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Regrets:
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James G. Neal, Columbia University, U.S., jm12103@columbia.edu/jneal@columbia.edu
Alexander Plemnek, St. Petersburg State Technical, plm@unilib.neva.ru
1. **Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed members and observers to the meeting. He noted the following points:

- 2004 is not an election year and, as a result, the Standing Committee meetings will be simple.
- The Chair was required to participate in a meeting of the Professional Board and must leave the Standing Committee at 1:00 p.m. He asked Frances Groen to chair the meeting when he departed and to focus on the program for the Oslo meeting and the evaluation questionnaire.
- He welcomed a colleague from Norway who offered help and input for the program in Oslo: Per Morten Bryhn, Overbiblioteka, Universitet I, Oslo

2. **Minutes of the Standing Committees I and II, Berlin**

These had been previously corrected on e-mail and were available on IFLA Net. All Committee members had been able to comment on the draft minutes and to add items to the draft agenda, distributed prior to the meeting.

3. **Financial Report of the Section**

(Previously distributed to members electronically)

The Chair noted that all the budget had been spent, including the support of registration costs.
for five Latin American colleagues. He hopes that the practice of supporting colleagues from less developed countries will continue. Because of difficulties in obtaining simultaneous translation into Spanish, the Section had to pay for the service from its own funds. He thought that this oversight was the result of transitions in IFLA headquarters staff. It has been challenging for staff to determine which sessions should receive simultaneous translation. The cost for the Section was $1,200 Argentinian pesos ($580 US). The Chair asked committee members to endorse the decision to spend Section funds in this way and there was general support of this decision.

The Chair asked for questions and comments on the reports sent to all members, and there were no questions. There was appreciation for the hard work of the Chair. (Toby Bainton)

4. **The Review Process**

The Chair advised committee members that the University Libraries Section had been selected as the first section to be reviewed and the draft questionnaire was developed to assist in this process.

Barbara Ford commented that incentives (prizes, etc.) were important to encourage all members to complete the survey, especially because the survey was quite lengthy. She suggested one complementary registration as a prize.

Jesus Lau observed that the questionnaire had two objectives: information about IFLA and information about the Section.

It was suggested by several members that the questionnaire addressed members and institutional heads who were the decision makers and that the survey should make clear the person who should reply. This will be addressed in a revised version.

5. **The Strategic Plan**

   (previously distributed to members electronically)

The Chair noted that the Section must report progress in its Strategic Plan. He discussed other planning issues, including the need of the organization to expand its reach and membership. He urged members to attend the President’s brainstorming sessions to participate in discussions on this issue. At the December meeting of the Professional Board, the criteria for approving project funds will be reviewed. There will no longer be a distinction between projects financed by the Professional Committee and the Coordinating Board. All projects will fall under the Professional Committee. However, the Coordinating Board will still be able to conduct certain projects on a “contracting out” basis. One such example is the current President’s priority of literacy which could be everything from reading to computer literacy to life-long learning and literacy.

6. **Section Activities during the Buenos Aires meeting**

   (Section activities were previously outlined in the agenda for the meeting)

Volunteers agreed to distribute and collect evaluation forms of the various programs, including evaluation, e-theses, and the joint session.

At this point the Chair left the meeting. Toby Bainton volunteered to take the Minutes as
Frances Groen assumed the Chair.

The Chair identified two major issues for discussion:

1. The Section’s program for next year’s conference in Oslo.
2. The questionnaire to be distributed to members of the Section seeking their opinions about its work.

*Program for Oslo Conference*

The first issue was discussed taking advantage of the presence of Per Morten Bryhn of Oslo University Library. The chair called for suggestions for a theme for the program, after which the Committee would identify a coordinator. Two suggestions were made, and it was agreed that they would fit into one program. The first was the interoperability of library portals with course management systems (also known as virtual learning environments). The second was the impact on libraries of wireless technology.

By agreement with Larry Woods of the Information Technology Section, who was present at that stage of the meeting, it was agreed that the two topics suggested would together form the basis of a joint (2-hour) session with the IT Section. The Chair would ask Jim Neal and Sue McKnight if they would coordinate our Section’s speakers for the session.

