

Evaluation Process of the Quality Assessment in the Catalan Universities

2001 Report

VOLUME II

© **Agència per a la Qualitat del Sistema Universitari a Catalunya**
Av. de la Catedral 6-8, 2a. planta
08002 BARCELONA

Dipòsit legal: B-9.762-2003

Crossed Report on the Evaluation of Library Services (LS) in Catalonia

December 2001

1. Presentation	5
2. The Library Services Evaluation Process	7
2.1. General Aspects	7
2.2. The Internal Evaluation Process	8
2.3. The External Evaluation Process	10
3. LS within the Institutional Context	11
3.1. The LS Plan within the Context of the Institution's Strategic Plan	11
3.2. Educational Planning and how it relates to LS	11
3.3. Research Planning and how it relates to LS	12
3.4. Relational Mechanisms between LS and Users	12
4. Processes and Communications	15
4.1. Library Services Organisation	15
4.2. Processes	16
4.3. Distance Services Offered	17
5. Resources	19
5.1. Staff	19
5.2. Facilities	20
5.2.1. Library Square Metres	20
5.2.2. Library seating	21
5.2.3. Library seating with Computers or Multimedia Equipment	21
5.3. Titles	22
5.4. Budget	23
6. Results	25
6.1. Efficacy of the Services Offered	25
6.1.1. <i>Introduction to the Concept of Efficacy</i>	25
6.1.2. <i>Entries</i>	25
6.1.3. <i>Loans</i>	26
6.1.4. <i>User Satisfaction</i>	26
6.1.5. <i>Acquisitions (Cost) per User</i>	27
6.2. <i>Efficiency of the Services Offered</i>	27
6.2.1. <i>Introduction to the Concept of Efficiency</i>	27
6.2.2. <i>Service by LS Staff</i>	28
6.2.3. <i>Cost of the Services Offered</i>	29
6.2.4. <i>Cost per Potential User</i>	30
6.2.5. <i>Cost per Library Seat</i>	31
6.2.6. <i>Cost Allocation as an Indicator of Budget Management</i>	31
6.2.7. <i>Final Comments on Costs</i>	32
7. Strengths, Weaknesses and Proposed Improvements	33
8. Beyond the Reports	35
8.1. From Education to Learning	35
8.2. Intensive Use of ICTs and Digital Information	35
8.3. Cooperation	36
9. Glossary	37
10. Appendices	41
10.1. Index of Abbreviations	41
10.2. Committee Members	43
10.3. Statistics and Basic Indicators	49

1. Presentation

As part of its 1998-1999 evaluation program, the Agency for the Quality of the University System in Catalonia, in collaboration with the Consortium of University Libraries in Catalonia (CBUC), conducted a crossed evaluation of the Library Services (LS) offered at public universities. The LS evaluated are shown on Table below.

The aim of this project was dual: first of all, to evaluate the library processes and the organizations supporting them and secondly, to assess the added value of libraries in terms of how they strengthen student learning and contribute to the betterment of research.

A committee was formed to define the evaluation methodology. The Committee was composed of quality experts from the universities and representatives from the library services themselves, the Consortium of University Libraries of Catalonia and the Agency. A subcommittee was also formed to prepare a *Library Services Evaluation Guide*¹, which would use as a reference for processes the guide used in the United Kingdom² which contains chapters focusing on the relationship between library services, education and research. The subcommittee also prepared a *Library Services External Evaluation Guide*, an evaluation tool³ to facilitate the External Committees job.

Library Services Evaluated

University	Internal Evaluation	External Evaluation	Final Reports Received
UB	March 1999 - February 2000	February 2000	June 2000
UAB	September 1999 - May 2000	June 2000	July 2001
UPC	March 1999 - September 1999	December 1999	July 2000
UPF	February 1999 - June 1999	November 1999	November 2000
UdG	March 1999 - September 1999	January 2000	November 2000
UdL	March 1999 - March 2000	July 2000	December 2001
URV	March 1999 - February 2000	March 2000	July 2001

The internal evaluation process commenced in March 1999 with a joint introductory and training session on the evaluation process for the members of the Internal Evaluation Committee (IEC). Approximately 150 members of the different committees attended.

1 Anglada, L; Arboix, E; Bravo, J; Rodríguez, S. (1998) *Guia d avaluació dels Serveis Bibliotecaris*. Barcelona: Agency for the Quality of the University System in Catalonia

2 *The effective academic library: a framework for evaluating the performance of UK libraries*. A consultative report to the HEFCE, SHEFC, HEFCW and DENI by the Joint Funding Councils ad-hoc Group on Performance Indicators for Libraries([Bristol: HEFCE], 1995)

3 Rodríguez, S. (1998) *Guia d avaluació externa dels Serveis Bibliotecaris. Eines per a l avaluació*. Barcelona: Agency for the Quality of the University System in Catalonia

The external evaluation process took place during the first half of 2000 with the participation of national and international experts. The External Committees were composed of LS academics and professionals as well as experts in evaluation methodologies.

This synthesised crossed report was written over the course of 2001 by a team composed of Agency and CBUC members in order to be made public in time for the publication of the Agency's Annual Report for 2001. The complementary data contained in part 2.2 of this report (internal evaluation process) was also gathered at this time. The analysis presented here is based on the internal and external evaluation reports and final reports.

A list of all of the people involved in the evaluation process is contained in the Appendix.

2. The Library Services Evaluation Process

2.1. General Aspects

A Joint Initiative

The evaluation of library services at Catalan universities is the result of a joint initiative of the Quality Agency and CBUC. The preparation of a *Library Services Evaluation Guide* (both internal and external) and other evaluation resources, as well as committee member training, were carried out jointly by technical personnel from both institutions.

Appropriateness of the Evaluation and Institutional Support

In general, considering that the decision to evaluate library services was made at the institutional level, the library service administrators considered that the time was right for the evaluation. Even so, the evaluations either took place at the same time or followed other library service evaluation processes (ISO certification, preliminary evaluations). As a result and as would be expected, the evaluation of the UAB's services was delayed and the evaluation of the UPC is limited to a single library, the Biblioteca Rector Gabriel Ferraté, which serves three schools: the Barcelona School of Telecommunications Engineering, the Barcelona School of Information Science and the Barcelona School of Civil Engineering. The UPC's library services were evaluated as part of the 1996-1997 programme.

Institutional Support for the Evaluation Process

The climate of institutional support for the evaluation process was very positive, with the involvement of the universities governing bodies. In some cases, however, a certain lack of involvement was observed on the part of some operations staff. The universities' technical evaluation units have been a good source of reference, particularly with regard to the most voluminous library services, which posed a challenge in terms of coordinating the efforts of the numerous evaluation subcommittees.

Definition of the Evaluation Unit

The comprehensiveness of university library services was the determining factor for considering the globality of the library services as the right frame of reference for the evaluation. This was true for all of the universities except two: the UPC, mentioned above, and the URV, where each library was evaluated individually, excluding its central services from the process.

Evaluation Instruments

In general, both the evaluation process and the technical tools developed to carry it out were well accepted. As for the *Library Services Evaluation Guide*, the excessive complexity of some parts of the guide may have hindered the work of the Internal Committees at the beginning of the process. In this regard, evaluators noted the need for committee members to receive more training prior to commencing the evaluation process, especially considering the different backgrounds of the members and that some are more familiar than others with the evaluation process.

2.2. The Internal Evaluation Process

Structure and Operation of the Internal Evaluation Committees (IEC)

Generally speaking, the composition of the IECs was in keeping with the instructions in the *Library Services Evaluation Guide*. All included representatives from the different university bodies although in some cases the participation of users, particularly students, was lower than would have been desired. In one case the External Committee was displeased that there were no high level representatives on the IEC (vice-chancellor's office/administration).

No dysfunctions were observed in IEC operations. However, most of the evaluation process revolved around the leadership of LS staffers and this may, on occasion, have resulted in the opinions of other members being suppressed. For example, in one case the External Evaluation Committee referred to the internal evaluation report as the work of a few.

Communication and Participation in the Process

Throughout the evaluation processes there were fluid communications between those involved in the process and dissemination of the self-evaluation reports among the community. However, merely complying with the formal mechanisms contained in the *Library Services Evaluation Guide* is not enough to guarantee participation in the process, especially if dissemination is limited to simply making the information available to the Community. This would explain the variation from one university to the next in terms of the effective participation of the different bodies involved, ranging from a low level of participation by some areas to very active collaboration by others. For example, LS staff members were much more involved than professors and students.

The Internal Evaluation Report

Overall, the structure of the different reports was in keeping with the guidelines contained in the *Library Services Evaluation Guide*. In three cases, the same External Committee took a very positive view of the quality of the structure and contents of the internal evaluation reports. Even so, in many reports the data were not explored thoroughly enough and others were limited by the fact that the data were based on the results of surveys in which the amplitude of the survey questions was limited.

The Data

The different evaluation processes provided a substantial collection of data. In this regard, the efforts of all involved are noteworthy. However, due to the newness of the process, one of the challenges for future evaluation processes will be to standardise both how the data are defined and what methodologies are used to obtain them. In some cases, the data obtained from surveys have been called into question by the External Committees with regard to questionnaire design, methodologies and response levels.

With regard to the indicators described in the *Library Services Evaluation Guide*, some IECs stated that they were not defined clearly enough, as a result of which they were open to different interpretations.

Inasmuch as there are different universities involved, the existence of data for an broad range of indicators is praiseworthy. However the analysis of the internal evaluation data as a whole revealed that:

- There is data missing for certain significant indicators at some universities.
- There are fluctuations in the data in some places that are difficult to explain. This could be due to the application of different criteria.

- Some library services have witnessed technological changes that have brought about significant changes in service compatibility at the international level (for example, databases which have gone from single-user CD-ROM to networked CD-ROM format or from locally networked CD-ROM to remote on-line consultation).
- The use of different criteria for allocating certain amounts to maintenance costs could explain the sharp differences between universities.

After a reflection and evaluation process regarding the data, the following decisions were taken to adjust the data contained in the report to the extent possible.

- Data were collected for the 1994-1995 academic year through the 1999-2000 academic year in order to obtain a more reliable and characteristic vision of library services.
- All of the data were reconsidered and subjected to revalidation, placing special emphasis on the indicators where the sharpest disparities were observed and asking the LS and the technical units of the different universities to fill in the gaps.
- A mean value of reference was obtained for the five-year period from 1995-1999 as a means of palliating the most notable fluctuations.

Thanks to these actions, it was possible to include an appendix to this report, which contains a set of indicators that are presented here for the purpose of considering whether it would be appropriate to include them in joint evaluations or informative actions of the LS in the future. The data prior to 1995 included in the report pertain to prior studies⁴. Finally, wherever possible values of reference external to Catalonia library services (national and international)⁵ have been included.

On this point, it is important to note that the directors of the evaluated libraries offered their full collaboration when it came to providing the data for the 1999-2000 academic year and completing and verifying the rest of the requested data.

Identification of LS Strengths and Weaknesses

Despite the fact that in some internal reports imbalances were observed in the synthesis and identification of LS strengths and weaknesses and the improvements derived therefrom, all in all these aspects were addressed in a clear, structured and comprehensive manner and included all of the elements evaluated.

In the UB's case, this section takes up 30 pages since it includes an analysis of the different areas of library services, something which was acclaimed by the External Committee and which supports the conclusions. In some cases, however, this section was not completed, often reiterating what had already been said in the explanation of the situation and occasionally pointing to very general improvements. Finally, there was one internal report which did not meet the structural or rigor requirements stipulated in the *Library Services Evaluation Guide*.

4 *Les biblioteques de les universitats públiques de Catalunya* (State-funded university libraries in Catalonia) (Bellaterra, UAB, 1993) pp. 19-38

5 C. Urbano i C. Rodríguez (1998). *Estadístiques i Indicadors biblioteques universitàries de la unió Europea i Espanya com marc de l'avaluació de les biblioteques universitàries de Catalunya* (Barcelona: CBUC, 2000)

2.3. The External Evaluation Process

External Evaluation Committees (EEC)

The composition of the EECs met the requirements of the *Library Services Evaluation Guide*. There are no objections to be raised regarding possible inadequacies. However, the External Committees had diverse opinions regarding the inclusion of a young professor from the institution as a member of the EEC.

The Evaluation Process. Visits.

Except in one case, the external evaluation process was carried out as planned. The EECs were pleased with how the process unfolded and with the assistance and collaboration offered by the IECs and the universities to enable them to carry out their mission. In two cases, the EECs referred specifically to the quality of the evaluation process as a whole.

The most pertinent observations in this regard referred to aspects such as:

- The lack of a final encounter between the two committees.
- The fact that some groups were not fully represented at some of the interviews, particularly students, as they had not been directly invited to participate or were unaware of the contents of the evaluation report in some cases.
- The fact that some types of information (partial library reports) were not available.

The External Evaluation Report Regarding the Internal Evaluation Process

Only in the case of the UPC, the EEC neither analysed nor evaluated the internal evaluation process. As far as the rest of the internal evaluation reports are concerned, the External Committees considered that, generally speaking, the analyses were exhaustive and thorough enough to enable them to validate the findings contained in the reports. Some EECs voiced their approval for the global evaluation process and the fact that it permitted them to contrast the evidence upon which the conclusions were based using the proposed methodology

3. Library Services within the Institutional Context

3.1. The LS Plan within the Context of the Institution s Strategic Plan

Overall, the support and receptiveness of the universities governing bodies to the suggestions and proposals of the library services are considered to be positive. However, the reports reveal the need to make progress in terms of formal relations and the dissemination of objectives at the heart of the university community and the scheduling of the activities designed to achieve them. In this regard, the evaluators recommended developing strategic plans and further specifying the actions, responsibilities and terms of the plans already in place. Along the same lines, the evaluation reports suggest simplifying the planning indicators and also encouraging the participation of library personnel in developing the action plans and programs as a way of contributing to the results being jointly monitored.

The Committees also indicated the need to strengthen the role of the library committees as a forum for debate and cooperation between library services and the university community in general and at the level of each individual university in particular. They also saw room for improvement in the coordination between information and library services in order to integrate their activities, promote the virtual campus and take advantage of the economies of scale in activities designed to provide access to the available information resources.

Finally, with regard to strategic plans the evaluators noted the positive attitude of management personnel and library services personnel regarding the design of action plans and the taking of actions geared toward improving the service. However, library personnel have very little knowledge of general planning, program monitoring and results. Perhaps the most relevant aspect in this regard is the absence in some universities of any form of strategic plan for the medium term. Finally, while all universities had defined objectives, they need to be more clearly specified and evaluated.

3.2. Educational Planning and How it Relates to LS

Obviously, this is a very important aspect, since contributing to the improvement of education is one of the basic goals of library services. To a certain extent, it can be said that all of the ongoing efforts to perfect library services are geared toward enriching an instrument at the service of this goal.

