2001-2002 SECTION ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING (SET) – STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS & OFFICERS, LIST OF TASKS & CORRESPONDING MEMBERS, OFFICIAL OBSERVERS

NAME	ADDRESS	TERM	TASK(S)
STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS			
Abdullahi, Ismail	Clark Atlanta University, School of Library & Information Studies, 223 James P. Brawley Dr. SW, Atlanta, GA 30314 USA T: +1 404 880 6009 / F: +1 404 880 8977 e-mail: abdull@cau.edu	2001-2005	Conference 2004 Proposal (Buenos Aires)
Elkin, Judith	University of Central England, Faculty of Computing, Information & English, Perry Barr, Birmingham B42 2SU, UK T: 44-121-331 5610 / F: 44-121-331 6281 e-mail: judith.elkin@uce.ac.uk	1997-2001 2001-2005	1. Database Directory 2. Procedures for Refereed Papers 3. Reciprocity of Credentials 4. Conference 2002 Proposal
Ertel, Monica	Korn/Ferry International, 3 Schirado Place, San Rafael, CA 94028, USA T: +1-310-226-2624 / F: +1-310-552-2915 e-mail: ertelm@kornferry.com	1999-2003	Conference 2002 Proposal (Glasgow)
Estivill, Assumpcio	Facultat de Biblioteconomia I Documentacio Universitat de Barcelona, Melcior de Palau, 140 08014 Barcelona, Spain T: +34 93 403 5773 / F: +34 93 403 5772 e-amil estivill@fbd.ub.es	2001-2005	Conference 2004 Proposal (Buenos Aires)
Field, Judy	Wayne State University, Library & Inf. Science Program, 106 Kresge Library, Detroit, MI 48202 T: 313-577-8539 / F: 313-557-7563 e-mail: aa4101@wayne.edu	1999-2003	
Gajo, Maria Gaia	Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale – Roma, Viale Castro Pretorio 105, 00185 Rome, Italy T: 39-06-4989249 / F: 39-06-4457635 e-mail: bncr@caspur.it	1999-2003	
Gitachu, Rosemary	Social Sciences Librarian , Kenyatta Universtiy, PO Box 43844, Nairobi, Kenya T: +254 51 84621 / F: +254 51 30251 e-mail: mailto:rgitachu@avu.org	2001-2005	
Haycock, Ken	School of Library, Archival & Info Studies, University of British Columbia, 831-1956 Main Hall, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1 T: 1-604-8224991 / F: 1-604-8226006 e-mail: ken.haycock@ubc.ca	1997-2001 2001-2005	
Hoglund, Lars	Swedish School of Library & Information Science University of Boras, S-50190 Boras, Sweden T: +46 33 164306 / F: +46 33 164306 e-mail: lars.hoglund@hb.se	2001-2005	
Lazinger, Susan	Chair, IFLA SET Section School of Library, Archive & Info. Studies The Hebrew University of Jerusalem POB 1255, Jerusalem 91904, Israel T: (972-2) 6585656 / F: (972-2) 6585707 e-mail: susan@wms.huji.ac.il	1997-2001 2001-2005	1. Chair of Standing Committee on Education and Training (elected) 2. World Guide to LIS Education
Lepik, Aira	Department of Information Studies, Tallinn Pedagogical University, 25 Narva Road 10 120 Tallinn, Estonia e-mail: aira@tpu.ee	2001-2005	
Lerouge, Francoise	Enssib, 11-21 Boulevard du 11 Novembre 1918 69263 Villeurbanne Cedex, France T: + 33 4 7244 4332 / F: +33 4 723 3244 e-mail: lerouge@enssib.fr	2001-2005	
Morizio, Claude	Enseignante Documentaliste Formateur 10 rte de Poitiers, 86130 Jaunay-Clan, France Tel: +33-5-49521783 (h), 49374566 (w) / Fax: 33-5-49521783 e-mail: crd@iufm.interpc.fr	1999-2003	Conference 2003 Proposal (Berlin)
Nicholson, Jennefer	Australian Library & Inform. Association, POB E441, Kingston Act 2604, Australia T: 61-2-62851877 / F: 61-2-62822249 e-mail:jennefer.nicholson@alia.org.au	1999-2003	1. Membership Development/Brochure 2. Cooperation with Other Groups

Pors, Niels Ole	Royal School of Library & Information Science Birketinget 6 - DK-2300, Copenhagen S, Denmark T: +45 3258 6066 / F: +45 3284 0201 e-mail nop@db.dk	20012005	Conference 2004 Proposal (Buenos Aires)
Schubert, Hans-Jurgen	Munich Library School, Kaulbachstr. 11 D-80539 Munchen, Germany T: + 49 89 2863 82299 / F: +49 89 2863 82657	2001-2005	Conference 2003 Proposal (Berlin)
Shirinyan, Anna	Republican Scientific Medical Library, Toumanian Str. 8, Yerevan, 375001, Armenia T: +374 1 52 2600 / F: +374 1 52 2600 e-mail:anna@medlib.am	2001-2005	
Weech, Terry	Secretary/Treasurer of SET University of Illinois Graduate School of Library & Info. Science, LIS Bldg., 501 E. Daniel Street, Champaign, IL 61820, USA T: 1-217-3330646 / F: 1-217-2443302 e-mail: T-Weech@UIUC.edu	1999-2003	1. Secretary/Treasurer of Standing Committee on Education and Training 2. Conference 2003 Proposal (Berlin)
Zhadko, Natalia	Rudomino School Traiing Center Library of Foreign Literature, 1 Nikoloyamskaya Moscow 109189 Russian Federation T: +7 095 915 0067 / F: +7 095 915 3637 e-mail: jadko@cs.libfl.ru	1999-2003	
CORRESPONDING MEMBERS			
Harvey, John	303 Chanteclair House, 2 Sophoulis Street, POB 21363, 1507 Nicosia, Cyprus T: +357-2-664286 / F: +357-2-676061 e-mail: john.f.harvey@usa.net	2003	1. Information Coordinator 2. Bulletin Editor
Rusch-Feja, Diann	Director, Library & Research, Documentation Max-Planck Institute for Human Dvlpmt Lentzeallee 94, D-14195, Berlin, Germany T: +4930-82406-230 / F: +4930-82499-39 e-mail: ruschfeja@mpib-berlin.mpg.de	2003	Translations to German
Xiaobin, Huang	Department of Library and Information Science, Zhongshan University, 135 Xin Gang Road West, Guangzhou 510275, P.R. China T: 020 84035077 e-mail: isdlis03@zsu.edu.cn	2003	
OFFICIAL OBSERVERS			
Kagan, Al	Convenor, Social Responsibilities Discussion Grp. Library, University of Illinois, Room 328, 1408 West Gregory Drive, Urbana, IL 61801, USA T: 1-217-333-6519 / Fax: 1-217-333-2214 e-mail: akagan@uiuc.edu		Represents :Social Responsibilities Discussion Grp.
Lau, Jesus	User Education Round Table, Universidad Autonoma de Ciudad Juarez, Paseo Country 1305, Frac. Country Racquet, CD Juarez CH.H. 32460 Mexico e-mail: jlau@uacj.mx		Represents: User Education Round Table
MacPhail, Martha	Spec. Clln/Catalog Librarian, San Diego State University, Malcolm A. Love Library, 5500 Campanile Dr., San Diego, CA 92182-8050, USA T: +619-594 6736 / F: +619-594 2700 e-mail: mmcphail@mail.sdsu.edu		Translations to Spanish
Ritchie, Ann	Chair, CPERT (Address to be provided at a later date)		Represents: CPERT

CONTENTS………

_____

Letter from the Chair
October 2001

To Members of SET:

Since I have been asked to write a letter to the SET membership, as the new Chair of the Section, and since I have been unable to locate any previous examples of such a letter in the *SET Bulletin*s preserved online, I am going to have to create my own template.

First, let me thank you for expressing your confidence in me by electing me as Chair in Boston. Although my experience as Secretary/Treasurer last year helped prepare me to some degree for this office, taking charge of my first meeting in Boston taught me that things are different when you are the person who is supposed to run the meetings in an orderly and productive fashion and know the answers to the questions.

In the short period of three months since the Boston conference, I have dealt with a number of questions and requests from both members of our section and other sections; prepared the minutes from the first SET meeting in Boston and coordinated the final, corrected version, including both meetings, with our new and marvelous Secretary/Treasurer Terry Weech; and helped with the final editing of the *Strategic plan for the Section on Education and Training: 2002 – 2003*, which was drafted in a remarkably short time by a highly able

subcommittee composed of Niels Ole Pors (Subcommittee Chair), Judith Field, Ismail Abdullahi and Martha McPhail.

In order to complete my duties as last year's Financial Officer, I have transferred funds in several currencies to Terry; prepared and sent off the complex Financial Statement for last year and the request for funding for next year, accompanied by the *REVISED PROPOSAL TO UPDATE THE WORLD GUIDE TO LIBRARY, ARCHIVE AND INFORMATION SCIENCE EDUCATION (2nd ed., Saur, 1995)*, the large and important project for which we are asking funding over the next two years from IFLA, UNESCO and other institutions. If this funding materializes, we will be able to take advantage of the generous offer of Evelyn Daniel to serve as Editor-In-Chief and of John Harvey to serve as Coordinating Editor of a new, updated version of this vital publication, both in print and database form.

There's more. Copies of the IFLA Section on Education and Training guidelines for co-sponsorship of conference and other programs , ably prepared by Jennefer Nicholson, were finished, reviewed by Terry and me, and sent out to all members of the Standing Committee. Like our other significant publications, it is both being published in this issue of the SET Bulletin and will then be put on the SET portion of the IFLA website by our tireless Information Officer, John Harvey. In these same three months, Judith Elkin sent me her recently completed

Procedures for Refereeing Papers for the Open Forum, much needed as a guideline for each year's referees, and the IFLA 2001 Glasgow Proposal for the Workshop, which she is chairing. The program was forwarded on to John and appears in this issue of the SET Bulletin. Finally, Terry and I consulted on the format of the Call for Papers, which he then prepared and distributed to Set Elected Members, Corresponding Members, Round Table Chairs, Discussion Group Chairs, and Official Observers and which John also put on the Web for greater exposure to potential presenters.

Through all this, my initiation period, I have been helped enormously by Ken Haycock's patience in answering all my "What next?" questions, John Harvey's insistence on thoroughness and high standards in all SET endeavors (and his uncompromising willingness to call me on the carpet when he is not satisfied with my performance), and Terry Weech's competence and speed in mastering and carrying out his new duties as Secretary/Treasurer.

Three months. A rich array of projects completed, cooperation offered, new members shouldering new responsibilities with enthusiasm and graciousness, experienced members continuing their fine record of hard work and impressive results.

I look forward to working with all of you as your Chair during the next two years, welcome and respect any suggestions you may offer on how best to realize the full potential of SET, vow to do my best to carry out faithfully what you ask of me, and promise to try and take this honor you have bestowed on me both with the utmost seriousness needed to do it well and the sense of humor necessary to enable us all to have fun while I'm doing it. -- *Susan Lazinger, Chair, SET, Nov 1, 2001*

NEWS……..

The Department of Library and Information Studies at the University of Buffalo will offer two graduate courses over the Internet for Spring

2002 (Jan 22 – May 9). The three credit hour graduate courses offered this Spring are:
LIS 531 Marketing of Information Services
LIS 584 Academic and Research Libraries
See the following for course details:
http://www.sis.buffalo.edu/faculty/ellison/ellison.html Cost and registration information can be found at:
http://www.sis.buffalo.edu/faculty/ellison/distance.html
Persons with questions regarding the above courses should contact Dr. John Ellison at johnwellison@yahoo.com

Happy Announcement

In an email to me on January 15, 2002, Marian Koren, who represented Division VII at the meeting of the Professional Committee in the Hague in December 2001, officially confirmed that the Professional Committee/Div VII has approved our **REVISED PROPOSAL TO UPDATE THE WORLD GUIDE TO LIBRARY, ARCHIVE AND INFORMATION SCIENCE EDUCATION (2nd ed., Saur, 1995).**

Two days later, on January 17, Terry Weech, the Secretary/Treasurer of SET, announced in another email that SET has received 5,559 EUR for the first year of the Update of the World Guide Project.

