

**Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
January 23 – 26, 2013
Chicago, Illinois**

Annual Meeting Task Force (AMTF) Interim Report
(Prepared by Co-chairs Fynnette Eaton and Kathy Marquis)

Since our last report (May 2012) this group has accomplished a good deal of data collection, reflecting the focus areas of the four subgroups: Social responsibility, content, meeting model, and online access. Several surveys have been conducted of other association representatives, asking about their current practices, resources, and plans. These have been useful in determining trends, new practices and options, and finding contacts for further questions.

Below are comments on several aspects of our work, as well as reports by the individual subgroups.

While we haven't completed all of our research, we do have two overall recommendations to make:

1. We support, and the membership seems eager for, a variety of new options. We believe that these should be undertaken in the spirit of "let's try this to see if it works for SAA," rather than "here is the new way SAA will always conduct the annual meeting." Along these lines, the AMTF wholeheartedly supports the efforts of Nancy Beaumont to explore meeting in a second-tier city – and in a convention center, rather than a hotel – if an advantageous contract can be negotiated for this option for 2015.
2. In addition to the cost factor, one consistent impression can be gleaned from both SAA member comments and current literature on professional conferences: at least half of the value of the annual meeting for attendees lies not in the educational sessions, but in the networking, connections, interactions, and sense of professional camaraderie that is gained from attending the annual meeting. As you read the thoughts and recommendations below, keep this in mind. It underlies many of our thoughts about a shorter meeting, concurrent sessions and meetings, new interactive session formats, and online avenues for conducting component group business away from the annual meeting.

Cost of the meeting: Please note that no one group was charged with addressing this factor, but rather each of them have addressed it as it relates to their topic (e.g. online

access: solutions for those who can't attend the meeting, meeting model: hotel or convention center, etc.)

Trade-offs: This may seem obvious, but we are aware that often choosing one option might mean saying no to another option. For example, there are cheaper room rates in second tier cities – but these cities are not major transportation hubs with cheaper air fares – Austin was a good example there. Another tradeoff is happening in New Orleans. Though our meeting is in the first half of August (the latter half is anathema to college and university archivists as it's too close to the beginning of school), it was originally a week earlier. However, the hotel asked us to move our meeting one week later, and in exchange, were willing to give us free Wi-Fi.

Task Force meetings: Most of our work has been through teleconferencing and individual research. We solicited information from the membership by staffing a table at the annual meeting where we collected attendees' thoughts on butcher paper (<http://www2.archivists.org/groups/annual-meeting-task-force/comments-from-the-amtf-table-in-san-diego-0>) and by holding a World Café forum where we presented questions that touched on the four areas of research to hear what attendees thought about our initial ideas.

Supporting documents: We have used a variety of methods for capturing our research, thoughts, and communications. These can be found on our website, which we suggest that SAA keep active, so if there are any questions about how the task force reached its conclusions, the documents will be available. Several documents are also linked within this report or included in the Appendix.

Comment gathering and social media: The Task Force has actively sought comments from the membership using a variety of means, including blog posts (via news items on our microsite and on SAA's leadership blog, *Off the Record*), Twitter, and articles in *Archival Outlook*. If the Council has any suggestions about how additional outreach can be accomplished, we would welcome their thoughts. We are pleased to note that several recent blog posts have generated a significant number of comments.

Next steps: Based on any comments we receive from the Council, our next step is to develop three or four scenarios that incorporate the recommendations of all four subgroups for the Council to consider at its May meeting. In addition, we are still gathering information from surveys that we are sending out to various communities. Our goal is to include the scenarios in our draft final report for the May Council meeting. We would suggest that a final open meeting be scheduled for the New Orleans meeting so that we can share our findings and solicit reactions from members at the meeting. We would also be happy to staff an informational table again, to solicit reactions to our final report.

Individual subgroup reports: We have included the individual subgroup reports to assist you in understanding the work that we have performed so far.