In modern universities, libraries have gone from being a support service for education and research to a driving force behind renovation in both areas. Thus, library services contribute to the development of an educational model based on professors teaching in a system which provides the education and the preparation needed for lifelong learning. From this perspective, it is essential that students use the library as an instrument to learn how to learn, by selecting and consulting different sources of information and using class notes less. An essential element in this regard is the analysis of the teaching methodologies used by the professors of different subjects. While this is obviously an aspect that falls outside of the scope of library services, it makes sense to refer to it in a chapter devoted to educational planning and its relationship to library services. The evaluation reports contain specific observations on this subject, some of which are reproduced below:

The relationship between library services and educational planning responds to a traditional concept of the university. The library has become a platform for the convergence of new educational models. As mentioned in the interview, the perception currently held by some students is that they can complete their university studies without ever using the library . (Report of the EEC. UAB)

It is interesting to note that a significant number of professors and students consider that it is possible for a student to obtain a university degree without ever using the library. In some cases, the only teaching models used are based on class notes and photocopies. As a result, students are not taking full advantage of the library as a source of learning. (Report of the IEC and EEC. UdG)

It was seen to be possible for some students to make relatively little or no use of the library without this actually having a negative effect on their obtaining an academic degree, and that the rector and the library administrators are determined to change this situation . (External Report on the UdL)

In this regard, most of the reports considered the deficient communications between library personnel and faculty members to be a weakness. As a consequence, one of the proposals for improvement contained in the reports focused on the need to strengthen such communications and to formalise them in order to promote the use of library services by students.

All of the universities evaluated indicated that the bibliographic titles recommended by professors are purchased and all agreed that library services should be informed of the recommended titles with more advance notice than is currently given.

One of the positive aspects noted in the reports is the effort of library services to provide information to users through a wide variety of initiatives such as the preparation of electronic dossiers, the promotion of web sites, recommended bibliography services and the gradual implementation of subject librarians.

With regard to user training, there are training plans in place at all universities. In some cases they are offered in classrooms inside the libraries themselves and students earn one credit by attending them. In this regard, the reports point to the need to strengthen the relationship between library services and faculty members in order to train students of the few first years on how to use the library and electronic resources.

Finally, the reports suggested that the department heads of the different degree programs should participate actively as members of library committees.

3.3. Research Planning and How it Relates to LS

One of the strengths noted in numerous reports is how the libraries are organized to support research activities. The evaluators took a positive view of the existence of digital services and services to obtain articles available to researchers as well as the growing use of databases.

While the committees considered that the relations between researchers and library services were good, they also agreed that communication was limited and that it should be formalized.

With regard to financing, the reports mention the contribution of the research funding to increase the libraries information resources, even though most of the universities evaluated have problems meeting the expense of annual increases in the price of journal subscriptions. With regard to resources, the evaluators highlighted the need to make progress on specifying research budget items more clearly.

In addition to improving communications between the library and researchers, the Committees also recommended preparing specific information plans and formalising the relations with research groups and institutes and with the Office of Technological Transfer and Research.

As far as services are concerned, the evaluators recommended promoting the figure of the subject librarian and taking steps to train library staff to assume these functions.

3.4. Relational Mechanisms between LS and Users

The evaluators noted the existence of library committees and the opportunities they provide for communication. However, they also noted low attendance levels at committee meetings by some groups, particularly students, and a lack of involvement in the issues concerning the committees.

On the other hand, the Committees took a positive view of the communication possibilities using technological means and the acceptance of the services web pages, despite the difficulties of making users aware of the libraries potential.

Another strength noted in all cases was the personalized attention to students, as evidenced by the results of the user satisfaction surveys.

The reports suggested a wide variety of initiatives including reinforcing communications with students, improving library committee operations, and clarifying the rules governing their competencies. With regard to training, the reports pointed out the need to intensify the information provided by teaching staff as a means of reaching all students, the participation of library personnel in the orientation sessions for new students and using the website as a self-learning tool.

From a more global point of view, it was considered necessary to approve the Charter of Users Rights and Responsibilities and, within this framework, to conduct user satisfaction surveys periodically and relate the dissemination of survey results to information on the annual objectives set for the library services.

4. Processes and Communication

4.1. Library Services Organisation

The reports noted four strengths common to all of the university library services evaluated: the unitary organisation of each individual service, coordination mechanisms, the autonomy of the different service points and library usage.

One of the traits that differentiates Spanish and Catalan universities from Anglo-Saxon universities and which is often used as a point of reference is their territorial dispersion. With few exceptions, the different schools and faculties of Spanish universities are usually located on separate campuses, often at a considerable distance from one another. This circumstance has ruled out the possibility of general libraries that serve the entire university community, or at least most of it. Consequently, the library services of Spanish universities are organized around different points of service.

This organisational model does not present a serious problem if there is a unitary service criterion whereby the same rights and responsibilities apply to the entire university community on all campuses and in all of the different libraries. This, however, is easier said than done, but the reality of the libraries evaluated shows that it is possible to offer library services which, despite physical distances, can be organised as a single service. This is not easily done in the Spanish university system, where the services are either centralised or decentralised, hence the difficulty of combining a unified service criterion with the decentralised rendering of the service. The reports show that Catalan university libraries are well organised and that, despite the inherent complexities, the organisation charts and operating systems are known.

Within this context, universities are not, at first glance, easy to run. Universities have organised their library systems in such a way that, while all part of the same university library, the services are actually rendered by different centres and, increasingly, by specific libraries for each campus or area. Hence, the university with the most points of service (UB) has sixteen different libraries while that with the fewest (UPF) has only five points of service.

It would obviously not be possible for this model to work without internal coordination and information mechanisms and policies. In this regard, it should be noted that at the universities evaluated there are numerous work groups of different types and the internal communication between them is good. Many library services have Intranets to organise and disseminate internal information more quickly and less rigidly than would otherwise be the case.

The situation of library services at Spanish and Catalan libraries prior to the LRU was one of complete fragmentation. With the implementation of reforms, library services underwent a necessary phase of process centralisation, which is now complete. Thus, the normal operation of a university's library services nowadays is based on homogeneous services (equal rights and responsibilities for all users, regardless of where they use the services) combined with a high level of autonomy of each library in order to adapt the service to users' specific needs. For example, at the universities with active library committees, there is no general committee plus specific ones for centres, campuses and areas. Thus, the fact that the different libraries make up a unified whole does not prevent each one of them from having a high level of autonomy to carry out its own functions and activities.

The reports also mentioned the degree to which the library services are geared toward satisfying users' needs. The results of the different satisfaction surveys and interviews with library personnel were most emphatic on this point. In recent years, libraries have placed a great deal of emphasis on automating internal operations and preparing the centralised processes referred to above. This phenomenon coincided with what was happening internationally. It can therefore be said that Catalan university libraries have been capable of overcoming the historical phase of internal organisation and have listened and responded to the needs expressed by users in an effort to satisfy them.

The reports also noted similarities in two weaknesses, which were more or less common to all of the libraries evaluated. The first refers to the universities' lack of flexibility in the organisation of their personnel and the lack of incentives. The second (noted in the reports on the UAB, UPC and URV in particular) refers to the lack of coordination between computer services and library services.

The first of these is attributable to the generic form and structure of the civil service employment system in general and of university administrative and service personnel (ASP) in particular. The different analyses of university administration often mention the need to professionalise this aspect. This is particularly true in areas such as library services where the administrative and service personnel have solid educational backgrounds and a high degree of vocational motivation. In these cases, organisational rigidity inhibits mechanisms for improvement and for the assumption of higher levels of responsibility.

The second area identified as a weakness, the lack of coordination between computer and library services, has serious general consequences. Despite the hackneyed image that associates libraries with antiquated working mechanisms, the fact is that library services have been forerunners in the use of diverse technological advances to improve their management since the nineteenth century. Libraries were among the first to use typewriters (late nineteenth century), microfilm (first half of the twentieth century) and computers (starting in the fifties). At this time, the intensive and innovative use of information technology (IT) by libraries, at the international level and in Catalonia, is an undeniable fact. Many library services rely heavily on IT. Despite this, library staffs do not usually include any computer specialists and many technological developments are applied by the regular library staff.

In countries at the forefront of library innovation (especially the UK and USA) the phenomenon known as the convergence of libraries, computer services and language labs is making itself felt. This phenomenon consists of unifying these services from an organisational standpoint. This tendency illustrates the need to work together with an intensity that does not exist in Catalonia. The situation seems to be just the opposite, since several reports indicate that the developments and improvements to library services are based on a technological component which cannot be implemented because of the deficient coordination between library and computer services.

4.2. Processes

With regard to processes, one of the strengths noted in numerous reports referred to the fact that all of the library services evaluated have principal processes which are identified, described and standardised and, for the most part, accessible to all library personnel through intranets. On the other hand, the principal weaknesses included deficient definitions of some processes, unclear definitions of management indicators and quality management tools. It should be noted, however, that with regard to the last of these, the evaluation process has served to create or improve such tools.

Process standardisation is one of the methods most commonly used to improve quality in private as well as public concerns. In the case of libraries, this is a particularly important aspect for two interrelated reasons. First of all, because library processes are particularly numerous and complex and secondly because these processes are carried out by numerous staff members working in different sections and at different times. Although it may appear that basic library services are relatively few and routine, the reality is that libraries also offer a wide spectrum of additional services, some of which (cataloguing, for example) are subject to specific regulations. Furthermore, almost all of the processes are decentralised and as such are carried out at the different points of service between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and sometimes on holidays and during evening hours. Behind the 1,737,696 loan transactions in the year 2000 lies a complex process that includes the management of different rights depending on the type of user, deposits, claims, renewals, losses, etc.

The fact that the reports concurred in affirming that the principal processes are identified, documented and available to library personnel is a clear sign of the good health of library services. The fact that the UAB library obtained ISO 9002 certification in 2000 is a clear example of this.

The existence of the Catalán University Collective Catalogue (CUCC) has a positive impact on the cataloguing process. Cataloguing activities have traditionally consumed many library resources. Internationally, this process has been improved by creating collective catalogues, which enable the card catalogue created by one institution to be used by many others. If collective catalogues did not exist, cataloguing processes would be much more costly. The use of the CUCC by the universities evaluated allows them to catalogue by copying three of every four new documents entering the library. This percentage is comparable to that of libraries in countries such as the United Kingdom and Holland.

There were differences of opinion with regard to process weaknesses. The fact that the reports noted that certain processes lacked clear definition must be considered normal within this context, since there are few of them and they are complex. It is also true that many processes are constantly being changed to adapt them to new needs and, in particular, to new technological possibilities. In this sense, a certain lack of definition can be considered almost inevitable.

The same can be said of the observations pointing to a generalized lack of clearly defined management indicators. While evaluations are not entirely new they only started to be conducted on public university libraries in Catalonia recently. In the early nineties, not even the most basic management data were available. One of the primary organizational tasks of the different library services has been to obtain reliable statistical data. It should be remembered that the first statistical yearbook was published in Spain in 1994. Catalan libraries began to keep track of their statistics during a period of change in which, internationally, libraries went from keeping track of input indicators (square metres, volumes, budgets, etc.)

to include output indicators (loans, entries, consultations, etc.). If, in addition to this, one considers that the decade of the nineties brought about great technological change (Internet, remote use of libraries, on-line access), it can be said that quality management using tools based on management indicators is still in the incipient stage.

Despite all of this, efforts to quantify and unify evaluation processes should serve as the basis for improving the tools that currently exist. In this regard it would be advisable, if only at the Catalan level, to determine not only the basic indicators but a unified method for measuring them. As a proposal for improvement, then, the evaluators recommend that work commence immediately on standardising data and indicators.

4.3. Distance Services Offered

One of the traits which differentiates the library services offered only fifteen years ago and those offered today is the possibility of offering distance services to users. Libraries, whose services were traditionally offered within their walls are now able to offer the same services outside of their own walls. This change has added flexibility to existing library services and the possibility of offering new ones.

One of the strengths mentioned in the different reports is that all of the units evaluated offer a wide variety of distance services and that they use the available technological instruments intensively (card catalogue and database consultations, telephone, e-mail, website and intranet services, etc.). Right now in Catalonia it is perfectly possible (although not necessarily recommendable) to use a number of different library services intensively without actually going to the library. We observe that this circumstance has not reduced the number of people entering libraries (in Spain or abroad). The increase in remote access to library services has highlighted the value of libraries as spaces for study, socialisation and discovery.

The second element noted in the reports as a common strength is that at the libraries evaluated, unlike the rest of Spanish University Libraries, the entire list of bibliographic titles is completely automated. This is particularly noteworthy since the complete automation of a library's bibliographic titles means, first of all, that there is more control and, secondly, that the titles can be consulted remotely and that usage will increase. Automated card catalogues multiply the possibilities of locating a specific document and thus favour the use of the information. The existence of the Catalan University Collective Catalogue (CUCC), a unique experience in southern Europe, contributes to the dissemination of bibliographic collections and, again, to the use of the materials. Finally, fully automated catalogues facilitate the internal work of libraries enormously, since the card catalogue is an instrument on which other activities that consume enormous amounts of human resources depend such as loans, acquisitions and the control of journal subscription arrivals.

When the *Library Services Evaluation Guide* was written (1998), there were no provisions made for the use of the Catalonia Digital Library, a joint service of public university libraries, the UOC and the Catalonia Library which provides remote access to various databases and electronic journals. Even so, its existence is worth noting, along with the fact that the services it provides have multiplied by two and three times in the cases of some universities the number of journals they are able to offer. It has also enabled them to acquire high quality databases at prices that would be hard to find on an individual basis.

The UB is a pioneer in Spain in the use of electronic dossiers (implemented in 1999). Electronic dossiers are among the new services made possible by information technology which are having the greatest impact. This service offers the possibility of consulting course syllabuses and bibliographies on line, in addition to all kinds of digitalised educational materials. The UB dossiers link the recommended bibliography to the library's card catalogue and include not only text but audiovisual materials as well. The URV's library is involved in database maintenance.

The university libraries evaluated have taken great pains to provide information on their web pages. It should come as no surprise, then, that one of the weaknesses noted in the reports refers to the difficulty, in terms of the efforts and resources involved, of keeping these web pages updated. This is a generalised phenomenon all over the world. So far, there is no indication as to where the solution might be found. Electronic resources are still relatively new and there are no standard quality assessment criteria. On the other hand, electronic resources are highly volatile tools that appear, disappear and change frequently. However, these obstacles should not prevent Catalan University Libraries from moving forward in their effort to provide information in a selective and organised manner on their web pages.

Another weakness noted in the reports referred to problems accessing certain pay-per-use resources electronically (primarily databases) from any part of the network or from outside the university. The use of these services, available

remotely since the eighties subject to the payment of a fee, became more popular once available for free in CD-ROM format. Local CD servers were added to the network and some are currently accessible on line. There are different types of problems involved, ranging from technological to security issues, with no solution in sight at the international level. It should be said, however, that during the period when the evaluation was being conducted (1999-2001), there was a progressive move toward replacing the electronic information services provided by the university's network to remote access controlled by IP addresses. This evolution has minimised the access problems noted in the reports. The access to electronic information services contracted by the libraries (either individually or as a group through the Catalonia Digital Library) it is possible to connect to the university's network from any point inside the university and, in most cases, from off campus using each university's proxy service.

5. Resources

5.1. Personnel

According to the reports, the strengths common to all of library service personnel are: their educational backgrounds, a good working environment, a training and motivation policy.

The reports unanimously agreed that library staff is competent, well educated, motivated and service-oriented. They also point out, on a very positive note, the multi-facetedness and multi-functionality of library services personnel. The fact that all of the reports coincide on this point should not lead one to believe that such results are easily achieved by library personnel or without merit. From a management point of view, the professional literature points out that a common weakness in libraries is an excessive emphasis by personnel on technical aspects. The verification in the reports of the service orientation of library services personnel in Catalan universities is an indicator of their adaptation to change.

The reports also note that the working environment is good, probably due to the participation of LS personnel in the decision-making process, the existence of internal communication mechanisms and the emphasis placed on teamwork and collaboration. Once again, it should be noted that such participatory mechanisms and teamwork are not especially easy to implement in decentralised service environments such as the libraries in question. It should also be noted that all of the university's libraries working together as a single service is a recent tradition in Catalonia. The results of the universities' efforts, which have been particularly intense in recent years, have not gone unnoticed by external evaluators.