The update, as stated in the proposal is planned as a two-year project, running from December 31, 2001-December 31, 2003, on which date the 3rd edition of the World Guide is scheduled for publication. Evelyn Daniel, the Editor-in-Chief of the project has informed me that she has already begun working on the database.

So, Congratulations to SET on our success on rounding up at least the preliminary funding for this essential project and Good Luck to Evelyn and to John Harvey, the Coordinating Editor of the project.

Anyone interested in volunteering to aid in this very large and labor-intensive project can get in touch with John (harvey@cytanet.com.cy) or Evelyn (daniel@ils.unc.edu) directly.

BOOK REVIEW SECTION...........

Library Disaster Planning and Recovery Handbook, *Edited by Camila Alire*
New York, Neil-Schuman Publishers, inc., 2000, pp. xxvi, 615. ISBN 1 55570 373 9

The title of this book is misleading, suggesting as it does that it is a comprehensive manual on library disaster planning and recovery. In fact, it is based on the experience of one academic library in the United States.

In July 1997 Colorado State University Libraries were hit by a massive flood, which entirely submerged one level of Morgan Library (very recently built and/or renovated), breaking through one wall, and toppling shelves. One assumes that Morgan Library is the main library, though this is nowhere stated. Other levels were threatened by high humidity and temperatures of over 95 degrees, with the danger of mould and mildew. Half a million volumes were affected. This book, written entirely by CSU staff (nearly all library staff), reflects these experiences and the actions taken in response by the library staff.

Because of this, it is concerned almost wholly with disaster caused by water (rather than fire, earthquake or other catastrophes). This makes the book seriously incomplete, in spite of its great length. It is a sometimes uneasy mixture of a true manual and an account of actions taken by one library. Moreover, it has, inevitably, a strong US bias, containing large sections that would not be very relevant in many other countries (e.g., on media relations, and on soliciting gifts and donations to replace lost volumes). Some sections dealing with issues that are of concern in all countries (e.g., insurance) are biased towards US circumstances. The long bibliography, which lists works consulted by the authors, also has a US bias; a good short work (51 pages) published in the UK (Ashman, 1995) is not included. The US slant is not necessarily a bad thing, but it limits the book's value to other countries, and potential users from outside North America need to be aware of it.

There are 27 chapters, involving in all 24 authors. The editor, Dean of University Libraries, who had been in the job only just over a week when the flood occurred, wrote three of the chapters herself. The strength of being written by many staff of one institution is that the book uses the experience and knowledge of many people while still being closely coordinated, unlike many multi-volume works; it reduces overlap between chapters, and the result represents a common experience. Or rather, it ought to reduce overlap; for the same or very similar matters (e.g. rebuilding collections) appear in different chapters. The weakness is that there is too little variety of experience; it is too inward-looking.

The chapters are grouped in six parts: I. Managing a Disaster, II. Public Services in Disaster Recovery, III. Technical Services in Disaster Recovery, IV. Gifts and Donations, V. Great Expectations: Restoring the Collections, and VI. Resource Sharing in Disaster Recovery. I confess I am not entirely clear as to the distinction between Part III and Part V, which is claimed to be 'a unique and comprehensive account of every aspect of technical services'. Comprehensiveness is certainly a feature of the topics that are covered; few stones are left unturned (sometimes the actual turning of the stone is described!). This has both its pros and cons: the chief con is excessive detail, the pros are very thorough accounts of, for example, the treatment of water-damaged books.

What is striking is the near-absence of anything on preparing for, and if possible preventing, disasters. Disaster plans are mentioned (CSU Libraries evidently had one), but little more. Equally seriously, as noted, there is very little on kinds of disaster other than floods, such as fire or earthquake, and not many pages on the conservation or restoration (as opposed to the immediate treatment) of damaged books. True, the Preface says (p. xx) that 'The book is intended for readers primarily interested in library-disaster recovery', but this should have been stated much more prominently.

Where the book is exceptionally strong is on management issues: relations with university administration, utilization of human resources (including such matters as handling stress), keeping services going while disaster recovery is under way, data collection (to aid replacement), and recovery or replacement of technical equipment. No other book deals with such issues in any depth.

Understandably, a feeling of pride comes through; at times this is in danger of turning into self-satisfaction. Several chapters start with the authors' personal experience of the flood; this may be therapeutic for the staff concerned, some of whom still seem to have been suffering from shock, but it is repetitive and of little interest to anyone using the book as a practical guide. The style moves rather uneasily between the personal and chatty on the one hand, and the objective and rigorous on the other.

The book would be much better if it were much shorter. A simpler and clearer structure, the elimination of overlap, less indulgence in reminiscences of the flood and greater conciseness could have reduced the length by at least a third. As it is, it is doubtful if any library faced with a crisis would have time to read it. And, as noted, for all its length it is far from complete.

Some chapters contain near the beginning a more or less (usually more) thorough literature review, useful in itself and for indicating what the chapter covers that other works do not. Each chapter ends with Key recommendations. Many of these are obvious, but are probably worth stating for completeness. Some are exhortations ('Be flexible or you will go crazy!'); some appear rather facetious ('Take two aspirin daily').

The book has some oddities and inconveniences. Some chapters written by more than one author speak of 'I' and 'my' (one such chapter mentions 'my husband', suggesting that the two authors have one between them!). Chapter headings in the summaries on pp. xxi-xxvi are not always the same as those in the list of contents and at the head of chapters (e.g. chapters 3 and 4). Running headings do not include the numbers of chapters, nor are they always helpful: for example, 'Why Can't Facilities Fix This?', 'It Was a Dark and Stormy Night', 'Upstairs / Downstairs' and 'Buried Alive' reveal nothing about the matter covered by the chapters. (The first has the additional handicap that 'facilities' is used in a sense that would not be understood outside North America). This all makes navigation harder than it need be.

Although the volume is printed on sturdy paper, it is not hard-bound, surprising for a manual that might need to be consulted in poor physical conditions. Also, being glued rather than sewn, it is impossible to keep open without a very heavy weight or strong clips – inconvenient in such a work, to say the least. The index is adequate for most purposes, though I did not find some entries I would have expected; indeed, it carries some entries to excess - for example, interlibrary loan is dealt with mainly in 20 pages of the text, but has 24 subdivisions in the index.

The misleading title is mentioned above. A more accurate one would have been Library Disaster Recovery and How to Manage It, with a sub-title The Response by Colorado State University Libraries to a Flood. For educational purposes, the personal element in the book might have an appeal, but the great detail might deter students. It could be of value for training in the areas where it is truly comprehensive.

To summarize: This work is not the comprehensive manual one might have been led to expect. It is strong on reaction to floods and on management, but weak on preparation for disaster and (to the point of invisibility) on disasters that are not due to water. It would undoubtedly be of value for libraries, especially for those in the United States, suffering similar experiences to those at CSU, but for libraries in most situations and in most countries one or more of the other works on the same topic (see References) would be better purchases, whether for practical use or for training.

REFERENCES

Ashman, John (1995) Disaster planning for library and information services. London: Aslib. (Aslib Know How Series).

England, Claire & Karen Evans (1988) Disaster management for libraries: planning and process. Ottawa: Canada Library Association.

Fortson, Judith (1992) Disaster planning and recovery: a how-to-do-it manual for librarians and archivists. New York: Neal-Schuman.

Kahn, Miriam (1998) Disaster response and planning for libraries. Chicago: ALA.

Morris, John (1986) The library disaster preparedness handbook. Chicago: ALA.

Maurice B. Line, Harrogate, England

Review by: J.A. Mouridou (M.A., Senior Dip. IDPM) and Mourides, Oriana (B.Ed., M.Ed.)

This substantial little volume, which was prepared as one of the outcomes of the activities of the IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions), is composed of several sections. These are:

- Dedication and introduction
- Seventy-year retrospective of the IFLA section servicing the disadvantaged
- Section professional reports
- Library services to the deaf: a bibliography, 1970-2000
- Library services to the elderly: a bibliography, 1970-2000
- Use and development of Easy-to-Read publications: a bibliography 1970-2000
- Library services to hospital patients: a bibliography 1970-2000
- Prison libraries: a bibliography, 1970-2000
- LSDP (Libraries Serving Disadvantaged Persons section of the IFLA) Papers presented at annual conferences from 1965 to 2000
- Author index
- Subject index to bibliographies.

A simple glance at the bulleted items listed above suggests that most of this volume of two hundred and fifty pages is bibliography – and probably rather dry reading at that. A simple appraisal suggests that the book might be useful for reference if the user were interested in disadvantaged persons (rather broadly defined), but that it offers little intrinsic interest of its own. Both assumptions prove quite wrong on even moderate perusal of the volume.

The initial section of the volume concerns the development and activities of the LSDP within the IFLA. An interesting passage concerning the background of the sub-committee and its subsequent formation present both the history of this body and also the development of its objectives or terms of reference: to "collect information regarding methods of conducting the hospital library service . . ."; to "undertake such publicity as may seem desirable . . ."; to "draw up a recommendation with regard to the organization of Hospital Libraries .

. ." (p. 5). From this inauspicious beginning, the LSDP became a sub-organization concerned with services for all the handicapped, defined in terms of mobility. By 1968, a new constitution outlined the areas of the sub-committee's responsibility including most of the handicapped or disabled and medical libraries (p. 19). As can be seen from the layout of the book's bibliographies, the body's interests now also include services to the blind, the deaf, the elderly and institutionalized prisoners.

For the most part, this is an excellently presented small book. Quite a large number of formatting errors appear throughout the text, but most of these seem to be the result of publication errors. There are a few, a very few, errors of the typographical sort – missing apostrophes and such. Although the text formatting problems strike the eye of the reader immediately, they prove, on examination, to be trivial and detract only very slightly from the quality of the work which has gone into the volume.

The section on sub-committee background and development is surprisingly interesting, and shows transparently the dedication of those professionals working as members of the body. Its presentation displays also the expertise and inherent professionalism of the ladies who compiled the history.

On page 47 of text, the Retrospective concludes with a comprehensive listing of footnotes: eighty-seven of them. It is followed by a section dealing with papers presented at the Annual Conferences of the LSDP. These papers span the period between 1965 and 2000 and have been collected and listed with scrupulous care. Papers have been presented, obviously, from many areas of the world and originated in several different languages. Translations of the titles of the papers have been provided in most cases, although fuller translations might have been desirable in one or two cases (e.g., bottom of page 55). For anyone living in Europe, translating a simple French title ought to provide no sort of challenge at all; however, this might be slightly more difficult for the average American citizen. Presumably, the average professional librarian (and member of the IFLA) undertakes simple translation exercises as a matter of course.

Apologies were offered at the beginning of the volume for deficiencies in researching activities and scholarship. This reviewer sees no need for any such qualification.

Pages 61 to 63 contain the listing of the LSDP Professional Reports. A little more translation from the original German might have

been desirable here for non-German-speaking readers.

Bibliographies fill the pages from 67 to 231 and include library services to the deaf, elderly, Easy-to-Read materials, hospital patients and prisoners. As far as I can tell, these bibliographies are excellently laid out and presented. The print format is easy to scan, and the entries are commendably consistent from entry to entry. I very much admire the persistence that has gone into the compilation of what appear to be comprehensive listings of services for this most difficult of audiences or markets. These reviewers have themselves taught the deaf, handicapped and learning impaired ("learning challenged") for many years on an on-again, off-again basis, and are fully familiar with the piecemeal and inconsistent nature of materials prepared for and about the handicapped. That comprehensive bibliographies of library services should be available for the handicapped and immobile is a definite move in the right direction.

