

## MACPAC representatives for the term of July 2008 through June 2009

From the MOBIUS Consortium Office ?????? will act as our primary liaison, while Justin Hopkins will act as our alternate.

Cluster	Representative	Alternate Representative
Archway	Lisa Farrell	Kelly Mitchell
Arthur	Mary Batterson	
Bridges	Julie Portman	
Galahad	Melissa Hopkins	
Lance	Donna Russell	Gayla McHenry
MERLIN	LaDonna Pierce	Mary Aycock
Quest	Cheryl Riley	Cynthia Dudenhoeffer
SLU	Martha Allen	
SWAN	Amber Carr	
Towers	Rick Dyson	
WashU	Erin Leach	
WILO	Not yet received	

### Contact information:

#### 2 year term 2008-2010

LaDonna Pierce (MS&T) [piercelad@mst.edu](mailto:piercelad@mst.edu)

Donna Russell (Truman State University) [drussell@truman.edu](mailto:drussell@truman.edu)

Kelly Mitchell (St. Charles Community College) [kmitchell@stchas.edu](mailto:kmitchell@stchas.edu) 636-922-8340

Amber Carr (Missouri Southern State University) [carr-a@mssu.edu](mailto:carr-a@mssu.edu)

Julie Ann Portman (Fontbonne) [jportman@Fontbonne.edu](mailto:jportman@Fontbonne.edu)

Mary Aycock (MU) [aycockm@missouri.edu](mailto:aycockm@missouri.edu)

Erin Leach (WashU) [eleach@wustl.edu](mailto:eleach@wustl.edu)

Lisa Farrell (East Central College) [lmfarrell@eastcentral.edu](mailto:lmfarrell@eastcentral.edu)

Gayla McHenry (Truman State University) [gmchenry@truman.edu](mailto:gmchenry@truman.edu)

#### 1 year term remaining 2008-2009

Mary Batterson (Columbia College) [mebatterson@ccis.edu](mailto:mebatterson@ccis.edu)

Melissa Hopkins (Mineral Area College) [mhopkins@mineralarea.edu](mailto:mhopkins@mineralarea.edu)

Cheryl Riley (University of Central Missouri) [riley@libserv.cmsu.edu](mailto:riley@libserv.cmsu.edu)

Martha Allen (SLU) [allenmh@slu.edu](mailto:allenmh@slu.edu)

Rick Dyson (Missouri Western State University) [fdyson@missourirwestern.edu](mailto:fdyson@missourirwestern.edu)

Cynthia Dudenhoeffer (CMU) [cmdudenh@centralmethodist.edu](mailto:cmdudenh@centralmethodist.edu)

## **Feedback from the 2008 MOBIUS Conference Presenters**

Twelve presenters emailed answers to the questions Felicity Dykas and Mary Batterson emailed all the presenters on June 14, 2008. One additional presenter did not answer the questions, but wrote, "I have no feedback – I thought the entire conference was great!" These responses were sent between June 15 and June 23, 2008.

Questions and Responses:

**1. Did you receive adequate and timely communication (e-mail updates) from the Planning Advisory Committee before the conference? If not, how could we have improved the communication?**

Yes	12
No	0

### Comments

I know it's expedient to designate a chief presenter who will distribute the information to a colleague, but it would have helped us if both our emails could have been included in distributed emails.

Communication was adequate.

Communication was timely and concise. Great job.

They were very helpful in making preparations.

Communication from PAC pre-conf was fine.

**2. Was there any information you did not receive in advance that would have been helpful to you? If so, please explain.**

Yes	3
No	9

### Comments

Some years ago, we'd get not only the count of number of people who signed up for our session, but their names and job titles. That was really useful. If there's now a privacy concern about the names, it would be helpful to just get job titles (don't need cluster or institution). That helps a speaker tailor the presentation to the audience. If I know my audience is full of Directors, I'll change a lot of the ways I explain things compared to if the audience is full of reference librarians or systems librarians.

It would have been helpful to know the newest version of PowerPoint would be available on the presentation computers. We brought our computer since we understood the newer version wasn't going to be available. We could have avoided hauling the extra equipment.

There was a bit of confusion re: panel members, but overall, no insuperable problems.

Everything was great.