Social Responsibility Subcommittee Report, December 10, 2012

Rachel Vagts, chair, members: Hillel Arnold, Lynda DeLoach, Jodi Koste, Alan Lefever

Note: this group posted on the AMTF blog on this topic as well, garnering quite a few comments from the membership (<http://www2.archivists.org/groups/annual-meeting-task-force/the-challenges-and-opportunities-of-being-socially-responsible>)

Fair Labor Practice

The subcommittee has been examining ways that SAA might mitigate labor issues at future annual meetings. Our discussion has included the following elements:

- Including contract language that requires hotels to address fair labor practice issues. (A request for sites to address fair labor practices in their proposal is included in the 2015 RFP.)
- Gathering information about labor contracts and being aware of any potential actions planned against a hotel property. This includes consulting UNITE HERE's [website](#) and other related sources.
- Increasing transparency about SAA's due diligence during the hotel contract process and potentially coordinating with component groups like the Issues and Advocacy Roundtable as a way of keeping on top of developing issues.

Sustainability

A great deal has been done to create a more sustainable annual meeting and reduce the Society's carbon footprint. The subcommittee has discussed the following items that may continue that progress:

- Having participants opt-in or out of a paperless meeting
- Using a mobile app for the conference schedule (available from our conference planner)
- More visibly displaying information about where surplus food has been donated (this has been SAA practice)

Service Project

An inaugural service project was organized by the Archivists of Religious Collections Section in San Diego in 2012. Service projects are also being planned for the New Orleans meeting.

- The subcommittee supports these efforts and plans to investigate ways the concept can be sustained.
- The Task Force has discussed asking SAA to make coordinating with such an effort the duty of a member of the annual meeting's host committee.

Content Subcommittee Report, December 10, 2012

Carl Van Ness, Chair (members Jacqueline Chapman, Courtney Chartier, Jelain Chubb, Jennifer Johnson, Ben Primer)

The subcommittee was chaired first by Jelain Chubb and then Ben Primer. Van Ness' tenure as subcommittee chair began on September 20, 2012.

The subcommittee conducts most of its business via email and through comments to documents posted on Google Drive and telephone conferences.

Before the annual meeting in August, the subcommittee developed a research agenda that focused on a review of the history of SAA meetings and the need to examine other professional meetings for new and innovative programming. Soon after the annual meeting in San Diego, preparations were laid for conducting two surveys, one related to past annual meetings and another that explored innovative concepts at other professional conferences. The first survey was undertaken by Jennifer Johnson and Van Ness, and it utilized 16 years of meeting programs, both preconference and onsite. Data was compiled on a number of meeting facets along with statistics (e.g., attendance, number of presenters) and entered into a spreadsheet and a text document and shared in Google Drive. The spreadsheet

(<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AkC7FZ0bJOqcdGRncDR1dIZKvXU0OTQ1TDdNMIFQOIE#gid=0>) is divided into two sheets, one for numerical data and the other for when events occurred. The text document

(<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ssm49ar6qc8SYZy8PavEQaGBoRW-VLowsjgaDHXj7is/edit>) contains narrative data that could not be entered into the spreadsheet as well as observations on the data compiled for the spreadsheet. Once the data was compiled, the documents were shared with other Task Force members and opened for comment. A number of comments were made and a blog post (<http://www2.archivists.org/groups/annual-meeting-task-force/survey-of-annual-meeting-programs-for-1997-to-the-present>) to the Task Force's website in October on the survey results.

The second survey was organized by Courtney Chartier and Jackie Chapman and looked at recent meetings of 30 different organizations. Four members of the subcommittee took part in the data gathering and the results were posted in a Google spreadsheet (<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0AqxV4TBfPDDKdGdBSjd3VjJLcDNrdEdTSUlhcxRpTnc#gid=0>). From that document, Courtney created a list of Innovative Concepts

(https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PF14iWkYUVGqUhsou_XBOwd5MLH_CMo5YKbn2Co5Lbo/edit) which she defined as "Things that SAA does not do." That document generated several comments and Courtney has written a blog post that does an excellent job of summarizing the implications of content changes.

(<http://www2.archivists.org/groups/annual-meeting-task-force/bringing-innovation-to-the-annual-meeting-a-report-from-the-conte-0>) This was posted on December 10.

In the meantime, the remaining subcommittee members, Jelain Chubb and Ben Primer, took on the task of reviewing the plenaries as this was an area that came up frequently in annual meeting evaluations. The annual membership survey also indicated dissatisfaction with the plenary sessions. Jelain and Ben conferenced and later reported back to the subcommittee on November 6.

Van Ness also conferenced with Lynn Eaton, chair of the Meeting Model subcommittee, to discuss areas of overlapping interest and the possible impacts of content changes to the meeting model.