In all cases, there are active policies to promote training and to facilitate attendance at conferences and other continuing education activities. These are composed of the activities of each university by their own administration and service personnel in addition to the specific training plans designed for library personnel. It should be noted that university libraries also have joint training plans channelled through training directors and the CBUC, to organise courses with a high level of specialization that probably could not be organised by one university individually. This joint training program not only complements each university's own program but also creates a dynamic of teamwork among the different universities.

Another strength pointed out in the reports refers to the fact that many universities conduct satisfaction surveys of their personnel. This is an innovative measure which has shown library personnel to be very satisfied with, knowledgeable of and identified with the library's objectives.

The first weakness detected, and one which is generalized according to the reports, is the need to adapt human resources to the progressive expansion of library services. While the increased productivity of recent years is viewed as a positive aspect, it was also observed that this has been a time of great expansion for ICTs in libraries and the creation of new services (distance services, electronic dossiers, user training, etc.). In some cases, the service could collapse if staff levels are not increased. Moreover, evaluators detected a generalised need for more computer support, a logical conclusion given the intensive use of ICTs by libraries internally and as part of the services they provide.

Despite the active training policy mentioned above, the reports give one the feeling that there is still a shortage of specific and intensive training to bring personnel up to date on new developments and the use of information technologies. This sensation carries over to the impact on the ICT in the work of library personnel and the configuration of the services they offer.

The reports detected some discontent on the part of library personnel as a result of the fact that they consider their work not to be highly valued by the rest of the university. Another weakness noted in the reports is a certain lack of enthusiasm due to the lack of promotional opportunities. Different international studies show that this sensation is common to many countries. On this point, the people in grade levels C and D merit special attention, since this is where the most training deficiencies and difficulties in participating in the decision-making process were observed. This makes it difficult to find the right fit between personnel with very specific technical training and personnel with more general or administrative training. In some cases there is a certain imbalance between A and B grade level personnel compared to C and D personnel, as well as an excess number of student scholarship holders in charge of functions that should be handled by library personnel. It is a generalized fact that libraries have certain shifts when there are only scholarship holders working, a dysfunction which should be corrected immediately. Every effort should be made to prevent a situation in which, due to internal imbalances, the services rendered to users are rendered by unqualified personnel.

Finally, some reports noted the appearance of the emerging figure of the subject librarian (UB, UPC and UPF). The subject librarian is new to Catalan libraries and the appearance of this concept indicates the organisational maturity of these libraries, since the existence of such librarians is only possible in services with high levels of internal productivity which permit them to shift resources to public service tasks. This figure, then, created based on an analysis of the best university library models, shows a high level of developmental and organisational modernity.

5.2. Facilities

5.2.1. Library Square Metres

The amount of space allocated by a university to its library has traditionally been considered one of the most significant indicators. While library space is certainly not equivalent to quality library services, a lack of space hinders quality. The Catalan situation in the early eighties was particularly deficient in terms of the space allocated to libraries. For example, there was not a single library that occupied its own building (whereas the first library of this kind existed in the USA by the end of the nineteenth century). The latter half of the eighties and particularly the nineties was a time when many new libraries were built. In many cases, the new buildings were able to house separate libraries on a single campus or area. This wave of new construction had already taken place in other countries in the sixties and seventies.

The introduction of ICTs to universities and libraries did not cause their space needs to decrease. Internationally, in the eighties it was considered that libraries would not be able to be enlarged indefinitely as their lists of titles grew longer, putting a stop to the construction of new buildings. In the nineties, the development of higher education coupled with the intensive use of ICTs, led to a situation around the world in which universities were again faced with the need once to expand, either as locations on the university campus to use the ICTs or by incorporating the self-learning of new technologies into the functions of traditional libraries. For example, as a result of the findings of the Follett Report⁶ numerous libraries in the United Kingdom were enlarged in the nineties.

The net growth of square metres allocated to libraries at public universities in Catalonia for the period 1995 to 2000 was 36,470 m². This is equivalent to an increase of 51.7%. Another piece of information to bear in mind is that in 1992 there were 55,973 square metres of library space and that by 2000 there were 107,067. To assign a value to this indicator, one must consider the square metres per user. This indicator, which had a very low value in 1992 (0.34 m²/student) improved gradually to the point where it was 0.38 in 1995 and 0.57 in 2000. The growth index of this indicator between 1995 and 2000 is almost the same as the net growth of square metres (50% compared to 51.7%). This must be viewed negatively since while Catalan universities have augmented their equipment, the number of users has likewise increased, which means that the growth was absorbed by increased demand.

Some years ago, library norms recommended indices of 1 m² for every one or more users. The context at the time was that of a library based on printed collections. The new situation calls for libraries to be places for socialisation, group work, self-learning and intensive ICT use. As a result of these requirements, libraries actually require more square metres per user than what they have available at this time, particularly when one considers the tendency to convert libraries into resources centres for self-learning.

A detailed analysis of the situation shows that no Catalan university meets the requirement mentioned above of 1 square metre per user. There are three universities above the average for Catalonia which is 0.57 m² per user. Indices falling within the range of 0.40 and 0.50 m² per user are considered low, although these numbers are found at universities with more or less important spurts of growth during the period from 1995-2000. The UdG's low index (0.27 m² per user) will be improved with the construction of new libraries for this university that is currently underway.

Spain, France and Italy have lower library space values than Catalonia. On the other hand, the figures are higher in northern European countries. For the future, it is important to note that the introduction of ICTs into university life and the recognition of the strategic role played by libraries in fostering learning and promoting research is leading to a redefinition and expansion of the library concept to refer to a resource centre serving the university.

⁶ <<http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/services/papers/follett/report>>

5.2.2. Library seating

As with the previous indicator, the number of library seats at a university library is significant because it is a sign of the potential of library services. Traditionally, the minimum ratio has been considered to be one seat for every ten students (0.1 m² of library space for each enrolled student), although the most advanced library systems have sought a ratio of 1 to 5 (0.2 m² per student).

Between 1995 and 2000, 4,357 new library seats were created. This represents an increase of 31.7%. If one considers the new additions since 1994, the increase is 40%. We observe that the increase in library seats is lower than the increase in square metres (51.7% between 1995 and 2000). This difference indicates that while universities are building new library space, the quality of the space is being improved at the same time. The libraries of Catalan universities, traditionally short on space, have managed to fit inside their walls more library seats than recommended by international standards and have attempted to ensure that the increased space goes hand in hand with increased quality. The improvements, however, have been less spectacular than one would assume from volume of new space. The 12,678 library seats in 1992 or the 13,727 in 1995 did not offer much more space per reading space than the 18,084 added in 2000. The observations regarding the seating capacities of university libraries are the same as those mentioned in the previous section.

The library seats per user have grown by 42.8%. When the increased number of students is factored in, the average has gone from 0.07 places per user in 1994 to 0.10 places per user in 2000. This average is the minimum recommended by Spanish legislation applicable to private universities (0.1). As far as the individual universities are concerned, only the UPF is situated near the recommended 2.0 and that the UdG, unto the construction work in process is completed, has an index which is considerably lower than the average for Catalonia.

Finally, although on this point it should be noted that efforts have been made to improve, some libraries are still not adequately equipped to accommodate people with physical disabilities and that noise is one of the main impediments to comfort noted by the users themselves.

5.2.3. Library seating with Computers and Multimedia Equipment

Although libraries have always had many materials that require tools for consultation (discs, microfilm, videos, etc.), the appearance of new forms of access to information through computerised networks has multiplied the need for special equipment at many of the library's seats (PCs connected to computer networks). In this sense, the ratio of spaces equipped with computers or multimedia compared to the total would, to a certain extent, indicate the degree to which libraries are ICT adapted.

Computerised or multimedia seats increased from 717 in 1995 to a very respectable 1,853 in 2000. This is equivalent to an increase of 158% in recent years. Similar growth rates were observed in all of the universities evaluated.

The ratio of computerised or multimedia seats with respect to the total, despite being 1 to 10, must nonetheless be considered low at a time when access to computer networks should tend to be a service offered on a more widespread basis at all library seats. The ratios between computerised or multimedia library seats and total library seats at each individual library evaluated were very similar.

The first strength worthy of note is the effort to enlarge and improve the existing facilities. The universities investment plans have allocated considerable sums to improve and modernise library equipment. Some libraries have very new equipment (the UAB's Humanities Library, the UPC's Rector Gabriel Ferraté Library, the UPF's Edifici de les Aigües Library, the UdL's Agronomy Library and the URV's Law Library) and that other library construction projects are currently underway (the UdG's Montilivi Campus Library and the UdL's Center of Cultures Library).

The reports also mention the technological resources at all libraries (photocopiers, microfiche readers, audio-visual and computer equipment, etc.) and the degree to which they are used.

The reports also took a positive view of recently implemented policies to concentrate library services in campus or subject libraries. While the period analysed was one of university expansion and consolidation, in the year 2000 there

were 64 libraries or points of service while in 1995 there were 70. The reduction of points of service is the result of policy of resource rationalisation which is easier to proclaim than to actually implement.

The first weakness noted in the reports refers to the lack of international standards for university libraries with regard to computerised library seats. This is an aspect which merits special attention, due to the heavy investment involved and also to the difficulty of finding space in new libraries or enlarging the libraries on city campuses.

The reports also noted the difficulty of staying up to date with computer equipment, despite the fact that increasing amounts of computer equipment are being made available to users. It should be remembered that libraries services are increasingly based on the use of computer equipment and that within 4 or 5 years the equipment becomes obsolete and must be replaced. For example, the gradual replacement of journals in hard copy format with their equivalent in electronic format involves a considerable investment in electronic information equipment at Library seats. The same is true of electronic dossiers.

5.3. Titles

Under the heading of bibliographic collections, one of the strengths is the efforts made to rationalise bibliographic titles (mechanisms for controlling duplication and attempts to purchase recommended bibliographies), as well as the existence of quality plans to cut down on the time between when a book is requested and when it is obtained by the library.

Under this heading the indicators of Catalan libraries reflect what has come to be known internationally as the journal crisis. Despite the fact that budgets for the acquisition of titles increased by 60% between 1995 and 2000, the increase was distributed unevenly with 22% going to monographs (particularly books) and 72% to journals. This inequality is not as much a reflection of active purchasing policies which favour books over journals as it is a result of annual increases in subscription costs that well exceed cost of living increases. As a result of inflation (much higher for journals than for books, the increase in the cost of new monograph purchases was negative (-0.3%) for the period from 1995 to 2000. The overriding weakness, then, refers to the fact that even when libraries allocate significant budget amounts to acquisitions, the budget imbalances caused by constantly rising journal costs remain. This leads to a progressive decline in the budget items allocated to book purchases and in turn to a decline in the quality of the library services offered. For universities whose spending levels are below average, the impossibility of having bibliographic collections that meet users' needs is evident.

Libraries around the world are attempting to palliate this phenomenon by establishing cooperation policies to build up their bibliographic collections. The Catalonia Digital Library (founded in 1999 and therefore in the initial stages throughout most of the evaluation) is a clear example of this, but not the only one. For example, the Catalan University Collective Catalogue (CUCC) is used as an information-sharing instrument that makes it possible to determine if a document in the process of being acquired is already available at another Catalan library. A decision can then be made as to the need to buy the document, depending on whether it is already available at a CBUC library. In addition, the interlibrary loan mechanism, in place since 1997, permits libraries at a physical distance from another to share their bibliographic resources.

Other weaknesses noted in the reports included the lack of a global purchasing policy for universities, which tend to be the aggregate of fragmented decisions. In general, it was observed that the subject areas in which the university excels in research are not identified and therefore cannot provide adequate support. Furthermore, the creation of new degree programs is not always accompanied by special budget allocations for the purchase of bibliographic titles.

In some universities, evaluators noted the existence of documents purchased by different departments, which had not been included in the library's catalogue and were therefore not accessible to the entire university community. It should be noted that efforts are being made to avoid this and that, in fact, significant improvements have been made in recent years. In any case, one of the improvements recommended by evaluators is that the university's entire bibliographic collection should be known by and accessible to all.

5.4. Budget

The budgets allocated to libraries and internal distribution are the classical indicators of the resources available to libraries to carry out their functions. While the professional literature has tended in recent years to emphasise indicators of results and satisfaction, it is undeniable that the ability of the library system to provide services is partly contingent upon the resources assigned to it. Traditionally, library budgets were the sum of the quantities allocated to personnel and acquisitions. Currently, however, in Catalonia and internationally, library budgets must also cover ICT expenses, personnel training and proportional parts of common expenses. However, since it is difficult to reconcile these elements, for analytical purposes we have basically considered the budget items referring to personnel and acquisitions.

Personnel expenses rose by 22% and acquisition expenses by 62% during the period between 1995 and 2000. The increase in personnel expenses must be judged bearing in mind that this period has been, at some of the newest libraries, a period of structural consolidation associated with personnel training or with the additional considerable amounts of physical space which goes hand in hand with the need for more personnel.

The total library service budget grew by 35% during the period between 1995 and 2000. The average in Catalonia for the period 1995-1999 was 4.37% and the average in Catalonia for 2000 was 4.48%. The international recommendation is normally 5%.

The increased expenditure for acquisitions (62%) does not take into account general inflation or the specific increase of the cost of bibliographic materials (which in the case of journal subscriptions was 17% per year). There are notable differences in the costs increases from one university to the next, although it is not possible to establish a particular pattern since the budget information must be analysed in relation to the spending per user.

The increase in spending on acquisitions per user for the period from 1995 to 2000 was 59.8%, slightly below the net increase. Once again, the phenomenon analysed above in relation to the increase in the number of users having palliated the net budget increase is repeated. Analysing the data for Catalonia within the European context, we see that they are between 50 and 100% lower than countries such as Ireland, Germany, Scandinavian countries and the United Kingdom. Compared to Spain, based on the most recent CRUE-REBIUN statistics, only three of the seven Catalan universities evaluated exceeded the national average, while the other four fell below. Individually, the UPF and the UdL are well above the average while the UAB is slightly above average and the rest are below average.

The ratios of monographs available per user (the total number, including the collections available at each library) show significant growth at the UPC, UdG, UdL and URV. Both these individual increases and the overall increase, however, must be seen in relation to the users for whom the titles are intended. It is impossible to evaluate the meaning of these ratios, since it would be necessary to look not only at the number of books per user but also at how suitable the books are to satisfying the needs of the university community.

The ratio of book to journal spending is also considered to be significant. Internationally, ratios of around 50/50 are normally used as a guide and the quantity of money allocated to journals may increase as the overall budget grows. Ratios of 0.33 (25% for monographs and the rest for journals) can be considered ideal in our case. In the average value of the universities evaluated for the year 2000 (0.59) it must be remembered that there is quite a bit of disparity. Table 47. $\text{Book Spending} / \text{Journal Spending}$ in the statistical appendix, this indicator is around 1 for the UdL, URV and UPF. The UB's journal subscriptions account for a significant amount of spending (0.18 in 2000). At the other end of the spectrum, the amounts budgeted by the UPC for book purchases are clearly higher.

