



An approach to evaluating Latin American university libraries

Ana Reyes Pacios

*Library Science and Documentation Department, Carlos III University,
Madrid, Spain, and*

Nidia Lubisco

Information Science Institute, Federal University of Bahia, Bahia, Brazil

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to identify the current evaluation processes and experiences among Latin American university libraries.

Design/methodology/approach – This study is based on the results of a questionnaire sent to 31 libraries in seven countries.

Findings – It was found that most libraries evaluate some aspect of their services, but the frequency of these actions does not appear to be very consistent. They seem to have an acceptable level of computerization, but some of them neither take advantage of nor make the most of it. Only a few libraries perform an evaluation to improve their management and few libraries have enough historical data sets to permit comparative studies.

Research limitations/implications – The response rate is limited, with just 51.6 percent of surveyed institutions (16 questionnaires returned of the 31 sent).

Practical implications – The paper can aid Latin American university libraries to analyze their evaluation needs in a common forum and to reach agreements as to what are the most appropriate indicators to measure their performance. This will help them in the long term to improve the quality of their services and the value of their role in the performance of the university.

Originality/value – This survey is the first to be carried out to discover the existing situation in Latin America.

Keywords University libraries, South America, Performance measures, Library management, Function evaluation

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

This work was conducted as a preliminary to the preparation of a doctoral dissertation that aimed to adapt and improve those methods used to evaluate Brazilian university libraries (Lubisco, 2007). A study carried out at the Federal University of Bahia in 2001 highlighted that the Brazilian Ministry of Education used an evaluation system that was very limited; it does not use appropriate criteria and instruments to measure and reflect the role played by the library as a pedagogical resource for the University's education programme. In order to improve those methods, we thought it was necessary to carry out a preliminary study that would allow us to gain a broad view of the Latin American environment, and a more detailed appraisal of the real situation in Brazil. To do so it was essential to take into account the existing evaluation processes and experiences being applied in other Latin American countries, and it is this preliminary study that we show below. Its objective is to offer an approach to the current state of the evaluation processes in Latin American university libraries. We aim to show what



actions are being carried out, what indicators are available to libraries to measure the quality of their services and assess their performance, what is the librarians' view of an evaluation process, and to infer what difficulties they face in the use of management instruments. We did not try to find out the level of development of the Latin American libraries included in the survey, nor to establish a ranking of them.

Review of the Latin American literature on library evaluation

Library evaluation is a recurrent issue in many countries, especially in Anglo-Saxon ones, as shown regularly by the continuous reviews that have been published (i.e. Brophy, 2006; Powell, 2006; Matthews, 2007). This is not the case in Latin American countries, where the implementation of library evaluation is relatively new, although the theoretical and conceptual aspects have already attracted interest among library professionals. This was one of the conclusions reached at the Electronic Symposium on Evaluation and Quality in Libraries, which took place in 2002 in Argentina. This forum, with massive participation from Latin American professionals, presented a fairly complete picture of the progress and weaknesses in the Latin American scenario at the time. There were many interesting conceptual and practical contributions, such as those from N. Gómez and L. Herrera, M. Fushimi, A. Belofatto, T. Carsen, M.R. Lombardo, R. Monfassani, M.C. Ladrón de Guevara, N. Palomino, and P. M. Allende Sullivan.

The most outstanding issues from this event, relating to university libraries, are, in summary, as follows:

- Argentinean and Brazilian libraries are in very similar situations. To a higher or lower degree, this is also true for other Latin American countries.
- The universities' concern to have quality certified infrastructures for teaching and research purposes has had a favorable impact for libraries. These have been obliged to get ready for both internal and external evaluation processes.
- In some countries – like Brazil, for example – the general perception of the role of university libraries is worrying. They are considered just as another physical university facility instead of being presented as an academic-pedagogical resource. Their academic function is hardly stressed, and it is seldom equated with the teaching activities.
- With the sole exception of Chile there are no Latin American standards that can be taken into account to evaluate quality.
- Library functions are seen in universities as administrative tasks, unlinked to the teaching-learning process.
- Whenever evaluation processes have been carried out, the commissions in charge of them failed to include any library staff.

To these conclusions, we must add the experiences that one of the authors of this paper gathered while working at the Federal University of Bahia.