Armed with the data from the two surveys, the report on plenaries, as well as comments from the Task Force table at Dan Diego and the 2012 meeting evaluations, the subcommittee is now generating a list of ideas that could serve as the basis for reasonable scenarios that will be submitted to Council for consideration. The Ideas list was circulated to the Task Force for comment on December 7. Once sufficient feedback is received, the subcommittee will develop three possible scenarios that will be submitted with the subcommittee's final report.

Online Access Subcommittee Year-end Report for 2012

Submitted on behalf of the Online Access Subgroup (Beverly Allen, Rebecca Bizonet, Lisa Carter, Erin Lawrimore, Wade Wyckoff) by Rebecca Bizonet, Chair, 12/12/2012

Summary of Activities

The subgroup is continuing its second round of an environmental scan of what similar organizations are doing to facilitate online access to annual meeting content. (The first scan, begun last year, focused more on vendors and their solutions across a small but broad array of professional organizations, not all of them in the archives, library, history, or cultural heritage fields. This scan looks at the organizations themselves, with more of a focus on the allied disciplines.)

Some general impressions that the subgroup has been able to determine so far, based on current research, SAA member feedback from various sources, especially from this year's annual meeting, are as follows. Recommendations are listed in order of perceived importance. Any actions (proposed or taken) or clarifying details follow the category.

Recommendations (to date)

1. **Wi-Fi in meeting rooms.** Much feedback indicates a willingness to pay a modest amount for this benefit, considered extremely important by a majority of respondents. Nearly all feedback pinpoints Wi-Fi in meeting rooms as very important. Wireless access would help members who are not present participate or follow along via attendees' social media postings, to name just one positive effect. If we move in a paperless (or less-paper) direction, Wi-Fi also becomes important for access to conference information—schedules, updates, etc.

2. **Virtual conferencing.** According to members, this issue crosses the boundaries of the Online Access charge and moves into other Task Force areas such as Social Justice (in the form of allowing greater member participation, including by archivists unable to afford travel to annual meetings, as well as in potentially reducing our environmental footprint). This point obviously affects the Meeting Model charge as well. Clearly, some

virtual conferencing component must be added. How best do so remains to be seen. Some examples of the range of options we are considering as well as examples and links are as follows, with the caveat that revisions are likely as our work continues.

Range of options

- a. *Downloadable materials/Content delivery library* (mp3s, handouts, etc.) made available shortly after the conference either free or for a fee. Not interactive at all. Not really virtual conferencing. More appropriately addresses the "access to other (past) meeting content" plank of our research agenda. Example: Us, for one! Also American Association of Law Libraries, (<http://www.softconference.com/aall/>, with sessions priced at \$12-15 each.)
- b. *Livestream* (not interactive) of conference: about one step up from a recording; added advantage that people could tweet about it while it's going on, thus interacting with the in-person audience that way. Could be combined with other options.
- c. *On-demand (asynchronous) webcast* (for individuals or groups). [Fancy recordings.] Advantage of being available anytime, anywhere, but lacks some of the energy and possible synergies inherent in taking place during the conference. Seems most similar to some webinars (non-live ones) and podcasts.
- d. *Scheduled (synchronous) webcast* (for individuals or groups) with interactivity among online attendees/speaker/moderator. Scheduled webcasts are usually also made available to participants afterwards, at least for a limited time. Usually involves some chat feature, either with the speakers/moderators or with speakers/moderators and the entire group. Scheduled webcasts are often also made available to participants afterwards, at least for a limited time. Example: CONTENTdm Virtual User Group Meeting 2012: <http://www.minitex.umn.edu/events/conferences/Highlights/2012/ContentDm/>, which was a virtual-only meeting, though there is an in-person meeting later in the year. (Sponsor/host: OCLC. Cisco WebEx, <http://www.webex.com/why-webex/who-uses-webex.html>, was used for the presentation and chat interface, and seems to be pretty widely used elsewhere.)
- e. *Scheduled (synchronous) webcast specifically to a group that is physically present together*. Has the advantage of getting a group together for discussion among themselves as well as with the speakers. Possible networking opportunities as well, depending on the size and location of the group meeting. Could be workplace, student/university space, regionals. (Borrow from SAA's current workshop webinar model for hosting at willing locations?) Involves same or similar form of chat feature as mentioned in "d." Scheduled webcasts are usually also made available to participants afterwards, at least for a limited time. (Example: American Association of Museums, <http://www.prolibraries.com/aam/?select=sessionlist&conferenceID=7>, though past meeting content structure and options differ from live options [WebEx]. Here is an example of a particularly engaging session from AAM 2012, "Wikipedia and the Museum: Lessons from Wikipedians in Residence," <http://www.prolibraries.com/player/?libname=aam&sessionID=2350#>. Vendor is ProLibraries.)
- f. *Fully integrated in-person and online conference (synchronous)*, with built-in interactivity between the two audiences in real time. We haven't yet run cross an

