

Appendix Seven - Background

The annual meeting provides an opportunity for law librarians from across the country to gather for professional development, continuing education, professional networking with their colleagues from all types of law libraries or subject specialties to the business of the association and learn of new products and services at a pre-eminent trade show. In addition, the annual meeting provides a significant revenue source for the Association.

The annual meeting plays a significant role in the strategic and financial plan of the association. It provides a significant continuing education/professional development opportunity to members and it generates significant revenue for the association. It needs to keep on working well and attracting members and exhibitors. It is budgeted to generate revenue generally 20% of the AALL budget.

The role of the SISes is rapidly changing. From large, extended committees a little over 25 years ago, SISes now represent the educational interests and further the special professional interests of law librarian subject specialists or type of library in the larger library and legal world. As the SISes have grown in size and sophistication they have created sub-units reflecting additional job responsibilities or further specialized skills. Some SIS leaders view themselves as the sole arbiter of the education needs of their SIS members.

The continuing education needs of law librarians change rapidly. To address that need the association expanded the number of education programs at the annual meeting by scheduling two or more programs simultaneously. The number of education proposals – from SIS Education Committees and from individuals, committees and chapters has grown faster than the number of available program slots. This imbalance between more program proposals than program slots creates competition for the Associations limited resources of rooms to schedule programs in and the money to pay for speakers.

Each year the AMPC tried to better meet the education needs of members, to change the competition from a win-lose to a win-win game. In the last 8 years, the program agenda – when plenary sessions are held, how many education programs occur, when the SIS functions happen, and the rules related to how many programs can be proposed by each SIS, how many programs are allocated or guaranteed to each SIS changed every year. The schedules kept changing and because librarians are rule-based it frustrated many.

Some groups feel they don't have enough programming to meet their interests. Some groups feel they must choose between different activities important to their group. Some groups don't have enough time to meet to discuss issues important to them without meeting every day at 7:AM.

The association seeks to meet member needs, appointing this special committee is one of the many on-going efforts to meet member needs, interests and demands.

The SIS Council recommended in July 2001 some changes scheduling of the annual meeting.

Appendix Eight - Committee's Process and Charge

The committee conducted its business by email, using a list set up through AALLNET, a one and half day meeting in Chicago, a conference call and individual phone calls. Working with email the committee worked through five drafts of the report.

The Director of Programs and the chair worked together to identify possible background materials for the committee. HQ staff assembled and distributed the materials to the committee before the March meeting in Chicago. The materials included AALL documents and documents from other associations about how they select and schedule educational programs. Additional background information was gathered from past chairs of the AMPC.

The committee gathered member input through an online survey hosted on AALLNET. In addition, the committee shared the executive summary and recommendations sections of this report with the SIS Council and the Professional Development Committee.

Before the meeting, the chair distributed a list of "givens" regarding the annual meeting. At the meeting, some additions were made to it. See Appendix Five. After the meeting in Chicago, additional statistical data was assembled by HQ staff. See Appendix Two.

Attending the Chicago meeting and participating in the conference call were: Mark E. Estes, Constance P. Dickson, D. R. Jones, Melody Busse Lembke, Daniel L. Wade, Martha S. Brown and Pamela Reisinger.

Committee Charge

The Special Committee is charged to examine the current process and timeframe, and the roles and responsibilities of all concerned entities, by which the Annual Meeting educational program is developed. The Special Committee shall recommend appropriate changes in Annual Meeting program development to the Executive Board. The primary focus of this study is to ensure that procedures reflect and meet the needs and interests of AALL members and Association entities, while also recognizing the need to ensure a vibrant trade show that is attractive to exhibitors.

All facets of the educational programming process should be investigated, including how programs are solicited and chosen, how the Annual Meeting educational program schedule is created, and the roles of the Vice President/President-Elect (and President), the Annual Meeting Program Committee, and the Association's headquarters staff. A broad spectrum of Association members and entities shall be involved in this examination, including current and past AMPC and PDC members and chairs, the SIS Council, Headquarters staff, and other interested stakeholders. The Special Committee should consider the evolving nature of the Association's subordinate groups, especially the SISs, which aim to meet the needs of their own constituencies at the Annual Meeting. The Special Committee shall consult with the current Professional Development Committee before finalizing its recommendations.

The Special Committee should prepare an interim report for the Board's first meeting in July 2002, and a final report for Board consideration at its November 2002, meeting. The Special Committee's term expires in November 2002.