After many years of contact with libraries, we can say that the precarious situation of university library evaluation is due, to a large extent, to a series of circumstances:

- Lack of specific policies and plans to develop and control the management of staff, services, user studies, use of technologies, access to various sources of information, and collection development, among others.
- Lack of librarian participation in determining the budget for the operation and development of the libraries they manage.
- Many libraries are neglected, as shown by discontinued collections, lack of staff training, lack of appropriate budget and policies, deterioration of buildings, even poor cleaning of the premises.
- Structural, planning and management problems. This makes it difficult for libraries to successfully face any evaluation process, whether external or internal, as this process requires the systematic collection of data for the calculation of indicators.

At the moment, this situation is slowly improving, for two main and complementary reasons: the international trend towards quality control of universities and, consequently, the increasing demands on libraries after degree studies were evaluated in the 1990s.

The most recent Latin American literature on this issue shows that there is a growing concern among some library professionals as they consider library evaluation a necessity. This literature is plentiful, as there have been many proposals, but it is still limited to the theoretical-conceptual aspects with no specific practical applications. Some works have focused on trying to adapt the Anglo-Saxon and European models to Latin American libraries, but this task is not always easy. In the words of Fushimi (2002): "All [these works] are based on something that does not exist in our country or countries: the practice of regular, standardized statistics." The author refers specifically to standards such as ACRL/ALA's, REBIUN's (Red Española de Bibliotecas Universitarias), and even those of Chilean libraries – the latter having a system that represents a breakthrough when compared with the rest of South America.

The interest in this issue is also reflected in the evaluation systems proposed for some university libraries by their librarians. In Brazil, it is worth highlighting the theoretical work that was done concerning the measurement of the quality of university libraries (Vergueiro and Carvalho, 2000). At a practical level, Universidade Estadual de Campinas' evaluation system was implemented more than ten years ago and its results directly influence the planning (Martins, 2004). In Argentina, Fushimi (2002) tried to bring theory and practice together in a project that she has been developing since 1997 at the Humanities and Education Sciences Library, which is why the National University of La Plata has statistical forms and yearbooks which are generally used to carry out evaluation processes. The idea of improving the instruments used led to the publication of a standard statistical form (Fushimi *et al.*, 2005). Some institutions related to this profession have also taken some steps in this direction; for example, the Documentation Subcommittee of the Argentinean Institute for Standards (IRAM) presented Standard IRAM 32062 on performance indicators in libraries. Another example are Chilean universities, which, through the Council of Principals' Library and Documentation Advisory Board, were pioneers in this matter and published the first standards for university libraries in 1993, and amended in 2001. They were created with the explicit purpose of supporting the process of designing new university libraries and evaluating the existing ones. Although addressing those

standards required by Chilean libraries, they can be interpreted in accordance with the different contexts. Universities in Mexico, like in other countries, have studies and proposals for quality management and indicators, but these are just theoretical and have some limitations (Arellano, 1996; Sánchez Ambriz, 2004; Arriola Navarrete, 2003, 2006). In Portugal, a first project was carried out to evaluate the impact of the services at the University of Porto (Melo and Monteiro, 2001). Surveys were conducted among a sample of users based on the work of Poll and Boekhorst (1996), adopting the indicators proposed by these authors for the ISO 11620 (1998) standard, and by the European Commission. Later, this project was also applied at other Portuguese universities, which permitted benchmarking (Melo, 2007). Also, there are some Portuguese academic librarians and other specialists who have made proposals in the same direction (Cavaleiro *et al.*, 2007). Finally, it is worth noting the case of Peru, where the National University Libraries Committee have very recently presented a proposal for performance indicators for Peruvian libraries based on the ISO 11620 standard (Samamé, 2007).

Method

To gather information about the current state of the evaluation in the library systems of the Latin American Higher Education Institutions, we prepared and sent a questionnaire to a sample of 31 libraries in seven countries. We selected those countries and universities by taking into account two considerations:

- (1) cultural affinities with Brazil, as the final goal of the work was to adapt and improve the existing evaluation methods there;
- (2) the prominent position exercised by some of them as a function of variables such as their geographic span and their available economic resources.

We used two main sources in the selection of the universities: the Academic Ranking of World Universities (2006) – ARWU (Shanghai) and the Web Ranking of World Universities (CINDOC-CSIC, 2006). In addition, for Brazil we took into account the Higher Education Synopsis (INEP, 2004). Finally, the selection of universities and libraries was also affected by other factors, such as their known leading position in evaluation matters, the interest among managers to exchange ideas, previous experience in the subject, the university's sociopolitical and academic leadership, the library's social role in the territory where it is located, and the library's good reputation based on the quality of its performance. In the end the field work was limited to seven countries and thirty-one libraries, fourteen of which were in Brazil (see Table I).