6. Results

6.1. Efficacy of the Services Offered

6.1.1. Introduction to the Concept of Efficacy

The *Library Services Evaluation Guide* collects many different types of data under the heading of efficacy in the rendering of services in order to build an empirical base to justify the statements contained in the reports. In general, all of the universities made an effort to provide statistical and management data. However, this wealth of data could not be fully reflected in the final analysis, primarily due to the fact that in some cases the data were not complete (either for all universities or for the period), making it impossible to reach global conclusions. This circumstance, which conditions the overall assessment does not affect the more detailed analyses, which may be worked up using complete, standardised data within each institution.

6.1.2. Entries

If one wishes to consider a library on the basis of its inputs only, one must look at the data on the use of library services as direct indicators of the library's profitability and indirect indicators of its benefits. While the number of people entering a library does not imply the use of any particular service, different local and international studies have shown that there is a correlation between entering a library and using its services.

The increase in the number of people visiting Catalan University Libraries has been spectacular. The number of visitors doubled between 1992⁷ (11,004,392) and 2000 (21,108,870), equivalent to an increase of 26.69% for the period from 1995 to 2000. This indicator must be viewed in correlation with the net increase in the number of users for the period between 1995 and 2000 (see Table 15, enclosed) which was 1.4% (5.29% since 1994) to see that, in this case, the growth is not vegetative. The number of visitors to libraries (entries) are, along with library loans, the most reliable indicators of the efficacy of the service. While it is true that there is no basis for deducing that the more people who enter a library the more information will be consumed, it is true that the number of entries, as mentioned above, is directly related to the use of library services in general. The converse is likewise true: library services that are not user-friendly or user-oriented do not generate increased entries.

If one considers the weight indicator of entries/user (see Table 44, enclosed), one observes an increase of 4.89% between the data for 2000 compared to the average of the period between 1995 and 1999; from 89.94 entries per user in 1995 to 112.35 entries per user in 2000. The increase in this case is lower due to the net growth of users for the period considered. Even so, the increase in the number of entries per user is significantly higher than the increase in users.

The indicator entries/potential users varies considerably from one university to the next. The highest ratio pertains to the UPF (260.28). This is generally attributed to the fact that this university's teaching methodology requires intensive library use by students. If this is true, and it would be difficult to find another explanation, it would show that an increase in the use of libraries and library services must inevitably be preceded by a renovation of educational methods. The worst results were obtained by the UdG and the universities with the largest student bodies (UB, UAB and UPC).

It should be noted that the number of library entries (see Table 15 enclosed) increased each year between 1995 and 1997, stabilised between 1998 and 1999 and decreased for the first time in 2000, dropping from 22,616,051 entries in 1999 to 21,108,870 entries in 2000, a 6.7% decrease, when the decrease in the number of potential users was only 1.1%.

7 «Les biblioteques de les universitats públiques de Catalunya», op. cit.

6.1.3. Loans

The professional literature considers the number of loans to be the most synthetic and reliable indicator for evaluating the quality of library services. Different studies have shown that this indicator is related to the number of books used inside the library but not taken out, with the consultation of databases, with the use of bibliographic information services and, finally, with the demand for external documents. There is also a correlation between this indicator and the teaching methodology. Internationally, it has been shown that in countries where the teaching methodologies require working with first-hand information, the number of loans per user is high. On the contrary, in countries where the teaching methods are based on class notes, this indicator is lower.

The number of loans was 1,507,396 in 1995 and rose to 1,737,696 in 2000. The increase for the period was 15.3% (44.45% if the figures for 1994 are included); in other words, higher than the increase in the number of users. This can only be considered a positive finding. While it is clear from the indicator of the number of entries that the number of library visits is increasing, the change in the number of loans indicates that the use of library services is also on the rise. From this piece of data one can only deduce that the system is working very well. Despite this, one also observes a stagnation, even a retrogression, in the number of loans in the most recent years of the last five-year period. In the reports, this circumstance is interpreted to mean that the growth is due to ongoing improvements to services, to loan service in particular, but that obtaining better results will depend on improvements to teaching methods and to the prescriptive activities of faculty members in terms of information usage.

The loans/potential users indicator (see Table 41, enclosed) increased by 13.63% between 1995 and 2000, with a 1.46% variation between the average for the period 1995-1999 and the data for 2000 and the average value rose from 8.14 loans per user in 1995 to 9.25 in 2000 (9.90 in 1998). An individualised analysis of this ratio offers some interesting elements for reflection. There is a great deal of variations between the results of the different universities (the one with the most loans per user has four times more than the one with the fewest). However, there are no differences in how the loan services of the different universities operate to justify this much of a difference between them. They must, then, be the result of the teaching methodologies employed. This is certainly a point that merits a deeper analysis.

The average loans per user in public universities in Catalonia is two points higher than the average in other Spanish and French universities, but lags quite far behind those of some other countries of reference⁸ (13.5 in Austria, 18.17 in Sweden, 22.26 in Ireland, etc.) and is even farther removed from others (26.61 in Denmark, 34.10 in Finland, 41.75 in the United Kingdom, etc.). The figure for the best universities in the USA is between EUA 60 and 80 loans per user per year.

6.1.4. User Satisfaction

Libraries in general and universities in particular have a longstanding tradition of reporting and self-evaluation. This tradition has been expressed primarily by preparing statistics and measuring inputs (resources). In recent years, assessment practices have been evolving in order to include and to focus on outputs, particularly user satisfaction. The reports show a clear concern on the part of library services for this aspect and point out that the fact that the universities have evaluation mechanisms in place, that they conduct usage and satisfaction surveys and that the levels of user satisfaction are high are the principal strengths under this heading.

In practice, most of the services evaluated having mechanisms for the ongoing evaluation of user satisfaction in place such as: periodical user satisfaction surveys, suggestion and complaint forms, forms for suggesting the purchase of bibliographic titles, indicators tables, library committees or personal contacts.

Specifically, the evaluation made it possible to conduct an exhaustive study of the use of and satisfaction with the services rendered. Although the studies took different forms at each university, in general they focused on the different types of users (first and second cycle students, third cycle students and professors) and the questionnaires were extensive enough to include questions of a general nature about how the library service works as a whole and specific questions referring to particular services.

⁸ Urbano & Rodríguez, op. cit.

The reports indicate that the results of the different satisfaction surveys point to a very high level of user satisfaction (students and professors) with both the services they offer and the treatment received by library personnel. These results were confirmed in the interviews conducted by the External Committees and in informal contacts as part of the external evaluation process.

While it is not possible to show unified usage and satisfaction data for all of the libraries as a whole, there are some very similar elements. For example, the different groups rated both the services available and the attentions they received as high or very high. The level of dissatisfaction was usually not higher than 10%. Another common element was the intensive use of libraries, since approximately 90% of the groups used the library at least once a month, with likewise high percentages of respondents who used the library more than once a month and more than once a week. Some surveys measured the amount of time spent at the library. In these cases, it was seen that most visits to the library lasted between one and three hours. Finally, the survey results also showed consistent use of the basic library services (*in situ* document consultation, card catalogue consultation, loans, photocopies).

The principal weaknesses noted in the reports with regard to user satisfaction refer, on the one hand, to a high level of unawareness of the library services offered on the part of the different user groups as well as the fact that some of the services are used less than would be expected. Another weakness that is particularly alarming is that the most innovative services (distance services, databases, electronic services, etc.) are those which are least well known and used the least. This circumstance, mentioned almost unanimously in all of the reports, should prompt the universities to take specific measures to improve users' awareness and use of these services.

6.1.5. Acquisitions (cost) per User

It has traditionally been considered that the volume of a library service's acquisitions is a clear indicator of its efficacy, to the extent that they are made available to users. Increases in acquisitions other than monographs and the current potential for inter-library loans have called this item into doubt as a reliable indicator. As a result, the evaluators decided it would be better to use the indicator of acquisition cost per potential user (see Table 38 enclosed) since it provides a closer approximation of the library service's efforts to augment its service potential.

For the year 2000 a difference of 109% is observed between the acquisition cost per potential user at the UPC (9,090 PTA) and the UPF (19,067 PTA) with an average of 10,621 PTA for library services overall. Although the increases between the middle of the five-year period from 1995 to 1999 and the year 2000 place these two universities in the opposite position (88.3% increase for the UPC and zero for the UPF), for library services as a whole, the average increase was 36.9%, considerably higher than the other two components of cost increase (personnel and maintenance).

6.2. Efficiency of the Services Offered

6.2.1. Introduction to the Concept of Efficiency

Addressing the subject of service efficiency often leads to controversy, particularly when the efficiency is measured on the basis of a group of indicators which, as in the specific case of library services, always overlook certain services which cannot be reconciled and are therefore difficult to measure (in-library consultations, training, document updating, etc.).

The efficiency indicators used must be considered as a whole rather than considering ASP alone in order to avoid fragmented views of the complex civilities characteristic of library services.

The fourteen indicators proposed to measure efficiency have been grouped into five subcategories to facilitate a comprehensive view:

1. Serviced rendered by LS personnel:
 - Loans/number of LS personnel (Table 31 enclosed)
 - Entries/number of LS personnel (Table 33 enclosed)
 - Potential users per LS personnel (Table 32 enclosed)
2. Cost of services rendered:
 - Total cost/loan (Table 26 enclosed)
 - Personnel cost/loan (Table 28 enclosed)
 - Total cost/entry (Table 27 enclosed)
 - Personnel cost /entry (Table 30 enclosed)
3. Cost per Potential User:
 - Total cost LS /potential user (Table 25 enclosed)
 - Cost LS personnel /potential user (Table 29 enclosed)
4. Cost per operative library seat:
 - Total LS cost /library seat (Table 39 enclosed)
 - Cost LS personnel / library seat (Table 40 enclosed)
5. Breakdown of cost as indicator of budgetary management:
 - Personnel cost / Total LS cost (Table 35 enclosed)
 - Maintenance cost / Total LS cost (Table 36 enclosed)
 - Acquisition cost/ Total LS cost (Table 37 enclosed)

It should be noted that since these data were prepared subsequent to the evaluation process in order to offer as updated a picture as possible, they were not available to the Internal or External Evaluation Committees. All of the tables containing the values of these indicators for the Library Services as a whole and individually have therefore been included with this report as attachments.

6.2.2. Services Rendered by LS Personnel

The efficiency of LS personnel is measured by different types of indicators that cannot be synthesised into quantitative data. Oftentimes, either there is no data available or it cannot be separated out of the library's daily activities (in library consultations, cataloguing, requests, etc.). The indicators shown on Tables 31 and 33 (loans/total LS employees and entries/total LS employees) are certainly insufficient to judge efficiency. The indicators shown on Table 32 (potential users/total LS employees) could be interpreted as an indicator of the system's own resources. Regardless of where it is located, it is an indicator considered in international studies.

a) Loans/number of LS employees

The loans/total LS employees (see Table 31 enclosed) shows sharp variations between universities for 2000 (1,173 for the UB and 2,650 for the UdL). It is interesting to observe the position of two universities (UPF and UAB), vastly different in terms of their personnel structures yet similar in terms of this indicator.

The different between the average for the five-year period from 1995 to 1999 and for 2000 demonstrates that despite the increase of 1.46% in loans per potential user (see Table 41), the loans per total LS personnel indicators (see Table 31) remained stable throughout the entire system (1,859 loans/number of LS employees for the period 1995-1999 and 1,858 for 2000). Even so, there are certain differences among universities: one group with positive values between 7% and 20% (UAB, UPF, URV) and another group dropping to between 6% and 20% (UB, UPC, UdG). In the UdL s case, the figure remained practically unchanged.

b) Entries/number of LS employees

With regard to the indicator of entries per number of LS employees (see Table 33 in the Annex), the difference between the average for the five-year period 1995-1999 and the data for the year 2000 (22,576 and 21,816, respectively) illustrates that throughout the system there has been a slight decrease in the number of entries per LS employee, while at the same time there was a moderate increase in entries per user (4.89%) (see Table 44 in the Annex). However, significant differences are observed from one university to the next. The UPF showed an increase of 52.7% in the number of entries per LS employee, while the number of entries per user at this university increased by only 18.16%; the UdG showed a decrease of 26.19%, although one must also consider that there was a 15.96% decrease in the number of entries per user.

c) Potential users / LS employees

With regard to the potential users /total LS employees indicator (see Table 32 enclosed), regardless of the composition of the staff, the data for the year 2000 (201 users) places the library services of Catalan universities in a very favourable position within the national and international context⁹ (Spain, 375.6; Italy, 304; France, 560.8; Denmark, 201.3; Sweden, 184.4). However, there are significant differences from one university to the next since the figures range from 113 for the UPF to 271 for the UPC.

Despite the increase of potential library services users (1,43%) during the period from 1995 to 2000, a 7% drop is observed in the ratio of potential users per total LS employees. This circumstance is explained by staffing increases. The situation of the different library services evaluated shows a maximum variation of +/-12%, except for the UPF with a decrease of 29% as a consequence of a clearly superior starring position.

6.2.3. Cost of Services Rendered

a) Total cost/loan Personnel cost/loan

The average cost of loan services for the library services as a whole for the year 2000 (see Table 26) is 3,250 PTA (1,686 PTA if one considers personnel costs only). This is 89.4% higher than the total cost of library services in Spain¹⁰ (1,717 PTA), 62,3% higher than in Denmark (2,004 PTA); but 81% lower than in Belgium (5,900 PTA) and 123% lower than in Italy (7,274 PTA).

There are sharp contrasts between the universities and for the most recent year examined (1999-2000 academic year). Hence, the difference in cost between the UdG (the lowest) and the UB (the highest) is almost 120%. When personnel costs are factored in (see Table 28), the difference rises to 130%.

- The difference between the average for the five year period (1994 to 1999) and the figure for the 1999-2000 shows a significant increase (16.22%) in the total cost per loan for the entire system and a great deal of variation. While the UPF reduced its total cost per loan by 1.28%, the UPC increased its cost by 38.15%. The increase for the other universities ranged between 5.96% for the UdG and 21.7% for the UB.

⁹ Urbano i Rodríguez, op. cit.

¹⁰ Urbano i Rodríguez, op. cit.

■ The increase in the personnel cost per loan indicator (Table 28) was moderate: 7.45% for the system as a whole and a variation between 5.09 for the UAB and 20.53 for the UdG. The reduction of this indicator at the UPF (17.95%) was noteworthy.

b) Total cost/entry and Personnel cost/entry

The data on total cost per entry (Table 27) and personnel cost per entry (Table 30) shows that the cost per visit indicator for the system as a whole is 268 PTA.

The figures vary considerably from one university to the next and for the most recent year examined (1999-2000 academic year). Thus, the difference in the total cost per entry between the URV (the lowest) and the UdG (the highest) is almost 101%.

The difference between the average for the five year period (1994 to 1999) (240.42 PTA) and the figure for the 1999-2000 academic year (268 PTA) shows that, as in the case of the cost per loan indicators, there was a 11.3% increase in the cost per entry for library services as a whole.

There is considerable variation between the universities depending on the service. For example, the UPF showed a 27% reduction (Table 27) of the total cost of library services per entry (significant increase in the number of entries and an increase in the number of potential users) while the figures for the rest of the universities ranged between 6.56% at the URV and 23.51% at the UPC.

The average increase in the personnel cost per entry (Table 30) was 2.85%, although a great deal of variation was seen here once again. Hence, while the figure rose by 34.7% in the UdG s case, the UPF experienced a 39.2% decrease. Once again, an adjustment might be in order here as a consequence of the UPF s favourable starting position ¹¹.

6.2.4. Cost per Potential User

a) Total cost of LS /potential user

This indicator, along with the personnel cost per user, widely considered in international comparative studies of library services for one simple reason: it does not require any monitoring or accounting of the services offered. Internationally, the data on the total costs of LS services per potential user vary significantly. Hence, compared to the average of 30,061 PTA for Catalan universities for the year 2000 (see Table 25), we also have 14,112 for Spain , 21,823 for Italy and 56,933 for Sweden.