existing model like this. (One model, meetings for the US Forest Service, managed by vendor iCohere, http://www.icohere.com/company_casestudies.htm, billed itself as "hybrid," and we at first thought maybe it fit the bill, but it was really more like choice "e" above.) We were charged with thinking big, however...

Other considerations

DIY vs. Outsourced. It doesn't fit in as a numbered point, but there's also the question threading through all of these options of *DIY vs. outsourced*, i.e. how DIY vs. how outsourced/fully managed our solutions could and should be, which corresponds somewhat to their level of complexity. There seems to be a perception among members that a cadre of committed volunteers could implement (and one assumes, sustain) reasonably low-cost, innovative DIY efforts. While we should not rule out such an approach, most of our research thus far has focused on options over on the "outsourced" end of the scale. The inherent risk in the DIY option, of course, is counting on unpaid volunteers to do this work, including recruiting and depending on them each year.

Amount/Scope. Another observation applicable to all of these options is that they could range from a small selection of sessions (perhaps organized around a theme, again e.g. AAM's 2011 "Museum of Tomorrow") to the entire conference.

Constancy vs. Change No matter how much we try to do on our own or find the best vendor we can to manage virtual conferencing, indications are that this field is an ever-shifting landscape, and we will need to remain flexible and strive to keep up to speed in both our means of presentation to our members/audience and in whatever ways we choose to amass and preserve existing content (e.g. Will Ustream be around forever? Probably not. But if it happens to be the best thing for 2013, or 2014, should that keep us from using it?). This could be one point in favor of finding a good vendor to manage things, but we still need to be asking them if/how they intend to resolve issues of access (and preservation, though indications thus far are that current and recent access is of greater concern to members than access to past content).

Outside Social Media. All of the types of options, but particularly the more "no-frills" options, rely on or benefit from social media such as Twitter for greater (or any) connection to a wider online community. Thus we continue to bear in mind social media as another running thread through all of the elements of our research agenda.

3. Recordings of meeting content. Nancy Beaumont has instituted a pilot project for SAA 2013 in New Orleans to record selected sessions and have them made available online. Fee structure and timing are yet to be determined.

4. Conference app. A surprising amount of feedback indicated a strong preference for a conference app for annual meeting scheduling, particularly one that could be used offline. The complexity (or range of complexity) for such an app, including how "interactive" it is, must be determined. A baseline would be a simple, offline app to access the conference schedule.

5. **Past meeting content.** (Besides conference recordings: session slides, papers, etc.) Seemingly of less concern to members than other issues listed. However, there does seem to be a potentially low barrier to implement a repository of this kind of material. Indeed, it could simply be an expansion of what SAA is already doing.

Changes or additions to our recommendations may occur as our research continues. We aim to provide many more specifics in our final recommendations.

Other Activities

The subgroup submitted two questions on online access and some recommendations of organizations to include to the Meeting Model subgroup's second survey in early December.

Goals for 2013

Goals for 2013 include completion of environmental scan II, composition of at least one blog post, and a series of fleshed-out recommendations to be included in the "scenarios" to present in the Task Force's final report. We have realized that we also should, along with the rest of the Task Force, and Nancy Beaumont, try to create a model for evaluation of the pilot recording project slated for SAA 2013, as well as some recommendations for its implementation prior to that.

Meeting Model Subcommittee Report

Lynn Eaton (Subcommittee Chair), Shari Christy, Ardys Kozbial, Berlin Loa, Christie Peterson

Charges and Deliverables

The Meeting Model's charge by SAA includes:

- Reviewing the rationale for current meeting model (e.g., conference events take place at one hotel)
- Consider alternative models that might meet SAA's needs, such as having meeting events split across two or more hotels or utilizing convention or university facilities.

The deliverables for this subcommittee include outlining the pros and cons of each alternative model, including costs to SAA and members of possible meeting models and, if possible, recommending one or more models for future consideration.