Once we had selected the countries and academic institutions, we found out the web addresses of the directors or the most senior responsible for each library system located at the main library or head library of the system. This is the person who exercises the coordination functions of a university's library web or system.

In parallel to this selection process, we drafted the questionnaire and ran a pilot test with the Federal University of Bahía. We chose this particular library because of the theoretical and practical experience of its professional staff with university libraries since the 1980s. This test served to identify some necessary adjustments to the survey and to validate the model.

The questionnaire was made up of ten questions which aimed to discover whether they had any evaluation practices and, if so, for what purpose, how often, and how or

Country	Institution	
<i>Argentina</i>	1. University of Buenos Aires (UBA)	
	2. National University of la Plata (UNLP)	
	3. National University of Córdoba (UNC)	
<i>Brazil</i>		
	<i>Bahía</i>	1. Federal University of Bahia (UFBA)
		2. University of the State of Bahia (UNEB)
		3. State University of Feira de Santana (UEFS)
		4. State University of Santa Cruz (UESC)
		5. State University of the Southwest of Bahia (UESB)
		6. Salvador University (UNIFACS)
		7. Federal University of Ceará (UFC)
		8. Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE)
		9. Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG)
		10. Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ)
		11. University of the State of São Paulo (USP)
		12. State University of São Paulo Julio de Mesquita Filho (UNESP)
		13. State University of Campinas (UNICAMP)
14. 14 Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)		
<i>Chile</i>	1. University of Chile	
	2. Pontifical Catholic University of Chile (PUC-CL)	
	3. University of Santiago	
	4. University of Concepción	
<i>Colombia</i>	1. National University of Colombia	
	2. University of the Andes (UNIANDES)	
	3. University of Antioch (UDEA)	
<i>Mexico</i>	1. National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM)	
	2. The College of Mexico (COLMEX)	
	3. Autonomous University of Chihuahua (UACH)	
<i>Portugal</i>	1. University of Aveiro	
	2. University of Lisbon	
	3. University of Porto	
<i>Venezuela</i>	1. Central University of Venezuela (UCV)	

Table I.
List of Latin American
universities by country of
origin

by what system the data were collected (see Appendix). The critical part of the questionnaire tables a list of the indicators developed by REBIUN (the Spanish Network of University Libraries) and which are used widely throughout the Spanish university library community. We used this model because of Spain's leading position among South American countries and the ongoing exchange of experiences established between some of them. REBIUN has been collecting data since 1994, using an annual statistical questionnaire that is answered by most – approximately 70 – university libraries. This permits the calculation of consistent indicators which makes comparative study and the analysis of trends possible, which can then be taken into account in the strategic planning of the library network. We included REBIUN's indicators in the questionnaire in order to gather the senior management's opinion on how useful and applicable they would be toward running an in-depth evaluation of a library's service or activity. We disregarded some indicators because they were divorced from Latin American reality (for example, students per computer), and others were altered to adapt them to that reality.

The questionnaires were sent twice – in September and again in October 2006 – because of the initial low response rate. Even so, it was still necessary to send some questionnaires by ordinary post in January 2007 while others were delivered by hand by colleagues. After what we considered a reasonable time to answer (September 2006 to January 2007), six countries and 16 library systems had answered: Brazil, eight institutions; Argentina, two; Chile, one; Colombia, two; Mexico, two; and Venezuela, one. Sadly, none of the three Higher Education Institutions in Portugal responded to the questionnaire.

In March 2008, we once again contacted the officers responsible at the libraries who had answered the questionnaire, to find out whether there had been any updates or changes, but the situation had remained the same.

The state of evaluation in Latin American university libraries – results of the survey

The results and conclusion below follow the same order as the questions in the questionnaire. At the introduction of the questionnaire, we asked for the details of the responding library. It is worth commenting on the answers relating to the library's hierarchical position within its university. We wanted to have an idea of how much the library depends on the university and, therefore, how much authority it has. It is also related to how it is viewed by the governing bodies of the higher-education institution and to the role it plays in the university. To reflect this, there were two possible answers: Level 1 (Principal) or Level 2 (Deputy Principal, or similar). Of the 16 libraries, 7 (43.7 percent) were in level 1, i.e. they reported to the Principal, and 9 (56.2 percent) in level 2, reporting to a Deputy Principal or similar.