**3. Was the room setup satisfactory for the purposes of your presentation? If not, how could the setup have been improved?**

Yes 8

No 4

Comments

It was adequate (every seat was filled).

In particular the clip-on mic setup worked perfectly – I was very pleased about that. (I did see as an audience member that at least one room had a problem with the projector not being aligned with the screen, so that the presenter's slides were cut off at the bottom. I was happy that didn't happen to me.)

It was fine.

Could have been better. I was the first presenter. Apparently there was a problem with the screen resolution or something so the bottom 10% or so of all my slides was cut off. I didn't realize this was the case until I was well into my presentation since my title slide didn't go very far down the page.

It would have been nice to have had speakers hooked up to the computer, but we made do.

The door opened up behind the speaker's podium. This wasn't ideal for later arrivers and early departers. Our room was completely full. A larger presentation room would have been better for all involved in our presentation. (D5: Library Improvement)

The room was satisfactory but there was not enough room to accommodate a second or third speaker to sit comfortably while waiting to speak.

**4. Did you experience adequate and timely technical assistance? If not, please elaborate on how the assistance could have been improved.**

Yes 8  
No 1  
N/A 3

Comments

I did have someone there to show me how to advance the slides.

The hotel staff was extremely friendly and helpful when I swapped laptops at both my presentations.

We spoke with someone 15 minutes before our presentation and he changed our projector and solved our sound issues in plenty of time.

Our presentation technology worked okay. Since we brought our own hardware, we were familiar with it and knew how to troubleshoot any unexpected surprises.

I seem to remember that the microphone had new batteries and for some reason wasn't working as well as it should, but we really didn't want to use it anyway.

The technical assistance was superb.

Very good.

**5. Was the introduction to your presentation satisfactory? If not, please make suggestions as to how it could have been improved.**

Yes 11  
No 1

Comments

Very good.

It would be better if I were contacted ahead of the conference and asked to email how I wanted myself presented. Getting asked a minute or two before the talk starts is distracting to my "presentation" mindset.

Satisfactory.

No problems. Also, the room monitor was helpful for keeping me on track.

Truthfully, I was too nervous to remember our introduction but I do know our room host and I'm sure he did a fine job.

The introduction was very brief (names and titles). I have a feeling most presenters could do a better than adequate job of introducing themselves but, I understand why the students are asked to perform this "speaking" task.

It was fine.

The introduction was fine.

Satisfactory.

## **6. What suggestions do you have for improving support to conference presenters at future events?**

If you need to save money for future conferences, I could do without the cute little gift (this time, a luggage tag). It's nice, but really not necessary. The "thank you" email we get afterwards is appreciated far more.

You did a great job!

Keep the communication channels flowing (like you do now) both before and after the conferences. This is very helpful.

Wonderfully managed. Impressive.

## **7. Additional Comments**

My comments above are obviously somewhat hypothetical since I'm leaving Missouri, but maybe they'll help support future speakers. I have very much enjoyed the MOBIUS conferences and have been happy to participate in them. I wish you and future MOBIUS/regional III conference organizers the best for the future.

I was wondering if the committee would consider setting a time limit on how long presentation materials are available on the website? Some organizations take materials down after a set period of time such as 90 or a 120 days after the conference. Thanks.

I think the MOBIUS Conference is very well organized all the way from submitting proposals to the actual conference. It is hard to do this well. The MACPAC committee does a great job.

Everything was very well organized and flowed nicely.

In future program announcements, please make it very clear when sessions are presentations versus forums. I signed up and attended two forums expecting to attend

presentations. In both cases, I was disappointed because I like to gather information and training in a lecture-style environment better than the forum-style environment. Please help people like me better identify the type of sessions I will be selecting. In retrospect, I know the program tried to inform me of the difference in 2008, but I just didn't catch on until it was too late.

Everything went very, very well.

I have no idea what went on behind the scenes, but from where I was sitting the conference was well-organized, well-supported and ran like clockwork. Thanks for an excellent conference!