The differences between the average for the five-year period from 1995 to 1999 and for 2000 show that the figures vary significantly from one university to the next. For example, the UPF s costs decreased as a consequence of a greater number of potential users, while the percentage of increase at other universities ranged from 1.97% (UdG) to 31.68% (UdL).

b) Cost of LS personnel/potential user

When one considers the cost of LS personnel/potential user (see Table 29), the breakdown of costs at Catalan universities shows two extremes: 11,467 PTA at the UPC and 32,588 PTA at the UPF, with the rest of the universities analysed at around 14,000 PTA. The figure for Spain is 8,867 and for Italy, 13,049, while the figure for Sweden and Denmark is over 30,000.

¹¹ Urbano & Rodríguez, op. cit.

6.2.5. Cost per Library Seat

a) Total cost of LS /library seat

The available data (see Table 39) indicate that the total cost of LS/Library seat for the year 2000 showed a 109% difference for the year 2000 compared to the lowest cost (235,688 PTA at the UdL) and the highest cost (474,406 PTA at the UdG).

The increase in the total cost LS per Library seat between the five-year period and the year 2000 was 2.97% for LS as a whole, with a decrease of almost 35.17% and 18.34% at the UPF and UPC, respectively, and an increase of 28.97% and 14.91% at the URV and UB, respectively.

b) Personnel cost/library seat

With regard to the personnel cost per library seat (see Table 40), the data indicate that the lowest and highest costs remained stable (UdL, 105,475 PTA and UdG, 253,922 PTA). Likewise, the cost for the LS system as a whole also remained stable. The change in the average from the five-year period to the 2000 was a decrease of 4.82%.

6.2.6. Cost Allocation as an Indicator of the Efficiency of LS Management

The data available enable us to position each one of the library services in relation to their cost allocation policies or practices (personnel, acquisitions and maintenance). These ratios vary considerably from one university to the next, possibly as a consequence of the different cost allocation criteria used by each one, particularly with regard to maintenance costs.

a) Personnel cost/total cost

Under the heading of personnel costs in comparison to total costs (see Table 35) one observes a variation of 16 points (UPC 42% vs. URV 58%), with an average of 52% for LS as a whole.

The difference between the average for the five-year period from 1995 to 1999 (0.56) and the year 2000 (0.52) shows a downward trend in participation of personnel costs as part of the total cost of library services (7.58% for all services, with differences ranging between 2.36% and 16.87%). The only increase was experienced by the UdG.

b) Maintenance cost /total cost

As indicated, the reconciliation criteria used by the universities to allocate the general cost of library services (see Table 36) may be responsible for causing such great disparity. Hence, the average for the overall system was 13% in 2002, and the changes ranged from 5% at the URV to 28% at the UPC.

c) Acquisition cost /total cost

With regard to the acquisition cost /total cost (see Table 37), one observes that the difference between the average for the five-year period between 1995 and 1999 and the year 2000 shows an increase of 16.18% in acquisition costs for library services as a whole. Broken down by university, the increases range between 1.75% at the UAB to 47.89% at the UPC).

6.2.7. A Final Comment Relative to Costs

As one would expect, one element which has a significant influence on costs is the extent of a campuses territorial dispersion. The economies of scale derived from greater physical concentration are notable, particularly with regard to personnel, the most important cost element. This is an aspect which in many cases goes beyond the university s ability to act, as the dispersion responds to an inherited situation that is impossible to correct, despite the serious efforts made by all universities to build campus libraries.

7. Strengths, Weaknesses and Proposed Improvements

Throughout this report and particularly in the internal and external reports on each university, the strengths and weaknesses of each one of the library systems have been mentioned, along with suggested improvements.

They are all important and the strengths achieved should serve as a foundation and stimulus for perfecting the service in order to face the challenges posed by the weaknesses and by new milestones in technological development.

From a global perspective, the most common of these can be summarised as follows:

Strengths

- The integration and coordination of the library services (LS) of each university as part of the overall system which guarantees that the entire university community enjoys the same rights and responsibilities on all campuses and in all libraries.
- The level of cooperation of the universities within the framework of the Consortium of University Libraries in Catalonia on strategic aspects such as cataloguing, acquisitions, digital library, training, etc. which offers economies of scale that benefit users.
- The efforts to take advantage of technological developments to inform users and create new services (websites, electronic dossiers, subject libraries, etc.) which improve the library services offered.
- The increases in the rendering of the services measured by the entries and loans indicators.
- The libraries' image and user satisfaction with the products and services offered and with the attitude of library personnel toward users.

Weaknesses

- First and foremost, the prevalence of pedagogical methods that do not encourage student learning from the use of bibliographic resources. This in turn affects the degree to which users actually take advantage of the efforts to improve library services.
- A lack of knowledge of the products and services offered by libraries, especially the most innovative ones.
- Imbalances in LS staff structures.
- Insufficient adaptation to a library model that makes provisions for the technological possibilities and educational resources at students' disposal and which permits future space needs to be planned and resized.
- Lack of enough computer support as required by the current rate of technological development.
- Insufficiency or lack of standardisation of the data and the indicators derived from them.

Proposals for Improvement:

- Preparation of a strategic plan which addresses a new stage focused on converting libraries as they currently exist into resource centres with the different transversal functions required for student learning.
- Analysis of changes in the cost structure of library services in order to integrate them into budget planning.

- Deep internal reflection on the roles and functions of the different categories of library personnel from the perspective of innovative changes in accessing and using information sources.
- Analysis of each university's computer requirements and reinforcement of current support levels based on the characteristics of increasingly demanding developments in this area.
- Creation, within the framework of the CBUC, a committee to improve the quantitative information which, in addition to defining the basic indicators for monitoring resources and results carefully, proposes uniform methodologies for preparing them.

8. Beyond the Reports

The evaluation of library services at public universities in Catalonia was closely directed by a common guide. This guide emphasises the analysis of the internal operations, processes and results of each university to the exclusion of other analyses that contextualise the internal situation in relation to the international arena. However, an evaluation of Catalan libraries must take into account their situation in an international context, posing such questions as: what challenges will libraries have to face in order to continue serving universities in the process of change? Are the lines of progress marked the same ones pursued by the most active libraries on the international scene? Do the efforts go beyond the points marked by the tendencies for progress?

In addition to the aspects which have been thoroughly addressed in the evaluation reports, there are certain tendencies marking library development at the international level. They are as follows:

- A shift in the focus of universities' efforts from teaching to learning, as a result of which the role played by library services is changing
- Intensive use of ICTs and the appearance of digital information.
- A renovation of cooperative structures.

8.1. From Teaching to Learning

The new challenges facing higher education are leading to changes around the world in university education trends, with the emphasis increasingly being placed more on learning than on teaching. Efforts are focusing on creating environments that are conducive to learning, on learning to learn, on continuing education, etc. Libraries are being used by universities as places of self-learning, and the shift from the use of the term libraries to resource centres for learning that is taking place in different countries is a clear indication of this. The convergence of services (libraries, information systems and language laboratories), mentioned previously in this report, is another indicator of this new trend. In this regard, the library has become the university's resource centre for learning. Thus, library personnel, along with information systems staff and experts in classroom and on-line pedagogical innovations must provide ongoing support to faculty members and the university's educational projects.

This trend is impacting libraries in two areas: facilities and organisation. The pressure on buildings translates into the need for more space and interior designs intended to facilitate socialisation, individual study and group study as well as the possibility of intensive ICT use. From an organisational point of view, this tendency is impacting libraries by making them work together with teams of professors (to prepare the educational materials or to gate the materials on the network) and IT specialists (to organise services jointly, to organise electronic information resources, to prepare information for the university's website, etc.).

In Catalonia there is no significant manifestation of this tendency. One positive aspect worthy of note is the Digital University collaboration platform led by DURSI with the participation of public universities, the UOC, CESCA and CBUC. Despite this, the evaluators recommend more decisive efforts to promote the initiatives in this regard.

8.2. Intensive Use of ICTs and Digital Information

Throughout this report, ICTs have repeatedly been mentioned as instruments for improving and expanding the use of library services. There is no need to emphasise this point any further. ICTs as they exist today and the services associated with them are changing the models for the manner in which scholarly information is disseminated and used. So far, there is no definitive model of which ones will be the determining elements of the new era.

Internationally, however, there are three clear tendencies: future exploration based on good practices and benchmarking or cooperation; the promotion of the use of new technologies and the digitalisation of information. While the first two are not exclusive to the university environment, universities play a preponderant role in third since most scientific and scholarly information is generated primarily by universities professors and researchers.

The future will be written with new rules of grammar that are in the process of being devised. Merely waiting for this to happen means losing out on competitive opportunities. Countries that are leaders in technological development have implemented institutionalised measures to share their experiences based on new technologies and to promote their use. With regard to digital information, there is a battle underway between universities and commercial publishers to regain the control over the information produced by universities and published by publishing companies. A good example of this seen in the TDC@t project, part of the Digital University initiative whose goal is to publish and provide free access to doctoral theses of students at Catalan universities. Despite the progress made in Catalonia so far, universities would do well to take further action in this regard and to promote new initiatives.

8.3. Cooperation

Cooperative movements among libraries are the result or consequence of the possibilities offered by technology. The first wave of cooperative efforts took place in the seventies with the arrival of library automation. With the appearance of on-line information in web format, the latter half of the nineties saw a second wave of cooperative developments through consortia and the creation of digital libraries. The simplest form of this trend is found in what are known as buying clubs and the most complex in territorial digital libraries. In all cases, there are at least three types of goals: to significantly increase the information available in digital format; to face the challenges of the new environment jointly and to promote the use of electronic resources.

Despite the fact that these new forms of cooperation are very new, the appearance of consortia whose objective is to contract electronic information in a cooperative manner represent one of the most significant changes experienced by libraries in the last four or five years. This phenomenon is not limited to any particular country but is rather being seen in North America and Europe in particular and in some Asian countries as well. Despite the advantages of joint negotiation, it is based on a common vision of the objectives to be attained, on mechanisms that make collective negotiation possible and on accepted internal cost-sharing formulae. The international experiences have shown that this transitional process and the change in the way information is purchased have a greater chance for success when the process is facilitated by a body that acts as a coordinator and when economic incentives are provided in the form of government aid.

In 1998 the project for the Catalonia Digital Library (BDC) was presented to the DURSI and received funding which enabled the first services to be offered in the following year. The goal of the BDC is to negotiate, in a cooperative manner, core electronic information that can be used by any members of the university and research community, regardless of where they work. The BDC has resource selection criteria, negotiating mechanisms and an internal cost-sharing formula in place. At this time, 25% of what would be considered the ideal library for Catalonia has been contracted. Despite the initial and ongoing funding, however, the evaluators recommend that there be a plan for reaching objectives and financial mechanisms in place to enable an increase in the negotiations over the next 3-5 years

9. Glossary

Students

The data includes 1st, 2nd and 3rd cycle students (doctoral students) and excludes others, specifically students from attached schools. The data were taken from the DURSI Report for the 1999-2000 academic year.

Professors

Number of professors (excluding attached schools). This includes the total number of professors regardless of category. The data were taken from the DURSI Report for the 1999-2000 academic year.

ASP

Administration and Service Personnel. The data were taken from the DURSI Report for the 1999-2000 academic year.

Potential Users

Library Service users, including students, professors and ASP.

Library Centres

Number of different libraries. The data were taken from the DURSI Report for the 1999-2000 academic year.

Library Square Metres

Square metres occupied by Library Services.

Library seating

Total number of seats available in university libraries for users to consult the library's materials. The data were taken from the DURSI Report for the 1999-2000 academic year.

Computerized/multimedia seats

Library seats equipped with terminals or audiovisual equipment.

Entries

Total number of library accesses.

Database Consultation

Total number of consultations of the Library Services database, electronically or otherwise.

Loans

Total number of book loans for the year of reference. In the absence of other data, the data were taken from the DURSI Report for the 1999-2000 academic year.

In-library loans

Total number of monographs consulted at the libraries.

Training Course Attendees

Number of users who have attended training courses offered by Library Services.

Training Hours

Total number of hours devoted to training courses.

Number of Monographs

Total number of monographic volumes, excluding volumes of bound journals. The data were taken from the DURSI Report for the 1999-2000 academic year.

Number of New Acquisitions

Total number of monographic volumes entering the library each year as a result of purchases, donations or loans.

Number of Live Journals

Total number of journals subscribed to by the library.

Number of Databases

Number of subscribed databases.

Library Staff

Library personnel employed in groups 1 or 2 or civil servants in groups A or B.

Other Staff

All other personnel, excluding scholarship holders.

FTE Scholarship Holders

The total number of scholarship holders converted into an equivalent number of scholarship holders working 20 hours per week.

Total Spending on Monographs

Total budget allocated to the acquisition of monographs, expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Total Spending on Journals

Total budget allocated to the acquisition of journals, excluding those in electronic format. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Total Spending on Databases and Electronic Information

Total budget allocated to the acquisition of electronic information, expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)

Sum of expenditures for the acquisition of monographs, journals and electronic information, expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Maintenance Costs (MC)

Total expense of operating the library services (excluding staff salaries and acquisitions).

Personnel Costs (PC)

Amount allocated to the salaries paid to library service personnel, including employer expenses, expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)

The sum of AC +MC+PC, expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Capital and University

Budget amount allocated to personnel expenses. The data were taken from the DURSI s initial budget.

Total University Budget

The data were taken from the DURSI s initial budget.

BASIC INDICATORS**Indicators of Resources / Personnel (P)**

Library Staff / Total Library Personnel

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of library staff members by the total number of library employees.

Administrative Personnel / Total Library Personnel

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of administrative staff members by the total number of library employees.

Scholarship Holders / Total Library Personnel

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of scholarship holders by the total number of library employees.

Total Personnel / ASP (University)

Indicator obtained by dividing the total number of library employees by the total number of ASP employed by the university

Indicators of Resources, Budget

TC LS / University Budget

Indicator obtained by dividing the Total Cost of Library Services by the university s budget.

Library Personnel Cost / Capital I Cost

Indicator obtained by dividing the Cost of Library Service Personnel by the university s capital I budget.

Indicators of Resources, Space

Library Square Metres / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of square metres occupied by libraries by the number of potential users.

Library seating / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the Library seating by the number of potential users.

Computerized Library Seating / Total Library Seating

Indicator obtained by dividing the computerized Library Seating by the total number of Library seating.

Efficiency Indicators

Total Cost / Potential Users

Indicator obtained dividing the Total Cost by the number of potential users. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Total Cost / Loans

Indicator obtained by dividing the Total Cost by the number of loans. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Total Cost / Entry

Indicator obtained by dividing the Total Cost by the number of entries. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Personnel Cost/ Loan

Indicator obtained by dividing the Personal Cost (PC) by the number of loans. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Personnel Cost/ Potential User

Indicators obtained by dividing the Personnel Cost (PC) by the number of potential users. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Personnel Cost/ Entries

Indicator obtained by dividing the Personnel Cost (PC) by the number of entries. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Loans / Total Number of Library Employees

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of loans by the total number of library employees.

Potential Users / Total Number of Library Employees

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of potential users by the total number of library employees.

Entries / Total Number of Library Employees

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of entries by the total number of library employees.

Total Number of Library Employees / Number of Libraries

Indicator obtained by dividing the total number of library employees by the number of libraries.