Appendix Nine – Demographics

Of the 5,103 members, 3,731 belong to at least one SIS; over 1,000 belong to two SISes. But, 1,444, or 27.9% do not belong to any SIS. The three largest SISes are PLL with 1,542, Academic with 894 and Technical Services SIS with 652.

The three largest types of employers are: law firms with 1,895 law schools with 1,707, and courts with 347. 81% of law firm librarians belong to PLL, 52% of academic librarians belong to ALL and 160% of court librarians belong to SCCLL. See Appendix Two – Table Five.

From the 1996 Demographics Survey conducted by Gordon S. Black Corp., more than 75% attended an annual meeting in the last 5 years. Employers pay for 90% of the registration fees and 64% pay all conference expenses. “Available funding” is the most cited factor in deciding whether to attend a meeting. Perhaps related to available funding, the respondents plan to attend a meeting and attendance does vary by geography.

Library directors are over twice as likely to attend a meeting as are one person librarians. The mid-summer meeting comes at a busy time for law firm and corporate librarians, which makes it harder for them to attend.

The Black study reported 73% of West Coast respondents planned to attend the meeting in Anaheim compared to 61% from the northeast/mid-Atlantic.

In 2000 and 2001 that regionalism continued with a swing of over 200 members in the regions of the meeting. See Appendix Two - Table Four.

Attendance by library type or SIS changes consistently across years. 1999 in Washington, DC had the largest numbers for all library types.

As a percentage of attendees, the proportion of SIS members or employer types remains relatively constant. See Appendix Two – Tables One through Three.

On a percentage basis of membership, attendance at AALL annual meetings is slightly lower than other associations. Actual attendance has held steady for AALL while other associations have seen declines in both membership numbers and attendance at annual meetings.

Over the last 10 years about 30% of AALL members attend the annual meeting each year.

1991 (New Orleans): 28%
1992 (San Francisco): 30%
1993 (Boston): 29%
1994 (Seattle): 28%
1995 (Pittsburgh): 27%
1996 (Indianapolis): 24%
1997 (Baltimore): 29%
1998 (Anaheim): 27%
1999 (DC): 31%
2000 (Philadelphia): 29%
2001 (Minneapolis): 27%

The percentage of by employer has also remained relatively constant: law schools 49.5%, law firms 29%, government 8.7%, courts 5.9%.

It's not possible to discern in great detail the number of people who consistently attend the meeting. Attendance seems to be related to whether it is held in a "tier one city" vs. a "tier two city", a destination city for a vacation before or after. Attendance may also be related to how far someone must travel or how long it takes them to travel. Namely, the meetings along the eastern seaboard are heavily attended than others. For the 2 years data is available – 2000 in Philadelphia and 2001 in Minneapolis, the number of people attending Minneapolis from the region was much higher than the number who attended Philadelphia. Likewise, Philadelphia regional members were in smaller numbers in Minneapolis. See Appendix Two – Table Four.

Appendix Ten - Programs proposed and accepted

Comparing the number of programs proposed by SISs and the numbers accepted is misleading because:

Program proposals come from the SISs, chapters, committees and individuals.

Program proposals sometimes overlap or duplicate;

Statistics report the proposing entity and do not indicate duplicate proposals.

In some years the AMPC suggested that the SISs limit the number of proposals. Some SISs did limit the number and some did not limit the number of their proposals. While there is little overlap in AMPC membership, the historical record is available to the committee and AMPC tries to balance across years the programs allocated to individual SISs. See Appendix Two - Tables Eight through Sixteen.

Appendix Eleven Survey Summaries

AMEPC survey summary

The committee conducted a web-based survey from February 21-28, 2002 to gather information about members' attitudes concerning educational programming at the annual meeting. At least two SIS leaders encouraged SIS members to complete the survey. There were 400 of 5,100 members completed the survey a response rate of 7.8%. Appendix One for the complete instrument and results. The results mirrored those of earlier surveys.

Members attend the annual meeting primarily for the educational programming. Members decide which program to attend based on what they need to know. Slightly less than 1/2 say SIS sponsorship is important in deciding which program to attend.

Most believe their SIS has the appropriate amount of input in the programming process.

Early morning meetings were preferred by less than 1/4 and less than half had conflicting SIS meetings.

See Appendix One for the complete survey.

2001 Annual Meeting Attendee Survey Summary

After the 2001 meeting AALL emailed a survey to the 1,684 annual meeting attendees. 472 were returned for a response rate of 28%.