Again, where translations are needed for the titles of articles and works originating from almost every corner of the civilized world, these translations have been provided. If not creatively-inspired, at least the translations appear to be accurate and fluent. In a few cases, slight errors occur in capitalization of French words, a few accent marks are missing, and there appear small errors in tiny details. In addition, there are again a few typesetting errors – but really surprisingly few considering that the languages used run from the top of Scandinavia through to the bottom of Europe and then into Asia. A light note is introduced on page 139 where a work by K. Yamauchi is cited by its English-language title followed by the following stipulation: "[in Japanese]". It seems likely that the intrepid professionals compiling this book would have included the Japanese title if they could have done so. That would hardly have been necessary, but how nice it is to know that the effort would have been made!

The indexes at the end of the volume, by author and by subject, are not extensive, but seem to be useful and carefully compiled. They end the book on the same professional note with which it started.

One of the most useful aids for the reader of this text is the left-hand column paragraph descriptions provided for the 'Retrospective' section of the text. It is apparent that this reader-aid gave difficulty to the publisher, but it is most helpful for someone wishing to scan quickly through the details of activities concerning a large number of years.

In conclusion, although this volume offers no gripping subject material, it was beautifully researched, thoroughly prepared, and admirably presented. For anyone interested in library services for the handicapped, or for the inmates of hospitals and institutions, it cannot be recommended too highly as a concise sourcebook. This compilation is certain to broaden the reader's knowledge of the materials available and the areas in which developmental library service work has been done and, by omission, of those areas which have not yet received more than cursory servicing attention.

Stern, David (ed). ***Digital Libraries: Philosophies, Technical Design Considerations, and Example Scenarios****.* *The Haworth Press, Inc. 10 Alice Street, Binghamton, NY 13904-1580, USA (1999) 230 pp.*

Review by: J.A. Mouridou (M.A., Senior Dip. IDPM; statistician)

This volume contains a five-page introduction by David Stern, editor and the Director of Science Libraries and Information Services at Yale University. Mr. Stern has had a distinguished career from 1987 to the present. Also included are articles by Michael E. Lesk, Daniel Jones, Barbara Buttenfield, David Stern (the editor), Robert Ferrer, Daniel Chudnov, Steve Mitchell, Eric H. Johnson, Patrick McGlamery and Timothy Lee Wherry.

The longest of the ten articles are those by Ferrer and Mitchell: "University of Illinois the Federation of Digital Libraries: Interoperability Among Heterogeneous Information Systems" and "Interface Design Considerations in Libraries". As it so happens, the titles of the articles are much more ferocious than their real contents. Initially, however, reading through the "Contents" of this high-tech text is a daunting experience. Fortunately, it is also the only thing truly daunting about an otherwise excellent small volume.

This book with its ten articles and introduction exhibits a great deal of cumulated expertise. Much scholarship and knowledge of both sources and methodologies have gone into the component parts of the edition. It is not a book with much superficial appeal for the traditional library old-timer. Nevertheless, in the judgment of one such old-timer, it is a book well worth taking the time to read, to consider, and to evaluate for ideas and directives. For the student of digital library technologies, this volume stands as a thought-

provoking edition rather than as a definitive textbook of the "state of the art"
at this point in time, i.e., during 1999. As the state of the art changes from week to week, perhaps a well-considered edition is better than a textbook. At any rate, the book is worth reading, with pen in hand and notebook *at hand*. A conventional English dictionary is of no use at all.

The volume itself has been nicely published in paperback with the minimum of publication-type errors. Typographical errors do appear here and there (e.g., read paragraph 1 on p. 39), but are reasonably minor in character. Each article is preceded by a descriptive, concise and *comprehensible* abstract. One or two of the authors write exceptionally clearly and present their materials in superlative fashion. Really ancient readers might ask that one or two of the others show more consideration for pronouns and commas, and a less cavalier approach to "well-known" abbreviations. Unfortunately, there *are* learned people in the library world who do not know the meaning of an "STM library" (p.27). It is interesting, though, to learn that English is still developing with new terms such as "multivalent", which, we hope, is meant to convey the obvious meaning related, perhaps, to equivalent, ambivalent or univalent (?) As for the multitude of computer, digital and technological catch-terms used throughout the volume, these are, without doubt, a necessary outgrowth of the subject matter and cannot be avoided entirely. Their indiscriminate use makes rapid reading more difficult, but this reviewer can certainly understand why they proliferate and appear in almost every sentence.

In defense of the ten authors of the edition. the text has been footnoted and bibliographied thoroughly. Although, I have not pursued the materials so mentioned, the list of references is impressive and exhibits wide collective familiarity with the field and in-depth scholarship of approach.

"*The Organization of Digital Libraries*", by Michael E. Lesk, starts the section titled *Digital Library Philosophies*. Although the article seems to have little connection with philosophies, except perhaps in their conception, this is an excellently-written short article highlighting the differences in nature between the conventional (hard-medium) library with its many types of holdings and the digital library where the holdings "are all in equivalent [electronic media] formats" (p. 10). Lesk makes a very strong argument in favour of digital libraries being required to offer new services to the reader rather than the traditional reading space, hard-copy volumes, and occasional reference assistance.

Lesk bravely discusses the issue of library "economics" under the new digital regime, and pinpoints the likelihood that inter-library cooperation may become an essential feature of twenty-first century libraries if they wish to continue to exist. Technical support and suitable staffing are discussed, throwing inevitable focus on the future activities and responsibilities of the university library schools in preparing professional and qualified personnel. For this reviewer, however, the most interesting short section deals with moral rights, plagiarism, libel and tort liability (pp. 15-16). As this latter focus represents a potentially seething issue over much of the world (all of which is currently committed to digital or magnetic media), we will certainly be hearing more about it.

Daniel Jones, in "*Collection Development in the Digital Library*", emphasizes that the digital library opens the definition of "collection" to examination and re-evaluation. He discusses materials identification, selection, content, interfacing, equipment, the inevitable licensing issues, ownership, and criteria affecting materials retention decisions. This is a particularly straightforward article which raises quite a number of inter-related questions and issues, all of which demand intelligent consideration by librarians operating within the digital services arena. It is an article notably easy to read.

Each of the ten articles offers its own brand of scholarship and its own legitimate focus. All ten are worth reading, not excluding 'Example Scenarios' which appear most technical on first sight. Barbara Buttenfield ("*Usability Evaluation of Digital Libraries*") discusses the taxonomy of usability evaluation methods from a very down-to-earth perspective. Her article should certainly not be omitted, no matter how little time is available to the reader. Any article taking a *pragmatic* approach to modeling is exemplary. Consider, for example, the <u>clarity</u> of her championing of the "double-loop paradigm" and "convergent evaluation" techniques.

On the whole then, I recommend this volume highly. Certainly, new developments have intervened between the pre-1999 preparation of the edition and the present, but as a series of well-considered, informed and introductory articles, this volume could hardly be bettered.

Mourides, Nicosia, January 2002.

BLUEPRINT FOR PLANNING A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM

By Joanna M. Burkhardt, Mary C. MacDonald, and Andree J. Rathemacher

Staging a continuing education program is a learning experience in itself.

Program planning entails:
➢ *Collaboration with seasoned volunteers.*
➢ *A scrupulous eye for details*
➢ *Determination to be the consummate host.*
➢ *The ability to remain flexible when disaster inevitably strikes.*

Sooner or later it will happen: You'll get selected as the perfect candidate for planning a program that will attract dozens of eager participants who want to know everything about the subject of your choice. You might even place yourself in this situation by volunteering, for one reason or another.

Librarians tent to have good organizational skills in general, but some have more program-planning experience than others. Doing anything for the first time is hard work. A first-time program planner can easily overlook important details. For those program/conference planners whose experience in this area is slight, here are some tips for planning that may help to make the overall experience better for you and your participants.

Stage one: Plan to plan

1. **Form a planning committee**. Because planning a successful program is a big job, you will need people to find and coordinate the location, technology, and food; handle registration; book the speakers; publicize the event; and duplicate printed materials. To get all of this done without making event preparation anyone's full-time job, you will need a number of responsible, creative and competent people to carry out all of these tasks - people who are well aware that their goal is to be invisible and unremembered.

   Ideally, your planning group should include individuals with experience, organization, and communication skills. Getting people involved in planning a program is also an excellent way to build leadership skills and increase participation within your organization. For example, involving library-school students not only provides additional assistance, but also helps them gain valuable experience and network with library practitioners.

2. **Select a program topic.** The topic should be relevant to your membership and other potential attendees, and be narrowly focused to keep it manageable. For possible topic ideas, look to feedback from your membership (such as suggestions from previous program evaluations) or to topics covered at recent national conferences.

3. **Select a date**. The right date is crucial to the success of your event. Avoid conflicts with other professional programs that might be scheduled for the same week. Also, be aware of holidays, long weekends, and the cycle of the academic calendar in general – for example, busy final-exam periods or the beginnings of semesters. If you are a sub-group of a larger organization, check to see if there is a policy on coordinating program times to avoid conflicts.

4. **Select a location**. Next to picking the right date, choosing the location is perhaps one of the most important decisions you will make. The location should be central to the population of your group, be easily accessible, and have adequate parking if at all possible. Find a facility that is large enough to accommodate the number of attendees you expect in whatever configurations you require, such as large lectures and small-group breakout rooms. Keep in mind any limits on room capacity set by the fire marshall or other authority. The location must also have adequate technological resources and support. Don't forget to find out if you will need to pay any fees for the use of the facility.

5. **Find speakers who are experts on the chosen topic.** In some cases, you will identify an expert and approach him or her to speak. In other cases, you may issue a call for proposals. If you do the latter, be

clear and direct in your instructions, stick to a firm cut-off date for submission, and ask for an abstract. Let potential speakers know how long they will be asked to speak, what you would like them to address, and the anticipated size and composition of their audience. Spell out what you will provide for them (i.e., an honorarium, meals, lodging, transportation). Ask speakers to send you their PowerPoint slides, handouts, and bibliographies two weeks before the program.

Stage two: Dealing with the details

There is nothing like a rehearsal to work out the kinks in any performance. The more you do prior to the program, the better. Success is in the details, every one of which requires a "think-through" and some of which require a run-through.

1. **Conference location.** Well before the event, visit the site. Double check that the meeting rooms will accommodate the projected number of attendees and that the space configuration is adequate. Specifically, count the number of chairs, make sure that any visuals can be seen from all seats, be aware of any special lighting needs, make a mental note of the air quality and temperature, and ask questions about any changes that facility management can make to eliminate unfavorable conditions. Inquire about potential disruptions such as scheduled construction or technology interruptions. Rehearse functions like registration and breaks to see how to best arrange the space.

   Make sure the space has the appropriate wiring and other technological support – and don't rely on any promises that infrastructure not yet in place will be available by your event date. Inquire into the availability of Internet access, desktop/laptop computers, projection equipment, microphones, speaker podiums with lights, and electrical outlets. Find out if technicians will be available to set up and operate any equipment – and whether they will be on hand throughout the event to help with any unforeseen problems. Make any arrangements for video and/or audio taping of the event.

2. **Publicize your event.** Start early, and offer regular updates as the actual program date approaches. Advertise the event's vital who, what, where, when and why through mailings, discussion lists, Web sites, newsletters, and calendars. Make sure that the information is consistent in each of the forums you utilize, and proof read everything many times to ensure that someone hasn't inadvertently changed dates, times, or places through typos.

3. **Do the math.** Determine how much it will cost to hold the event. Factor in the costs of the facility, equipment, catering, printing, mailings, speakers' hororaria, lodging, and travel. Subtract any subsidies you have been provided and divide by the number of participants to arrive at a registration fee. If your budget is flush enough to make a registration fee unnecessary, consider whether you should charge a nominal amount anyway: sometimes a small fee will attract more attendees.