Personnel Cost (PC) / Total Cost (TC)

Indicator obtained by dividing the Personnel Cost by the Total Cost. Expressed as a percentage.

Acquisition Cost (AC) / Personnel Cost (PC)

Indicator obtained by dividing the Acquisition Cost by the Personnel Cost. Expressed as a percentage.

Maintenance Cost (MC) / Total Cost (TC)

Indicator obtained by dividing the Maintenance Cost by the Total Cost. Expressed as a percentage.

Acquisition Cost (AC) / Total Cost (TC)

Indicator obtained by dividing the Acquisition Cost by the Total Cost. Expressed as a percentage.

Acquisition Cost (AC) / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the Acquisition Cost by the number of potential users. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Total Cost (TC) / Library Seat

Indicator obtained by dividing the Total Cost by the number of Library seating. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Personnel Cost/ Library Seat

Indicator obtained by dividing the personnel cost by the Library seating. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Maintenance Cost / Library Seat

Indicator obtained by dividing the maintenance cost by the number of Library seating. Expressed in thousands of pesetas.

Efficacy Indicators

Loans / Potential Users

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of loans by the number of potential users.

Monographs / Student

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of monographs by the number of students.

Monographs / Professor

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of monographs by the number of professors.

Monographs / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of monographs by the number of potential users.

Number of Live Subscriptions / Student

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of live subscriptions by the number of students.

Number of Live Subscriptions / Professor

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of live subscriptions by the number of professors.

Number of Live Subscriptions / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the number of live subscriptions by the number of potential users.

Entries / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the entries by the number of potential users.

Library seating / Library

Indicator obtained by dividing the Library seating by the number of libraries.

User Training / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the user training hours by the number of potential users.

Training Hours / User Training

Indicator obtained by dividing the training hours by the number of user training hours.

Training Hours / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the training hours by the number of potential users.

New Acquisitions / Potential User

Indicator obtained by dividing the new acquisitions by the number of potential users.

10. Annexes

Annex I: Index of Acronyms

CDL: Catalonia Digital Library

AC: Acquisition Cost

EEC: External Evaluation Committee

IEC: Internal Evaluation Committee

CCUL: Consortium of Catalonia University Libraries

CCUC: Catalan University Collective Catalogue

CSCC: Catalonia Supercomputing Centre

MC: Maintenance Cost

PC: Personnel Cost

CSUR: Conference of Spanish University Rectors

LSTC: Library Service Total Cost

DURIS: Department of Universities, Research and the Information Society

URA: University Reform Act

ASP: Administration and Service Personnel

ULN: University Library Network

LS: Library Services

TDC@t: Catalonia Catalogue of Doctoral Theses

ICT: Information and Communication Technologies

UAB: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

UB: Universitat de Barcelona

UdG: Universitat de Girona

UdL: Universitat de Lleida

UOC: Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

UPC: Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya

UPF: Universitat Pompeu Fabra

URV: Universitat Rovira i Virgili

Appendix II: Committee Members

University of Barcelona, UB

Internal Evaluation Committee

Mr. M riu s Rubiralta. *Vice Chancellor of Research*
 Ms. Neus Jané. *Head of Acquisitions and Administration Area*
 Ms. Dolors Lamarca. *Library Director*
 Ms. Pilar Llopart. *Assistant Director of Resource Management and Administration*
 Ms. Llu sa N ez. *Assistant Director of Personnel and Computers*
 Mr. Jordi Casadell . *Head of the Geology Library*
 Mr. Joaquim Viaplana. *Division I Professor*
 Mr. Carles Sudri . *Division II Library Committee Member*
 Mr. José Luis Morenza Gil. *Department Director*
 Ms. Esperanza Ballesteros. *Chairwoman of the Area IV Library Commission*
 Ms. J lía Esp n. *Chairwoman of the Division V Library Commission*
 Mr. Adri Rotger i Duny . *Second cycle student (math)*

Human and Social Sciences Area Subcommittee

Mr. Francisco L pez Fr as. *Chairman of the Division Library Commission*
 Ms. Carme Janer. *Head of the Humanities Area*
 Ms. Llu sa Villa. *Head of the Letter Area*
 Ms. Maria Forn. *Head of the Geography and History Library*
 Ms. Margarida Pons. *Technical Specialist, Philosophy Library*
 Mr. Josep Melqu ades Turiel D ez. *Letters Area Library*
 Ms. Maria Manadé Palau. *Art Library*
 Mr. Manuel Garc a-Carpintero. *Assistant Dean of the School of Philosophy*

Legal, Economic and Social Sciences Area Subcommittee

Mr. Francisco Mart n Pe a. *Chairman of the Division Library Commission*
 Ms. Carme Gamb s. *Head of the Economic and Social Science Area*
 Ms. M. Dolors Gutiérrez. *Head of the EUEE Library*
 Ms. Conxa Porcar. *Head of the School of Law Library*
 Ms. Carme Ferrer. *Head of the School of Economics Library*
 Ms. Roser Vila. *Library Assistant, University School of Business Studies*
 Mr. José Andrés Rozas Valdés. *Professor*
 Mr. Ram n Ferrer. *Professor and Secretary of the University School of Business Studies*

Experimental Science and Mathematics Area Subcommittee

Mr. Joaquim Gutiérrez, *Chairman of the Division Library Commission*
 Ms. Judit Casals. *Head of the Experimental Sciences and Mathematics Area*
 Ms. Isabel Parés. *Head of the Physics and Chemistry Library*
 Ms. Carmen Navajas. *Head of the Math Library*
 Mr. Josep Coll. *Biology Library Aid*
 Mr. Miquel Hernández. *Professor*
 Ms. Elisabet Bosch. *Professor*

Health Science Area Subcommittee

Ms. Esperanza Ballesteros. *Chairwoman of the Division Library Commission*
 Ms. Carme Cambrod . *Head of the Health Sciences Area*
 Ms. Coral Bacchetta. *Head of the Clinical Medicine Library*
 Ms. M. Joaquina Maicas. *Head of the Pharmacy Library*
 Mr. Ramon Borr s. *Specialised technician at the Bellvitge Library*
 Ms. Carme Fuste. *Professor*
 Ms. Modesta Pousada. *Professor*

Vall d'Hebron Campus Subcommittee

Ms. J. lia Esp n. *Chairwoman of the Library Division Commission*
 Ms. Merc Montané. *Head of the Vall d'Hebron Campus Area*
 Ms. Conxa Ivarez, *Head of the Library-Economy Library*
 Ms. Ester Acereda. *Psychology Library Aid*
 Mr. Roger Angela Gamb s. *Vall d'Hebrón Library*
 Ms. N ria Lorenzo Ram rez. *Secretary of the Didactic Department*
 Ms. Carina Rey. *Professor*
 Ms. Merc Cardona Hernández. *Education Sciences Library*
 Ms. Montserrat Freixa. *Professor*
 Mr. Josep Gustems. *Professor*
 Ms. Eva Inglés Barrosa. *Student*

External Evaluation Committee

Ms. Mar a Pinto Molina. *Universidad de Granada. EEC Chairwoman*
 Mr. Miguel Jiménez Aleixandre. *Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*
 Mr. Alastair John Charles Bainton, *SCONUL (Standing Conference of National and University Libraries)*

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, UAB

Internal Evaluation Committee

Ms. M.Carme Picallo. *Vice Chancellor of Research. IEC Chairwoman*
 Mr. Joan G mez Escofet. *Director of Library Services. Secretary of the IEC*
 Ms. N ria Balagué. *Deputy Director of Library Services*
 Mr. lvar Mart nez. *Library Coordinator*
 Mr. Josep Santal . *Library Coordinator*
 Ms. Merc Bausili. *Member, Library General Committee*
 Ms. Montse Catafal. *Head of Library*
 Ms. Montse Mallorqu . *Head of Library*

External Evaluation Committee

Mr. Josep M. Terricabras. *Universitat de Girona. EEC Chairman*
 Ms. Mar a Pinto Molina. *Universidad de Granada*
 Mr. Francisco Javier de Jorge. *Universidad Complutense de Madrid*

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, UPC

Internal Evaluation Committee

Ms. Montse Aragüés. *Librarian*
 Mr. Joan Carles Gil. *FIB representative*
 Ms. Ruth Ifigo. *Library Research Services Unit*
 Mr. Sebastià Olivella. *Deputy Director of ETSECCPB*
 Mr. Arnau Sumpsi. *Student*
 Ms. Anna Valls. *Head of Library*
 Mr. Jorge Villar. *Deputy Director of ETSETB*

External Evaluation Committee

Ms. Assumpta Estrada. *Universitat de Lleida. EEC Chairwoman*
 Ms. Margarita Taladriz. *Universidad Carlos III de Madrid*
 Mr. Josep M. Gómez Pallars. *Universitat de Girona*
 Mr. Josep M. Torrens Dolz. *Professor-user UPC*

Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF)

Internal Evaluation Committee

Mr. Oriol Amat. *Vice Chancellor of Economics, Information Systems and Services*
 Mr. Martí Adroher. *Student*
 Ms. Mercè Cabo. *Library Director*
 Ms. Anna Casaldaliga. *Head of Rambla Library*
 Ms. Montserrat Espinosa. *Library technical coordinator*
 Mr. Josep Ferrer. *Professor*
 Mr. Josep Fontana. *Director, IUHJVV*
 Ms. Teresa García-Milà. *Dean of the School of Economic and Business Science*
 Mr. Àlvar Martínez. *General Library*
 Ms. Cloe Masotta. *Student*
 Mr. Javier Rodríguez. *Student*
 Ms. Anna Torres Lacomba. *Student*
 Ms. Rosa Virsós. *Director of the Political and Social Sciences Department*

External Evaluation Committee

Ms. Assumpta Estrada. *Universitat de Lleida. EEC Chairwoman*
 Ms. Margarita Taladriz. *Universidad Carlos III de Madrid*
 Mr. Josep M. Gómez Pallars. *Universitat de Girona*
 Mr. Manel Ollé. *UPF user representative*

Universitat Rovira i Virgili, URV

Internal Evaluation Committee

Mr. Antoni Pigrau. *Vice Chancellor of Student Education*
 Ms. Maria Antònia Aloguin. *Head of library services*
 Mr. Amancio Isla Frez. *Professor*
 Ms. Mercè Camps. *Professor*
 Mr. Gerard Pujadas. *Professor*

Ms. Maria Mart . *Head of the School of Legal Sciences Library*
Ms. Marta Sed . *Head of the School of Letters/Chemistry Library*
Ms. Esther Alberich. *Student*
Mr. Alfons Gregori. *Student*

External Evaluation Committee

Mr. Francesc Pedr . *Universitat Pompeu Fabra. EEC Chairman*
Ms. Marta Torres. *Universidad Complutense de Madrid*
Mr. Joan Bravo. *Agency for the Quality of the University System in Catalonia*
Mr. Montserrat Nadal. *URV user representative*

Universitat de Girona, UdG

Internal Evaluation Committee

Ms. Maria A. Gispert. *Vice Chancellor*
Ms. Ant nia Boix. *Library Director*
Mr. David Brusi. *Dean of the School of Science*
Ms. ngels Merino. *Head of unit*
Ms. Loles Pal . *Head of unit*
Ms. Lola Badia. *Professor*
Mr. Miquel Mart n. *Professor*
Mr. Modest Fluvi . *Professor*
Mr. Alfred Lacasa. *Student*
Ms. Mireia Domingo. *Student*
Ms. Cristina Alsina. *Student*
Ms. Anna Roca. *Technical personnel*
Ms. Dolors Arpa. *Technical personnel*

School of Law Subcommittee

Mr. Eduardo Rojo. *Dean of the School of Law*
Ms. Cristina Orts. *Head of the Law Unit*
Mr. José Luis Linares. *Professor*
Mr. avier de Ramon. *Student*
Mr. Daniel Juliol. *Student*
Ms. Cesca Turu. *Technical personnel*

Barri Vell Campus Subcommittee

Mr. Narc s Soler. *History Studies Coordinator*
Ms. Loles Pal . *Head of the Barri Vell Unit*
Mr. Alfons Martinell. *Professor*
Ms. Margarita Sánchez. *Professor*
Mr. Sadurn Mart . *Professor*
Ms. Cristina Alsina. *Student*
Ms. Judith Lloveras. *Student*
Mr. Jaume Ruf . *Technical personnel*
Ms. Ester Badia. *Technical personnel*

Montilivi Campus Subcommittee

Mr. Jaume Portella. *Dean of the School of Economic and Business Science*
Ms. Angels Merino. *Head of the Montilivi unit*
Mr. Joan Miró. *Professor*
Mr. Josep Lluís Marzo. *Professor*
Mr. Gabriel Delgado. *Student*
Ms. Laia Dulcet. *Student*
Ms. Eulàlia Sin. *Technical personnel*
Ms. Clàudia Plana. *Technical personnel*

Education and Nursing Subcommittee

Mr. Joaquim Pílach. *Dean of the School of Education*
Ms. Nària Boadas. *Head of unit*
Ms. Meritxell Estebanell. *Professor*
Ms. Carme Arp. *Professor*
Mr. Jordi Baus. *Student*
Ms. Marta Gironès. *Student*
Ms. Lourdes Catalan. *Technical personnel*
Mr. Joan Carles Corney. *Technical personnel*

External Evaluation Committee

Mr. Francesc Pedrós. *Universitat Pompeu Fabra. President del EEC*
Ms. Marta Torres. *Universidad Complutense de Madrid*
Mr. Joan Bravo. *Agency for the Quality of the University System in Catalonia*

Universitat de Lleida (UdL)

Internal Evaluation Committee

Mr. Òliver Company. *Rector's Delegate to the SBD. IEC Chairman*
Ms. Loli Manciñeiras. *SBD Director*
Mr. Joan Estany. *Professor*
Mr. Enric Herrero. *Professor*
Mr. Carles Enric Florensa. *Professor*
Ms. Pilar Vinuesa. *Professor*
Ms. Rosa Ros. *Head of library*
Ms. Elionor Vilalta. *Head of library*
Ms. Montse Larios. *Technical personnel*
Ms. Eva Estupinyà. *Technical personnel*
Ms. Meritxell Fontanet. *Student*
Ms. Rosario Matamoros. *Student*
Mr. José Antonio Calles. *Student*

External Evaluation Committee

Mr. Josep M. Terricabras. *Universitat de Girona. EEC Chairman*
Ms. María Pinto Molina. *Universidad de Granada*
Mr. Francisco Javier de Jorge. *Universidad Complutense de Madrid*
Mr. Carlos Colinas. *Professor, UdL user representative*

Final Report-Writing Committee

Mr. Joan Bravo Pijoan. *Agency for the Quality of the University System in Catalonia*

Mr. Lluís Anglada i de Ferrer. *CBUC*

Mr. Sebastián Rodríguez. *UB*

Mr. Esteve Arboix. *Agency for the Quality of the University System in Catalonia*

