Week 3 Case Analysis: Conference Decision Case, Part 2

Date: September 15, 2005

Two weeks after New Orleans was devastated by Hurricane Katrina, you made the decision to postpone the conference and select a different city to hold the conference. Based on your initial objectives and a survey you took of the registered attendees, you created the following consequence table based on the information available.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **ALTERNATIVES** |
| **Cancel conference for this year—schedule for next year** | **Keep in New Orleans, but schedule for a later date (when the hotels re-open)** | **Keep same dates, but move to another city** | **Move to another city and schedule for a later date** |
| **O****B****J****E****C****T****I****V****E****S** |   **Maximize attendance** | **Does not meet objective.**Senior management stated that cancelling is not an option. | **Does not meet objective.**Uncertainty on when New Orleans will be back in business is too far off. | **Does not meet objective.**Cost and logistics of finding a new location and getting attendees to change flights with such short notice is cost prohibitive. | **Meets objective.**In a survey of attendees, they would be willing to look at a new date in October and were most interested in Las Vegas, Chicago, or New York as alternative sites. |
|  **Keep conference costs at current level** | **Does not meet objective.**Refunding registration fees would cause a loss for conference. | **Does not meet objective.**Because of uncertainty with city, the registration fees would need to be refunded. | **Does not meet objective.**Conference would lose money and incur additional costs for last minute scheduling. | **Meets objective.**A preliminary survey shows that costs would be similar to current budget. |

From the survey, you found out that the attendees were willing to still come to the conference and suggested three cities as possible new locations for this year’s event.

1. Chicago
2. Las Vegas
3. New York City

As you move forward in locating available hotels and conference facilities, you formulate the following objectives to select which cities will be best to hold the rescheduled conference.

* Airfare (the estimated average round trip cost of the attendees)
* Hotel Room Rate (the nightly rate the attendees will pay during the conference)
* Conference Costs (the costs you will incur for meeting facilities, reception, registration, etc.)
* Survey Response (you want to factor in how the cities were ranked based on the survey you conducted.)

Because the budget is tight, you feel that the Conference Cost objective is twice as important as the other three objectives.

Based on your research, here is the information you gathered on the cities the user group was interested in.

**New Orleans (Not applicable, but used to compare original costs of conference)**

Average Airfare:            $300 to $400 (Round trip cost per person)
Hotel Room Rate:         $149.00 (Conference rate per room per night)
Conference Costs:        $16,000 (Meeting rooms, reception, refreshments, registration materials, etc.)
Survey Rank                 Not Applicable

**Chicago**

Average Airfare:            $200 to $300 (Round trip cost per person)
Hotel Room Rate:         $149.00 (Conference rate per room per night)
Conference Costs:        $25,000 (Meeting rooms, reception, refreshments, registration materials, etc.)
Survey Rank                 1

**New York**

Average Airfare:            $300 to $400 (Round trip cost per person)
Hotel Room Rate:         $349.00 (Conference rate per room per night)
Conference Costs:        $20,000 (Meeting rooms, reception, refreshments, registration materials, etc.)
Survey Rank                  2

**Las Vegas**

Average Airfare:            $200 to $300 (Round trip cost per person)
Hotel Room Rate:         $169.00 (Conference rate per room per night)
Conference Costs:        $15,000 (Meeting rooms, reception, refreshments, registration materials, etc.)
Survey Rank                 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
| MGMT530–Conference Decision Case, Part 2 |
|

|  |
| --- |
| Using this information, create the following.* A consequence table
* A weighted scoring model

Are there any dominated alternatives that can be eliminated? Are there any even swaps?For additional resources pertaining to this assignment, please review the Building a Weighted Scoring Model Video found under the Week 3 Lecture Tab and the Conference Decision Case, Part 2 Video below. A weighted scoring example is located in Doc Sharing under the name Sample Decision Problem.Submit your definition of the problem in a MS Word document to the Week 3 Case Analysis Dropbox. Input your responses in the template found [here](http://vizedhtmlcontent.next.ecollege.com/CurrentCourse/Documents/MGMT530_Week3_CaseAnalysis_Template.docx). This document is also available in the Doc Sharing tab. [**Conference Decision Case, Part 2**](http://vizedhtmlcontent.next.ecollege.com/ec/Courses/13775/CRS-DVUO-2148869/SSO/hub2/sso.html?node=27138) |
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