

2009 IDS CONFERENCE
SUNY OSWEGO
August 3-4, 2009
(RELATIVELY) BRIEF EVALUATION SUMMARY
(52 respondents)

All 52 attendees who responded to the conference evaluation said that the conference met their expectations; several said it exceeded their expectations. All program sessions received ratings primarily of 4 or 5 on the 1-5-point rating scale, as did the SUNY Oswego local planning committee arrangements. The 52 responses break down into 32 ILL staff, 15 administrators, and 5 other guests.

Quite a few participants felt that the new, longer conference evaluation was much **too** long—especially since we asked them to also do session evaluations for the first time this year—and that we should do it online in the future. Perhaps we should consider this for next year since only about 1/3 of attendees submitted an evaluation, compared to last year when closer to ½ of attendees did so.

Most **ILL Staff** thought the **most beneficial aspects of the conference** were ILLiad V.8, Workflow Toolkit, and, of course, networking with colleagues. **Admin Staff** liked the strategic planning discussions; what IDS is now, what it's future is, and future directions of library services; brainstorming and networking; and hearing about all the new products—ILLiad V.8, GIST, IDS Search. **Other Attendees** liked talking with others about their policies; opportunities to meet the people involved with the project; talking to medical libraries; learning more about ILL; meeting colleagues; learning more about GIST; and info about new initiatives & best practices.

Almost all attendees said there was nothing that was not beneficial to them. A few **ILL Staff** said the **least beneficial aspect of the conference** was IDS Search (they did not see how it related to them). One **Administrator** mentioned Velocity (not interested because they wanted to join for articles only); someone said there were too many breaks and it should be a one-day conference; another said there were too many surveys and the survey should be electronic. A couple of **Other Attendees** said inability to get hands-on access to GIST; and some of the sessions seemed to stretch on a little too long.

Welcome Session: Rated mostly 4s & 5s by all groups. **ILL Staff** thought this could be a handout or online conference preview but liked the previews of some of the sessions as it helped decide which to attend; GIST was interesting; IDS Search has great potential; love ALIAS! **Administrators** thought it went a bit too long but was a good overview. **Other Attendees** thought it was a good intro to new projects.

IDS Search Session: Rated mostly 4s & 5s by all groups. **ILL Staff** said, Why not hold it in a computer lab and have a short hands-on exercise; thought this is an interesting search interface and will be a good service for patrons; a few did not understand it. **Administrators** thought it was a good intro, are anticipating future development, and definitely willing to implement; it's great tool; will be a great service--better than Aleph; while informative. **Other Attendees** want to know if there are any thoughts of replacing the Aleph opac with IDS Search interface; it was good content but some folks seemed to misunderstand the scope, asking for their own servers, etc.

Future of LAND Session: Rated mostly 4s & 5s by all groups; however only **15 ILL Staff** and **3 Admin staff** recorded attending. Predictably, no one in the **Other Attendees** group attended. **ILL Staff** thought it was a great beginning conversation; that it was excellent to hear from Velocity but they really didn't talk about the future; nice to see how Velocity operates—they definitely take our concerns seriously. There were **no comments from Admin Staff**.

Keynote Speaker: Rated mostly 4s & 5s by all groups. **ILL Staff** said they wished someone had recorded the session as her speech would have been nice for IDS archives; they love Genie!! she's always interesting; awesome as always; very engaging. **Admin Staff** thought she was excellent! **Other Attendees** thought she was very familiar with the subject and was entertaining.

ILLiad Ver. 8 Demo: Rated mostly 4s & 5s by all groups. Although many **ILL Staff** thought the demo was excellent and very useful, some were hoping for more explanation and others thought it might have been helpful to have a brief presentation by current users to general audience rather than breakout sessions; some noted that backs were to the demonstrator. **Administrators** said it was a helpful preview; and **Other Attendees** said the new interface looked promising.

Document Delivery & Resource Sharing for Distance Education: Rated mostly 4s & 5s by all groups; Unfortunately, however, only **7 ILL Staff** and **3 Administrators** (as well as **3 Other Attendees**) recorded attendance at

the session. **ILL staff** said the info gained in this session will be used to convince home staff that Doc. Del. can and should be offered to both on and off-campus patrons; others thought it seemed to be more geared for “regular students” and purchase on demand. **Administrators** thought it was great stuff! **Other Attendees** said the speaker was very interesting and thought of great ideas ahead of the times.

Hands-on ILLiad 8 Training: Rated mostly 4s & 5s by all groups. **ILL Staff** wanted to know why the client was not installed on the computers; offer this more than once when there’s a new version or tool; hands-on portion was hectic; needed more trainers; we all had many questions and couldn’t hear presenter because everyone was talking with each other and her voice was soft; she seemed to know ILLiad 8 very well; the room had technical problems; bad room because our backs were to the monitor; my staff said it was great.

Administrators also wondered why Ver. 8 was not pre-installed on computers and thought there were too many participants and not enough test records; but said it provided a good working overview and thought the materials were nice. **Other Attendees** said they were impressed they could keep people on task in the rooms; it’s always hard to talk over them but the number of mentors really helped; it would be good have individual staff usernames to keep profiles separate.

Library Staff Group Meetings for ILL staff: Rated mostly 4s & 5s by all groups.