- (1) *Practices relative to the evaluation.* Answers were almost unanimously affirmative, with 14 libraries (87.5 percent) saying they carried out some evaluation practice, and just two (12.5 percent) saying they did not.
- (2) *Reasons for running an evaluation.* Of the 14 libraries that answered affirmatively, some said they had more than one motive or reason, hence the following results: ten (62.54 percent) do it on their own initiative; five (31.2 percent) because they are asked to do it by the coordinating body; five (31.2 percent) because of an institutional requirement; three (18.7 percent) at the request of the Ministry of Education or other official entity; and two (12.5 percent) for other reasons, such as providing data and information requested by official entities preparing yearbooks or similar publications.
- (3) *Frequency.* The answers given by the libraries about how often they run these exercises were as follows: three (18.7 percent) do it when they consider it necessary; four (25 percent) have no specific frequency; one (6.2 percent) every six months; nine (56.2 percent) annually; and one (6.2 percent) every three years. As with the second question, of the 14 libraries that do evaluate some carry them out in more than one period, which is why the totals are higher than the number of respondents.
- (4) *Data collection system.* This question aims to identify how automated the data collection systems are and whether they are manual or computerized. Of the 13 libraries that answered this question, eight (50 percent) use both manual and computerized systems, two (12.5 percent) use purely manual methods, while

three (18.7 percent) have fully computerized systems. Three libraries (18.7 percent) did not answer. Bearing in mind that these techniques are not mutually exclusive, the inference is that these libraries have a good level of computerization, but that there is some information that can only be collected manually, and that two libraries do not use computers at all. What we do not know, in the case of the libraries that use both methods, is what types of information are collected manually, i.e. whether some weakness in the system prevents automatic collection, or some other reason applies.

- (5) *Level of integration of the computerized system with that of the institution.* Since integration is operationally useful and technologically possible, with this question we sought to find out which libraries integrate their own functions or services with other university systems. Integrating the student registration system, for example, with the loan management system is not only a practical measure, but also desirable, as it improves the quality of the controls. Eight (50 percent) did, while five (31,2 percent) do not use integrated systems, even though they are available.
- (6) *Usefulness of REBIUN's indicators.* Question 6 asked their opinion about the relevance of REBIUN's 20 indicators to evaluating library performance. The questionnaire presented two options, either to consider their validity as a whole (yes or no) or to judging each indicator individually.
- Answers to this question were as follows: two did not consider *any* of the indicators valid; four considered them all valid; and ten marked each indicator individually. Table II shows the indicators by order of relevance, based on the replies.
- (7) *Proposal of other indicators.* Question 7 offered the opportunity to identify other indicators which they considered more appropriate. Of the 12 senior officers who considered none of the proposed indicators relevant, only five gave any

1.	Number of digitalized volumes over total volumes
	Loans per user
2.	Spending in electronic resources, over total spending
3.	Students per reading station
4.	Increase of monographs per user
	Users per library staff
	Technicians in relation to total staff
	Spending in monographs, over total spending
5.	Database consultations per researcher
	ILL: documents obtained per researcher
	ILL: items served per current paper journal
6.	Square meters built per user
	Visits per user
7.	Catalog consultations per user
8.	Web visits per user
9.	Spending in acquisitions, per user
10.	Current paper journals per researcher
	Spending in journals, per researcher
11.	Digitalized articles per researcher
12.	Scholarships in relation to total staff

Table II.
The 20 REBIUN
indicators listed by order
of relevance

comments. The low number of responses to this question probably means, in our opinion, that it was misunderstood. On the other hand, it is surprising that some librarians did not consider any of them valid when we know the data sets they are gathering and the instruments they have available. The following comments they did give us should be noted: “We do not have enough data or information to calculate these indicators”; “We would like to have indicators that can be used to measure user satisfaction and the impact of library services”; “We would prefer to have more indicators of generic costs”.

- (8) *Data collected to calculate the indicators.* Calculating any indicator requires systematic collection of a series of data over a period. In question 8, taking into account the data necessary to calculate the REBIUN indicators, we were asking whether these data sets were actually collected and, if so, how; or, if they were not currently collected, whether it was possible to do so. The answers to this question do not necessarily reflect that these indicators were adopted. In our opinion, many indicators are not used because they are too sophisticated to meet the needs of librarians in Latin American libraries, who consider other needs more pressing.

The results show that of the 45 suggested data sets, libraries collect, either manually or automatically, between ten and 45; only two libraries collect all 45, and they are followed by five libraries that collect 36, 35, 34, 27 and 20, respectively; then three that collect 18; one that collects 17; two that collect 16; and two that collect 14 and 10, respectively. Most say they could collect more. In general we considered that although many are collecting data that could be used to improve the management of the library, but do not seem to use it for any purpose at all.

