



**ASERL Fall 2017 Membership Meeting
Meeting Evaluation Summary
November 28-30, 2017 – Miami, FL**

- 1) Please rank the following discussions/presentations in terms of their overall value.
(1 = "poor", 3 = "average", 5 = "excellent.")
 - a) Ways ASERL Libraries can Support Digital Scholarship (Joan Lippincott).
Average = **4.47**.
 - b) Draft ASERL Values Statement on Diversity & Inclusion, Examples of D&I Programming.
Average = **4.11**
 - c) Update on Legal Actions at LSU & GSU.
Average = **3.94**
 - d) Update on VIVA Study of Package Usage.
Average = **3.92**
 - e) Initial Results from ASERL Salary Survey.
Average = **4.00**

Other/Comments regarding discussion topics:

- Engaging, substantive meeting that underlined the importance of the association.
- Good and relevant programming.
- I think a lot of folks have grown skeptical of Ithaka and some dubious research methods... There was much laughter in the room about asking Ithaka to work on another project.
- The digital scholarship discussion was particularly timely and useful for me and thinking about how our institution can progress in this area.
- We pack in a lot and sometimes I feel there might have been some useful discussion-- but did not have any time left for discussion
- What was lacking is salary information by years in an organization. We need a way to see how salaries at a single institution compare with others. It's a missed opportunity not to ask what the incoming salary is for a new graduate.

- 2) What was your #1 take-away from this meeting (most memorable piece of information gained, most useful insight, etc.)?
 - a) Continued developments in digital scholarship centers
 - b) Digital scholarship discussion

- a) Digital scholarship is a team effort. Librarians should understand we are part of the team. We need to reach across the institution and work collaboratively with faculty and other supporting roles. I plan to make this point at our next staff meeting. This is not an issue to "own"
 - b) Digital scholarship *IS* scholarship.
 - c) Digital scholarship seems to be an area of significant common interest. ASERL can have a productive role as convener of training and exploration that will result in further cooperative action.
 - d) I really appreciated the visits to FIU and UofM. Digital scholarship -- validation of the "organic" growth approach for such a program at the institutional level.
 - e) I took lots of notes during the DS discussion. I found both the format and discussion very useful.
 - f) I would have preferred to spend more time on the items at the end of the agenda.
 - g) Joan said, "make sure your librarians are engaged with the faculty" and the VIVA stuff is very helpful to me.
 - h) Salary survey data
 - i) Salary survey findings -- they motivate me to contract with Ithaka for my institution's responses.
 - j) Some of the information implied in the salary survey.
 - k) Talking with colleagues informally is the best thing about the meeting. The formal presentations are not always high value.
 - l) That we need to continue to work together to define best practices for digital scholarship and that there is definitely a need for more staff training and exchange of expertise. My other major impression was how the Directors in ASERL pay attention to mentoring and encouraging the new and "interim" leadership.
 - m) The conversation about digital scholarship was most helpful.
 - n) The depth and breadth of interest by all in various forms of digital scholarship centers.
- 3) What was the "low point" of this meeting? Please be candid.
- a) Elevator speeds at the hotel. :)
 - b) I really didn't find any parts of the program/meeting to be of low interest or value.
 - c) It seemed like the Ithaka salary survey report
 - d) Joan spent too much time talking - doing the ppt.
 - e) No low point, except that it remained interesting to the end...and I'm sorry to see people checking out early and missing good stuff.
 - f) No real low point for me; the agenda was very packed, so it was hard to linger on any one thing for too long. We could have spent the entire meeting on just DS.
 - g) Nothing I would consider a "low point."
 - h) Roger Schonfeld. Really.
 - i) Scattered presentations, separated by long gaps in the program for tours and other non-sequiturs.

- j) The fire alarm at 3 am! No seriously - All "low points" are connected to hotel failures rather than anything related to the actual organization and execution of the meeting. John and Cheryle were fantastic!
 - k) The fire alarms at 2:30am!
 - l) Update on Scholars Trust. I know it's Important to recover space. We need to find new ways to make it interesting and relevant out of the gate. Make the connection with space. Find examples of ASERL institutions who are using this program to make decisions with impact.
 - m) We were rushed on the tours and did not get to see everything. The hotel was not ready.
- 4) Overall, how was the amount and mix of discussion topics at this meeting?
(1 = "Light on topics / we had more time than needed"; 3 = "A good mix of topics and adequate time for discussion"; 5 = "Too full – too many topics / too little time to discuss them adequately.")
 Average = **3.43**
- 5) Was attending the ASERL meeting a good use of your time? Please rate using the scale below.
(1 = "Not a good use of my time"; 3 = "Meh – Not particularly useful"; 5 = "It was OK, but not great"; 7 = "A very good use of my time.")
 Average = **6.53**
- 6) How would you rate this ASERL meeting in terms of usefulness, productivity, and enjoyability?
(1 = "Poor", 3 = "Average", 5 = "Excellent".)
- a) Usefulness: Average = **4.47**
 - b) Productivity: Average = **4.05**
 - c) Enjoyability: Average = **4.41**

