

Conference recommendations:

Recommendation #1

Revise the program committee structure. Develop one central committee with 1 representative from each division, 1-2 Interest Group reps (hopefully one of these to be the new librarians IG in order to include the younger demographic), 1 member from the host city, and 1 additional member (either a cla volunteer, or one of the council councillors at large)

Justification:

- Divisions represent significant numbers of members who want to see their interests/issues reflected in the conference. Issues that were raised at the council meeting in Toronto might not have arisen if Divisions and IG were at the table. If the governance structure were to change, the reps would change to reflect this. The key issue is to reflect the members.
- Staff have raised a concern regarding consistency and turnover on the committee with this model. Executive members are elected for two years. Divisions could be asked to appoint a member for two years. With various terms, this would also provide “new blood” to the committee.
- This streamlines the process. The reps would communicate with their executives and have an active role in the planning.
- There has been concern expressed as well that having divisions at the table creates “silos” however, we do feel that it increases the opportunity for partnering on programs, and it links back to the Association stakeholders. Right now we have a “silo” between the program committee and the Divisions and IG which does not work well.

Recommendation #2

Eliminate the theme from the conference as a whole in favour of a President’s program(s).

Justification:

The theme does not usually follow through in practice and can eliminate some programs from the conference because they do not fit the theme. The President’s program provides the opportunity to bring in theme speakers without trying to have the whole conference fit the theme.

Recommendation #3:

Revise the criteria for program selection.

Justification:

Existing criteria such as “broad sector appeal” may eliminate programs needed for particular sectors. I would use the example of school libraries given at the council meeting in February as an example, new and innovative does not seem to be consistently applied as there are many repeat speakers and clarity of outcomes is hard to define.

Developing criteria could be a member engagement process. The conference does need to meet member needs.

Recommendation #4

Ensure conference registration costs are competitive with other larger library conferences (OLA, ALA, PLA)

Justification:

Certainly the conference needs to pay for itself, and generate funds for the association. However, we are also competing with other opportunities. The cost model needs to be carefully reviewed.

Recommendation #5

Eliminate streams and tracks.

Justification: Feedback we get from members is that they do not work. It might be a useful development model, eg if we are trying to ensure there is a good set of programs on teens, but they don't seem to work well for those signing up for the programs.

Recommendation #6

Consider specialized conferences that might focus on particular issues in depth and build to policy and other longer term outcomes.

Justification

- An example is the HR Summit. The conference could be an opportunity to bring together experts, have working sessions, build policy, identify need for working committees and define next steps.
- There does appear to be a market for this, it reflects a national role and helps address issues of change that libraries are facing.
- Market could be global. The Seattle Central Libraries conference was a good example of this.