

American Library Association / Association of College and Research Libraries
RARE BOOKS AND MANUSCRIPTS SECTION
43rd Preconference Evaluation, Atlanta, GA, 2002

[CLICK HERE for MS WORD VERSION OF THIS EVALUATION](#)

*Results of this evaluation are tabulated and reported to preconference organizers (past and future) every year.
Please take a few moments to fill it out and return it.*

What is your profession?

- Special Collections Librarian/Archivist/Curator
- Academic Librarian (not in Special Collections)
- Public Librarian (not in Special Collections)
- Book Dealer
- Publisher
- Scholar
- Other _____

2. For librarians: Which of the following define(s) your primary responsibilities? Please check all that apply.

- Administration
- Public Service
- Cataloging
- Collection Development
- Systems
- Exhibitions
- Preservation/Conservation
- Other _____

3. How many RBMS preconferences have you attended?

- 1 to 5
- 6 to 10
- More than 10

4. How many years have you been in your profession?

- 1 to 5
- 6 to 10
- 11 to 20
- 21+

5. Will you attend this year's ALA Conference in Atlanta?

- Yes
- No

6. What percentage of costs did your employer provide toward your attendance at this preconference?

- 0%
- 1-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-75%
- 76-99%
- 100%

7. Please select the two factors that most influenced your decision to attend this preconference.

- Theme/Speakers
- Short paper presentations
- Workshops
- Location
- Proximity to ALA Conference

8. How did you learn about the 2002 RBMS Preconference?

- American Libraries / C&RL News*
- Email posting on listserv
- RBMS web page
- Announcement at 2001 RBMS Preconference
- From a colleague
- Other _____

Please rank questions 9-21 on a scale of 1-5. 1 indicates *Strongly Disagree* and 5 indicates *Strongly Agree*:

9. The preconference theme was appropriate to the concerns of the profession.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

10. Plenary sessions adequately addressed the preconference theme.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

11. The number of plenary sessions was appropriate for the preconference.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

12. The plenary sessions included adequate time for questions and discussion.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

13. The seminars contributed positively to the overall quality of the preconference.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

14. The number of seminars was appropriate for the preconference.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

15. The seminar sessions I attended included adequate time for questions and discussion.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

16. The short papers contributed positively to the overall quality of the preconference.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

17. The number of short papers was appropriate for the preconference.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

18. The short papers I attended included adequate time for questions and discussion.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

19. Local arrangements were well-organized and met attendees' needs for information, transportation, facilities, and equipment.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

20. Tours and site visits provided good opportunities for professional development/personal enjoyment.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

21. I stayed in _____ and the accommodations were satisfactory.

Strongly Disagree *Strongly Agree*
1 2 3 4 5 N/A

22. My overall rating of this preconference is:

Very poor

Poor

Neutral

Good

Very good

Please use this space for any comments you care to make would like to offer for future preconference programs including topics for future seminars or workshops.

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this evaluation. Please return it at the end of the preconference or mail to:
Eric Holzenberg, The Grolier Club, 47 East 60th Street, New York, NY 10022.**