Mission

To promote the development and good management of academic and research libraries in all countries, and to strengthen the integration of the library in the core institutional functions of learning, teaching, research and services.

!!! IMPORTANT !!!

Review of our Section … Your chance to provide input

Readers will note that Section 5 of our Strategic Plan requires us to survey our members and review our Section.

A survey is attached at the end of this newsletter (from Page 8). I urge you to complete the survey and return it to the Editor, Sue McKnight, IFLA University Libraries and other General Research Libraries Section, c/- The Boots Library, Nottingham Trent University, Goldsmith Street, Nottingham, NG1 5LS, United Kingdom, or email: sue.mcknight@ntu.ac.uk by 30 April 2005.

To assist you, the Section’s Strategic Plan has been included in the newsletter so that you may refer to our goals and actions when completing the survey. It will take about 15 minutes to complete, as it covers a wide range of issues. However, it is your chance to influence the direction of the Section. Your comments will be considered by the Section’s Standing Committee at its meetings in Oslo, when a new Strategic Plan will be drafted, based on YOUR feedback.

IFLA/OCLC Early Career Development Fellowship

The IFLA/OCLC Early Career Development Fellowship programme provides early career development and continuing education for library and information science professionals from countries with developing economies.

For information on the Application Procedures visit the OCLC Web site.

The Program Guidelines and Application for the IFLA/OCLC Fellowship 2006 are now posted on the OCLC web site. The links to the files, available in pdf and Word formats, are accessible under the 2006 Application details at the following location:

http://www.oclc.org/institute/resources/fellowships/ifla/default.htm

Buenos Aires - IFLA 70th World Library & Information Congress Report

Many members will have enjoyed the hospitality of our colleagues at the 70th General Conference of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, which was

Our Section was very active during the World Congress, ensuring there were many sessions of interest to our members.

**Session on Electronic Theses and Scholarly Communication** (Report by Melita Ambrozic)

The session’s topic is one of the most important issues for university libraries in the future. University libraries have to move from the printed to the new form of transferring knowledge. Four papers were presented.

**Jean-Claude Guédon** from Université de Montreal (Canada) made an excellent introduction to the problem of theses which usually are prepared by the candidates, are defended and later mostly found in a place somewhere on the libraries’ shelves and rarely published. A brief history of the problem of theses has been given. He emphasized that the first published abstracts of theses, that have been published, made a great change. They became more visible and their use increased; knowledge and new ideas could be shared more easily. Digitization and the use of the new technologies in their preparing and dissemination created new rules in the scholarly communication processes. Universities have started with the building of institutional repositories but we could not be satisfied with the speed of these initiatives. Also, as the speaker pointed out, peer-review of theses and their evaluation are not broadly initiated. But it is important that libraries started with cooperation in the process of building, using technical resources and a common software solution and also in designing and using common evaluation systems and meta-data. Above mentioned attempts are changing the way of communication in higher education, also free/open access publishing activities are concerned by universities. One of the attendees, from Italy, mentioned in discussion, that his country has already started with the process of building open access archives for theses but two university boards opposed; authors are afraid of e-publishing their theses before related original scientific articles are published. Dr. Guédon answered that such thinking is conservative and should be changed. By e-publishing and open access theses are promoted, more are becoming a “health” concurrence to the open access data basis of journals.

**Jean-Paul Ducasse** from the University of Lyon (France) presented both the political and technical stakes of scholarly communication cyberthesis. The goal of a common project of universities of Montréal, Lyon and Alexandria that were joined by the universities of Chile and Geneva has been to create a platform for electronic and scientific information for all universities in any country that wish to archive and diffuse research papers in order to facilitate open scientific communication. An ETD project based on a structured approach of a document and the use of the SGML and the DTD TEILite in 2003-2004, the cyberthesis project underwent important changes: it is full “open source”, based on the XML standard, and it works in a dynamic mode. Next step has been the passage to the cyberdocs, and XML way of publishing, an electronic publishing platform of a structured document. An author presented the conversion process, the control process and the publishing process and the results obtained by the project.