## MOBIUS 2008 Annual Conference Evaluation Report

Updated 7/3/2008

135 Forms Completed			
1 = Excellent; 2 = Above Average; 3 = Average; 4 = Below Average; 5 = Poor; 6 = Not Applicable			
	<b># of responses</b>	<b>AVERAGE</b>	
Keynote Speaker	127	3.2598	Average to Below Average
Networking Session	122	3.3361	Average to Below Average
Opening General Session	131	3.0153	Average to Below Average
Sessions (overall quality)	127	1.8189	Excellent to Above Average
Session Topics	132	1.9621	Excellent to Above Average
Forums	123	3.1138	Average to Below Average
Exhibits (quantity & quality)	130	2.7308	Above Average to Average
No Conflict Time for Exhibits	124	2.1210	Above Average to Average
Share Fair	123	2.8455	Above Average to Average
Networking Opportunities	128	2.2813	Above Average to Average
Hotel Meeting Rooms	133	2.2030	Above Average to Average
Hotel Guest Rooms & Facilities	128	2.3984	Above Average to Average
Meals	135	2.1037	Above Average to Average
Registration Process	133	1.5940	Excellent to Above Average
Conference Staff (MCO, grad student help, etc.)	131	1.4885	Excellent to Above Average
Overall	130	1.7923	Excellent to Above Average
Would you recommend this conference to others?	103		103 Yes / 33 "did not respond"
Shall we keep conference at Tan-Tar-A	96		71 Yes / 25 No
Rate the importance in your decision to attend this conference:			
No Charge Registration	99	1.7677	Ranked 2nd
No Charge Continental Breakfast	90	3.6444	Ranked 4th
No Charge Lunches	93	2.6344	Ranked 3rd
No Charge Lodging	94	1.7128	Ranked 1st
Would you still attend the conference if you or your institution had to pay a conference registration fee?	98		72 Yes / 7 No / 19 "depends on cost"
Did the 2008 conference meet the stated goals?	103		102 Yes / 1 No
Would you change the purpose or focus of the conference in any way?	89		5 Yes / 84 No

## **Overview & chronology**

NOTE: Dates are based on a conference held during the first week in June. Adjust dates as needed if conference is held at a different time. Meetings are usually held at the MOBIUS office.

### Two to Three Weeks after the Conference

- Post-planning meeting (go over what worked and what didn't work; determine what changes, if any, should be made for next year's conference).
- A final report needs to be generated for the Executive Committee.
- A new chair needs to be elected

### July

- New committee members begin their 2 year term.
- Initial planning meeting
- Appoint sub-committees.
- Select a theme for the conference (optional)
- Prepare preliminary outline for Conference
- Prepare progress report for Executive Committee.

### August

- Call for presentations and forums deadline 10/31/08
- 

### September

- Reminder of presentation and forum deadline 10/31/08
- Determine list of possible keynote speakers

### October

- Recommend Keynote speaker to MCO
- Deadline 10-31-08 for presentations and forums
- 

### November

- MACPAC meets in Columbia
- Review and select presentation proposals and forums
- Layout Conference-At-A-Glance
- Report to Executive Committee
- 

### December

- Notify acceptance/non-acceptance of presentation proposals and forums to submitters



## January

## February

- Conference program finalized
- Website ready
- 

## March

- Registration open 3/1 – 3/30 (extend to mid-April if necessary)
- Send emails regarding Keynote speaker; what's new; share fair; training; etc.
- Make budget recommendation to MCO for 2010 conference
- 

## April

- Deadline for “bag stuffing”
- 

## May

- Share Fair call
- Room hosts information
- Final report to the Executive Committee
- 
- 

## June

- Conference
- Thank you emails to presenters and attendees

## **MOBIUS Annual Conference Planning Advisory Committee**

### **Sub-Committees**

1. Keynote
2. Website/logo
3. Publicity/promotion/advertising
4. Proposals
5. Correspondence with presenters
6. Forums
7. Share fair
8. Door prizes
9. Room hosts