Index Table

- Table 1. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat de Barcelona (UB)
Table 2. Basic Indicators. Universitat de Barcelona (UB)
Table 3. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB)
Table 4. Basic Indicators. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB)
Table 5. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC)
Table 6. Basic Indicators. Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC)
Table 7. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF)
Table 8. Basic Indicators. Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF)
Table 9. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat de Girona (UdG)
Table 10. Basic Indicators. Universitat de Girona (UdG)
Table 11. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat de Lleida (UdL)
Table 12. Basic Indicators. Universitat de Lleida (UdL)
Table 13. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat Rovira i Virgili (URV)
Table 14. Basic Indicators. Universitat Rovira i Virgili (URV)
Table 15. Basic Quantitative Data. Addition of the University System
Table 16. Basic Indicators. Addition of the University System
Table 17. Indicators of Resources. Personnel: Library Staff / Total Number of Library Employees
Table 18. Indicators of Resources. Personnel: Other Staff (excluding scholarship holders) / Total Number of Library Employees
Table 19. Indicators of Resources. Personnel: Scholarship Holders / Total Number of Library Employees
Table 20. Indicators of Resources. Budget: Total Cost LS / Total University Budget
Table 21. Indicators of Resources. Budget: Personnel Cost / Chapter I Cost (%)
Table 22. Indicators of Resources. Spaces: Square Metres / Potential User
Table 23. Indicators of Resources. Spaces: Library seating / Potential User
Table 24. Indicators of Resources. Spaces: Computerized Library seating / Total Library seating
Table 25. Efficiency Indicators: Total Cost LS / Potential User (PTA)
Table 26. Efficiency Indicators: Total Cost LS / Loans (PTA)
Table 27. Efficiency Indicators: Total Cost LS / Entries (PTA)
Table 28. Efficiency Indicators: Personnel Cost / Loans (PTA)
Table 29. Efficiency Indicators: Personnel Cost / Potential User (PTA)
Table 30. Efficiency Indicators: Personnel Cost / Entries (PTA)
Table 31. Efficiency Indicators: Loans / Total Number of Library Employees
Table 32. Efficiency Indicators: Potential User / Total Number of Library Employees
Table 33. Efficiency Indicators: Entries / Total Number of Library Employees
Table 34. Efficiency Indicators: Total Number of Library Employees / Number of Libraries
Table 35. Efficiency Indicators: Personnel Cost / Total Cost LS (%)
Table 36. Efficiency Indicators: Maintenance Cost / Total Cost LS (%)
Table 37. Efficiency Indicators: Acquisition Cost / Total Cost LS (%)
Table 38. Efficiency Indicators: Acquisition Cost / Potential User (PTA)
Table 39. Efficiency Indicators: Total Cost LS / Library seating (PTA)
Table 40. Efficiency Indicators: Personnel Cost / Library seating (PTA)
Table 41. Efficacy Indicators: Loans / Potential User
Table 42. Efficacy Indicators: Number of Monographs / Potential User
Table 43. Efficacy Indicators: Number of Live Journals / Potential User
Table 44. Efficacy Indicators: Entries / Potential User
Table 45. Efficacy Indicators: Library seating / Library
Table 46. Efficacy Indicators: New Acquisitions / Potential User
Table 47. Indicators of Resources. Funds: Monograph Expenses / Journal Expenses

Table 1. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat de Barcelona (UB)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (5)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000 (6)
General Data								
Students	68,139	67,166	66,114	64,270	62,617	61,810	65,661	-5.87%
Professors	3,806	3,967	4,092	4,149	4,152	4,164	4,033	3.24%
ASP	1,714	1,735	1,816	1,828	1,828	1,900	1,784	6.49%
Potential Users	73,659	72,868	72,022	70,247	68,597	67,874	71,479	-5.04%
Resources								
Facilities								
Library Centres	16	16	18	18	18	18	17	4.65%
Library Square Metres	30,808	33,084	37,062	36,619	42,446	44,660	36,004	24.04%
Library seating	6,024	6,024	6,025	6,110	5,852	6,004	6,007	-0.05%
Computerized/multimedia seats	422	422	422	422	480	599	434	38.15%
Activity								
Entries	6,262,038	5,878,062	9,461,044	9,122,602	9,636,707	7,488,509	8,072,091	-7.23%
Database Consultation	nd	nd	nd	nd	704,568	403,414	704,568	-42.74%
Loans	436,163	386,809	389,783	456,443	442,207	396,352	422,281	-6.14%
In-library loans	1,535,420	1,378,334	1,895,337	1,435,815	1,435,815	1,435,815	1,536,144	-6.53%
Training Course Attendees	nd	nd	nd	2,923	nd	332	nd	nd
Training Hours	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Titles								
Number of Monographs	1,785,509	1,805,877	1,507,969	1,694,346	1,728,741	1,772,039	1,704,488	3.96%
Number of Acquisitions	35,041	34,864	42,249	42,305	45,563	43,298	40,004	8.23%
Number of Live Journals	5,551	6,076	6,076	6,459	10,860	11,180	7,004	59.61%
Number of Databases	nd	nd	nd	179	188	277	184	50.95%
Personnel (P)								
Library Staff	130	130	138	149	148	148	139	6.47%
Other Staff	71	121	136	94	93	93	103	-9.71%
FTE Scholarship Holders *	94	94	124	97	97	97	101	-4.15%
Total	295	345	398	340	338	338	343	-1.52%
Financial Information (in thousands of PTA)								
Total Spending on Monographs	104,113	111,348	94,985	61,560	93,024	98,370	93,006	5.77%
Total Spending on Journals	299,979	359,737	398,774	472,652	474,032	535,727	401,035	33.59%
Total Spending on DB and Electronic Information	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	32,720	nd	nd
Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)	404,092	471,085	493,759	534,212	567,056	666,817	494,041	34.97%
Maintenance Costs (MC) (1)	217,765	196,342	189,276	186,975	55,338	178,976	169,139	5.82%
Personnel Costs (PC) (2)	853,216	1,013,582	1,047,021	1,043,773	1,055,707	1,067,640	1,002,660	6.48%
Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)	1,475,073	1,681,009	1,730,056	1,764,960	1,678,101	1,913,433	1,665,840	14.86%
Chapter I, University (3)	21,532,872	22,947,398	22,938,127	24,098,471	24,836,884	26,296,890	23,270,750	13.00%
Total UB Budget (4)	33,418,435	35,576,607	35,917,119	36,011,231	37,233,837	42,278,504	35,631,446	18.66%

(1) MC has been calculated as the difference between TCLS and the addition of PC and AC

(2) 1999 data has been calculated as the average between the data of 1998 and 2000

(3) DURIS data

(4) DURIS data. Data corresponds to the initial expense budget

(5) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(6) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(*) Full Time Equivalent

Table 2. Basic Indicators. Universitat de Barcelona (UB)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1999-1990	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000 (2)
Resources Indicators								
Personnel (P)								
Library P / Total Library P	0.44	0.38	0.35	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.41	7.30%
Administrative P / Total Library P	0.24	0.35	0.34	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.30	-7.34%
Scholarship Holders / Total Library P	0.32	0.27	0.31	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	-2.71%
Total P / ASP (University)	0.17	0.20	0.22	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.19	-7.44%
Budget								
TCLS / University Budget	4.41	4.73	4.82	4.90	4.51	4.53	4.67	-3.15%
Library P Cost / Chapter I Cost	3.96	4.42	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.06	4.31	-5.70%
Spaces								
Library Square Metres / Potential Users	0.42	0.45	0.51	0.52	0.62	0.66	0.51	30.19%
Library seating / Potential Users	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	5.21%
Computerized Library seating / Total Library Seating	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.07	38.09%
Titles								
Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	0.35	0.31	0.24	0.13	0.20	0.18	0.24	-24.82%
Efficiency Indicators								
TCLS / Potential User	20,026	23,069	24,021	25,125	24,463	28,191	23,340.88	20.78%
TCLS / Loans	3,382	4,346	4,439	3,867	3,795	4,828	3,965.58	21.74%
TCLS / Entries	236	286	183	193	174	256	214.40	19.18%
PC / Loans	1,956	2,620	2,686	2,287	2,387	2,694	2,387.37	12.83%
PC / Potential Users	11,583	13,910	14,538	14,859	15,390	15,730	14,055.85	11.91%
PC / Entries	136	172	111	114	110	143	128.66	10.81%
Loans / Total Number of Library P	1,479	1,121	979	1,342	1,308	1,173	1,245.97	-5.89%
Potential Users / Total Number of Library P	250	211	181	207	203	201	210.28	-4.51%
Entries / Total Number of Library P	21,227	17,038	23,771	26,831	28,511	22,155	23,475.75	-5.62%
Total Number of Library P / Number of Libraries	18	22	22	19	19	19	19.96	-5.90%
PC / TCLS	0.58	0.60	0.61	0.59	0.63	0.56	0.60	-7.22%
AC / PC	0.47	0.46	0.47	0.51	0.54	0.62	0.49	27.00%
MC / TCLS	0.15	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.09	0.10	-8.79
AC / TCLS	0.27	0.28	0.29	0.30	0.34	0.35	0.30	17.72%
AC / Potential Users	5,486	6,465	6,856	7,605	8,266	9,824	6,935.56	41.65%
TC / Library seat	244,866	279,052	287,146	288,864	286,757	318,693	277,337.03	14.91%
PC / Library seat	141,636	168,257	173,779	170,830	180,401	177,821	166,980.82	6.49%
MC / Library seat	36,150	32,593	31,415	30,601	9,456	29,809	28,043.14	6.30%
Efficacy Indicators								
Loans / Potential Users	5.92	5.31	5.41	6.50	6.45	5.84	5.92	-1.31%
Number of Monographs / Student	26.20	26.89	22.81	26.36	27.61	28.67	25.97	10.38%
Number of Monographs / Professor	469.1	455.2	368.5	408.4	416.4	425.6	423.52	0.48%
Number of Monographs / Potential User	24.24	24.78	20.94	24.12	25.20	26.11	23.86	9.44%
Number of Live Journals / Student	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.17	0.18	0.11	68.18%
Number of Live Journals / Professor	1.46	1.53	1.48	1.56	2.62	2.68	1.73	55.25%
Number of Live Journals / Potential User	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.16	0.16	0.10	66.93%
Entries / Potential User	85.01	80.67	131.36	129.86	140.48	110.33	113.48	-2.77%
Library seating / Libraries	376.50	376.50	334.72	339.44	325.11	333.56	350.46	-4.82%
Users Training / Potential Users	nd	nd	nd	0.04	nd	0.00	nd	nd
Training Hours / Users Training	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Training Hours / Potential Users	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
New Acquisitions / Potential Users	0.48	0.48	0.59	0.60	0.66	0.64	0.56	13.62%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

Table 3. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1998-1999	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (4)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (5)
General Data								
Students	35,547	36,030	35,739	35,744	36,753	36,378	35,963	1.16%
Professors	2,488	2,643	2,687	2,728	2,795	2,818	2,668	5.61%
ASP	1,115	1,141	1,182	1,212	1,232	1,252	1,176	6.43%
Potential Users	39,150	39,814	39,608	39,684	40,780	40,448	39,807	1.61%
Resources								
Facilities								
Library Centres	16	16	14	13	14	13	15	-10.96%
Library Square Metres	18,919	20,384	25,118	25,643	26,207	26,048	23,254	12.01%
Library seating	3,061	3,483	3,903	3,930	3,998	4,100	3,675	11.56%
Computerized/multimedia seats	70	104	211	276	341	437	200	118.06%
Activity								
Entries	4,229,000	4,289,280	4,601,584	4,625,727	4,383,105	4,359,081	4,425,739	-1.51%
Database Consultation	47,028	36,158	40,435	32,438	31,203	31,203	37,452	-16.69%
Loans	416,545	430,901	477,809	494,778	481,881	495,303	460,383	7.59%
In-library loans	1,535,450	1,564,892	1,532,322	1,554,996	1,557,871	1,306,492	1,549,106	-15.66%
Training Course Attendees	2,326	2,557	3,118	2,246	1,139	2,152	2,277	-5.50%
Training Hours	256	329	445	422	247	312	340	-8.18%
Titles								
Number of Monographs	615,635	649,252	675,919	700,948	724,990	722,105	673,349	7.24%
Number of Acquisitions	42,207	33,617	26,667	24,747	21,376	24,579	29,723	-17.31%
Number of Live Journals	12,027	13,105	13,156	12,984	12,856	12,809	12,826	-0.13%
Number of Databases	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Personnel (P)								
Library Staff	70	70	68	67	68	67	69	-2.33%
Other Staff	81	80	82	83	83	84	82	2.69%
FTE Scholarship Holders *	55	57	57	56	56	56	56	-0.36%
Total	206	207	207	206	207	207	207	0.19%
Costs								
Total Spending on Monographs	181,206	147,251	121,024	104,751	81,408	113,668	127,128	-10.59%
Total Spending on Journals	185,298	203,849	254,407	250,618	234,541	309,828	225,743	37.25%
Total Spending on DB and Electronic Information. (**)								
Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)	366,504	351,100	375,431	355,369	315,949	423,496	352,871	20.01%
Maintenance Costs (MC) (1)	126,772	103,187	159,459	166,077	189,587	191,552	149,016	28.54%
Personnel Costs (PC) (2)	528,874	547,343	557,005	597,653	613,184	644,014	568,812	13.22%
Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)	1,022,150	1,001,630	1,091,895	1,119,099	1,118,720	1,259,062	1,070,699	17.59%
Budget								
Chapter I, University (2)	12,669,943	13,871,763	14,353,336	15,116,786	15,952,447	16,958,266	14,392,855	17.82%
Total UAB Budget (3)	21,831,565	23,257,530	27,995,192	24,219,798	24,817,222	25,351,748	24,424,261	3.80%

(1) MC has been calculated as the difference between TCLS and the addition of PC and AC

(2) DURIS data

(3) DURIS data. Data corresponds to the initial expense budget

(4) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(5) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(*) Full Time Equivalent

(**) Expenses on data base and electronic information is counted as monographs or journals

Table 4. Basic Indicators. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1999-1990	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
Resources Indicators								
Personnel (P)								
Library P / Total Library P	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.32	0.33	-2.52%
Administrative P / Total Library P	0.39	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.41	0.40	2.49%
Scholarship Holders / Total Library P	0.27	0.28	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	-0.55%
Total P / ASP (University)	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.18	-5.98%
Budget								
TCLS / University Budget	4.68	4.31	3.90	4.62	4.51	4.97	4.40	12.78%
Library P Cost / Chapter I Cost	4.17	3.95	3.88	3.95	3.84	3.80	3.96	-4.09%
Spaces								
Library Square Metres / Potential Users	0.48	0.51	0.63	0.65	0.64	0.64	0.58	10.34%
Library seating / Potential Users	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	9.87%
Computerized Library seating / Total Library Seating	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.05	103.17%
Titles								
Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	0.98	0.72	0.48	0.42	0.35	0.37	0.59	-37.63%
Efficiency Indicators								
TCLS / Potential User	26,109	25,158	27,568	28,200	27,433	31,128	26,893.43	15.75%
TCLS / Loans	2,454	2,325	2,285	2,262	2,322	2,542	2,329.40	9.13%
TCLS / Entries	242	234	237	242	255	289	241.93	19.39%
PC / Loans	1,270	1,270	1,166	1,208	1,272	1,300	1,237.21	5.09%
PC / Potential Users	13,509	13,748	14,063	15,060	15,036	15,922	14,283.21	11.47%
PC / Entries	125	128	121	129	140	148	128.56	14.92%
Loans / Total Number of Library P	2,022	2,082	2,308	2,402	2,328	2,393	2,228.35	7.38%
Potential Users / Total Number of Library P	190	192	191	193	197	195	192.68	1.41%
Entries / Total Number of Library P	20,529	20,721	22,230	22,455	21,174	21,058	21,421.91	-1.70%
Total Number of Library P / Number of Libraries	13	13	15	16	15	16	14.25	11.77%
PC / TCLS	0.52	0.55	0.51	0.53	0.55	0.51	0.53	-3.71%
AC / PC	0.69	0.64	0.67	0.59	0.52	0.66	0.62	5.44%
MC / TCLS	0.12	0.10	0.15	0.15	0.17	0.15	0.14	10.09%
AC / TCLS	0.36	0.35	0.34	0.32	0.28	0.34	0.33	1.75%
AC / Potential Users	9,362	8,819	9,479	8,955	7,748	10,470	8,872.26	18.01%
TC / Library seat	333,927	287,577	279,758	284,758	279,820	307,088	293,167.89	4.75%
PC / Library seat	172,778	157,147	142,712	152,075	153,373	157,077	155,616.89	0.94%
MC / Library seat	41,415	29,626	40,855	42,259	47,420	46,720	40,315.17	15.89%
Efficacy Indicators								
Loans / Potential Users	10.64	10.82	12.06	12.47	11.82	12.25	11.56	5.91%
Number of Monographs / Student	17.32	18.02	18.91	19.61	19.73	19.85	18.72	6.05%
Number of Monographs / Professor	247.44	245.65	251.55	256.95	259.39	256.25	252.20	1.61%
Number of Monographs / Potential User	15.73	16.31	17.07	17.66	17.78	17.85	16.91	5.59%
Number of Live Journals / Student	0.34	0.36	0.37	0.36	0.35	0.35	0.36	-1.27%
Number of Live Journals / Professor	4.83	4.96	4.90	4.76	4.60	4.55	4.81	-5.49%
Number of Live Journals / Potential User	0.31	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.32	0.32	0.32	-1.71%
Entries / Potential User	108.02	107.73	116.18	116.56	107.48	107.77	111.20	-3.08%
Library seating / Libraries	191.31	217.69	278.79	302.31	285.57	315.38	255.13	23.62%
Users Training / Potential Users	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.06	-7.27%
Training Hours / Users Training	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.19	0.22	0.14	0.16	-7.80%
Training Hours / Potential Users	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-9.74%
New Acquisitions / Potential Users	1.08	0.84	0.67	0.62	0.52	0.61	0.75	-18.84%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