**Gabriela Ortuzar** from the University of Chile, Santiago (Chile) presented experiences in organizing a network in Chile and throughout Latin America (implementation of e-thesis and open archives initiatives). They started in 1999 with the defining of university’s policy and in 2000 they started with using cyberdocs platform. All necessary guidelines for users have been prepared and a lot of courses have been provided for students above how to use a software in the process of preparing their thesis. Nowadays University of Chile is involved in the network of 49 universities which are building a common open access archive for e-theses and they initiated further cooperation in the region of L-A. Author also presented a portal which allow to search and read more than 7,000 e-theses in full-text. Participants in a discussion were interested about the possibilities of participating in above mentioned project and about the conditions of using developed software. An author answered that the only condition is a willingness to participate and enough motivation.
Marlin Bossenbroek from the Netherland’s National Library presented perfect ALF@NED ("knowledge domain for history, language and culture"), the aim of which is building a shared digital heritage collection.

“What is Quality?” Quality Issues Discussion Group (sponsored by our Section)

Approximately 150 attended this session. Below is a summary of the university section of the presentation given by Toby Bainton, Secretary of SCONUL (Society of College, National and University Libraries) on the “Assessment of library quality in the United Kingdom” as it relates to university libraries.

What do we mean by quality? (Report by Toby Bainton)

Acceptable definition: ‘good quality = good quality from the user’s point of view’

BUT (1) users don’t always know what a good quality library might give them and (2) repeated assessments tend to produce 66% satisfaction rate.

In practice: a good quality library is constantly attempting to improve itself

- by consulting its users (as to areas of dissatisfaction)
- [dynamic concept] comparing itself with other libraries (looking for possible improvements): SCONUL libraries’ approach (benchmarking).

Quality assessment of UK university libraries

Until the early 1990s universities took sole responsibility for their teaching and research, including all related activities such as library provision.

From the early 1990s until 1997, teaching provision was subject to two, separately organised, forms of external review

• quality audit (systems and procedures for academic standards) [reviews carried out by the Higher Education Quality Council, an agency jointly owned by universities themselves]

• quality assessment of teaching in discrete subjects [reviews carried out by the government funding agencies, one each for England, Scotland and Wales], the format of which were: 1. briefing documents; 2. visit by assessors, a few for 3 days; 3. a published report.

In order to encourage consistent assessment of libraries and computing services, SCONUL issued (1996) its Aide mémoire for assessors when evaluating (library and computing services).

Dual assessment was burdensome and unpopular. In 1997 the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) was established, paid for by contributions from all universities. It assesses quality of teaching under contracts with the government funding agencies.

The QAA places emphasis on the assurance of academic standards. It develops codes of practice and standards concerning the issue of qualifications, the design of courses, and the teaching of specific subjects. It has also carried out many reviews of specific subjects in individual universities, in order to complete the process begun by earlier bodies. SCONUL’s (revised) Aide mémoire reviewers evaluating learning resources was published in 2003 for the benefit of reviewers working for the QAA.

From 2003 it is moving to an audit of institutions (rather than subjects). The form of this audit is slightly different in the separate countries of the UK.

Library quality in the context of research support has never been assessed. Research is assessed by peer review on a national scale every few years. Funding is granted in accordance with the quality of research and may be spent on any activity.

Other speakers at the Discussion Group meeting included MIGUEL DUARTE, who gave a Spanish perspective, and ROSWITHA POLL, the German perspective.