4. **Registration.** Set a maximum number of attendees (including your committee members), and do not overbook. Also, set a cut-off registration date – and stick to it. Because you need to arrange in advance for catering and photocopying you will need an accurate head count.

   Make registration forms available well in advance and in as many formats as necessary. Ask everything you need to know, including the registrant's name, title, institution, address, phone, fax, email, session, food preferences, and whether he or she requires a receipt or has any special needs. You may also wish to provide a membership form to join the sponsoring organization. Have all registrations processed at one central location to avoid confusion.

   Acknowledge registrations promptly, providing such additional information as directions to the event, local amenities, and assignments for breakout sessions. Deposit registration fees quickly and

efficiently. Decide whether or not you will allow refunds, and if so under what circumstances and up until what date.

5. **Speaker liaison.** Have specific committee members assigned to each speaker, with the job of gathering information such as the speaker's biography, his or her equipment needs, and advance copies of his or her handouts and presentation materials. In turn, the liaison will give the speaker vital information about travel, lodging, equipment, and logistics.

Stage three: The big day

1. **Signage, signage, signage.** There is nothing more frustrating than arriving at a meeting in an unfamiliar location and discovering that you have been left no clues as to how to get from point A to point B. On the day of the program, post numerous and visible signs to parking, from the parking lot to the building, and from the building entrance to the program room(s) within the building. Also, don't forget to point out rest rooms, elevators, telephones, and any other necessary conveniences. Don't rely on signs already at the facility. Make signs unique to your program with a recognizable logo, color, and/or typeface.

2. **Get to the program site early.** Be prepared to deal with problems and emergencies, and *do not assume anything!* Set up any equipment and make sure it is working. Load PowerPoint presentations ahead of time onto the computers that will run them to allow for seamless transitions between speakers. Check all rooms and spaces and see that all is as you want it. Try to have a backup plan for technology glitches, such as having PowerPoint slides available as transparencies for use on an overhead projector, if necessary.

3. **Refreshments.** If you are offering refreshments during registration, make sure the caterer is on-site and has everything in order.

4. **Streamline the registration area.** This is the first impression your guests will have

of you, your facility, and your organizational skills. Keep the process quick and simple.

The registration space should be big enough to handle the total number of people registered, with adequate space for formation of lines. Have enough people positioned at strategic spots to keep attendees moving in the right direction. (The process should flow easily from left to right if possible.) Label any lines in which people need to wait, and direct them to the refreshment area if you are providing one. If registration takes place off-site, be sure to direct people to the program area.

Have materials for registrants organized alphabetically by last name. Provide all program materials at the same time and place.

5. **Questions.** Make sure someone is available to answer any questions that people have as they walk in, so attendees feel welcomed. Also post facilitators (identifiable by name tags, "team" T-shirts, or some other device) at critical places along the registration route and the path to the program location. Make sure all helpers know critical things like the location of restrooms. Public telephones, and general emergency procedures. Have staff offer help, rather than waiting to be asked.

6. **Speakers.** Remember that your speakers will probably be nervous – or at least preoccupied. They should be free to focus solely on the content of their presentation. Have each speaker liaison stick with his or her assigned person to smooth introductions, get water, click slides, deal with technology snags, and enforce time constraints.

7. **The program itself.** A master of ceremonies should start the program by introducing him/herself, welcoming attendees, and dispensing with housekeeping announcements. Then the emcee should introduce the program, placing it in context by describing its intent. Run through the day's program quickly, and direct attention to the materials picked up at registration.

Start on time and stick to the schedules. Have people assigned to introduce speakers and moderate discussions, and have someone on hand to remedy problems, act as a runner, or answer general question as needed.

Keep speakers on track by holding up cards indicating how much time remains. Inform speakers in advance that you will be doing this, so they are not surprised during their presentation. Budget time for questions and comments, and assign someone to call on people. End Q&A periods firmly, even if it means leaving some participants unheard. Direct people to their next session, where applicable.

Plan for adequate break and meal times, giving clear instructions about the amount of time allotted, location of refreshments, and the starting time of the next session. If people are on their own for lunch, refer them to the list of restaurants in their packets.

8. **To end the program.** Summarize the event and offer thank-yous and any final instructions about follow up, such as filling out an evaluation form. Provide multiple locations for handing in the form.

Do not plan to dash out of the building the minute the conference ends. Continue to provide assistance to anyone who needs it. Collect evaluation forms, extra handouts, and any items that do not belong to the facility. Have people assigned to visit every room used, to retrieve materials and to pick up any stray items that might have been left behind. Try to leave the facility in good shape. Thank your speakers and escort them to their hotels or transportation

Stage four: The aftermath

If you promised to post information on your Web site, do so as soon as possible. Send thank-you letters to your speakers, local host, and program committee. Compile and summarize in writing the program evaluation forms, and distribute the results as needed. Pay all bills, including speakers fees.

Also, think about what went right and what went wrong and write it down for future reference. You never know when you will have to plan another event!

Planning a conference, workshop, or program is a complex undertaking. There are many small details that, if overlooked, may well compromise success. You want your audience to pay attention to the program's content not its mechanics. The mark of a successful event is that attendees remember the speakers and what they had to say not how long the registration process took.

Program Packets and handouts
There are some standard things that should be included in a program packet. Others are just nice to have. The following list contains both:
➢ Name tag (printed when possible)
➢ List of attendees with contact information
➢ Outline of the day/program
➢ Lunch information (list of restaurants, or where to pick up your box lunch)
➢ Rest room locations
➢ Travel and housing information
➢ Evaluation form
➢ Scrap paper/note paper
➢ Speakers' handouts
➢ Speakers' biographical information
➢ Membership form for your organization, if applicable
➢ Bibliography of related resources
➢ List of any web addresses to which speakers refer during their presentations
➢ Receipt (if not previously mailed)
➢ Explanation of how the group is to be divided (if necessary) and instructions as to where each individual is supposed to go for breakout or concurrent sessions.

Joanna M. Burkhardt is planning librarian at the University of Rhode Island/Providence.
Marcy C. MacDonald and Andree J. Rathemacher are reference librarians at the University of Rhode Island/Kingston.

(Source: American Libraries, November 2001, page 48-50)

PRACTITIONERS VS. LIS EDUCATORS: TIME TO RECONNECT
By Barbara B. Moran

Positions are hardening in the growing rift between the educators and the practitioners in the library field. Many practitioners are convinced that the library and information science (LIS) schools have either abandoned educating librarians or that they are not educating them well (or both). Library educators are persuaded that many practitioners are out of touch with what goes on both in the programs and in present-day higher education. Folks from each side talk at the other, but few of their messages are heard. It is time to end the argument and find ways to work together.

Congress without consensus
Attempting to address common issues and concerns of practitioners and educators, the American Library Association (ALA) has convened two Congresses on Professional Education. The first, in 1999, dealt with the MLS degree. The second, in 2000, focused on continuing professional development. New ALA task forces were formed to define core competencies and core values; to reexamine the ALA accreditation process; and to look at other issues. All of this action led to useful discussions, but so far there are very few concrete results. In some ways the attempts to reach consensus seem to have increased the rancor. Among practitioners, discontent about LIS education is reflected in the literature and in platform statements of candidates seeking office in professional organizations. Some library educators seem to disdain the library profession and its values. They boast of being information specialists, not librarians, and appear ready to discard any lingering allegiance to libraries.

The lack of consensus is not totally bad. The contention over LIS education has an encouraging side, in that dispute is far better than disregard. However, the misunderstanding and mistrust have gone on too long. It is time for the two sides to bridge the gap between them – to listen as well as talk to each other. We need genuine dialog. Since practitioners and educators live in separate worlds, each group is much more aware of the needs and demands of its immediate environment than those of the other's.

Views from the practice
Practitioners who are dissatisfied with LIS education have a number of legitimate concerns. Some graduates complete LIS degrees without taking what they believe are essential courses such as reference, cataloging, and collection development. The schools are not supplying the number of new librarians needed, and the libraries foresee even more severe shortages as large numbers of baby boomers reach retirement age. There is a persistent scarcity of LIS graduates in certain specialities such as cataloging and children's librarianship. Many LIS graduates are choosing to pursue careers in nonlibrary settings.

The educators' case
The educators argue that changes that have taken place are not only necessary but advantageous. They too are concerned about the supply-demand problem. They assert, however, that they have no way to force students to enter specializations that do not appeal to them. Often, they point out, recruits are turned away by unattractive salaries and few opportunities for advancement in libraries.

In the two decades since I became part of what was then called library education, the field has been reshaped. The current forms of LIS education can be understood by viewing the forces that precipitated the transformation. The changes have resulted in stronger but different schools. Currently LIS enrollments are up, and, overall, LIS schools are more robust than they were – both in terms of the marketability of graduates and the intellectual content of the curricula.

The decade of the Eighties was marked by the closing of one school after another. Fifteen LIS schools, almost 25 percent of the total, closed between 1978 and 1993; many others were threatened. Library education was in dire straits. Every time a school closed, it posed a threat to those remaining. There was talk that there would be no schools left.

There were many explanations for the closings. Although the financial pressure that beset all of higher education at that time was a primary rationale, it remained to be explained why schools of library science were closed instead of other units.

Small, invisible, expensive
LIS schools were vulnerable because they shared certain characteristics. The first was their size. Typically, the schools are the smallest independent units on most campuses. That worked against them because administrators faced with the problem of eliminating programs often opted for closing those with fewer students and faculty.

The LIS programs lacked campus visibility. Most programs had no undergraduates and thus were unknown to the majority of students. Because the

faculty was so small, it was hard for even the most active faculty to achieve the level of campus visibility possible in schools or departments with larger faculties.

They also lacked influence. Library science graduates did not typically go into the type of position – for instance, the state legislature - where they could be strong champions of their schools. They did not command compensation at levels that allowed them to make large contributions to development campaigns or to promise large bequests.

The schools were not central to the university's mission. They had a difficult time explaining why it was essential to have such a unit on campus. Although a university must have a department of English or biology, most universities were getting along just fine without a school of library science. The schools certainly would not argue that they were an indispensable part of undergraduate education since few undergraduate students ever took their courses.

The cost of library education was increasing. Graduate education has always been more expensive than undergraduate education, but the library schools were becoming more and more costly owing to their need to provide students with access to up-to-date information technology. The schools found it difficult to attract outside funding from research grants or individual or corporate donors to offset these increasing costs.

The school closings had a tremendous impact upon the profession but an even larger impact upon library educators. Obviously, those in the schools that closed had their professional careers disrupted and, in some cases, ended.

The perceptions and assumptions of the educators in the schools that remained – the LIS educators who taught during the period – were changed forever. It suddenly became apparent that the continued existence of LIS education was not a certainty. Even a very good school could be closed, as some were, if the university in which it was located did not comprehend its value.

In response to these external threats on campus, faculty in most of the schools began to plan methods to defend their programs. It was obvious that changes would have to be made to survive. Some of the changes in LIS education would have occurred even without the impetus of closings. Many changes, however, were the result of strategic decisions by LIS faculty members and administrators to ensure that their schools were kept viable. Schools responded in various ways,

seeking to find a successful niche for themselves within the larger university. They factored local conditions and needs into the reshaping of many of the programs. These new approaches have changed the schools, usually strengthening them. They are not the same schools as the one I graduated from in 1973 (at Emory, now closed) nor the one I came to as a new faculty member at Chapel Hill in 1981.

The new LIS programs are more complex and varied. Often librarianship is just one program among several. Nonetheless, from the point of view of most faculty and administrators in LIS education, these changes were necessary to maintain the viability of the programs. In the changing world of higher education, no program can survive if it merely maintains the status quo.