Survey and Research

This subcommittee reviewed options for obtaining information about other meeting models and decided to create a survey to be sent out to a limited number of organizations. Survey results are summarized here: <http://www2.archivists.org/groups/annual-meeting-task-force/meeting-model-survey-summary>. We will be sending out an updated survey to some organizations in January once things are more settled.

In addition to this survey, the subcommittee gathered information from other available sources, including:

- Meeting Content subcommittee survey results
- Feedback from Nancy Beaumont’s discussions with leadership from other organizations
- Meeting notes and evaluations gathered at and after the August 2012 Annual Meeting in San Diego

Limiting the cost to attendees of attending SAA’s annual meeting was a primary concern to members we heard from in every forum. For many participants, one of the largest costs associated with attending the meeting is lodging. While SAA has not raised conference registration fees significantly in the past few years, as illustrated below, lodging costs to participants have risen significantly since 2007.

The figures below are taken from SAA’s published programs for its meetings since 2007. Notably, hotel rates listed below do not include taxes and other fees, which can add 10-15% or more to lodging costs.

Year	Early Bird Member Registration	Conference Hotel Nightly Rate Single	Conference Hotel Nightly Rate Double
2012	319	199	199
2011	319	199	199
2010	319	185	215
2009	299	153	153
2008	299	149	169
2007	299	129	149

Between 2007 and 2012, registration cost has risen \$20, or 6.7%. Over the same period, the pretax cost of a single room at the conference hotel has risen \$70 per night, or 54.3% while the shared pretax cost of a double room at the conference hotel has risen \$25 per night, or 33.6%.

Between 2007 and 2010, when the double room cost peaked, the shared pretax cost of a double room rose \$33 per night, or 43%.

Findings and Recommendations

The Meeting Model Subcommittee Report attempts to address the most frequently repeated suggestions and issues found in the reviewed sources. In preparing this report, the subcommittee worked from a very limited knowledge of hotel and conference center costs. We did not pursue this information, as our contacting any businesses would result in their contacting SAA headquarters. SAA, like all organizations, negotiates with hotels and vendors for the best prices and services at the period in time. Any contact we made could have negatively affected SAA’s power at any future negotiating table.

The Meeting Model's recommendations consist of: a list of possible alternative models for SAA to consider for its annual meeting; a list of functional requirements; and, evaluative information for each.

Alternative Models

A. Conference held at a conference center.

A conference center setting may mean that participants pay more for registration costs for the meeting than they would if it were held at a hotel. Hotels subsidize or comp costs related to meeting rooms if a certain number of hotel rooms are sold out. At this time, the subcommittee does not know the cost.

B. Conference held at a second tier city.

Holding the conference in a second tier city (whether in a conference center or hotel) is likely to have lower costs in two of the functional areas: hotels and food.

Transportation costs may be a concern, but there are second tier cities with a nearby airport at the least. Intra-city transit may not be as widely supported as would be the case in a first tier city. The evaluations appear to trend towards less need for "cultural opportunities" if that would mean lower costs.

C. Shorter conference meeting.

Limiting the cost to attendees of attending SAA's annual meeting was a primary concern to members we heard from in every forum. For many participants, one of the largest costs associated with attending the meeting is lodging. A shorter meeting would potentially lower the housing cost.

D. Use of university housing.

Several attendees at the 2012 meeting commented at the AMTF feedback table that they would like to see SAA adopt a model similar to that employed by the RBMS preconference at ALA, which organizes alternative lodging at a local college or university. While the Meeting Model subcommittee was unable to explore the logistics of this option thoroughly, it appears to be something that SAA should explore seriously.

It is important to emphasize that the RBMS model provides an *alternative* lodging option for meeting attendees. Dormitories would not replace a hotel as the primary lodging for most attendees, but would offer a lower-cost alternative to budget-constrained attendees who still wanted to experience the camaraderie of shared conference lodgings.

E. Maintain present model.

There are many things that work well with the present model – conference held in a major city with the meeting held in the conference hotel within close proximity to other hotels - depending upon a wide range factors, including the functional requirements noted below. Wi-Fi would likely remain and become more of a focal point in discussions if the annual meetings remained in these same settings.

Functional Requirements

This subcommittee recommends that the functional requirements listed below be taken into consideration when choosing any meeting site. We recognize that these points are included in current discussions of meeting locations. However, in this subcommittee's review of the potential meeting models, the importance of the functional requirements by the membership could not be overlooked and these requirements will be included in discussions for the different models.