Since our allocation is two hours of program time, we would also collaborate 50:50 with the Statistics Section on a two-hour session on quality issues. Eva Hesselgren agreed to be responsible for our section’s input. The precise topic would be decided at the Standing Committee’s meeting at the end of the week, but it might well provide an overview of formal quality assessments required of libraries in different parts of the world. (Detailed matters, such as what standards can be used to judge quality, could be dealt with in a separate Discussion Group.) We would seek a separate speaker from Norway, where quality is now part of the legal régime for university libraries, and from South Africa, where such requirements are also being introduced.

As part of the Committee’s discussion, Roswitha Poll invited those present to contribute to the bibliography of publications on library quality which the Section on Statistics and Evaluation had mounted on the IFLA website.

*Questionnaire for Section members*

A draft questionnaire had recently been circulated to Standing Committee members who had raised matters for improvement. It was agreed that the final questionnaire would be in two parts: one relating to the institution in membership of the Section, and the second relating to any individual person who has taken part in IFLA conferences and/or Section activity during the last two years. Melita Ambrozic, with help from Barbara Ford, will revise the questionnaire and send a draft to all Standing Committee members and all observers present. Responses to the draft would be sent to Melita by 15 September. Melita would then issue a near-final version, to be completed, as a further pilot, by the same Standing Committee members and observers by 31 October. Melita and Barbara would then issue the final version to all Section members.
Other matters

Reports from working groups would be considered the following Saturday at the next meeting. The proposed publication had been almost abandoned since it had been found to overlap with the Statistics Section’s current revision of the 1996 IFLA handbook “Measuring Quality”. Roswitha Poll suggested, and the Committee agreed, that she should recruit a small joint group to participate in the revision of the handbook.

Standing Committees II
27 August 2004
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Chair: Cristobal Pasadas
Secretary: Frances Groen

The Chair convened the meeting. He expressed the appreciation of the committee to Valentina Comba, University of Bologna, for arranging the program on open access at the Circulo Italiano. He then stressed the need for the active assistance of committee members over the next year, especially on the part of members who will not rotate off the Committee in Oslo.

The question of the evaluation of the Section, previously discussed at Standing Committee I, was again reviewed. Melita Ambrozic, with the assistance of Barbara Ford will assume responsibility for this activity. Tentative dates were established:

- September 15: Committee members send comments to Meliata Ambrozic on the questionnaire
- September 30: Pre-test questionnaire sent to Committee members
- October 30: Final version approved and sent to all members of the Section

These dates were tentative since the Chair said that there may be more information forthcoming on deadlines. In general, the Chair felt that, where possible, the working groups should determine all deadlines. Headquarters requires a review that is qualitative as well as quantitative, with a review period from December 2005 to August 2006. He reminded committee members that the University Libraries Section is a “test” section for the review process.

1. Review of Section Activities at the Buenos Aires Meeting

Session on Electronic Theses – Christian Lupovici, Convenor

This session was extremely well attended. Melita Ambrozic has prepared a commentary on this session and this is appended to these Minutes, for possible inclusion in the Section’s Newsletter. Some headsets were missing at the end of this session but all were eventually returned. Mackenzie Smith (M.I.T.) had been unable to attend due to lack of funds. She was replaced by a speaker from the Royal Library of Netherlands (Name ??) Since attendance was far greater than anticipated, the room was too small. Approximately
300 were in attendance, although only 17 evaluations were returned. There were requests for a further session on Open Access in general.

**Quality Issues Discussion Group**

Approximately 150 attended with 62 completed evaluations. These noted the high quality of presentations but also the scarcity of time. Attendees would have liked handouts for the tabular material and simultaneous translation into Spanish. The absence of Latin American speakers on this program was noted.

**Joint Session with Statistics and Evaluation**

The meeting was ranked “good” to “excellent”. Approximately 460 attended this session. Further topics suggested for consideration for future programs in this area were e-library costs and electronic archiving.

In general the absence of Latin American content was noted, although this certainly was not true of all programs. This need should be given priority consideration in identifying speakers for the meetings, especially in Korea and South Africa. There was strong support for local content and committee members should bear this need in mind in program planning.

