017 conference. The average overall ratings for the three sessions ranged from 4.02 to 4.18. Michel Dumontier’s presentation was timely on data, with several respondents commenting positively about his presentation. Many respondents commented on the thought-provoking nature of April Hathcock’s presentation on scholarly communication. Dr. Carol Tilley’s “The Secret Life of Comics: Socializing and Seriality” prompted many positive comments about the interesting nature of this presentation.

**Other Sessions**

NASIG offered 29 concurrent sessions during the 32nd annual conference. Twenty-three of those (79%) received an overall rating of 4.0 or higher. The number of sessions offered was lower than last year’s conference in Albuquerque. Most comments were positive, or offered specific, constructive criticism of an individual session. Feedback will be shared with presenters upon request.

This year’s conference marked the fifth year of the great ideas showcase, formerly called poster sessions. There were seven participants in 2017. All seven participants received a 4.0 rating or higher. The showcase sessions did not generate many evaluation comments.

The 32nd conference was the fourth year to offer snapshot sessions, “designed for 5-7 minute talks in which projects, workflows, or ideas are presented.” There were four sessions, with weighted averages from 3.86 to 4.15.

There were six student spotlight sessions, with weighted averages from 3.67 to 4.35.

The survey requested that responders rate and comment on ideas for future programming. Comments were entered with general and specific ideas for various types of sessions. A detailed summary of feedback will be submitted to the board.

**Events**

The First Timers/Mentoring Reception received a rating of 3.98. An overwhelming 90.63% would like to see this event continue. Comments submitted about the event were mostly positive, with a few comments about wanting a more structured event.

The Business Meeting received a rating of 3.82. Participants noted that the meeting was short and to the point.

The Vendor Expo received a rating of 3.85 with the majority of survey respondents (86%) wanting to see it continue.
Respondent Demographics

As in previous surveys, academic library employees continue to represent the largest group of respondents at 74%. This is a lower percentage than was held by academic libraries for the 2016 conference at 79%.

Respondents were asked to “describe your work” using as many of the 30 given choices as necessary (including “other”). This was the fourth year that “electronic resources librarian” garnered the highest number of responses (50). Acquisitions Librarian (34), Serials Librarian (33), Collection Development Librarian (25), and Catalog/Metadata Librarian (23) round out the top five responses.

When asked about the number of years of serials-related experience, “11-20 years” received the majority at 28 responses.

---

1To ease the reading of the demographic chart, several categories offered on the survey were condensed:
Academic libraries contains: College Library, Community College Library, University Library
Vendors and Publishers contains: Database Provider, Publisher, Subscription Vendor or Agency
2 Specialized Libraries contains: Law Library, Medical Library, Special or Corporate Library
Government Libraries contains: Government, National, or State Library
Others contains: Public Library, Student, Other
Several other categories were available, but not selected by a survey respondent.
Forty-one percent of respondents noted that this was their first NASIG conference.