Joint Session with Statistics and Evaluation on the Cost of Information Access
Approximately 460 attended this session and it was ranked by participants as ‘good to excellent’. It consisted of papers from:

**Management of the electronic collection with cost-per-use data**  
BRINLEY FRANKLIN (University of Connecticut, Storrs, USA)

**Do users get what they pay for? A resource allocation model for Oxford University Library Services**  
MICHAEL HEANEY (Oxford University Library Services, Oxford, UK)

**Library management with cost data**  
ROSWITHA POLL (University and Regional Library, Münster, Germany)

**Non-subscription costs of print and electronic journals on a live-cycle basis**  
ANN OKERSON (Yale University, USA) and ROGER C. SCHONFELD (Ithaka, USA)

These papers are available on the IFLA web site at:  
www.ifla.org/IV/ifla70/prog04.htm

---

**IFLA’s Three Pillars: Society, Members and Profession**

IFLA’s Governing Board has endorsed a new model for IFLA’s operations, the three pillars, which recognises that IFLA’s core functions relate to: the societal contexts in which libraries and information services operate, IFLA’s membership, and professional matters. These three pillars are supported by the infrastructure offered by IFLA HQ, IFLANET and the Federation’s governance structures.

* The Society Pillar focuses on the role and impact of libraries and information services in society and the contextual issues that condition and constrain the environment in which they operate across the world. Those issues are addressed currently through FAIFE, CLM, Blue Shield, and our advocacy in the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) and other arenas.

* The Profession Pillar focuses on the issues covered by the long established Core Activities - ALP, ICABS, PAC, UNIMARC - and the Sections and Divisions. They lie at the core of our professional practice and help libraries and information services to fulfil their purposes and to shape responses to the needs of clients in a rapidly changing global environment.

* The Members Pillar is of course central to IFLA. It includes the services we offer to members, management of their membership of IFLA, conferences and publications. We must work together to make IFLA more vibrant and attractive and beneficial for members throughout the world.

Of course, all three pillars and the underlying infrastructure are interdependent and not mutually exclusive. They offer a way of understanding and presenting IFLA holistically to the library and information sector and to governments and the wider community. The pillars should also provide the framework for IFLA’s management and their focus should be reflected in program based budgeting.

(extracted from IFLA Professional Board Communication)

**Section Strategic Plan**

The following is a draft of the Section’s 2004-2005 Strategic Plan, which is being considered by the IFLA Professional Committee. The final version will be mounted on our Section Website at: [http://www.ifla.org/VII/s2/sulogrl.htm](http://www.ifla.org/VII/s2/sulogrl.htm)
The University and Other General Research Libraries Section serves to promote and strengthen the development and good management of academic and research libraries in all countries. The Section aims to foster collaboration with national and parliamentary libraries represented in Division 1 and with special interest Sections of IFLA.

The University and Other General Research Libraries Section’s programs aim to encourage:
- the integration of the library in the core institutional functions of learning, teaching, research and services;
- research for evidence of the contribution and impact of the library on its various constituencies; and
- integration of the library into the broader national and international frameworks for information policy and for key skills provision.

**Goals**

1. *Assist librarians in academic and research institutions to understand and work effectively with the new professional functions of educator and knowledge manager, especially in training users to be information literate and lifelong learners*

   Relation to IFLA professional priorities: a) Supporting the role of libraries in society; c) Promoting literacy and reading; d) Providing unrestricted access to information; f) Promoting resource sharing; h) Developing library professionals.

**Action**

1. Cooperate with other IFLA units in the creation and maintenance of an international Information Literacy Forum or Foundation to develop a shared framework for Information Literacy developments

1.2. Broaden the Information Literacy issue to include cooperation and partnership with other libraries, educational agencies, NGOs and other bodies for collaborative development projects.

   These activities will be first responsibility for the Information Literacy Working Group of the Standing Committee.

2. *Promote the development and dissemination of best practices in quality assurance and review of services as part of the institutional evaluation processes*

   Relation to IFLA professional priorities: a) Supporting the role of libraries in society; c) Promoting literacy and reading; i) Promoting standards, guidelines and best practices

**Action**

2.1. Collaborate with Division I, the Statistics and Evaluation Section, and the Library Theory and Research Section to establish and convene the Quality Issues in Libraries Discussion Group in Buenos Aires 2004 and Oslo 2005, according to the rationale agreed in Berlin and approved by PC.