Further general comments on the meeting in Buenos Aires (presented at the post conference Standing Committee).

- Over 600 Latin American colleagues attended this meeting; for many this was their first IFLA meeting.

- It was noted that, unlike private universities, state university libraries, i.e. University of Buenos Aires, had not been included in the Library visits for delegates. This University has more than 100,000 students.

- The need for local (national (?) groups to build upon this shared experience was mentioned. IFLA could assist by providing follow-up Web-casting to encourage broader sharing. Informal organization of local libraries through geographically based sections might help to take advantage of IFLA meetings in their locality.

- Africa will take a strong organizing role in 2007 to maximize attendance by African countries.

- It was suggested that IFLA meet every second year with national meetings held in intervening years. It was further commented that a regional approach is viable only on a selective, country basis. The annual meeting, despite being shortened by one day, is still very costly, especially to those involved in committee work. There was strong support for further shortening of the meeting, especially with formal sessions.

- Media coverage of the conference was seen as good and important.

- The conference planners at Headquarters need to do a better job in negotiating hotel rates. IFLA rates are often higher than individually booked rates.
Update on the WSIS Summit  -  Barbara Ford

- Barbara Ford, Committee member responsible for monitoring developments in the WSIS, began by emphasizing the importance of member engagement on the national level. She emphasized the importance of telling the success of libraries – “stories” as exemplified by the IFLA publication, “Success Stories: Libraries @the Heart of the Information Society.” C. Pasadas mentioned the importance of selling IFLA throughout the world.

- The Tunis Summit in 2005 will be preceded by a pre-conference summit in Alexandria. It was proposed that IFLA gather information at the Headquarters level through an electronic discussion list and the Chair agreed to look into this matter. The section membership will be asked for their personal experiences. Committee members felt the need for further information on this topic.

- The Chair invited members to consider the Section’s Action Plan and the need to link to WSIS with issues identified in the plan.

- Returning to the issue of countries, every country will have the opportunity to contribute to WSIS. Each country will have a particular governmental agency(ies) responsible for representation at WSIS, and the librarian members need to inform themselves of the manner in which their country intends to organize its representation.

- The Chair asked Roswitha Poll to work with Barbara Ford to prepare input for the WSIS summit, as it related to evaluation measurement of library successes. The Chair further proposed that Jim Neal be invited to provide input within the framework on issues of Open Access.

Program for Oslo, 2005

- The Chair reminded committee members that the Section will require a new strategic plan in 2005.

- Larry Woods, from the Information Technology Sector, had invited the University Library Section, to cooperate in a joint session at the Oslo meeting, in particular the relationship between library portals and e-learning. This topic will include the interoperability of library management systems with course management systems. The Chair suggested that this might be done on an off-site workshop.

[Roswitha Poll to provide further information on evaluation and statistics program planning, subsequent to the first meeting of the Standing Committee.]

Working Groups

The Committee discussed progress of the groups created at the second meeting of the Standing Committee in Berlin.

1. Information Literacy – Jesus Lau
   The group is concerned to develop programs concerning the issues of Latin American newspapers, government and information literacy; information literacy standards and how to implement them.
2. **Performance Evaluation – Eva Hesselgren Mortensen**
   A publication is being considered. R. Poll is working on a book, outside the Section, on quality issues. It is proposed that the Section identify authors, and invite potential authors to make presentations at the Oslo meeting.

3. **Scholarly Communication – Christian Lupovici**

4. **Relations with FAIFE**
   There is a strong need to liaise with other groups in IFLA on this issue. The continuation of this group is being evaluated. (Chair) since the issue of lifelong literacy has become the priority of incoming President Alex Byrne. The Governing Board will be discussing the document on lifelong literacy with UNESCO at the post-conference meeting.

**Additional Business**

- The need to create more opportunities for socializing within the Committee was identified. A dinner (food event) was proposed for the Committee in Oslo, just before or after the first meeting of the Standing Committee.

- Since next year is an election year, all committee members should be considering nominations. The Chair emphasized the need to nominate colleagues who will attend and work throughout the entire year.

**MEETING ADJOURNMENT**