The continued existence of LIS education depended on the schools making changes. They had to become more competitive in the number of students they recruited, the amount of research funding and corporate and individual support they attracted, and in the campus partnerships they forged. LIS educators had to become entrepreneurial to survive, and the schools changed as a result.

Technology forces change
The growing importance of information technology was the other major force for change. Technology gave the schools a way to be responsive to local needs and still become more competitive. Just as the academic library was ahead of most other units on campus in incorporating new technologies, the LIS schools were ahead of most others in including technology as part of their curricula. They had begun teaching courses in automation and information systems in the 1970s. It became apparent in the Nineties that technology, especially the personal computer and the Internet, were going to transform everyone's lives. Most f the LIS schools were ready to take advantage of the need for computer and systems expertise. Units campuswide sought these skills. Suddenly they were in demand in a way never experienced before. The courses became central to the needs of large numbers of outside students and faculty.

Many of the schools began to expand their course offerings and programs. It was this demand for information technology education that allowed many of the schools to grow larger, more central to the mission of the university, and more visible on campus. We had learned our lessons from the closures of the 1980s, and like Scarlett O'Hara, we were 'never going to be hungry again."

The closings and the impact of technology resulted in a reshaped system of education for librarianship. There is no longer one model, there are several. A few schools still have library science education as their sole focus; more have it as one program within a larger unit containing other programs such as information science and network management. All of the schools are approaching education for librarianship differently and emphasizing different facets. There is a great diversity, but some trends are common to all.

More than the MLS

The first is a move toward offering degrees in addition to the MLS. A number of schools (Rutgers, UCLA, Kentucky, and most recently Buffalo) have been consolidated with other units on campus. Many of the still-independent LIS schools are offering degrees in areas such as information studies and related fields. A growing number are offering undergraduate programs in information studies. As a result, library programs are now commonly part of a larger unit, and students preparing to work in libraries often share classes and facilities with students going into related careers.

In most cases this is healthy. Schools where librarians are educated can also educate other information professionals. In fact, students benefit from sharing some elements of their education experience. The education of the students is enriched by the greater variety of courses and these students learn from one another. Students can be well prepared to work in the special environment of the library and can learn about the politics, philosophy, and ethics associated with librarianship within a larger unit.

The traditional values of librarianship can be upheld as long as there is a discrete set of courses dealing with the topics that need to be covered. The students preparing to work in a library would take those core courses. They would share other courses with students preparing to work in other environments.

Too few students

There will be more mergers and more LIS schools seeking to expand the programs offered. The day of the small, single-purpose, freestanding unit to prepare librarians is nearing its end. Larger schools and units provide economy of scale. The knowledge base of librarianship has expanded so greatly that many different types of faculty members are required to cover all the facets, and the number of MLS students alone is too small to justify the needed faculty numbers. Faculty, especially in the information technology area, can

teach students preparing for multiple information careers. Faculty members will still be needed to teach the core courses for MLS students. Those faculty will be supplemented with others, some without a background in librarianship. That is, after all, the same staffing pattern that is found in many libraries where the MLS is not the only professional degree recognized.

All schools have had to expand; some have done it by adding new programs and others by instituting initiatives such as distance learning that also increase the number of students. In all cases the overall objective is the same: to have sufficient faculty and students to maintain the critical mass necessary both to teach the variety of course required and to remain competitive within the university. The schools that will remain most vulnerable to closing are the very small ones - the ones with five and six faculty members. Such small units can too easily be marginalized.

Education, not training

The MLS curriculum has necessarily been revamped as the scope of librarianship itself has changed. Many new courses have been added because of the need to prepare students to work in the ever more technologically sophisticated libraries of today.

At the same time, the traditional skills of librarianship, e.g., reference, cataloging, and classification, are still needed by new graduates. The schools are trying to provide a comprehensive education for new professionals – a difficult task considering how much the knowledge base of the field has expanded in the past 20 years.

The increasing number of technology courses has meant that there is not enough time for many students to take more advanced courses along with some of the courses that were considered basic a few years ago. For most students the MLS program consists of 12 courses.

The schools also try to incorporate both theory and practice. They attempt to balance the competing demands of preparing students to perform well as professionals over the long term, and to function at top effectiveness from day one in a specific job.

Inevitably theory often takes precedence over practice. In education for any profession, it is the long-term effectiveness of the education that must be the focus. That dictates emphasis on basic principles, theory and foundations, not on the details of practice. These details should be woven into the fabric of courses that focus on the design

and structure of information and access to it. If LIS schools wish to remain part of academe, they must emphasize education not training.

Another trend apparent in LIS education is the growing use of multiple means of delivery. Almost all the courses have been enriched with the use of computer modules, web pages, and other high-tech methods to improve the way learning is accomplished. Many schools nationwide are also experimenting with a number of delivery methods to make education more accessible, and some schools are now providing all or almost all their master's degrees through distance learning. There are large areas of the country without LIS schools. Giving students the opportunity to get degrees without going to campus will bring more people to the profession. The growth in distance education will help answer some of the supply – demand problems currently confronting us.

Serving two masters
Education for librarianship began in libraries; it was only after the 1923 Williamson report that it was moved to the universities. The location of LIS education within higher education is the cause of much of the tension that exists between educators and practitioners. LIS schools, like all other professional schools, have to serve two masters. The first is the profession. Obviously, the schools need to be responsive to librarianship – it is the profession from which most of the faculty came and the one that will hire many of the graduates.

There are many educational issues that can only be addressed by practitioners and educators working together. LIS curricula should be influenced by the reactions of those working in the field. The schools send students to libraries of all types for internships and preprofessional job experience. They need their graduates to be supporters and advocates for LIS education. Any school that cuts itself off from the profession is doing itself a larger disservice than the one it does to the profession.

LIS schools do not exist because they decide to do so or because the profession says they should. They exist as a part of the university and thus also serve that second master: their home academic institutions. If they are not seen as responsive to local academic needs, values, and interests, they will certainly not prosper and may disappear entirely. If the top administration in a particular university decides that the school is not essential, it is likely to be abolished despite the best efforts of its graduates, employers, and the profession as a whole.

LIS units are in competition with other academic programs for scarce resources. They will not continue to be funded just because they provide practitioners for a profession that does worthy things for society. Within the university context, these programs have to show their value continually in a competition against well-established and emerging disciplines. The faculty in LIS schools have to conform to the standards and values of their home institutions.

LIS schools serve two masters, but only one pays the bills. It is not surprising that that one's message has been listened to a bit more attentively. Although keeping a balance between the needs of the profession and the demands of academe is difficult, most LIS educators realise that both must be satisfied if the schools are to succeed.

Two different worlds
Librarians and educators operate in their separate worlds. There is too little interaction between them. Many librarians have little firsthand experience with library education after they graduate. They don't go back to the schools for alumni functions, and often their knowledge of what is happening in the schools comes to them second- or third-hand.

On the other hand, library educators have not succeeded in communicating well with the profession. Most do not have recent work experience in libraries. They often move in new directions in the schools without fully explaining the rationale. Owing to limited resources, they have not been sufficiently responsive to some legitimate needs of the profession. Yes, there is an ongoing attempt in most schools to keep in touch with practice. Schools use advisory boards and contact with alumni and employers, both as part of accreditation and at other times. Obviously, they are not doing enough.

As a result, we have arrived at the current debate. On one side, many practitioners believe that the schools are failing to provide the type of education needed for new professionals. On the other, the educators are defensive about the criticism from the profession. They feel that practitioners are often unrealistic about what they expect from graduates emerging from what are still primarily one-year master's programs.

Inadequate communication has resulted in misunderstanding and hard feelings on both sides. The tension between practitioners and educators is not unique to librarianship. Indeed, it is found in many fields ranging from law to education to psychology. It can be healthy as long as both

sides are committed to engaging in ongoing communication and to working together.

We must connect

What we must do more than anything else is connect. There are real differences in what each side of the debate does at work each day. The two fields are, however, joined in a common purpose – to ensure that the libraries of today and tomorrow are the best that can be provided. Too often we have failed to realize that education and practice are inextricably linked and share both common interests and similar threats. We need to work together to solve the problems, such as the low salaries being offered in most libraries. Ultimately, we will succeed or fail together.

There are also people of good will on both sides. Some people from both the practice and LIS education have a "circle the wagons" mentality and a propensity to fight to preserve the status quo (or sometimes the status quo ante).

Both sides also claim large numbers of individuals who are willing to alter their positions and change for the common good. These are the people who will need to work together to repair the rift. Then they can continue and build upon the conversations begun as a result of the Congresses on Professional Education. They made a beginning, but we need to follow up.

Educators and practitioners must reconnect, re-establish their common cause so that the traditions and values that libraries and librarians brought to society in the
past will be there tomorrow. Libraries will continue to change, and the knowledge and skills demanded of tomorrow's librarians will also change. If the profession is to succeed, practitioners and educators must work together to embrace that change and solve the problems it brings. That co-operation must begin now.

(Source: Library Journal, November 1, 2001 page 52-55)

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS (IFLA) SECTION ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING

ANNUAL REPORT 2000/01

SECTION	Education and Training
SCOPE STATEMENT	The Section focuses on education and training for LIS professionals based on research and professional practice. It serves library and information science (LIS) educators, practitioners, and managers with training responsibilities. Appropriately educated, adequately trained, and continually learning professionals are a requirement for effective and efficient information services. Education and training for library and information services concerns all IFLA's divisions and requires cooperation with them and other international and inter-regional associations who have a related mission. Of special interest to the Section is the state of LIS education and training in developing countries.
MEMBERSHIP	255
OFFICERS	Professor Ken Haycock (Chair) School of Library, Archival and Information Studies The University of British Columbia Vancouver, Canada Susan Lazinger (Secretary/Treasurer) School of Libraries, Archives and Information Studies The Hebrew University of Jerusalem Jerusalem, Israel Professor Judith Elkin (Treasurer to 00/12)

	Faculty of Computing, English and Information Studies University of Central England Birmingham, United Kingdom
INFORMATION COORDINATOR And EDITOR	John F. Harvey P.O. Box 21363, 1507 Nicosia, Cyprus E-mail: john.f.harvey@usa.net
GOALS 1998-2001 [approved in 1996]	1. foster international cooperation on basic and continuing education of library and information science (LIS) educators and practitioners 2. uphold the professional status of LIS personnel through internationally recognized qualifications for LIS work 3. maintain a current directory of world-wide LIS educational programs 4. foster the multicultural principles of IFLA, though contribution to the current multilingual lexicon for LIS 5. offer professional development opportunities for LIS professionals and educators in developing countries 6. disseminate information on innovative curriculum development and creative teaching methodologies and materials 7. foster new professional development opportunities in order to encourage new knowledge, skills and competencies.
MEETINGS	Two Standing Committee meetings were held in Boston--August 18 and 24, 2001. Attendance was approximately 18 plus 12 observers at each meeting
PROJECTS	**Completed:** Guidelines for Library and Information Studies Education. Approved by IFLA. Worldwide Database of Library and Information Studies Professional Qualifications and Accrediting Bodies. Report presented to open forum. Report filed with Coordinating Board. Procedures for refereed papers. Criteria for Co-sponsorship of IFLA Programs. PreConference Institute (Satellite Meeting) with Section on Management and Marketing. "Education and Research for Marketing and Quality Management Montreal, Canada. **Section Services:** Reinstatement of SET Bulletin. Created SET presence on IFLANet. Developed membership brochure. Process for Conference planning. Planning committees established for 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004. **In Progress:** World Guide to Library, Archive and Information Studies Education Funding being sought. History of the Section. **Discontinued:** Multilingual Glossary. Project abandoned.