- (9) *Aim of current evaluations.* In the final question we were attempted to discover whether or not the libraries prepare reports on the performance of their services and, if so, whether they do it manually or automatically, if they are published, and for what specific purposes they are used.

Regarding the aim of the evaluation – the last item of this question – some answers are clearly related to the function of the evaluation, but others are either inconsistent or not very convincing at all. The answers were all very different, and consequently we have thought it appropriate to go into the responses in greater detail:

- (1) Two libraries generate reports based on the collected data, and use them for self-evaluation and institutional accreditation, as well as to draft academic programs.
- (2) One states that it does not carry out evaluation; however, it does prepare a library performance report that it uses for budget planning and applications.
- (3) One prepares reports to promote the habit of reading, which, in our opinion at least, cannot be directly related to either the collected data nor to the management information that make up the reports.
- (4) Two do perform evaluations, but do not issue a report. Being aware of the real situation, we think this answer is incomplete, as we know that these two libraries are very concerned about management issues.
- (5) Two use the evaluation reports in relation to their users. One library use them for user training and for the collection conservation policies. The other uses them for user studies.

- (6) Four libraries publish reports to promote their services. The very succinct answer from one of them surprised us, as we know that the library system has studies drawn from a management system implemented in the 1990s, is a leader among its country's university libraries thanks to state-of-the-art studies and services it normally provides, and systematically publishes annual plans and reports.
- (7) One states that the report disseminates the work of its researchers, a fact that is apparently not relevant to this case.
- (8) Two use the evaluation to draft reports, prepare projects, and take decisions – measures that are compatible with the aim of the data and the reports.
- (9) One carries out an evaluation occasionally for diagnostic and problem-solving purposes. Therefore, it states that the data collected are for administrative control, as it seeks to evaluate administrative and operational tasks; i.e. it does not consider the whole of the library but rather individual processes.
- (10) One uses the report for management control.

We believe that when libraries have described “dissemination” as the purpose of the evaluation process, they are using the results solely to respond to the many questionnaires they receive. These demands for figures often come from official entities (government, or even international entities) that collect data and information for yearbooks and similar publications. In addition we must not forget that libraries traditionally collect data, even if they do not use them for any practical or useful application.

In summary, only four libraries produced consistent answers and a further one which already has a previously defined mission. The answers from the other merely suggest the repetition of a script.

With questions 8 and 9, we sought to find out the relationship between the traditional collection of data and the generation of reports for library management purposes. Of the 16 libraries, only six just partially fitted this criterion. Some variables may explain this situation:

- maybe the questions was not sufficiently precise, which would contribute to varying interpretations;
- the respondents did not comprehend the association between both questions; and
- those libraries traditionally collect the data, but in fact do not use them at all.

Conclusions

Although we feel the response rate of 52 percent is limited, with just 16 replies from the 31 sent out, the results still permit us to draw some conclusions about the state of the evaluation issue in Latin American libraries:

- From the response rate, we infer a possible lack of interest in this issue, taking into account that the letter accompanying the questionnaire stated as one of its aims as improving evaluations by reaching agreements across Latin America.
- The good organic situation of Latin American university libraries allows to think that they are seen as important by their institutions. However, most are neither

involved in the general planning of the university, and nor in budget forecasting either.

- Although most libraries evaluate some aspect of their services, the frequency of these actions does not appear to be very consistent. The fact that some library heads say that they perform them “when considered necessary” gives the impression that they are “crisis-triggered actions”. The activity does not seem very systematic, and not part of an action plan with established annual objectives, reflecting weaknesses in the planning and management system. With respect to the information collected, there is a lack of significant qualitative elements being measured.

On the other hand, the respondents did show concern and active occupation in this activity, and even more so if we take into account the work and cost involved in carrying out an evaluation process, and whether included in a wider process to evaluate management or to satisfy the specific interests of their university.