NOTE: *(This session was broken into 3 groups but could not be broken down by group here as many respondents did not identify which group they were in (although there was a place on evaluation to do so. At future conferences we must find a better way to break into groups and have fewer people in each group)*

ILL Staff said the group was very engaged and talked of a variety of topics; some thought the session was too long--that one hour would be plenty; people should be grouped by tech and staff; glad it didn’t turn into a gripe session; good, but we may need a list of topics like last year; it was nice to discuss issues with other library staff that I would have otherwise not spoken to; very good—learned a lot of little tips on ILLiad 8; a happy surprise; informative—amazing how we all have similar problems; love talking to others who are really doing the work; lots of good discussion; good opportunity to share. **Administrators** said networking is always helpful. **Other Attendees** said it would be nice if the groups were divided into systems people vs. ILL staff so questions could be appropriate to audience; participants may do better later in the day—folks were shy at 8 am but rallied.

ILLiad Billing Manager: Rated mostly 4s & 5s. Only a few **ILL Staff** attended [*probably because most people thought it was not applicable to them*]. They commented that they understood most of it and hope they can retain it; Genie did a very good job.

GIST Demo: Rated mostly 4s & 5s. Low attendance at this session. Some **ILL staff** said it was an interesting concept but won’t fly at my library; others said it was very informative, that screenshots were helpful in understanding how it can be used; lots of useful possibilities but it will be up to our director and reference dept. if we use it; there was supposed to be content on print serials but it was not covered.

Administrators said they needed more time [*presumably to discuss*]; they want to implement! Need a GIST track for next year or one-day emersion; very interesting, very impressive—I doubt that I could have seen a use for it in our library without the demo; handouts of workflow would have helped. **Other Attendees** thought it was an interesting idea and can’t wait to try it; not enough time for discussion.

Ask-a-Mentor Support Time: Rated mostly 4s & 5s. Although this session also had very few attendees, all **ILL Staff**, they thought it was very helpful and were prepared with a lot of questions; they said the mentors were very knowledgeable; they thought we should offer more sessions with fewer participants (although this particular session had a pretty good ratio--6 mentors and 12 participants!).

Workflow Toolkit session: Rated mostly 4s & 5s. Understandably, this session was most popular with **ILL Staff**, who said there was a lot of good info; one person said their “boss” downloads and creates a reference book! One mentor said she “thought she knew [it] all, but learned something that’s plagued us for years! Some thought the session was a bit too long; another said it wasn’t useful to “me, but . . . very good for ILL staff. **Administrators** said it was nice to add a human element to the toolkit and good to keep up with the changes. **Other Attendees** said some of it was new but much already covered last year. The session evaluations actually revealed much more about how important and helpful this session was to ILL staff.

Docline & ILLiad V.8 session: Rated mostly 5s from the few people that attended. **ILL Staff** thought it was excellent and **Other Attendee** said they learned a lot from the medical library folks. No comment from the **Administrator** that was there.

Administrator sessions: All admin sessions were **Rated mostly 4s & 5s**. **Administrators** said they like the leadership track but unable to attend all [as they] already have conflicts; although the point is valid about more directors attending, there might have been a little too much negative (sarcastic) comments about administrators; great idea to do admin track—we do need to get more directors to attend; IDS Search is great—I will point users toward it, when it is available, before SUNY Union Catalog. **Other Attendees** said the group work was helpful in GIST session and need to do more of it.

Poster Sessions: Rated mostly 3s & 4s. 11 out of 32 people said they thought we should have poster sessions again next year. There was less interest in them than we had hoped. Many **ILL Staff** and **Admin Staff** said they enjoyed what they saw but didn't really have enough time to look at them. Someone suggested we vote for best in show. One administrator said they learned about the NYS library. Another suggested we display them during cocktail hour next year. **Other Attendees** said they enjoyed them and thought they were an opportunity for shy people to participate.

What topics would you like included at future conferences?

ILL staff would like to see: Print serials-how to maintain Serials Solutions records; more individual discussions on the day-to-day items; Web Junction; more on ALIAS; List of [membership] benefits; more basic training for newbies; sharing tips & tools for ILLiad 8; systems for non-systems people; sharing multi-media; where to services like Netflix and Chegg fit into ILL; best practices for stats—[how to prove] your value to leverage support

Administrators would like to see: a brochure for guests on what it means to belong to IDS—commitments, reasonable expectations; business practices; what changes are being made by directors; how people are using new tools; technology, best practices, i.e., scanners; more specific and practical sessions for directors; how to implement these major changes to workflow; how to review TPAM results and how to implement changes based on them; perhaps have all participants attend general overview of new tool, then divide up into the staff/director groups for targeted discussion based on their roles, e.g., IDS Search; how would staff use, etc. Directors: what are implications for library service? How does it fit with other tools, how does it help further library's mission, implementation/adoption issues, etc.; something from directors' standpoint on a piece of the project—project workflow, etc.; best practices for solo ILL clerks/Mentor specific for solo ILL clerks

Other Attendees would like to see: customizing Word docs; web page show & tell comparisons

Conference Accommodations & Arrangements: All areas rated mostly 4s and 5s by all groups.
For specific comments see the complete evaluation.

General Comments: For specific comments see the complete evaluation.

How many IDS Project Conferences have you attended before this one?

	<u>First Conf.</u>	<u>Second Conf.</u>	<u>Have attended more than one conf.</u>
ILL Staff:	12	9	11
Administrators:	6	8	1
Other Attendees:	1	3	1