30% had director/chief or head in their title. 47% worked in a law school, 31% in a law firm and 4% in a court library. Almost 80% attended at least 6 educational programs. 27% served on committees. See Appendix Four for the complete survey results.

Appendix Twelve - Other Observations

In the last 8 years, the program agenda – when plenary sessions are held, when the SIS functions happen, how many education programs occur, etc has changed each year. In other words, the schedules keep changing, librarians are rule-based, and it creates some disenchantment that can be ameliorated by not changing the annual meeting schedule structure for 3 years.

The PDC, AMPC and headquarters staff continues to improve the process of soliciting program proposals and the quality of the proposals themselves. Perhaps, for the 2004 meeting program proposals can be accepted electronically and go directly into the database needed by AMPC.

The individual members of AMPC are dedicated and fair. They evaluate the program proposals consistently and without bias. The process for reviewing program proposals is generally viewed positively.

Several respondents to the AMEPC survey noted they had not been told why their program proposal wasn't selected. When it comes through an education committee the message needs to reach through the committee to the individual who submitted it to the education committee.

Program Planner's Handbook and Speaker's Handbook are both excellent. But, many individual AALL members are unaware of how much useful information is included within those two handbooks. For example, the section on writing learning outcomes and adult learning could make training activities offered by law librarians to their customers more effective. An abstract or summary might make the handbooks user-friendlier.

The Bylaws specify that SIS meetings are open to all AALL members. Only SIS members can vote. (Bylaws Art. X Sec. 7)

The SISs are responsible for encouraging members to generate quality program proposals. It is not easy to get people to make proposals and coordinate programs. When program proposals get accepted the SIS leadership wants: (a) the SIS members to know their interests are being met, and (b) to recognize the hard work of the people who prepared the proposals. The SISs should be able to identify the programs they sponsor (and co-sponsor) and promote them. The SISs leadership should also recommend other programs that further the educational needs of their members.

Consolidate all guidelines, policies, etc. related to the annual meeting, responsibilities of volunteers, HQ staff and others.

Continue to improve quality of program proposal writing by: (a) encouraging the AMPC liaison to each SIS to take a proactive role in working with the SIS education/program committee the programs are selected, (b) using tutorials and proposal writing tips on AALLNET. These could be developed either by PDC or under contract by PDC or by staff. Next, communicate to the program proposer why the program was not accepted. The rubric to be developed by PDC should help with this communication.

In addition, consider creating an additional mentoring or coaching activity for the Mentoring Committee, i.e. proposal writing. This should improve the quality of educational program proposals and the quality of proposal writing for grant proposals, or for other projects at their library.

Permit program proposals to include supplemental rationale for their proposal. This would not be required, but could expand on the limited description permitted for the pre-convention mailing.

Encourage levels of program proposals related to demographics of who attends the meetings. For example, more programs targeting a more experienced librarian.

Encourage describing the target audience of a program by SIS type, by experience level or by size of library.

SISs rank their proposals as to priority. If an education committee comes with no ranking then it's considered the lowest

Involve more people in reviewing the proposed schedule of programs to seen unforeseen conflicts in scheduling.

Keep the database of proposals and make the bibliographic/metadata" available to members for review.

After program is sent to members, collect program suggestions via an AALLNET database or email address. Forward the suggestions to SIS education committees and the next AMPC for possible future programs.

Appendix Thirteen - Other recommendations considered

The committee considered other recommendations related to the size and structure of AMPC and of program proposal selection requirements. They are included in this section for historical perspective.

A Plan to Reconstitute the AMPC Committee

Based on the Committee's discussion in Chicago, the "Federal Model":

We recommend that AMPSC be reconstituted to secure a broader representation of AALL Special Interest Sections (SIS'S) in the program selection process following a federal model (or perhaps, better, the plan can be analogized to the composition of the United Nations Security Council) where the larger SIS's will have permanent representation, while the smaller functional SIS's are permitted some voice. To allow this, planning is based on a four-year cycle with Committee members serving two-year terms. The five SIS's that will have permanent representation on the Committee are Academic Law Libraries; Private Law Libraries; State, Court and County Law Libraries; Technical Services; and Social Responsibilities. We feel that it is important that Social Responsibilities, regardless of size, be represented at all times because of the importance of having concerns of personal and professional responsibility continually brought to the attention of AMPSC. The Committee members will serve two-year terms, and the functional SIS's will be partnered so that when a member of one SIS is not on the Committee the other SIS can represent the needs of that SIS throughout the program selection process. It is believed some of the SIS's have concerns of mutual interest, but other of these pairings are totally random, and the SIS's are expected to learn to work together. The following SIS's are paired: Computing Services and Online Bibliographic Services; Foreign, Comparative and International Law and Legal History and Rare Books; Government Documents and Legal Information Services to the Public; Micrographics and Audiovisual and Research Instruction and Patron Services.