- Latin American libraries seem to have an acceptable level of computerization. However, some of them neither take advantage of nor make the most of it.
- The answers concerning the proposed indicators shows, in general, that they are currently impossible to apply. Most librarians consider them too sophisticated in the face of the more pressing needs of Latin American libraries. Also, it can be inferred that some REBIUN indicators – which in Spain are used to show the performance of university libraries – would be far away from reality in some Latin American countries.
- The librarians’ preferred order of the indicators in Table I can be associated with hidden wishes. Looking at the top three we conclude that they show a real concern in increasing their electronic resources, the use of the collection, and providing more reading stations for the students.
- Only a few libraries perform an evaluation to improve their management judging by the answers which focused on indicators, but although they regularly collect data they do not disseminate any figures (whether standards or indicators) that could be of interest to other libraries. This makes us think that they have created their own standards that are just enough for them to carry out internal comparative or benchmark studies, take decisions based on reality, and have information for planning in general, and for budget purposes in particular.
- With some exceptions, libraries do not have enough historical data sets to permit comparative studies. If they did, they could use such measurements of performance to establish a set of indicators and quality standards for Latin American university libraries.

We believe that conducting quality evaluation of library services is unavoidable nowadays. If Latin American libraries share a common reality, it is important that they set up appropriate forums to select the most useful data or variables to build a set of indicators appropriate to their unique situation. This will allow them, through a long-term analysis, to gain an overview their respective performance, and would also serve as the basis of regular benchmarking exercises. Only with such a system of

indicators and data sets gathered over time will a real picture of the evaluation in Latin American university libraries be revealed.

References

- Academic Ranking of World Universities (2006), Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Institute of Higher Education, available at: <http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/ranking2006.htm> (accessed 30 March 2007).
- Arellano, A. (1996), "Modelo de evaluación integral de las bibliotecas de educación superior en México" ("A model for the comprehensive evaluation of higher-education libraries in Mexico"), México.
- Arriola Navarrete, O. (2006), *Evaluación de bibliotecas: un modelo desde la óptica de los sistemas de gestión de calidad (Library Evaluation: A Model from the Perspective of Quality Management Systems)*, Alfagrama, Colegio de Bibliotecarios, Buenos Aires.
- Arriola Navarrete, O., Añorve Aguirre, A.C., Barragán Delgado, V.L. and Vázquez Santa Ana, M.G. (2003), *Biblioteca Francisco Orozco Muñoz: propuesta de gestión de calidad y evaluación, (Francisco Orozco Muñoz Library: A Quality Management and Evaluation Proposal)*, Escuela Nacional de Biblioteconomía y Archivonomía, México.
- Brophy, P. (2006), *Measuring Library Performance, Principles and Techniques*, Facet Publishing, London.
- Cavaleiro, J., Lourenço, M.A. and Cardoso, C. (2007), "Indicadores de desempenho em serviços de documentação, informação e arqutos: uma experiencia" ("Performance indicators in documentation, information and archiving services: an experience"), paper presented at 9th Congresso Nacional de Bibliotecários Arquivistas e Documentalistas – Bibliotecas e Arquivos: Informação para a Cidadania, o Desenvolvimento e a Inovação, Ponta Delgada, Universidade dos Açores, Portugal, available at: <http://badinfo.apbad.pt/Congresso9/COM95.pdf> (accessed 14 May 2008).
- Fushimi, M. (2002), "Normas y criterios para la evaluación de las bibliotecas universitarias: la experiencia de la biblioteca de la facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación de la Universidad de la Plata" ("Norms and criteria for university library evaluation: the experience of the library at the faculty of Humanities and Education Sciences, University of La Plata"), paper presented at Simposio electrónico evaluación y calidad en bibliotecas, Sociedad Argentina de Información, Buenos Aires.
- Fushimi, M., Mangiaterra, N. and Miguel, S. (2005), "Instructivo: formulario estadístico 2004" ("Instructions: statistics form 2004"), ROBLE Portal de Bibliotecas de la UNLP, La Plata, available at: www.roble.unlp.edu.ar (accessed 12 April 2008).
- INEP (2004), "Sinopse da Educação Superior" ("Higher-education synopsis"), Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (INEP).
- Lubisco, N.M.L. (2007), "La evaluación en la biblioteca universitaria brasileña: evolución y propuesta de mejora" ("The evaluation at Brazilian university libraries: evolution and an improvement proposal"), doctoral dissertation, Departamento de Biblioteconomía y Documentación, Universidad Carlos III, Madrid.
- Martins, V. (2004), "Sistemas de informação das bibliotecas da UNICAMP: identificação e avaliação dos principais indicadores para gestão estratégica" ("Information systems of UNICAMP libraries: identifying and evaluating the main indicators for strategic management"), dissertação, Mestrado em Engenharia Mecânica, Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
- Matthews, J.R. (2007), *The Evaluation and Measurement of Library Services*, Libraries Unlimited, Westport, CT.