	Proposal for regional seminars. Project abandoned.
PROGRAMS **Open Forum** **Boston, 2001**	*'Parameters of Knowledge Management within Library/Information Science Education'* Moderator: Susan Lazinger [Perspectives on education for knowledge management](#) ABDUS SATTAR CHAUDRY and SUSAN ELLEN HIGGINS (Division of Information Studies, School of Computer Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore) [A bounded or unbounded universe? Knowledge management in postgraduate LIS education](#) MARK BROGAN, PHILIP HINGSTON and VICKY WILSON (School of Computer and Information Science, Edith Cowan University, Mount Lawley, Australia) [Knowledge management: opportunities of IS graduates](#) ANNE MORRIS (Reader in Information Processing, Department of Information Science, Loughborough University, UK)

PROGRAMS
Workshop
Boston, 2001
	Off-site: *Simmons College*
	
	'Extending the Reach of Library/Information Science Education'
	    Morning:
	    Moderator: Stanley Kalkus
	
	[Reaching the unreached for library and information science education: a perspective for developing countries](#)
	S.B. GHOSH (Professor, Faculty of Library & Inf. Science, Indira Gandhi National Open University, Maidan Garhi, New Delhi, India)
	
	[Extending the Reach of library/Information Science Education](#)
	TERRY WEECH (Associate Professor, University of Illinois. Champaign, IL USA)
	
	[Impact of Internet on Schools of Library and Information Science in Thailand](#)
	LAMPANG MANMART (Associate Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand)
	
	    Afternoon:
	    Moderator: Stepheney Ferguson
	
	Meditation, mediation and multimedia: A pragmatic philosophy
	SUE MYBURGH (Senior Lecturer, Information Management, University of South Australia)
	
	[Interaction and student retention, success and satisfaction in web-based learning](#)
	KATHLEEN BURNETT (Associate Dean & Associate

	Professor, School of Information Studies, Florida State University, USA) On the reform of Library and Information Science Education according to the changes of librarians' function under network environment MA HAIQUN (Department of Information Management, Heilongjiang University, Harbin, R.O. China)
AUTHOR	Ken Haycock, August 31, 2001

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LIBRARY ASSOCIATIONS (IFLA)
SECTION ON EDUCATION AND TRAINING
Draft of MINUTES of Standing Committee on Education and Training Meetings
August 18th and August 24th, 2001

Minutes of the Standing Committee meetings during the IFLA Conference in Boston, Massachusetts, USA, on Saturday, August 18, 2001

Participating:

Current Members: Ismail Abdullahi, Judith Elkin, Monica Ertel , Assumpcio Estivill, Judy Field, Maria Gajo (absent), Rosemary Gitachu (absent), Ken Haycock (Outgoing Chair), Lars Hoglund, Claude Horizio (absent), Susan Lazinger, Aira Lepik (absent), Francoise Lerouge, Jennefer Nicholson, Niels Ole Pors, Hans-Jurgen Schubert, Anna Shirinyan (absent), Terry Weech, Natalia Zhadko (absent)

Outgoing Members: Evelyn Daniel, Stephney Ferguson, Ole Harbo, Stanley Kalkus

Corresponding Member: John Harvey (Information Coordinator/Bulletin editor),

Round Table Chairs: Linda Ashcroft (CPERT), Jesus Lau (User Education - absent)

Discussion Group Chair: Al Kagan (Social Responsibility).

Observers: Gabriel Bunmi Alegbeleye, Kalpana Dasgupta, Leslie Farmer, Susan Freiband, Caroline Hoffman, Atash Jafar-Nejad, Constance B. Modise,

I. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

- **Introduction of New Members/Role of Members, Corresponding Members, Observers.**

Ken Haycock, Chair, called the meeting to order, welcoming members and observers. Ken said that he had emailed the agenda to all members on the SET email list, but passed out printed copies of the agenda to those present who did not have email and/or who had not received an agenda. Members and observers introduced themselves. Ken passed out a list of new and outgoing SET members to initial and correct, and a list for Observers to record their names. Ken noted that SET is one of the few Standing Committees to hold elections for places, since there are more candidates than places, and congratulated the new and reelected members. He then read the rules and responsibilities of IFLA SET members (to be fluent in at least one official language, to attend at least three of the four annual conferences, to contribute actively, to observe deadlines, and to respond to IFLA Headquarters requests and to be available to respond to advice from other sections). Haycock stated that our section is also one the few which has written guidelines for corresponding members (a maximum of five corresponding members who must be willing to contribute to the section, as well as observers). SET currently has three corresponding members: John Harvey and Diann Rusch-Feja and Huang Xiaobin. In addition we have three official observers: Linda Ashcroft, Al Kagan and Jesus Lau.

- **Approval of Agenda.** Ken asked for additions and corrections to the Agenda and suggested that we skip (**VI. Affiliated Groups: Relationships and Reports**) and deal with it later. The agenda was adopted with some arrangement of the order to accommodate members who were absent at the Saturday meeting but expected for the Friday meeting. The minutes reflect the order of the agenda with information from both meetings integrated.

- **Approval of Minutes**. Ken passed out a corrected version of the minutes from of the August 2000 SET meetings in Jerusalem to those who didn't received them by email and asked for corrections to these. Terry Weech then moved that the minutes be approved as revised. The minutes of the meetings in Jerusalem were approved.

II. ELECTION OF OFFICERS, 2001-2003

- **Chair.** The outgoing Chair, Ken Haycock, read aloud the outline of the process of electing new officers of the section. Nominations for the position of

Chair may be made only by current members elected to SET for 2001-2003. If there is only one nominee, he/she is confirmed unopposed. If there is more than one nominee, a secret ballot is held. Only members elected to SET for the 2001-2003 term can vote. A quorum (one third of SET members) must be present. Judith Elkin nominated Susan Lazinger for the position of Chair. The nomination was unopposed and approved by acclamation. Ken will continue running this first SET meeting, and Susan will take over as Chair during the second meeting.

- **Secretary [includes Financial Officer].** The nominations for the position of Secretary were then opened. Susan Lazinger, the incoming Chair, nominated Terry Weech for Secretary. This nomination was also unopposed, and Terry Weech was approved by acclamation as the new Secretary of SET. Susan Lazinger will take minutes during this first SET meeting in Boston, and Terry will take over as Secretary and take minutes during the second meeting.

- **Appointed Positions.** It was recommended that John Harvey, who has been serving as the SET Information Coordinator and editor of the SET Bulletin, be renominated for the position, and this was approved.

III. OFFICER REPORTS

- **Chair.** Ken Haycock, the outgoing Chair, gave the President's report. He stated that there are currently SET 241 members, making SET the fifth largest section in IFLA. Achievements of the past year included approval of guidelines to appoint members and corresponding members, reinstatement of the SET Bulletin, which now has a strong presence on IFLANet, the taking of responsibility for the Social Responsibility Discussion Group and provision of a home for it, the establishment of a process for conference planning (so far, a list of themes for 2001-2003 has been generated), and the establishment of a process for refereeing papers for the SET Open Forum. We still need guidelines for cooperation with other groups and for reciprocity of qualifications. Ken reported on the sponsored pre-conference with the section of Management and CPERT. Other achievements completed include the approval of the revision of the LIS guidelines, carried out by Evelyn Daniel, Ole Harbo and Susan Lazinger) in 2000 and now available on IFLANet, and the study on the database of professional qualifications and national accrediting bodies which was completed and reported on in a paper in 2000. The multilingual glossary project, however, has been dropped. Still to be done:

- the History of SET,
- the guidelines for regional seminars,
- the *World Guide to LIS Education* (a new proposal needs to be discussed).

Furthermore, the new IFLA priorities require a new SET Strategic Plan (on the Agenda)

Secretary. Susan Lazinger, the outgoing Secretary, delivered the Secretary's report. She described the selection process and gave the titles of the papers for the Open Forum and the Workshop. Susan also reported that the proposal to update the *World Guide to Library, Archive and Information Science Education* was filed with IFLA at the end of 2000 but rejected by IFLA because of a lack of funds.

Treasurer. Susan Lazinger, the outgoing Treasurer reported that no disbursements were made from SET funds during 2000-2001, but that the money, currently being held in 2 separate accounts (Dutch Guilders and British Pounds, representing monies transferred to her by IFLA Headquarters and by Judith Elkin, the previous Treasurer) is losing value monthly because of fees charged by Israeli banks on foreign currency accounts. Therefore she recommended that she transfer the funds immediately after the conference to the new Treasurer/Financial Officer. The total in the two accounts at the time of the Boston Conference was: 199.41 Pounds Sterling and 2,131 Dutch Guilders.

After finishing **III. Officer Reports** on the Agenda, Ken Haycock skipped items IV-V, and went to:

VI. AFFILIATED GROUPS: RELATIONSHIPS AND REPORTS

Linda Ashcroft, the present of the CPERT Round Table, described the program for CPERT. Al Kagan, the head of the Social Responsibilities Discussion Group, gave a history of the discussion group. He said he has received a communication from the editors of the forthcoming book, *Libraries in the Information Society* inviting the SRDG to include its paper. Ken mentioned a communiqué from Ross Shimmon stating that some discussion groups have expressed a desire to try to become sections. He also noted that we (SET) have spent nearly all of our time on *Education* and very little time on *Training*, something that the new officers may need to rethink.

After item VI., Ken returned to item IV. on the Agenda, followed by item V.:

IV. CONFERENCE PROGRAM PLANNING

• **Boston 2001 (Ferguson,*Field, Kalkus).** Ken handed out maps to the Workshop at Simmons College. Judy Field, the Chair of the Workshop, who was detained and arrived at the meeting just as item IV. began, gave a report on planning the Workshop.

• **Glasgow 2002 (proposal by * Elkin, Christensen, Ertel).** Judith Elkin, who is now Chair of the Glasgow workshop, handed out a proposal for the workshop and the Open Forum. The topic suggested for the workshop was *Driving Change in the Profession*, to be composed of two short presentations and a panel discussion by SET representatives from various regions. Since the evening's reception is in Edinburgh, and the workshop is in Glasgow, she suggested a half day workshop plus lunch to allow time to get to Edinburgh. There was a discussion of the topic. The theme proposed for the Open Session was: *Think local, Act global: enhancing competencies for a diverse world.*

Ismail Abdullahi suggested that we add *diversity* to the topic, and Susan Lazinger agreed with him. The committee agreed to revise the proposal and present the revised proposal on Friday.

• **Berlin 2003 (Gajo, Morizio, *Weech).** Terry Weech, Chair of the Berlin planning committee, said that no progress has been made and that SET needs a representative in Berlin. Hans-Jurgen Schubert agreed to be the on-site representative. Terry asked whether the section was still interested in pursuing the connection with the School Libraries section and said that, if so, we need to contact the School Libraries section. Stephney Ferguson suggested that the theme might include youth librarianship as well.

V. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS

• **Guidelines for Library and Information Studies Education (Daniel/Lazinger/Harbo)**, as mentioned above, has been completed.

• **World Guide to Library and Information Studies Education (Daniel/Harvey):** Since the proposal was rejected by IFLA, it was decided that Susan, first of all, needs to talk to IFLA (e.g., Sjoerd, Claudia Lux) and find out whether they are truly interested in our doing this project. Evelyn and Susan agreed to talk to Claudia Lux and report back on her response on Friday.

• **Survey of Education for Management in LIS Programs [cosponsor with Section on Management and Marketing] (Zhadko).** Since Zhadko was not present at this meeting, Ken said he will find out what happened with this project for the Friday meeting.

• **History of the Section [Bowden/Harbo].** Russell Bowden has not responded to attempts to contact him and seems to be off this project. Ole Harbo reported that he is working on it.

• **Proposal for Regional Seminars (Bowden).** It was reported

that Bowden has not been working on it. Ken suggested that we give it to someone else to work on on Friday.