For any meeting model, it will be impossible to achieve all four functions. At present, the requirements are listed in the priority of pricing and the weight given in the evaluations (prior to review of the December blog entry [<http://www2.archivists.org/groups/annual-meeting-task-force/the-annual-meeting-needs>] for this subcommittee).

- A. Availability of hotels at multiple price points
- B. The city is a travel hub, accessible by multiple forms of transportation
- C. Availability of quick lunch and snack options nearby
- D. Wi-Fi available, whether that means free or available for purchase

Discussion

Conference held at second tier city

The evaluations appear to trend towards less need for "cultural opportunities" if that would mean lower costs. Most cities – whether first or second, or third for that matter – have cultural sites and venues available for interested attendees. A conference held in a second tier city may also provide access to university dormitory space. Second tier cities may be more limited in conference space within one hotel, but this may not always be the case. Many second tier cities are found within Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas (per the US Census this would include areas as diverse as Milwaukee-Racine or the Plano-Frisco area of Dallas-Fort Worth), and therefore may have more transportation services than stand-alone cities. Salt Lake City-Ogden, UT; Memphis, TN; Portland, OR; and Charlotte, NC are examples of hub or major airports which would likely provide a number of direct flights while also able to support a meeting the size of an average SAA meeting.

The cost benefits of holding the meeting in a second tier city would need to be enough to outweigh the possible negative reactions of holding the meeting in a smaller venue to draw large numbers of the membership. The cost of food (both in eating establishments and stores) is a major point of concern and would very likely be much less expensive in such cities.

Shorter Meeting

The spike in lodging costs, noted earlier in this report, has occurred simultaneously with an overall downturn in the economy, which has affected many members' personal finances as well as their professional travel budgets. In order to maintain or even increase

the level of member participation in the annual meeting, it is essential for SAA to reduce the burden of lodging costs on meeting participants.

The Meeting Model subcommittee has identified two ways in which SAA can help attendees reduce lodging-related costs: sponsor alternative lodging (as discussed below) and reduce the number of nights of lodging needed in order to participate fully in the meeting. This means shortening the meeting length.

While the Meeting Model subcommittee recommends considering shortening the annual meeting length, advising on the best method for doing that would fall under the responsibility of the Meeting Content subcommittee. However, some options which might serve this end include:

- Reducing the total number of education sessions
- Shortening the time available for each education session
- Scheduling more sessions per day
 - Multiple people noted, for example, that at SAA's 2012 annual meeting, Friday seemed particularly light on content
- Refocusing and shortening section meetings to eliminate programmatic-type content
 - This was proposed by several people on the feedback from the 2012 annual meeting

Use of University Housing

As noted above, lodging costs for annual meeting attendees have risen significantly over the past few years and remain a significant impairment to the full participation of some members. Many conference attendees have long chosen to stay at hotels other than the conference hotel due to cost or other considerations. More recently, a self-organized group has created the "Crash Space for Archivists" (<http://newarchivist.com/crash-space/>) list to share information about archivists willing to host their colleagues for meetings and educational events. However, an opportunity still exists for SAA to formally acknowledge the challenges its members face with respect to finding affordable lodging and help them address that challenge by organizing or sponsoring alternative lodging. If the meeting moves away from being hosted by a single hotel, requiring a block of rooms be filled, this option becomes more viable.

At the 2011 RBMS preconference, for example, single rooms in 4-room dorm suites at LSU were offered to attendees at the rate of \$50/night, which is half the pretax rate an attendee would have paid to share a room at the SAA conference hotel that year. See **Appendix** for information about this alternative provided to attendees at the 2011 conference, including information from the "Dormitories" tab at <http://www.rbms.info/conferences/preconferences/2011/accommodations.shtml> and the application at <http://rbms.info/conferences/preconferences/2011/docs/RBMSDormRegistration2011.pdf>

In addition to addressing the need for lodging at multiple price points, the nature of campus life virtually guarantees that some form of moderate-cost transportation exists

between regional transit hubs and the dormitories, and also increases the likelihood of low-cost food options being available, including the opportunity to store food and prepare breakfasts, sack lunches and other meals in dormitory kitchens or kitchenettes.

Maintain Present Model

Conclusions and Recommendations

More conclusions to come in our final report. We recommend that an AMTF be reconvened in 2020 (or another year) to review the feedback from the membership on the various models and changes that were implemented within the next 8 meetings.