-
- Melo, L.B. and Monteiro, M.I. (2001), "Projecto de avaliação dos serviços da biblioteca da Universidade Lusíada do Porto" ("Project to evaluate the Porto University library services"), *Páginas A&B*, Vol. 7, pp. 69-84.
- Melo, L.B. (2007), "Reconhecer Boas Práticas em Bibliotecas do Ensino Superior: projecto de avaliação do desempenho de serviços de documentação das Universidade do Porto, Lusíada – Famalição, Açores e Escola Superior de Enfermagem do Porto – S. Joao" ("Identifying good practices in higher-education libraries: a project to evaluate the performance of documentation services at the universities of Porto, Lusíada – Famalição, and Azores, and at Porto – S. Joao Higher Nursing School"), paper presented at 9th Congresso Nacional de Bibliotecários Arquivistas e Documentalistas – Bibliotecas e Arquivos: Informação para a Cidadania, o Desenvolvimento e a Inovação, Ponta Delgada, Universidade dos Açores, Portugal, available at: http://eprints.rclis.org/archive/00009364/01/Comunicacao_LBM_et_al_9CNBAD07.pdf (accessed 14 May 2008).
- Powell, R.R. (2006), "Evaluation research: an overview", *Library Trends*, Summer, pp. 102-20.
- Ranking Web de Universidades del Mundo (2006), "Ranking Web de Universidades del Mundo" ("Ranking webs of world universities"), CINDOC-CSIC, Laboratorio de Internet, Madrid, available at: www.internetlab.cindoc.csic.es (accessed 12 March 2007).
- Samamé, G.L. (2007), "Indicadores de desempenho para bibliotecas universitarias nacionales" ("Performance indicators for domestic university libraries"), *Proceedings III Jornadas Nacionales de Bibliotecas Universitarias, Arequipa, Peru*.
- Sánchez Ambriz, G. (2004), "Estrategias para desarrollar procesos de evaluación en el sistema bibliotecario de la UNAM" ("Strategies to develop evaluation processes in the UNAM library system"), Universidad de Murcia, Murcia.
- Poll, R. and Boekhorst, P. (1996), *Measuring Quality: Performance Measurement in Libraries*, K.G. Saur, Munich.
- Vergueiro, W. and Carvalho, T. (2000), *Quality in Brazilian Academic Libraries: Proposal of Indicators from the Customers' Point of View*, University of Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, available at: www.slis.ualberta.ca/cais2000/vergueiro.htm (accessed 26 February 2008).

Further reading

- Anuario de las bibliotecas universitarias y científicas españolas (2007), *Spanish University And Scientific Libraries Yearbook*, available at: www.rebiun.org/DOC/REBIUN.PDF (accessed 2 May 2008).
- ANUIES (2000), "Guía metodológica para evaluar las bibliotecas de las instituciones de educación superior de la región centro occidente de ANUIES" ("Methodological guide to evaluate the libraries of higher-education institutions in the western central region of ANUIES").
- Carvalho, M.C.R. (1995), *Estatísticas e padrões para o planejamento e a avaliação de bibliotecas universitárias (Statistics and Patterns for University Library Planning and Evaluation)*, SESu; CAPES; CNPq; FINEP, Brasília.
- Paiva Lopes, C. (2006), "Qualidade de serviço em bibliotecas universitarias: desenvolvimento e validação de um instrumento de avaliação" ("Service quality at university libraries: development and validation of an evaluation instrument"), Tese de Doutoramento, Universidad de Salamanca.
- Sociedad Argentina de Información (2007), "Simposio electrónico evaluación y calidad en bibliotecas" ("Electronic symposium of library evaluation and quality"), Sociedad Argentina de Información, Buenos Aires, available at: www.sai.ar (accessed 13 January 2007).

QUESTIONNAIRE – EVALUATION OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN LATIN AMERICA

LIBRARY IDENTIFICATION DETAILS

- 1) University name:

- 2) Name of the main library (head of system; coordinating function) or coordinating body:

- 3) Name of director or most senior officer:

- 4) Postal address:

- 5) Website:

- 6) Hierarchical position of the library in the university (relevant organization chart may be attached):

- 7) Structure of the system of libraries (relevant library organization chart may be attached):

QUESTIONS

- 1) Are library services evaluated in any way? Yes [] No [] . If negative, go to question 6.