- **Procedures for Refereed Papers (Elkin).** Judith Elkin handed out the procedures, small amendments were made and the procedures were approved. They will be sent to John Harvey and put on IFLANet.
- **Membership Development/Brochure (Nicholson).** Jennefer Nicholson handed out the new brochure. She said that a problem with the brochures is that they get out of date quickly. It was decided to discuss where the brochures will be distributed. A decision was made to distribute them at all the Newcomers' sessions (Sunday, Monday, Thursday); Evelyn said she would take some to the ALISE booth 50 of them would be left at the IFLA booth, and finally Terry said he will take some to distribute.

Minutes of August 18, 2001 submitted by Susan Lazinger, Outgoing Secretary.

MINUTES OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE IFLA CONFERENCE IN BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, USA, ON SATURDAY, AUGUST 24, 2001

Participating:
Current Members Present: Ismail Abdullahi, Judith Elkin, Monica Ertel , Assumpcio Estivill, Judy Field, Ken Haycock (Outgoing Chair), Lars Hoglund, Susan Lazinger (Incoming Chair), Francoise Lerouge, Jennefer Nicholson, Niels Ole Pors, Hans-Jurgen Schubert, Terry Weech.
Current Members Absent: Maria Gajo, Rosemary Gitachu, Claude Horizio, Aira Lepik, Anna Shirinyan, Natalia Zhadko.
Outgoing Members Present: Evelyn Daniel, Ole Harbo, Stanley Kalkus
Corresponding Member: John Harvey (Information Coordinator/Bulletin editor),
Round Table Chairs: Linda Ashcroft (CPERT), Jesus Lau (User Education - absent)
Discussion Group Chair: Al Kagan (Social Responsibility - absent).
Observers Present: Mowna Benslimane, James Farrell, Jr., Dineth K. Fuest, S.B. Ghosh, Atash Jafar-Nejad, Vincent Liquete, Lampang Manmart, Martha McPhail, Obianuju Mollel, Lynne Murphy, Jean-Michel Salaun, Rejean Savard

**I.   INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME
       TO THE AUGUST 24, 2001 MEETING**
Susan Lazinger assumed the duties of Chair of the Committee and welcomed all to the 2d business meeting of the Standing Committee on Education and Training. She thanked Judy Field for the organization and hosting of the workshop at Simmons College and all present concurred in the thanks. The Chair introduced Terry Weech as the new Secretary and proposed that he also assume the duties of Financial Officer/Treasurer. The members present approved his assumption of the duties of Financial Officer for the Section. The Chair, as the prior financial officer, will transfer the section's funds to the new financial officer. The Chair then directed the discussion to item IV on the agenda "Conference Program Planning."

IV.   CONFERENCE PROGRAM PLANNING
Glasgow 2002 (proposal by Christensen, Elkin, Ertel). Judith Elkin distributed a revised proposal for the Glasgow workshop and the Open Forum. The topic suggested for the workshop remains *Driving Change in the Profession*, to be composed of two short presentations and a panel discussion by SET representatives from various regions. The workshop will be scheduled from 9:00 to 14:00, since the evening's reception is in Edinburgh, and the workshop is in Glasgow. The two presentations will consist of subject review/benchmarking (Quality Assurance Agency) in United Kingdom and UK Research Assessment Exercise (Higher Education Funding Councils). The Panel will consist of speakers on:
Denmark/Scandinavia (Nils Ole Pors)
U.S./Canada (Ken Haycock)
U.K. (Representative from BAILER)
Asia/Pacific (Jennifer Nicholson)
   Africa (Representative to be determined)
   Latin America (Rep. to be determined)

The theme proposed for the Open Session was: *Think local, Act global: enhancing competencies for a diverse world.* The session would focus on diversity of Graduates, Clients, Learning styles, Ethnicity, and Delivery. The referees will be Judith Elkin, Monica Ertel, and Linda Ashcroft. The Committee approved this the revised proposal for both the Workshop and the Open Session.

- **Berlin 2003 (Morizio, Schubert, Weech).** Terry Weech, Chair of the Berlin planning committee, reported that he had met with the Chair of the School Libraries Section and that the possibility of a joint sponsorship of a workshop in Berlin was favorably received. Terry will proceed to contact the new Chair of the School Libraries Section so planning can proceed in Glasgow for the Berlin conference. Terry will work with Hans-Jurgen Schubert on local arrangements. It was suggested that the plans include attention to open and distance education as well as how we can focus on training as well as professional education.

- **Buenos Aires 2004 (Estivill, Pors, Abdullahi).** A planning committee for the Buenos Aires conference in 2004 was name. The committee will look forward to a report on preliminary plans for 2004 at the conference next year.

V. PROJECTS AND PUBLICATIONS

- **Draft Guidelines for Co-sponsorship of LIS Education Programs (Nicholson).** Jennefer Nicholson distributed the draft guidelines or co-sponsorship of programs. After a brief discussion the Guidelines were approved and they will be sent to John Harvey for publication in the Newsletter for posting on IFLANet.

- **Membership Development/Brochure (Nicholson).** Following up on the discussion from the meeting on August 18th, it was suggested that an insert be considered to be put in the brochure with the list of current Standing Committee members and officers.

- **World Guide to Library and Information Studies Education (Daniel/Lazinger):** Susan Lazinger presented a revised proposal for funding the World Guide. It reduces the cost the original $50,000 (which was rejected as too expensive) to $26,000. Susan proposed that SET request $5,000 a year from the IFLA Board for two years (for a total of $10,000) and that SET

find funding for the remainder from its own budget and/or other sources (UNESCO). Evelyn Daniel would be the Editor-in-Chief of the project. There was extensive discussion regarding the funding and how much money the SET budget could spare to put toward the costs of the project. It was the sense of the members that the Newsletter and conference related costs should have priority from the SET budget. If funds remained after those expenses, then those funds might go to the support of the World Guide. Evelyn Daniel noted that the revised budget would not likely meet all the costs, so it was likely there would be donated staff time on her part and perhaps others at her institution toward the project if IFLA approved. Susan Lazinger was authorized to take the proposal forward with the understanding that if funds were available from the SET budget after all regular SET expenses were met, they could be directed toward the project.

VI   Cooperation with Other Groups

Francoise Lerouge distributed a proposal for a joint sponsorship of a PreConference or Post Conference institute in Geneva for 2003 on "E-Learning for Training in Marketing and Management of Libraries." The Institute would be co-sponsored by SET and the Section on Marketing and Management. Presentations and discussion on experiences and products of e-learning in marketing and management of libraries would be covered. Geneva is convenient to Lyon (ENSSIB) and thus collaboration could take place. Because of the need to proceed to IX (Strategic Planning) in the limited time that remained, further discussion of this proposal was tabled.

IX.   Strategic Planning

So little time remained to go over the strategic plan for SET required by IFLA by October 1, 2001, that it was decided to establish a sub-committee to work on a draft strategic plan. Terry Weech indicated he would send the sub-committee members background material and requested that a draft be made available by September 15th so it could be circulated to the membership for comment prior to the October 1st deadline. Ismail Abdullahi, Judy Field, Martha McPhail, and Niels Ole Pors volunteered to serve on the sub-committee and Niels Ole Pors agreed to act as Chair.

X.   Other Business:

Jennefer Nicholson proposed that we affirm to the Coordinating Board our commitment to both Professional Education and Training. She felt, and others agreed, that SET in the past few years had focused more on Education and less on training and that,

****

SET Secretary's Report: 2000-2001

I. Open Forum, Monday, August 20, 2001, 13:30-16:00, Boston:
'Parameters of Knowledge Management within Library/Information Science Education'

The following papers were selected (Susan Lazinger, Organizer; Susan Lazinger and John Harvey, Referees):

Susan Lazinger, Moderator

1. **Perspectives on Education for Knowledge Management**
   ABDUS SATTAR CHAUDRY and SUSAN ELLEN HIGGINS (Division of Information Studies, School of Computer Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore).

2. **A Bounded or Unbounded Universe? Knowledge management in postgraduate LIS education**
   MARK BROGAN, PHILIP HINGSTON and VICKY WILSON (School of Computer and Information Science, Edith Cowan University, Mount Lawley, Australia).

3. **Knowledge Management: Opportunities of IS Graduates**
   ANNE MORRIS (Reader in Information Processing, Department of Information Science, Loughborough University, UK)

II. Workshop: Thursday, August 23, 2001, 9:00-16:00, Boston
'Extending the Reach of Library/Information Science Education'

Off-site: Simmons College
The following papers were selected (Judith Field, Organizer)**:**

Morning: Moderator: Stanley Kalkus

perhaps, was the reason why the roundtable on Continuing Education felt the need to be established.   The   membership   present concurred with this recommendation.

Minutes of August 24, 2001 submitted by Terry Weech, Secretary.

1. **Reaching The Unreached For Library And Information Science Education: A Perspective For Developing Countries**
   S.B. GHOSH (Professor, Faculty of Library & Inf. Science, Indira Gandhi National Open University, Maidan Garhi, New Delhi, India)

2. **Extending the Reach of library/Information Science Education**
   TERRY WEECH (Associate Professor, University of Illinois)

3. **Impact of Internet on Schools of Library and Information Science in Thailand**
   LAMPANG MANMART (Associate Professor, Department of Library and Information Science, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand)

Afternoon: Moderator: Stepheney Ferguson

4. **Meditation, Mediation And Multimedia: A Pragmatic Philosophy**
   SUE MYBURGH (Senior Lecturer, Information Management, University of South Australia)

5. **Interaction And Student Retention, Success And Satisfaction In Web-Based Learning**
   KATHLEEN BURNETT (Associate Dean & Associate Professor, School of Information Studies, Florida State University, USA)

6. **On The Reform Of Library And Information Science Education According To The Changes Of Librarians' Function Under Network Environment**
   MA HAIQUN (Department of Information Management, Heilongjiang University, Harbin, R.O. China)

III. Other events, 2000-2001

1. **PROPOSAL TO UPDATE THE WORLD GUIDE TO LIBRARY, ARCHIVE AND INFORMATION SCIENCE EDUCATION (2nd ed., Saur, 1995), Total direct cost (excluding considerable donated professional time) = $50,000**
   a. Filed with IFLA (proposal attached)

b. Rejected by IFLA because of a lack of funds

Susan Lazinger, Secretary, SET, August 1, 2001

Section on Education and Training (SET) - Treasurer's Report: 2000-2001

Funds received from Judith Elkin, previous treasurer (funds left over from previous year) in December 2000:
 In Pounds Sterling:
 *217.00

Funds received from IFLA Headquarters (SET's allotment for 2001, based on 238 members):
 In Dutch Florins
 **2, 250

*This sum was deposited into a regular foreign currency account subject to all the currency rules for Israeli citizens
**This sum was deposited into a special foreign currency account, which the bank discovered in the interim between receipt of the first sum and receipt of the second sum, for New Immigrants to Israel. The difference between the terms of the two accounts is that money can be transferred from this special account without paying a tax on the transferred sum.

In the 8 months since the money has been held in these 2 accounts, I have had no requests for disbursements and have made none.

I was advised by the Israel Discount Bank, where the money is deposited, to keep both of the sums in the original currency in which they were transferred to me so that I would not be charged for an additional currency change, which I did. That is why the first account is still in Pounds Sterling.