Conference held at a conference center in a second-tier city:

Ardys Kozbial, one of the subcommittee members attended the EDUCAUSE annual conference in Denver in November 2012 and offers the following observations that speak to both the functional requirements and other feedback received by the AMTF.

EDUCAUSE 2012 (<http://www.educause.edu/annual-conference>)

Denver Convention Center

November 6-8, 2012

- 8000 attendees (figure cited in an email message sent to participants post-conference)
- Denver Convention Center centrally located downtown.
- This conference easily fit inside the Convention Center and it seemed that it used about 70% of the available space.
- Convention Center is within a 15-min walk of many hotels
 - Ardys stayed a 20-min cab ride away from the Convention Center, arriving at 7:30 each morning (Wed and Thurs) and leaving downtown at 10 pm each evening.
- All activities related to the conference, plus food options were in the Convention Center. Ardys made a concerted effort to leave the building at lunch because the weather happened to be nice that week.
- Food is available inside the convention center.
 - Multiple convention center concessions (breakfast and lunch offerings, coffee!)
 - Vendor-sponsored breaks (coffee, snacks, food set up by the convention center, locations spread around the convention center)
 - Vendor-sponsored lunch on Wed and Thurs
 - In the exhibit hall
 - Catered by convention center
 - One of Ardys' colleagues attended and reported a buffet and unassigned seating to give people a chance to mingle.
- Large auditorium for 2 plenary sessions
- 2 (or maybe 3) ballrooms that could be partitioned into small group sessions (small groups at this conference ranged from 50-200)
- Multiple meeting rooms along corridors for 50-person sessions
- A meeting room reserved for speakers. Projector to test ppts, conference tables for speakers to meet in groups, water, copier. EDUCAUSE staff available to help with a) technical issues and b) logistical issues (eg in which room am I speaking?).
- 2 rooms set up as studios for online sessions. Used the Adobe webcast tool. EDUCAUSE education staff managed the online sessions.
- Hallway outside exhibit hall for posters.
 - Wifi available, specific to EDUCAUSE. Username and password given when picking up registration materials. Unclear who paid: EDUCAUSE? Vendors? Wifi signal was strong.

Preconference Hotel

Dormitories



Dormitory-style accommodations will be available at [Louisiana State University East Campus Apartments](#).

Each apartment has four bedrooms, each with a single bed and desk and chest of drawers. One person will be assigned to each bedroom. Linen Service will be provided and includes pillow, sheets, blanket and towels. The apartments have two private bathrooms as well as a full kitchen with stove, sink, refrigerator and microwave. All rooms are air-conditioned and non-smoking. Rooms do not include phones or TVs.

To request a dorm room, please fill out the [RBMS/LSU Dorm Room Reservation Form](#) by **Friday, June 10, 2011**.

Getting to and from the Hilton Baton Rouge from the LSU Apartments

The LSU bus system, [Ingertrails](#), offers free service between campus and downtown on the "Downtown/Vet Trail" route. During the summer this service runs once an hour, beginning at 7 a.m. and ending at 6 p.m. It is a five-block walk from East Campus Apartments to the nearest bus stop on the Downtown/Vet Trail route, which is at Lockett Hall. You can access real-time information for buses on this route at <http://lsu.transloc.com>, choosing the **TEAL route**. Downtown, get off the bus at the corner of Third Street and Florida and walk one block west on Florida to Lafayette Street. The entrance to the Hilton is one-half block south of Florida at 201 Lafayette.

On campus, if you prefer not to walk the 5 blocks to Lockett, you can ride a "Purple Trail" bus (also free) between East Campus Apartments and Lockett Hall. During the summer, Purple Trail buses run every 20 minutes between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m., stopping at East Campus Apartments and connecting with the Downtown/Vet Trail route at Lockett Hall. See <http://lsu.transloc.com> for real-time information about this bus route.





Rare Books and Manuscripts Section

Association of College and Research Libraries
A Division of the American Library Association

The 52nd Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Preconference
In the Hurricane's Eye: Challenges of Collecting in the 21st Century
Tuesday - Friday, June 21-24, 2011
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
http://www.rbms.info/conferences/preconferences/2011/

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY RESIDENCE HALL/
RBMS DORM ROOM RESERVATION FORM

Please use this form to reserve residence hall accommodations on the LSU Campus. Please fax to ACRL RBMS REGISTRATION at (312) 280 - 1538 by JUNE 10, 2011.