In order that there will be carry over among the Committee members in any given year, during the first year of our proposal, the members of the first SIS of the functional SIS pairs (i.e., Computing Services, Foreign, Comparative and International Law, Government Documents, and Micrographics and Audiovisual) will serve only one year so that the second year there will be four new members from the other functional SIS's. In the event, a new SIS will be created or an SIS should disband, the SIS will be put with an already existing pair, and every two years there will be an additional Committee member.

The AMPSC Chair will choose the Committee members representing the various SIS's in consultation with the SIS Chair. In the event a Chair cannot find someone from a specific SIS to serve as a Committee member, a member from the other SIS pair may be chosen to serve.

The following diagram illustrates how the makeup of AMPC will look for the first seven years if the "Federal Model" is adopted. Year One is the year that the model is

implemented. I have included the incoming chair as a separate position. I am not sure if that is correct. There are a total of 12 members on the Committee.

YEAR ONE	YEAR TWO	YEAR THREE	YEAR FOUR	YEAR FIVE	YEAR SIX	YEAR SEVEN
PERMANENT REPRESENTATION						
ALL Rep 1	⇒	ALL Rep 2	⇒	ALL Rep 3	⇒	ALL Rep 4
ALL Rep 1	⇒	ALL Rep 2	⇒	ALL Rep 3	⇒	ALL Rep 4
CC Rep 1	⇒	CC Rep 2	⇒	CC Rep 3	⇒	CC Rep 4
S Rep 1	⇒	S Rep 2	⇒	S Rep 3	⇒	S Rep 4
R Rep 1	⇒	R Rep 2	⇒	R Rep 3	⇒	R Rep 4
ROTATING REPRESENTATION						
CS Rep 1	DBS Rep 1	⇒	CS Rep 2	⇒	DBS Rep 2	⇒
CIL Rep 1	HRB Rep 1	⇒	CIL Rep 2	⇒	HRB Rep 2	⇒
GD Rep 1	JSP Rep 1	⇒	GD Rep 2	⇒	JSP Rep 2	⇒
MAV Rep 1	RIPS Rep 1	⇒	MAV Rep 2	⇒	RIPS Rep 2	⇒
EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS						
Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair
Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison
Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison

TO: Members of the Special Committee on Programming
FROM: Connie Dickson
DATE: 4 March 2002
SUBJECT: Composition of the AMPC (The Alternative Federal Model)

The focus of this paper is strictly limited to the proposed composition of the AMPC program selection process and our Committee's recommendation that evolved on Saturday afternoon.

Currently, the AMPC committee is to have six members, plus a Chair to facilitate the meetings, and an ex officio member who is next year's Annual Meeting program. The six members are to represent the membership at large. We are limited in the number of programs that can be assigned.

In 2001, the AMPC Committee I sat on, there was one PLL member (the Chair was also PLL, but Chairs are traditionally neutral). We had three members who represented various aspects of academic libraries, two from State Court, one PLL, and one vendor. The result was that PLL, the largest SIS which counts for 40% of the membership, had only one person who could knowledgeably rank its programs for content and quality, and six members that could not. As a result, most PLL proposals were ranked below the cutoff and therefore were not considered. This resulted in the PLL, whose members accounted for 16% of those attending the 2001 annual meeting, having only six programs to offer its 418 members who attended the annual meeting.

Part of the recurring inequity in program selection results is the failure to have an appropriate number of PLL representatives on the AMPC Committee. An example of how this occurs can be found by counting the number of accepted program proposals from the ten functional SISs, nine of which are unique to academic law libraries, and comparing it to the total of PLL accepted programs. In 2000 the Academic related SIS accepted total was 52, and the PLL was 12. In 2001, the Academic total was 47, the PLL 6; and in 2002, Academic SISs totaled 31, and PLL 5.