- 2) If affirmative, the evaluation is done:
 - a) on the library's initiative [];
 - b) on the coordinating body's initiative, if it exists [];
 - c) following an institutional requirement [];
 - d) by the Ministry of Education or other official entity [] ; or
 - e) for some other reason [] ; if so, please specify:

- 3) How often is the evaluation performed (compiling and analyzing collected data)?
 - a) When considered necessary []
 - b) At no fixed intervals []
 - c) Every six months []
 - d) Every year []
 - e) Every two years []
 - f) Every three years []
 - g) Every five years []
 - i) At more than five-year intervals []

4) Data collection (or recording) is done:
manually []; computerized []; both ways []

5) If computerized, Can the library functions be integrated with the functions of the institution (for example: loan system with student registration system)? Yes [] No []

If affirmative, please specify:

6) Below are the 20 performance indicators to evaluate REBIUN's university libraries. Please say, in your opinion, whether they could serve to evaluate in depth a service or an activity carried out in your library.

6.1. All of them: Yes [] No []

6.2 Some indicators only. In this case, please say which ones:

No.	INDICATOR	YES	NO
1	Square meters built per user		
2	Students per reading station		
3	Increase of monographs per user		
4	Current paper journals per researcher ¹		
5	Number of digitalized volumes over total volumes		
6	Visits per user		
7	Loans per user		
8	Database consultations per researcher		
9	Digitalized articles per researcher		
10	Web visits per user		
11	Catalog consultations per user		
12	ILL ² :documents obtained per researcher		
13	ILL: items served per current paper journal		
14	Users per library staff		
15	Technicians in relation to total staff		
16	Spending in acquisitions, per user		
17	Spending in journals, per researcher		
18	Spending in monographs, over total spending		
19	Spending in electronic resources, over total spending		
20	Scholarships in relation to total staff		

7) If negative, please say which ones you would add:

(continued)

Figure A1.

8) To calculate the above indicators, the data shown in the table below are needed. Please say whether you collect such data and, if you do not, whether you could collect them, either manually (M) or in an automated way (A). As certain items are repeated to keep their correspondence with the indicator, you just need to answer an item the first time it appears in the list.

DATA NEEDED TO CALCULATE THE REBIUN INDICATORS	YES, I COLLECT THEM		I DO NOT COLLECT THEM	I COULD COLLECT THEM	
	M	A		M	A
a) Overall library surface area, in square meters					
b) Total number of potential users					
a) Total number of undergraduate students					
b) Total number of postgraduate students					
c) Number of seats (reading stations)					
a) Total acquired monographs					
b) Total number of potential users					
a) Current journals (total titles being received)					
b) Total number of researchers ³					
a) Total number of bibliographic registers in the OPAC					
b) Total number of monographs					
a) Entry registration (user control, frequency)					
b) Total number of potential users					
a) Number of loans					
b) Total number of actual users					
a) Number of database consultations					
b) Total number of researchers					
a) Number of electronic journal consultations					
b) Total number of researchers					
a) Number of web visits					
b) Total number of potential users					
a) Number of catalogue consultations					
b) Total number of users					
a) Number of requests (interlibrary loans)					
b) Total number of researchers					
a) Supply of items					
b) Total number of current paper journals					
a) Total number of actual users					
b) Total number of staff, by category (senior management ⁴ , technicians ⁵ , support ⁶ , scholarships)					

Figure A1.

(continued)

a) Number of senior managers					
b) Number of technicians					
c) Number of support staff					
d) Number of scholarships					
a) Spending in monographs					
b) Spending in journals					
c) Spending in databases					
d) Spending in other materials					
a) Spending in journals					
b) Total number of researchers					
a) Total spending in monographs					
b) Total spending in library holdings					
a) Total spending in electronic information					
b) Total spending in library holdings					
a) Total scholarships					
b) Total staff					

9) If your library generates some type of report on its services and performance, please answer as appropriate:

- Manual system for data collection
As per established model: Yes [] No []
- Computerized system
Automatically generated system: Yes [] No []
- Whether it is published, and how:
- Comment whether it is used for any purpose:

10) If the library system you manage already has an evaluation system (indicators, systematic data collection, and management reports), please attach the data collection templates and the last report (or the URLs where they can be found).

REMARKS/CLARIFICATIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

Notes: ¹Researchers = teachers and postgraduate students; ²ILL = interlibrary loan; ³Researchers = teachers + postgraduate students; ⁴Senior management = library directors, library and service managers; ⁵Technicians = librarians and other senior staff; ⁶Support staff = clerical staff

Figure A1.

Corresponding author

Ana Reyes Pacios can be contacted at: areyes@bib.uc3m.es

To purchase reprints of this article please e-mail: reprints@emeraldinsight.com
Or visit our web site for further details: www.emeraldinsight.com/reprints