Session	Title	Presenter	Evaluations	Overall	comments
A1	Exploring how people look for information	Thompson, Hunter	50	good	material was pertinent but not consistent with title; needed more time for Q & A
A2	Usability testing of the MOBIUS web page	Scoville, Johnson, Spears	11	good	excellent evidence of how things don't work; couldn't read screens
A3	Update on the future of cataloging	Cascio	47	good	needed a microphone (2), used too many acronyms (2)
A4	Podcasting 101	Allen, Borgerding	44	good	very informative; interesting; helpful
A5	Fair & Flexible	Gillespie	20	good	good discussion
A6	You found what?	Riley	27	good	"low tech" approach was good
A7	<b>Vendor</b>				
A8	Forum-Getting collection ideas	Diaz, Gnuschke	15	good	good topic
B1	Connect with your patrons in the digital age				
B2	Teaching online searching to students	Clark, Ely, Langholt	37	good	learned a few things;
B3	Campus partnerships	McGrane, Woodmansee	21	good	good ideas
B4	Does anyone ever click?	Wynn	19	good	very informative; great idea; my library can use this;
B5	Demystifying IUG enhancements	Schweitzberger, Stumpf	17	good	interesting but hard to follow;
B6	Protecting our collection	McKinley, Jiao	24	good	discussion at the end was very helpful
B7	<b>Vendor</b>				
B8	Forum- ER Management	Cascio	32	good	set up a roundtable for discussions; would like to see more organized sessions next year;
C1	<b>Vendor</b>				
C2	Clickers in the classroom	Romine, McGurk	30	good	excellent presentation!!
C3	Forum- Preparing for the future of cataloging	Dykas	42	good	Interesting and provocative; excellent conversations; practical advice
C4	Free and open source software	Pryor	37	ok	wanted more discussion/examples-less background info
C5	Art & Science of Interviewing	Byerly	37	good	excellent presentation!!
C6	Blackboard to the rescue	Davis, Hallis	35	ok	interesting; hard to see slides; need more start up info
C7	<b>Vendor</b>				
C8	Forum- Catalog redesign for Web Pages	Wynn, Maseles, Detwiler, Hays	27	ok	open format led to sidetracked discussion and little real content
D1	<b>Vendor</b>				
D2	Finding and getting Google Books	Belvadi	52	good	excellent presentation but overwhelming; very fast talker
D3	Revisiting the OPAC	Aycock, Davis	31	good	great job showing comparative information; too many slides
D4	Missouri Digital Heritage	Wingo	29	good	interesting subject; great workshop
D5	Library Improvement	McGrane, Morgan, Carr	42	good	great presentation
D6	Forum- MCO feedback				
D7	<b>Vendor</b>				
D8	Will you hire me?	Langholt, Erdlelez, Scoville	20	ok	focused on Reference/searching; thought it would be more general information
E1	<b>Vendor</b>				
E2	Forum- Disabilities	Hays, Mellis	15	good	would have liked handouts with basic information; interesting; best session I attended at the conference;
E3	Custom fit	Schlegel, Mercante	21	good	favorite session; fun and informative
E4	Using YBP and GOBI	Lynam, Bergeson	13	good	(NO COMMENTS)
E5	Usability evaluation of your library website	Erdelez, Thompson, Paul	46	good	provided practical examples; need session on Google Analytics
E6	Processing, Training and Powerpoint	Riley	29	good	easy to follow and helpful
E7	<b>Vendor</b>				
E8	Forum- 1st Choice	Weir, Sanguinet	21	good	more of a presentation than a forum;

[illegible]

## **Committee Overview**

The MOBIUS Annual Conference Planning Advisory Committee exists to help the MCO Office and the Executive Committee with the annual conference. The primary job of the committee is to schedule individual member sessions and to promote the conference. The committee divides the conference responsibilities among its members....each member normally has primary responsibility for one aspect of the conference. In addition, each member should routinely communicate committee activities with their home cluster. The cluster representative is responsible for keeping their cluster informed about the annual conference.

The Committee has approximately three face-to-face meetings each year. Meetings are held in Columbia. Conference responsibilities for the coming year will be determined at the first meeting of the year; we also review the conference at this meeting and make suggestions for next year. Please review the list of sub-committees for specific conference responsibilities. The MCO office is responsible for exhibits and vendor presentations at the conference.

The conference program is normally the topic of the second meeting of the year.

The third meeting is one last general wrap-up before the conference.

There is documentation for each of the tasks that will facilitate learning for new members. Adhering to deadlines is an important aspect of committee work; it is especially important for the publicity and program/proposals sub-committees.

In addition to information available in your committee notebook, there is a section of the MCO website for committee communication. This area includes a conference planning guide and documentation relevant to previous conferences. The area is password protected so you will need to log-in to review the material. It is a good place to store information. Members are encouraged to routinely review the information at: <http://mco.mobius.missouri.edu/filemanager/list/481/>