2.2. Contribute to the IFLA publications program by authoring a monograph on “Improving Quality: issues for academic and research libraries” by 2005. A special activity (such as a 4-hours session joint with other IFLA units as appropriate) to be scheduled for Oslo 2005 for presentation and discussion of the final content of the book.

2.3. Commence a cost analysis study of the open access publishing model, including political, social and economic considerations.

   Activities related to these actions will be the main responsibility for the Performance Evaluation and Quality Assessment Working Group of the SC. Action 2.3 will be developed in close cooperation with the Scholarly Communication Working Group.

3. *Address opportunities, issues and challenges faced by academic and research libraries in the changing nature of scholarly communication and the long time preservation of digital materials in cooperation with national libraries and other key players in the national information system for the benefit of all type of users, especially from less developed countries.*

   Relation to IFLA professional priorities: a) Supporting the role of libraries in society; d) Providing unrestricted access to information; e) Balancing the intellectual property rights of authors with the needs of users; k) Representing libraries in the technological marketplace.
Action

3.1. Participate in the final discussion of the IFLA Open Access Statement and eventual preparation of an addendum specifically targeted to the academic and research libraries community.

3.2. Prepare a joint program with the Information Technology Section on “Libraries and Scholarly Communication” for Buenos Aires in 2004, with a strong focus in Latin American developments. These activities to be developed by the Scholarly Communication Working Group.

4. **Monitor and report on trends in Higher Education around the world which could convey special opportunities and challenges to IFLA and the Library and Information Services profession, particularly as regards promotion of resource sharing between the information rich and the information poor, according to recommendation nº 10 of the Social Responsibilities Discussion Group**

Relation to IFLA professional priorities: a) Supporting the role of libraries in society; b) Defending the principle of freedom of information; d) Providing unrestricted access to information; e) Balancing the intellectual property rights of authors with the need of users; f) Promoting resource sharing; h) Developing library professionals.

Action

4.1. Appoint a Section liaison person who will liaise with the IFLA team at the UNESCO World Summit on the Information Society and report to the Section on issues that should be addresses by the Section.

4.2. Liaise with FAIFE, CLM and other strategic IFLA units, especially Division VIII, to bring forward the principles and recommendations of the SRDG as adopted by Council in Glasgow. These activities to be developed by the FAIFE and SRDG Working Group and reported through the Section Newsletter as appropriate. Liaison with Division VIII for specific issues to be assumed by the Chair of the SC.

5. **Commence preparations for the assessment and review process of the Section to be completed before 2007**

Relation to IFLA professional priorities: h) Developing library professionals; j) Supporting the infrastructure of library associations.

Action

5.1. Survey the Section’s membership during 2004.

5.2. Draft a briefing paper on vision, mission, remit and rationale for the Section within Division I. for Buenos Aires, with discussions to be carried on until Oslo, where a clear agenda on the evaluation and review process should be established. These activities to be led by the executive board of the Section.

---

**Have you visited IFLANET lately?**

This newsletter is not intended to be a substitute to the IFLANET website, which contains loads of information about IFLA, this Section, and all other sections/activities of IFLA. Please visit the site and bookmark it for future reference. Then visit it at least once a month to keep up with what is happening with your Association. Go to: [http://www.ifla.org](http://www.ifla.org) You will find all the minutes of the Section’s meetings, conference papers, brochures about the Section and more.

**Future Conferences**

**World Library and Information Congress: 71st IFLA General Conference and Council**

*Oslo, Norway, August 14-19, 2005*
World Library and Information Congress: 72nd IFLA General Conference and Council
Seoul, Republic of Korea, 2006

World Library and Information Congress: 73rd IFLA General Conference and Council
Durban, South Africa, 2007

World Library and Information Congress: 74rd IFLA General Conference and Council
Québec, Canada, 2008

Editorial Note:

This newsletter is produced by the University Libraries and other General Research Libraries Section of IFLA. The Section intends to publish two newsletters per year, one before the annual IFLA conference in that year, and one after the IFLA conference, serving as a summary of conference highlights. This way, we hope to encourage members to attend, by highlighting what was, and what is planned to be, showcased at these great conferences.