LSU East Campus Apartments
100 East Campus Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
Front Desk Phone: 225-334-4248

Accommodations at LSU East Campus Apartments are "apartment style." Each apartment has four bedrooms, each with a single bed and desk and chest of drawers. One person will be assigned to each bedroom. Linen Service will be provided and includes pillow, sheets, blanket and towels. The apartments have two private bathrooms as well as a full kitchen with stove, sink, refrigerator and microwave. All rooms are air-conditioned and non-smoking. Rooms do not include phones or TVs. If you do not include a suitemate(s) on your form, you will be assigned suitemates of the same gender. If you request a suitemate, they must be of the same gender according to LSU policy.

For a floor plan and further details see:
http://app1003.lsu.edu/slas/reslifeweb.nsf/\$Content/East+Campus+Apartments

[] Single bedroom in 4 bedroom suite, \$50/ per person, per night

Your Name: _____ [] Male [] Female
Arrival Date: _____ Approx. Arrival Time (if known): _____
Departure Date: _____ # of Nights: _____
Institution: _____
Phone: _____ E-mail: _____
Required for confirmation.

Requested Suitemate Name(s) (if applicable): _____ [] Male [] Female
Requested Suitemate Name(s) (if applicable): _____ [] Male [] Female
Requested Suitemate Name(s) (if applicable): _____ [] Male [x] Female

[] AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT ASSISTANCE - One or both of these participants will require Americans with Disabilities Act assistance on site. (An ACRL staff member will contact you.)

CHECK-IN:
Standard Check-in time begins at noon on June 20 and continues everyday between 9:00 a.m. and midnight. If you must check in between the hours of midnight and 9:00 a.m., on-call personnel contact information will be listed on the doors of the ECA Activity Center.

CHECK-OUT:
Standard Check-out time is by noon on the day of departure, however staff will available for check-out on Friday, June 24 beginning at 7:00 a.m. Room keys must be returned to the front desk upon check-out. Late check-out without prior front desk approval or absence of a check out at the front desk will result in charges for an additional night(s) stay.

LOST KEYS:

You will be issued two keys at check in, one for the front door and one for your bedroom. If you lose the front door key, the cost is \$65, if you lose the bedroom key, the cost is \$60.

TELEPHONE:

There is no phone provided in the rooms. It is recommended that you bring a cell phone.

INTERNET ACCESS:

Please check this box if you would like to request a guest internet account. We will use the name, email address, institution listed above to request a guest account for you. We will email you login information in advance. Wireless access is available in the common areas of East Campus Apartments. You should bring an Ethernet cable in order to have Internet access in your room.

PARKING:

Please check this box if you would like a parking pass. Parking passes are \$15 for the week (any seven days during your stay). The parking pass will allow you to park in the lots surrounding East Campus Apartments. You may pick up your parking pass when you check into your room.

SUMMARY OF PAYMENT:

Single bedroom in 4 bedroom apartment @ \$50 x _____ # of Nights = \$ _____

Parking @ \$15 (if applicable) = \$ _____

Total: = \$ _____

PAYMENT METHOD:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Visa	<input type="checkbox"/> MasterCard
<input type="checkbox"/> Amex	<input type="checkbox"/> Enclosed check payable to ALA/ACRL
Credit Card number	_____
Name on Card	_____
Expiration date	_____
Signature	_____

CANCELLATION POLICY

Refund requests must be submitted in writing prior to June 10, 2011 and are subject to a \$25 cancellation fee. Refunds will be processed and mailed after July 27, 2011. The preconference or any of its events may be cancelled in the case of insufficient registration. In the event that an ACRL-sponsored activity is canceled, ACRL cannot be responsible for any cancellation/change charges assessed to registrants by airlines, travel agencies, or hotel/housing organizations. I have read and agree to the terms of the cancellation policy.

Please initial: _____ & Date: _____

PLEASE REMIT BOTH PAGES WITH PAYMENT INFORMATION OR CHECK BY June 10, 2011.

TO REMIT BY FAX: Please fax to ACRL RBMS REGISTRATION at (312) 280 - 1538.

TO REMIT BY MAIL: ACRL RBMS REGISTRATION
50 East Huron St.
Chicago, IL 60611

QUESTIONS: Please call 800-545-2433 and press option #5.