However, because of the strict and difficult Israeli foreign currency restrictions, there has been a monthly fee deducted from each sum which has reduced the amount in each, as the fees were deducted, as follows (per my last report from the bank):

The account in Pounds Sterling (money left from the previous year):

Date	Fee deducted
Dec. 12, 2000	-10.70
Jan. 1, 2001	- 1.34
Feb. 1, 2001	- 1.37
Mar. 1, 2001	- 1.38
Apr. 1, 2001	- 1.40
May 1, 2001	- 1.40

TOTAL IN ACCOUNT 199.41 Pounds Sterling

Funds received from in Dutch Florins:
Date
Jan. 1, 2001 (Amount left after transfer fees)

Date		
Jan. 1, 2001	-	38.11
Feb. 1, 2001	-	4.75
Mar. 1, 2001	-	4.77
Apr. 1, 2001	-	5.01
May 1, 2001	-	4.96

TOTAL IN ACCOUNT   2,131 Dutch Florins

From this report it is apparent that:
(1) because of its foreign currency taxes and fees, SET's money should not be held in Israel and the Treasurer should not be an Israeli citizen; and
*(2) **It is imperative that as soon as there is a new Treasurer I must transfer the balance in both accounts immediately to him/her (entailing the payment of an additional tax on the amount in Pounds Sterling, in the regular account), since each month the balance decreases without our actually spending any of the funds.***

I apologize for this unpleasant state of affairs. When I agreed to be Treasurer, since I had never held money in foreign currencies in Israel, I did not know about these taxes and fees which make holding foreign currency here inadvisable.

Susan Lazinger, Treasurer, SET, August 1, 2001

Strategic plan for the Section on Education & Training: 2002 – 2003

Preamble:

The section on education and training (SET) relates its work to some of IFLA's professional priorities. The relevant priorities are quoted here:

"IFLA works to strengthen the abilities and knowledge of library and information science professionals and paraprofessionals throughout the world in order to improve service to the user. Programmes supported by IFLA encompass all educational processes, including library and information science curricula and continuing education activities such as lectures, seminars, workshops and in-service training." This is the most valuable priority for the section but it must be emphasised that the work of the section also relates to the relevant aspects of the following professional priority:

"IFLA actively promotes standards, guidelines and best practices to provide guidance to libraries throughout the world in how to perform core functions well, and in many cases how to perform them in the same manner. The latter is particular important in areas such as electronic communications where conformity with clear, established and widely accepted and understood standards is indispensable for the exchange of information in cost-effective ways."

Mission:

The section on education and training has as an ultimate mission to improve Library and Information Science education and to strengthen the link between the basic education and continuing education or continuing professional development for librarians and paraprofessionals.

It is important to work towards profiling the profession in relation to both the educational systems in different countries and the professional bodies and stakeholders.

It is especially important to focus on the educational situation in developing countries.

As education and training are relevant for all of IFLA's divisions and sections SET ill actively cooperate with any of these. The section will act as an advising body in relation to other sections in IFLA in all matters concerned with educational questions and in relation to the development process.

Priorities and strategic goals:
1. Foster international cooperation on basic and continuing education of library and information science (LIS) educators and practitioners. (IFLA Professional Priority: Developing Library Professionals)
2. Uphold and strengthen the academic and professional status of LIS – staff through international recognised qualifications for LIS – positions. (IFLA Professional Priority: Developing Library Professionals)
3. Maintain a current directory of world-wide LIS educational programmes, including continuing education. (IFLA Professional Priority: Developing Library Professionals)
4. Foster the multicultural principles of IFLA
5. Offer professional development opportunities for LIS professionals and education in developing countries (IFLA Professional Priority: Developing Library Professionals)
6. Disseminate information on innovative curriculum development and creative teaching methodologies and materials (IFLA Professional Priority: Developing Library Professionals
7. Foster new professional development opportunities in order to encourage new knowledge, skills and competencies (IFLA Professional Priority: Developing Library Professionals)
8. Encourage high quality conference papers through a rigorous refereeing process (IFLA Professional Priority: Promoting Standards, Guidelines and Best Practices)
9. Foster a process that encompasses both standard educational requirements and continuing education as focus for the work of the section (IFLA Professional Priority: Developing Library Professionals)

Action plan:

Glasgow conference in 2002:
Workshop on the theme: Driving change in the Profession and an Open Session on the theme: Democracy, Diversity and Delivery. (Goals 1, 6, 8 and 9)

The final planning of the Berlin Conference 2003: A workshop and an Open session.: programme, call for papers and establishment of the refereeing process. This planning process also includes a possible

cooperation with other sections on joint pre-conferences, for example joint pre – conferences on marketing issues. (Goals 1, 6, 8 and 9)

Initiate the planning of the Workshop and Open Session for the Buenos Aires conference 2004. (Goals 1, 6, 8 and 9)

Take action to foster closer co-operation with CPERT (Continuing Professional Education Round Table) (Goal 1) //*This must be revised in the light of the future status of CPERT, but it is pertinent that continuing education problems will fall under the umbrella of SET)*

Take action to establish educational co-operation with South American colleagues on a workshop for the Buenos Aires conference (Goal 5 and 7)

World Guide: Implement the revised proposal that ends with a publication in 2003, if necessary support, both financial and otherwise, is obtained. (Goal 3)

Newsletter: Issue a newsletter twice a year in print and electronic format (Goal 1 and 6)

Disseminate SET's policies on co-sponsorship for conferences, workshops and programs. (Goal 1 and 2)

Evaluate the need for a revision of the standards for LIS Educational Programmes to keep it up to date on a continuous basis (Goal 2)

Initiate a process to evaluate the need for revision of the SET leaflet (Goal 1)

Continue the work on the History of the Section (goal 1)

Take action to establish a high degree of participation and work delegation among all elected members of the Section (Goal 1)

Submitted September 28, 2001

IFLA Section On Education And Training Guidelines For Co-Sponsorship Of Conference And Other Programs

The programs of the Section on Education and Training are relevant to all of IFLA's divisions and require co-operation with them and other international and inter-regional associations who have a related mission. So that the Section's activities, financial resources and member expertise may be best applied the Section will be guided by the following criteria in considering co-sponsorship with other bodies.

General Principles

- the purpose and outcomes are clearly stated, compatible with and further the goals of each party

- the scope of the program is within IFLA's Professional Priorities

- the responsibilities of each party are outlined

- the requirements can be met within the range of the Section's member expertise without disadvantaging the Section's priority programs

- funding for the program will not prejudice funding for other Section programs

Management

The proposed management of the program includes:

- SET is represented on the planning group for the program or alternatively provision is made for ongoing input by a SET representative

- overall financial responsibility is allocated to one party. Where this is not SET regular financial reports are provided to the SET Treasurer

- any variation to the scope or financial commitment to be agreed to by the SET Chair and Treasurer

- promotional materials carry appropriate SET branding

- reporting lines are set out and include reporting to SET

Where support from SET in name only is sought the criteria will be applied with the exception of those relating to financial and planning group requirements.

DISCUSSED AND APPROVED IN DRAFT FORM BY SET STANDING COMMITTEE, AUGUST 24, 2001, AT BOSTON CONFERENCE. - SUBMITTED October 22, 2001, BY Jennefer Nicholson.

History

Clausen, H. and Wormell, I. A Bibliometric Analysis OF IOLIM Conferences 1977-1999. Bibl f graph tab *J Inf Sci* v27 no3 p157-69, 2001

California

Bluh, P. M. Mission accomplished! Proceedings of vision, mission, reality: creating libraries for the twenty-first century (2000 LAMA national Institute: special section) *Libr Adm Manage* v15 no3 p141-78 Summ 2001

Illinois

White, J. C. Public Library Servce For All: a report from the Summit on the Unserved (October 2000) tab *Ill Libr* v83 no1 p4-17 Wint 2001

Great Britain

Love-Rodgers, C. Electronic resources for the arts: supporting distance learners at the Open University. Bibl f diag *Program* v35 no3 p227-39 Jl 2001

Train, B and Elkin, J. Branching Out: a model for experiential learning in professional practice (program trains librarians in reader guidance) bibl diag tab *J Libr Inf Sci Engl* v33 no2 p68-74 Je 2001

Hawaii

Harada, V. H. Professional Development as Collaborative Inquiry (continuing education for school librarians in Hawaii) bibl f tab *Knowl Question* v29 no5 p13-19 My/Je 2001

Vietnam

Tran, L. A. Training in the implementation and use of electronic resources: a proposed curriculum for Vietnam, par I bibl f tab *J Educ Libr Inf Sci* v42 no3 p257-63 Summ 2001

Education for Librarianship

Wohlmuth, S.R. Breaking Through the Linguistic Barrier: a challenge for initial professional education and continuing education of librarians. (*In* Library services to Latinos) McFarland & Co. 2000 p41-50 bibl

In-service Education

Johnson, C. P. Domain competencies and Minnesota's voluntary certification program (in-service professional education for employees in small and rural libraries) bibl f il *Public Libr* v40 no4 p228-34 Jl/Aug 2001

Internet

Singh, N. Internet: importance and usage for library and information professionals. Bibl f DESIDOC *Bull Inf Technol* v21 no3 p17-28 My 2001

College and University Libraries

Aparac-Gazivoda, T. and Brana, R. Advancement of academic communication by use of networked information: a Croatian perspective. Bibl f *Int Inf Libr Rev* v33 no2/3 p133-48 Je/S 2001

Armstrong, C.J. and Others. A Study of the use of electronic information systems by higher education students in the UK (at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth) bibl f tab *Program* v35 no3 p241-62 Jl 2001

Barsun, R. Computer mediated conferencing, e-mail, telephone: a holistic approach to meeting students' needs (at Indiana University) bibl *J Libr Adm* v31 no3/4 p31-44 2001

Felts, J. W. Now you can get there from here: creating an interactive Web application for accessing full-text journal articles from any location (at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro) *J Libr Adm* v31 no3/4 p207-18 2001

Holmes, K. E. and Brown C. F. Meeting adult learners, wherever they may be: if it's Thursday, it must be Thermopolis! (*In* Teaching the new library to today's users. Neal-Schumann 2000 p221-35) bibl

Lonberger, J. Remote possibilities: a "fill in the blanks" approach to creating web-based reference and instructional services (at Emory University) il *Ga Libr Q* v36 no4 p5-13 Wint 1999

McGillis, L. and Toms, E.G. Usability of the academic library web site: implications for design (study at the Memorial University of Newfoundland) bibl f il tab *Coll Res Libr* v62 no4 p355-67 Jl 2001

Off-campus Library Services Conference (9th: 2000: Portland, OR) off-campus library services; Anne Marie Casey, editor, Haworth Press 2001 491 p.

Tricarico, M. A. and Others. Interactive online instruction for library research: the small academic library experience (web-based BI at Emmanuel College) *J Acad Libr* v27 no3 p220-3 My 2001

Junior and Community College Libraries

Buckstead, J. R. Developing an effective off-campus library services web page: don't

worry be happy! (at Austin Community College) bibl il *J Libr Adm* v31 no3/4 p93-107 2001

Developing Countries

Omole, D. W. Information science and technology in developing countries. Bibl f *Int Inf Libr Rev* v33 no2/3 p133-48 Je/S 2001

Bibliographic Instruction

Teaching the new Library to Today's Users; reaching international, minority, senior citizens, gay/lesbian, first-generation, at-risk, graduate and returning students, and distance learners; edited by Trudi E. Jacobson (and) Helene C. Williams. Neal-Schuman 2000 xxvi, 256p

****

68th IFLA General Conference and Council

Libraries for Life: Democracy, Diversity, Delivery

August 18th - 24th 2002, Glasgow, Scotland

INVITATION

Dear colleagues,

The IFLA 2002 National Organising Committee and The Library Association of Great Britain take great pleasure in inviting you to attend the 68th IFLA General Conference and Council to be held in Glasgow, Scotland from Sunday August 18 until Saturday August 24, 2002. We look forward to welcoming you there. It is particularly significant that this conference is returning to Scotland where IFLA was founded in 1927, and we hope you will join us for this special 75th anniversary.

Conference theme

The conference theme is *Libraries for Life: Democracy, Diversity, Delivery*. Libraries continue to be valued by people of all ages, races and walks of life throughout the world, but our societies are continually changing as a result of new developments. The conference seminars, lectures, workshops and discussion groups will invite you to examine how libraries can continue to provide a variety of services, adapting them to meet the changing needs of our societies and encouraging democratic access to knowledge in the future.

Registration Forms are available at: http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla68/reg-e.htm