To keep costs as low as possible, the newsletter will be emailed to members who have nominated an email address, with a paper version to those who have no email address. In addition, the newsletter will be published on IFLANET.

Contributions to the Newsletter are invited from members. Forward these to:

Sue McKnight
Information Officer
IFLA University Libraries and other General Research Libraries Section
c/- The Boots Library
Nottingham Trent University
Goldsmith Street
Nottingham, NG1 5LS
United Kingdom

email: sue.mcknight@ntu.ac.uk
IFLA
UNIVERSITY AND OTHER GENERAL RESEARCH LIBRARIES SECTION
MEMBERSHIP SURVEY 2005

The University and Other General Research Libraries Section of IFLA, Division I, is reviewing its existing activities as part of the general survey of IFLA programs to be completed by 2007.

As part of this review, we are conducting a survey of our membership that should only take about 15 minutes to complete. We would therefore be grateful if you would complete and submit this questionnaire by 30 April 2005. Your responses will remain anonymous and the results of the survey will be published on the Section’s Newsletter later in 2005.

Complete and return the survey to:

Sue McKnight
Information Officer
IFLA University Libraries and other General Research Libraries Section
c/- The Boots Library
Nottingham Trent University
Goldsmith Street
Nottingham, NG1 5LS
United Kingdom

email: sue.mcknight@ntu.ac.uk
Fax: +61 (0)115 848 2286

Throughout the questionnaire, where there is a box, please tick as appropriate.

SECTION 1: TELL US ABOUT YOUR INSTITUTION

1. What type of institution do you work in?
   □ Academic library service □ Academic library branch
   □ Library association □ National library
   □ Research library □ Library school
   □ other (please, specify)

2. Where is your institution based?
   □ Sub-Saharan Africa □ Latin America or the Caribbean
   □ United States or Canada □ Western or Central Europe
   □ Australasia and Pacific □ Eastern Europe
   □ North Africa or Middle East □ Asia

3. What other professional associations is your institution a member of?
(please list the main benefit to your institution after each).

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
SECTION 2: TELL US ABOUT YOUR MEMBERSHIP OF IFLA

4. How long have you been a member of IFLA?
   □ 5 years or less      □ 6–9 years          □ more than 10 years

5. How long have you been a member of the University and Other General Research Libraries Section?
   □ 5 years or less      □ 6–9 years          □ more than 10 years

6. Why did you or your institution join IFLA?
   (Select more than one if you wish, ordering them by importance, i.e. 1 most important reason, then 2, then 3 etc.)
   □ advocacy for the profession □ networking with colleagues
   □ professional development  □ website
   □ access to IFLA publications □ annual conference
   □ to address international professional concerns
   □ declarations and position papers issued
   □ other (please specify)     □ don’t know

7. Why did you or your institution join the University and Other General Research Libraries Section?
   (Select more than one if you wish, ordering them by importance, i.e. 1 most important reason, then 2, then 3 etc.)
   □ advocacy for the profession □ networking with colleagues
   □ professional development  □ website
   □ access to IFLA publications □ annual conference
   □ declarations and position papers issued
   □ academic focus
   □ to address international professional concerns
   □ don’t know
   □ other (please specify)

8. What others IFLA divisions or sections do you belong to?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

9. Have you or any of your staff ever been a member of a Standing Committee, Governing Board or other official position?
   □ Yes (please specify) □ No
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

10. How many annual IFLA conferences have you or one of your staff attended?
    ______________________________________________________
    ______________________________________________________
    ______________________________________________________
    ______________________________________________________