Inequity in the selection process, whether perceived or actual, is one of the reasons Barbara Bintliff created this committee (Spectrum, November 2001, p. 14). For at least a decade, the PLL membership has believed their programs, designed to support and educate the private law librarian, are not fairly represented in the programs selected. While many reasons have been put forth, the bottom line is that the PLL has not had equitable representation on the AMPC Committee.

In a memo to Barbara Bintliff in October 2001, I proposed that we have a committee of ten members, four from the Academic SIS, four from the PLL, one from the SCC, and one "other," which I recommended would be for a vendor.

This allowed for four different Academic SISs to participate, and it would be balanced with four PLL members. It would be more reflective of AALL's membership (40% PLL, 34% Academic, and 26% composed of SCC and others). It would allow the four largest Academic SISs to be represented, It would be flexible enough should in the future a rotation system be developed by the Chair when selecting members.

For these and other reasons noted below, I believe that the nine-member plus Chair AMPC Committee composition recommended at the end of our meeting will not meet the goals and objectives that we had envisioned.

1. We have three types of law libraries – Academic, Private Firm, and State Court - from which all other SIS functions evolve. We have combined apples and oranges by including Tech Services and Social Responsibilities among the five permanent positions. These two SISs do not represent library types; they very definitely represent functional SISs and/or "other" and should be grouped with them.

2. Allotting ten programs to the PLL will probably not be acceptable to the Executive Board, the SISs, and perhaps even the PLL, which believes it, has suffered from others' favoritism and would not like to have the same accusation directed at them. I believe that most private firm librarians would prefer to have a selection process that is viewed as equitable, with acceptance and selection of programs based on quality. I propose that we not set any minimum for the PLL beyond the two that was originally adopted several years ago for each SIS.

3. Rotating assignments among eight or nine other SISs appears on the surface at any rate to be a real challenge. Recognizing the SISs' relative size and specific functions are important considerations as to their representation on any AMPC. In addition, the number of programs these groups generate has varied widely from year to year. If their programs are fewer than the minimum required or allocated, how will the inequities be worked out, as it will be too late for other SISs to generate new proposals after the initial deadline for submission/acceptance. Or would this situation force the AMPC to look to already rejected proposals to fill in the needed slots?

Because of these concerns, I believe that an attempt to include all SISs in any AMPC, even on a rotating basis, does not require nor will it provide the balance that we are seeking. However, there may be other ways of accommodating the smaller SISs, which we have not explored.

4. Additional problems related to the dissolution, recombining, and creation of new SISs need to be addressed, as there is no guideline as to how these situations could be accommodated.

5. But most importantly with this proposal as framed on Saturday, we will be sustaining the same problem that now exists for the PLL: with the Academic, Tech Services, and four additional academic SISs as the primary members of the AMPC, we will once again have overwhelming representation by academic groups whose effect will be the continuation of unequal representation by the PLL.

Alternative Federal Model Illustration:

The table below illustrates the model proposed by Connie Dickson. The one exception is that I did not include a slot for a vendor rep. ALL-SIS has four representatives that in turn represent the four largest function SISs. PLL-SIS has four “slots” for representatives. SCC-SIS has one slot. I have indicated that the incoming chair is a separate position. Note that this model does not include staggered terms so that not all of the committee is new each year.

There are a total of 12 members on the Committee.

YEAR ONE	YEAR TWO	YEAR THREE	YEAR FOUR	YEAR FIVE	YEAR SIX	YEAR SEVEN
PERMANENT REPRESENTATION						
ALL TS Rep 1	⇒	ALL TS Rep 2	⇒	ALL TS Rep 3	⇒	ALL TS Rep 4
ALL RIPS Rep 1	⇒	ALL RIPS Rep 2	⇒	ALL RIPS Rep 3	⇒	ALL RIPS Rep 4
ALL CS Rep 1	⇒	ALL CS Rep 2	⇒	ALL CS Rep 3	⇒	ALL CS Rep 4
ALL FCIL Rep 1	⇒	ALL FCIL Rep 2	⇒	ALL FCIL Rep 3	⇒	ALL FCIL Rep 4
PLL Slot 1, Rep 1	⇒	PLL Slot 1, Rep 2	⇒	PLL Slot 1, Rep 3	⇒	PLL Slot 1, Rep 4
PLL Slot 2, Rep 1	⇒	PLL Slot 2, Rep 2	⇒	PLL Slot 2, Rep 3	⇒	PLL Slot 2, Rep 4
PLL Slot 3, Rep 1	⇒	PLL Slot 3, Rep 2	⇒	PLL Slot 3, Rep 3	⇒	PLL Slot 3, Rep 4
PLL Slot 4, Rep 1	⇒	PLL Slot 4, Rep 2	⇒	PLL Slot 4, Rep 3	⇒	PLL Slot 4, Rep 4
SCC Rep 1	⇒	SCC Rep 2	⇒	SCC Rep 3	⇒	SCC Rep 4
EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS						
Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair	Incoming Chair
Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison	Board Liaison
Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison	Staff Liaison

