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The 29th annual NASIG (North American Serials Interest Group) conference was held in Fort Worth, Texas. The conference offered three pre-conferences, three vision sessions, thirty-six program sessions, four “Great Ideas Showcase” sessions, four snapshot sessions, and vendor lightning talks. Other events included an opening reception, first-timers reception, informal discussion groups, and a vendor expo.

CONFERENCE RATING

Overall Conference Rating

In total, 152 surveys were submitted from 346 conference attendees. This 44% response rate is a significant drop from the 68% response rate for 2013. Survey respondents could enter a name and email address for a chance to win a $50 gift card. Jeff Kuskie from the University of Nebraska at Omaha was the winner.

Below is a summary of the survey results.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked to give ratings on a Likert scale of one to five, with five being the highest. The overall rating of the 2014 conference was 4.42. This is higher than both 2013 (4.31) and 2012 (4.39).

**Facilities and Local Arrangements**
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All ratings for the 2014 conference were higher than 2013, except social events. The geographic location question saw the highest jump. The 2014 rating was 4.42, while Buffalo saw a rating of 3.72 and Nashville a rating of 3.89.

Fifty-one comments were entered on the survey about local arrangements and facilities, some of which touched on multiple issues. Issues with HVAC and wireless access were noted. Many compliments were received on the hotel and Ft. Worth in general. Some expressed displeasure with the shuttle services. The abundance of food available at breaks was commented on by several, some in a positive light, while others would have liked to see less food.

Comments about the meeting rooms were generally positive, mostly focusing on the tables being available for those who wished to type during sessions. Multiple commenters did ask that speakers remember to use microphones in the room to aid attendees’ ability to hear adequately.

A total of 71% of survey respondents brought a laptop or a tablet to the conference. Many commented on whether wireless access in the meeting rooms was a necessity. Some thought that as long as it was available in the rooms, paying for connectivity in the meeting rooms was not necessary. Others, however, stated that wireless access in the meeting rooms was such a necessity, it should not even be a survey question.


**Website, Blog and Schedule**

The majority of survey respondents (123) thought the program’s layout and explanation were easy to understand. The Sched online program received both praise and complaints in the comments. The conference website received high marks at 4.17. The conference blog was rated less highly at 3.68. Many of the commenters did not know that a conference blog was available.

**Pre-Conferences**

Three pre-conferences were offered at the 29th annual conference. Ratings ranged from 3.82 to 4.78. Comments were generally positive. A few participants cited technical difficulties.

**Vision Sessions**

Three vision sessions were a part of the 2014 conference. All were highly rated, ranging from 4.16 to 4.48. One commenter went so far as to say, “The vision sessions were my favorite part of the conference. They were all excellent and timely.” Katherine Skinner’s high energy was noted in several comments. The topical interest of her talk was questioned by some, while others noted that it was nice to receive new information. Herbert Van de Sompel’s session was thought-provoking to many. Comments on Jenica Rogers’ session were mixed; several praised it, while other were not as impressed.

**Other Sessions**

NASIG offered thirty-six concurrent sessions during the 29th annual conference. Twenty-eight of those (78%) received an overall rating of 4.0 or higher. The number of sessions offered was higher than in Buffalo. Most comments were positive, or offered specific, constructive criticism of an individual session. Feedback was shared with presenters upon request.

2014 marked the second year of the “Great Ideas Showcase,” formerly called poster sessions. While seventeen participated in 2013, there were only four in 2014. Commenters noted that space and timing were not ideal for this type of session. There were also comments about posters, or the “Great Ideas Showcase” being a good thing to continue for those starting out in the profession. Comments indicated that there was confusion over this session and the snapshot session.

The 29th conference was the first to offer snapshot sessions, “designed for 5-7 minute talks in which projects, workflows, or ideas are presented.” There were four participants, none of whom were rated 4.0 or higher. Due to an oversight by the Evaluation & Assessment Committee, there was no comment box for the snapshot sessions.

Another new type of session for 2014 was the vendor lightning talks. 81% of survey respondents would like to see them continue; the overall rating was 3.89. Comments were mostly positive. Suggestions were offered through the comments to open the session up to more vendors, move the timing, and structure the session around a theme.

The survey requested that responders rate and comment on ideas for future programming. Comments were entered with general and specific ideas for concurrent, preconference and vision sessions. A detailed summary of feedback has been submitted to the board.

**Events**

The first-timers reception received a rating of 3.98. An overwhelming 89% would like to see this event continue. Comments submitted about the event ranged from gratitude for allowing newcomers a chance to connect with other conference attendees to complaints about location and timing.

There were ten information discussion groups, one of which was added on-site, and therefore not included in the survey. Seven groups received a rating of 4.0 or higher. Requests for other types of discussion groups
were submitted via the comments as well as feedback that one leader did not arrive.

Comments on the business meeting were varied. Many were thankful for a short meeting, while others requested that a more substantive agenda be prepared for the annual conference.

The vendor expo is another event that the majority of survey respondents (88%) would like to see continue. Several comments were received about the timing of the event. Many think it should be scheduled later in the conference as several missed it this year due to travel schedules. There were also suggestions that the vendor expo be coupled with the vendor lightning talks.

The dine-arounds did not have a specific section on the 2014 conference survey. They were, however, mentioned several times in the comments as a positive way for conference attendees to socialize.

**Respondent Demographics**¹

1 To ease the reading of the demographic chart, several categories offered on the survey were condensed: Academic libraries contains: College Library, University Library

Vendors and Publishers contains: Automated Systems Vendor, Binder, Book Vendor, Database Provider, Publisher, Subscription Vendor or Agency

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.
As in previous surveys, academic library employees continue to represent the largest group of respondents at 75%. This is the same percentage held by academic libraries for the 2013 conference.

Respondents were asked to “describe your work” using as many of the twenty-three given choices as necessary (including “other”). The 2014 conference marks the first year that “electronic resources librarian” garnered the highest number of responses (72). Serials librarian (64), acquisitions librarian (47), catalog/metadata librarian (39), and collection development librarian (32) round out the top five responses.

When asked about the number of years of serials related experience, “more than 20 years” received the majority, at forty-five responses. Thirty-four respondents have 11-20 years of experience with serials. It is interesting to note that the years of experience does not necessarily translate to comparable experience with NASIG. Ninety-three respondents (61%) have been to five or fewer NASIG conferences.