11. Does your institution pay the membership of IFLA?
    □ Yes      □ No
12. Does your institution allow for attendance at IFLA conferences as part of your working day?
    □ Yes    □ No

13. Which of these factors are most important for your decision to attend annual IFLA conferences? Please rank from 1 to 6.
    □ cost    □ timing    □ program    □ Standing Committee commitment
    □ location    □ topic    □ other (please specify)

14. How do you rate your level of knowledge and familiarity with the following features from 1 ‘very good’ to 5 ‘very poor’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFLA strategic priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA statutes and rules of procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibilities Discussion Group recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential theme 2003–2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA role in the World Summit for the Information Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and Other General Research Libraries Section strategic plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 3: TELL US YOUR OPINIONS

15. Does the NAME - University and Other General Research Libraries Section - actually reflect your interests and priorities?
    □ Yes    □ No

Why? _________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
Any suggestions for a new name?
______________________________________________________________________

16. What do you believe should be the role of the University and Other General Research Libraries Section within IFLA?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

17. What marketing strategies could IFLA/University and Other General Research Libraries Section use to improve direct communication with your authorities to help you sell our professional image?
    IFLA?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

    University and Other General Research Libraries Section?
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

18. How useful are IFLA conferences to you?
    □ not at all useful    □ somewhat useful    □ useful
    □ very useful    □ don’t know
19. What are two things your institution most needs now from IFLA?
IFLA?
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
From University and Other General Research Libraries Section?
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

20. What would you lose if IFLA did not exist?
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

21. Rank the following IFLA products from 1 ‘excellent’ to 5 ‘not at all good’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and Other General Research Libraries Section’s Newsletters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLANET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Rank your overall level of satisfaction from 1 ‘very satisfied’ to 5 ‘not satisfied at all’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and Other General Research Libraries Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLANET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA Publications Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA Headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Rank the importance of IFLA functions and roles from 1 ‘most important’ to 5 ‘least important’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking and meeting with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in IFLA SC, boards, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education and professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs are reasonable and provide value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website and IFLANET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Rank the following statements from 1 ‘strongly agree’ to 5 ‘strongly disagree’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My voice is easily heard in IFLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel familiar with IFLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership and participation in IFLA helps me to perform better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents of IFLA are important for my profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA deals with issues important for my library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA helps develop professional contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA website is very useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Rank the following statements from 1 ‘strongly agree’ to 5 ‘strongly disagree’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My voice is easily heard in University and Other General Research Libraries Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel familiar with University and Other General Research Libraries Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership and participation in University and Other General Research Libraries Section helps me to perform better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents of University and Other General Research Libraries Section are important for my work and professional activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and Other General Research Libraries Section deals with issues important for my library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and Other General Research Libraries Section helps develop professional contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and Other General Research Libraries Section page in IFLANET is very useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. How well does University and Other General Research Libraries Section communicate with membership?

- □ very effectively
- □ quite effectively
- □ effectively
- □ not very effectively
- □ not at all effectively

27. How well does IFLA represent membership interests to key stakeholders? Rank the following from 1 ‘very well’ to 5 ‘very badly’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers/vendors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 4: TELL US YOUR IDEAS FOR THE FUTURE

28. What role as an international organisation do you believe IFLA should play?

- □ continuing education and professional development
- □ leadership
- □ public relations and advocacy
- □ government relations
- □ relations with non-government organisations and international organisations
29. What IFLA features, programs, activities are not as useful to you or your institution as they ought to be?
IFLA

University and Other General Research Libraries Section

30. Do you have any suggestions about services not currently provided that ought to be included in programs and services?
IFLA?

University and Other General Research Libraries Section?

31. What one thing would you change if given the chance?
for IFLA?

for University and Other General Research Libraries Section?

That is all. Thank you for your interest and feedback. If you have any further queries, please contact Sue McKnight as listed on page 1.