Comments:

- All around, well done, y'all!
- Enjoyed the tours of FIU and Univ. of Miami reception on Wed. night was lovely.
- I also look forward to meeting with my colleagues
- We were fortunate to have Joan with us to facilitate the DS session. She brought so much knowledge and experience to our discussion. The Ithaka initial report was another item of significant substance and relevance to our libraries. John's overall management of the meeting was great, and I appreciated Cheryle's work, as well, particularly her report on Scholars Trust.

- 7) Please provide feedback about the meeting facilities (likes & dislikes, suggestions for improvement, etc.)
(1 = "Poor", 3 = "Average", 5 = "Excellent".)
- a) Meeting Room: Average = **4.47**
 - b) Lodging accommodations offered by the Sonesta Hotel: Average = **3.11**
 - c) Convenience of travel to/from Miami: Average = **3.93**

Other/Comments:

- Enjoyed the reception at U-Miami and the tour of FIU.
- Elevators were slow, but I thought the hotel did a good job otherwise given the circumstances
- My hotel room was untouched by renovation since the Carter administration.
- I'd go back anytime
- Miami was relatively convenient and a pleasant venue for an ASERL meeting. Many thanks to our institutional hosts for the tours and reception.
- The hotel had some serious problems, but they were mostly annoyances. Of course, we know much of the issues were related to the hurricane damage, but nonetheless...but having said that, the hotel would have been perfectly wonderful if it had not been for the slow elevators and the renovation activity and crappy wifi. The restaurant was lovely, the catering was fine, the workout facility very nice, etc.
- The hotel wasn't ready. I don't blame them for saying they were to get the business. I'm sure they needed us to be there but they weren't ready yet. Not anyone's fault. Not even theirs.
- The service at the hotel was exceptional. However, the construction on our floor early each morning was not welcome. They had plenty of rooms open on other floors. The fire alarm going off at 3:00AM Thurs morning just on our floor reminded me of being evacuated at CNI.
- The view of the Biscayne Bay was obstructed too much during the meetings/presentations ... just kidding!
- Traffic. The elevators and inconsistency of the hotel were frustrating. Not ASERL's fault.

- 8) If you could describe ASERL in one word or short phrase, what would it be?

1. Action oriented
2. Collaborative
3. Collaborative
4. collaborative, more open than ARL.
5. collegial
6. Collegial
7. Current and relevant, and great colleagues!
8. Friendly and collaborative group
9. Fun

10. Networking at its best
11. Responsive to members
12. Useful

- 9) Any ideas for the Spring 2018 meeting in Knoxville? (Any suggested topics, other suggestions...)
- a) Allow some informal discussion time. I learn more from small group discussions than the formal presentations.
 - b) Are there next steps on the Ithaca study that could be pursued? We should follow up on the digital scholarship discussion. Has there been much interest expressed among ASERL deans/directors in regard to Open Educational Resources/Affordable Learning? We also need to continue to make sure that newer members are welcomed and encouraged to take ownership. The newish directors lunch and orientation dinner this time were good ways to do that.
 - c) Bring in a diversity expert to present-- someone who can advise how to do DEI work correctly. I would like to hear more about the gov docs stuff (I wasn't able to attend the Tuesday session). I could benefit from hearing tips for fundraising, marketing libraries, and branding.
 - d) Continue D&I discussion; discuss action items for ASERL that emerged from the DS session; more on "big deal" negotiations -- I always enjoy John U's insights
 - e) Follow up on the Diversity and Inclusion committee, more discussion of how we could benefit from shared information about digital scholarship centers
 - f) More analysis of survey data and a speaker on diversity.
- 10) Would you like an ASERL Board member to follow up with you about your feedback? If yes, please provide your name here. If no, leave blank. (Null / no replies).