Formula approaches for program selection:

To the extent possible, select at least one proposal for each 200 SIS members proposed by each SIS education committee according to the following minimum guideline: one program for every 200 SIS members, one program minimum.

Calculate the SIS membership as of August 1 the year before. (For the 2002 this would have meant: Academic - 4, Computing Services - 2, Legal History - 1, Legal

Information to the Public - 1, FCIL - 2, GovDocs 1-1, Micrographics - 1, OBS - 2, PLL - 8, RIPS - 3, Social Responsibility - 1, State Court-3, TSS - 3, Total-32 SIS education committee proposals)

Using SIS membership rather than attendance of SIS members at the annual meeting is forward looking. It seeks to create an annual meeting that will attract members rather than one that might have attracted members.

Appendix Fourteen - History and Overview of AMPC program selection process

Note: this section describes s current: process:

HQ staff recommends site for the Annual meeting. Executive Board approves the recommendation. Vice-president appoints AMPC chair and committee. The chair serves ex officio in the committee before.

The committee is now 6 members plus a chair. The AMPC chair-designate serves ex officio. They serve a one-year term and are exempt from the policy requiring a member who has not served on a committee.

The charge is: The Annual Meeting Program Selection Committee shall select programs that are consistent with the theme selected by the Vice-President and Director of Programs that takes into consideration recommendations of the Professional Development Committee. The Annual Meeting Program Selection shall oversee implementation of selected programs through the Annual Meeting; set the guidelines for program selection and programs; will schedule the Committee's Annual Meeting; will meet with the Vice President and Director of Programs for orientation at the Annual Meeting prior to the selection of programs at the Committee's fall meeting. The Committee will meet prior to the Annual Meeting they are planning to review proposals and select Annual Meeting programs

Before 1990 there was a separate annual meeting education committee and an Association education committee. The annual meeting committee did the meeting education programs; the education committee did workshops and institutes. In 1990 the responsibilities for educational events around the annual meeting, i.e. workshops, institutes and the programs were consolidated into one committee.

In 1996 the Board adopted parts of a proposal from the Task Force on Education Policy chaired by Merle Slyhoff. The proposal established a Professional Development Committee and a separate Annual Meeting Program Selection Committee (AMPSC). The size of the original committee was the chair and four members plus the staff liaison. The term was one year. This recommendation grew out of a prior report (1995?) of a committee chaired by Sally Holterhoff. That Committee felt that a single committee could not handle the 55 – 75 programs at the Annual Meeting and expanded Professional Development program.

The 2000 committee recommended changing the name to Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC) and formally changing the size of the committee (reflecting actual practice) to a chair plus six members, the next year chair as an ex officio member and the staff liaison.

SISes, committees, individual members and chapters propose programs. Sometimes an individual member proposes a program on the same or similar topic as proposed by an SIS. And, the individual member's proposal is better – better speaker, better developed statement of learning outcomes, proposed program coordinator, etc. About 1/3 of the proposals come from individuals or committees.

Currently the annual meeting programs are ranked from 1 to 5. There are guidelines in the handbook, but these are not very detailed. There are no allocation of scores and no formal, written guidelines to accompany the scores, so that good proposals can be overcome by a ranking that puts undue emphasis on one aspect of a proposal. Committee members may apply the same, similar or different criteria when ranking the proposals.

Timeline for current process

6 years out: the site is selected

1.5 to 2 years out, AMPC appointed

15 months out, AMPC meets, discusses theme, begins revising program planners handbook

Approximately 14 months out, theme announced

13 months out, program planners handbook available

1 year out, meeting with interested program proposers.

11 months out, program proposals due to HQ. HQ staff enter into database, indexed by coordinator, subject, level, length of program, sponsoring body – SIS, individual, chapter, vendor, committee, other; summary of room setup.

9 months out schedule of programs finalized for preliminary program printing.

Two months to one month out, Hot topic selected