Table 5.
Basic Quantitative Data.
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC)

	18 1999	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (3)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (4)			
General Data								
Students	32,582	32,526	31,903	31,524	32,140	30,414	32,135	-5.36%
Professors	2,131	2,188	2,231	2,237	2,236	2,247	2,205	1.92%
ASP	989	1,055	1,113	1,175	1,221	1,223	1,111	10.12%
Potential Users	35,702	35,769	35,247	34,936	35,597	33,884	35,450	-4.42%
Resources								
Facilities								
Library Centres	14	14	14	12	12	12	13	-9.09%
Library Square Metres	7,182	11,871	11,852	11,852	12,529	15,303	11,057	38.40%
Library seating	1,512	1,512	2,087	2,073	2,153	2,776	1,867	48.66%
Computerized/multimedia seats	56	104	128	169	234	275	138	98.99%
Entries								
Entries	2,706,584	2,544,043	3,080,834	3,041,394	2,718,675	2,805,354	2,818,306	-0.46%
Database Consultation	18,864	19,724	23,733	24,698	25,470	48,102	22,498	113.81%
Loans	268,075	284,055	304,475	301,409	285,541	257,486	288,711	-10.82%
In-library loans	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Training Course Attendees	2,883	3,087	2,437	2,174	2,931	4,613	2,702	70.70%
Training Hours	1,153	1,235	1,219	1,087	1,466	2,307	1,232	87.26%
Titles								
Number of Monographs	220,498	241,738	265,295	288,179	316,862	348,575	266,514	30.79%
Number of Acquisitions	12,271	9,460	12,899	12,205	22,143	24,879	13,796	80.34%
Number of Live Journals	2,134	2,134	2,134	2,883	3,327	3,914	2,522	55.17%
Number of Databases	25	23	23	23	23	36	23	53.85%
Personnel (P)								
Library Staff	59	66	68	66	69	73	66	11.28%
Other Staff	26	30	30	28	30	29	29	0.69%
FTE Scholarship Holders *	23	24	26	26	27	23	25	-8.73%
Total	108	120	124	120	126	125	120	4.52%
Financial Information (in thousands of PTA)								
Total Spending on Monographs	80,000	95,000	100,000	130,000	160,000	200,000	113,000	76.99%
Total Spending on Journals	29,464	40,000	63,515	66,000	68,000	71,000	53,396	32.97%
Total Spending on DB and Electronic Information	14,800	16,400	18,250	20,300	22,555	37,000	18,461	100.42%
Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)	109,464	135,000	163,515	196,000	250,555	308,000	170,907	80.22%
Maintenance Costs (MC) (1)	241,748	169,191	249,212	167,094	193,859	219,819	204,221	7.64%
Personnel Costs (PC) (2)	353,252	366,065	366,065	373,917	380,771	388,542	368,014	5.58%
Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)	704,464	670,256	778,792	737,011	825,185	916,361	743,142	23.31%
Chapter I, University (3)								
Chapter I, University (3)	11,872,368	12,958,859	13,450,756	14,251,444	14,923,907	15,855,107	13,491,467	17.52%
Total UPC Budget (4)	23,300,492	25,525,051	26,063,487	26,622,410	28,461,297	28,565,206	25,994,547	9.89%
(1) DURIS data (2) DURIS data. Data corresponds to the initial expense budget (3) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999 (4) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999 (*) Full Time Equivalent								

Table 6. Basic Indicators. Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1999-1990	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
Resources Indicators								
Personnel (P)								
Library P / Total Library P	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.58	0.55	6.48%
Administrative P / Total Library P	0.24	0.25	0.24	0.23	0.24	0.23	0.24	-3.66%
Scholarship Holders / Total Library P	0.21	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.18	0.21	-12.68%
Total P / ASP (University)	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11	-5.31%
Budget								
TCLS / University Budget	3.02	2.63	2.99	2.77	2.90	3.21	2.86	12.13%
Library P Cost / Chapter I Cost	2.98	2.82	2.72	2.62	2.55	2.45	2.74	-10.54%
Spaces								
Library Square Metres / Potential Users	0.20	0.33	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.45	0.31	44.70%
Library seating / Potential Users	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.05	55.37%
Computerized Library seating / Total Library Seating	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.11	0.10	0.07	38.60%
Titles								
Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	2.72	2.38	1.57	1.97	2.35	2.82	2.20	28.19%
Efficiency Indicators								
TCLS / Potential User	19,732	18,738	22,095	21,096	23,181	27,044	20,968.57	28.97%
TCLS / Loans	2,628	2,360	2,558	2,445	2,890	3,559	2,576.08	38.15%
TCLS / Entries	260	263	253	242	304	327	264.48	23.51%
PC / Loans	1,318	1,289	1,202	1,241	1,334	1,509	1,276.56	18.21%
PC / Potential Users	9,894	10,234	10,386	10,703	10,697	11,467	10,382.79	10.44%
PC / Entries	131	144	119	123	140	139	131.25	5.53%
Loans / Total Number of Library P	2,482	2,367	2,455	2,512	2,266	2,060	2,416.54	-14.76%
Potential Users / Total Number of Library P	331	298	284	291	283	271	297.31	-8.83%
Entries / Total Number of Library P	25,061	21,200	24,845	25,345	21,577	22,443	23,605.70	-4.93%
Total Number of Library P / Number of Libraries	8	9	9	10	11	10	9.13	14.11%
PC / TCLS	0.50	0.55	0.47	0.51	0.46	0.42	0.50	-14.74%
AC / PC	0.31	0.37	0.45	0.52	0.66	0.79	0.46	71.76%
MC / TCLS	0.34	0.25	0.32	0.23	0.23	0.24	0.28	-12.91%
AC / TCLS	0.16	0.20	0.21	0.27	0.30	0.34	0.23	47.89%
AC / Potential Users	3,066	3,774	4,639	5,610	7,039	9,090	4,825.66	88.36%
TC / Library seat	465,915	443,291	373,163	355,529	383,272	330,101	404,234.12	-18.34%
PC / Library seat	233,632	242,106	175,402	180,375	176,856	139,965	201,674.42	-30.60%
MC / Library seat	159,886	111,899	119,412	80,605	90,041	79,186	112,368.58	-29.53%
Efficacy Indicators								
Loans / Potential Users	7.51	7.94	8.64	8.63	8.02	7.60	8.15	-6.73%
Number of Monographs/ Student	6.77	7.43	8.32	9.14	9.86	11.46	8.30	38.03%
Number of Monographs / Professor	103.47	110.48	118.91	128.82	141.71	155.13	120.68	28.55%
Number of Monographs / Potential User	6.18	6.76	7.53	8.25	8.90	10.29	7.52	36.76%
Number of Live Journals / Student	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.13	0.08	63.74%
Number of Live Journals / Professor	1.00	0.98	0.96	1.29	1.49	1.74	1.14	52.53%
Number of Live Journals /Potential User	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.12	0.07	62.25%
Entries / Potential User	75.81	71.12	87.41	87.06	76.37	82.79	79.55	4.07%
Library seating / Libraries	108.00	108.00	149.07	172.75	179.42	231.33	143.45	61.27%
Users Training / Potential Users	0.08	0.09	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.14	0.08	78.77%
Training Hours / Users Training	0.40	0.40	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.46	8.70%
Training Hours / Potential Users	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.07	0.03	95.98%
New Acquisitions / Potential Users	0.34	0.26	0.37	0.35	0.62	0.73	0.39	88.70%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

Table 7. Basic Quantitative Data Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998- 1999	2000 1999-2000	Mitjana 1995-1999 (5)	Valoració mitjana 1995- 1999/2000) (6)
General Data								
Students	5,000	5,949	6,560	7,005	7,390	7,699	6,381	20.66%
Professors	665	817	844	879	814	845	804	5.13%
ASP	433	443	448	461	464	513	450	14.05%
Potential Users	6,098	7,209	7,852	8,345	8,668	9,057	7,634	18.63%
Resources								
Facilities								
Library Centres (7)	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0.00%
Library Square Metres	4,570	4,673	6,139	6,139	7,967	7,923	5,898	34.34%
Library seating	817	832	1,342	1,313	1,390	1,741	1,139	52.88%
Computerized/multimedia seats	87	90	151	144	144	195	123	58.28%
Activity								
Entries	1,241,650	1,619,827	1,754,972	1,926,872	1,895,512	2,357,345	1,687,767	39.67%
Database Consultation	11,242	19,940	26,616	34,351	33,764	33,764	25,183	34.08%
Loans	140,487	168,063	172,727	183,677	189,924	179,401	170,976	4.93%
In-library loans	971,436	1,291,645	1,738,222	1,707,823	1,714,691	2,121,610	1,484,763	42.89%
Training Course Attendees	1,500	2,580	2,382	3,830	3,455	5,163	2,749	87.79%
Training Hours	225	389	361	498	352	297	365	-18.63%
Titles								
Number of Monographs	188,345	210,044	245,920	277,703	304,953	328,184	245,393	33.74%
Number of Acquisitions	36,618	21,699	35,877	31,783	27,250	23,231	30,645	-24.19%
Number of Live Journals	4,283	4,160	4,351	4,608	5,039	5,026	4,488	11.98%
Number of Databases	nd	nd	58	37	60	103	52	99.35%
Personnel (P)								
Library Staff	61	61	59	59	55	51	59	-13.56%
Other Staff	29	29	29	29	28	29	29	0.69%
FTE Scholarship Holders *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Total	90	90	88	88	83	80	88	-8.88%
Financial Information (in thousands of PTA)								
Total Spending on Monographs	67,347	67,597	84,168	68,483	72,960	80,893	72,111	12.18%
Total Spending on Journals	65,355	62,903	67,277	76,097	78,964	73,953	70,119	5.47%
Total Spending on DB and Electronic Information	nd	nd	nd	nd	6,318	17,848	6,318	182.49%
Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)	132,702	130,500	151,445	144,580	158,242	172,694	143,494	20.35%
Maintenance Costs (MC) (1)	34,249	30,463	31,430	20,280	35,639	68,741	30,412	126.03%
Personnel Costs (PC) (2)	327,974	348,513	341,586	336,975	342,700	295,146	339,550	-13.08%
Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)	494,925	509,476	524,461	501,835	536,581	536,581	513,456	4.50%
Chapter I, University (3)	3,740,720	4,219,608	4,372,149	4,526,444	4,693,167	4,992,042	4,310,418	15.81%
Total UPF Budget (4)	7,112,268	9,056,385	7,440,785	8,632,454	8,496,009	8,961,230	8,147,580	9.99%

MC has been calculated as the difference between LS budget and the addition of PC and AC

(2) 1995 TCLS has been estimated according to 1996 and 1997 increase

(3) DURIS data

(4) DURIS data. Data corresponds to the initial expense budget

(5) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(6) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(7) The collection of Insitut Universitari d'Història Jaume Vicens i Vives is not considered a centre

(*) Full Time Equivalent

Table 8. Basic Indicators. Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1998	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
Resources Indicators								
Personnel (P)								
Library P / Total Library P	0.68	0.68	0.67	0.67	0.66	0.64	0.67	-5.11%
Administrative P / Total Library P	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.36	0.33	10.46%
Scholarship Holders / Total Library P	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Total P / ASP (University)	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.20	-20.21%
Budget								
TCLS / University Budget	6.96	5.63	7.05	5.81	6.32	5.99	6.35	-5.74
Library P Cost / Chapter I Cost	8.77	8.26	7.81	7.44	7.30	5.91	7.92	-25.32%
Spaces								
Library Square Metres / Potential Users	0.75	0.65	0.78	0.74	0.92	0.87	0.77	14.08%
Library seating / Potential Users	0.13	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.19	0.15	30.23%
Computerized Library seating / Total Library Seating	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.11	3.62%
Titles								
Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	1.03	1.07	1.25	0.90	0.92	1.09	1.04	5.58%
Efficiency Indicators								
TCLS / Potential User	81,162	70,672	66,793	60,136	61,904	59,245	68,133.41	-13.05%
TCLS / Loans	3,523	3,031	3,036	2,732	2,825	2,991	3,029.63	-1.28%
TCLS / Entries	399	315	299	260	283	228	311.10	-26.83%
PC / Loans	2,335	2,074	1,978	1,835	1,804	1,645	2,004.97	-17.95%
PC / Potential Users	53,784	48,344	43,503	40,380	39,536	32,588	45,109.55	-27.76%
PC / Entries	264	215	195	175	181	125	205.92	-39.20%
Loans / Total Number of Library P	1,561	1,867	1,963	2,087	2,288	2,243	1,953.32	14.80%
Potential Users / Total Number of Library P	68	80	89	95	104	113	87.27	29.73%
Entries / Total Number of Library P	13,796	17,998	19,943	21,896	22,837	29,467	19,294.16	52.72%
Total Number of Library P / Number of Libraries	23	23	22	22	21	20	21.95	-8.88%
PC / TCLS	0.66	0.68	0.65	0.67	0.64	0.55	0.66	-16.87%
AC / PC	0.40	0.37	0.44	0.43	0.46	0.59	0.42	38.44%
MC / TCLS	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.13	0.06	116.58%
AC / TCLS	0.27	0.26	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.32	0.28	15.27%
AC / Potential Users	21,762	18,102	19,287	17,325	18,256	19,067	18,946.52	0.64%
TC / Library seat	605,783	612,351	390,806	382,205	386,029	308,203	475,434.84	-35.17%
PC / Library seat	401,437	418,886	254,535	256,645	246,547	169,527	315,609.93	-46.29%
MC / Library seat	41,920	36,614	23,420	15,446	25,640	39,484	28,608.00	38.02%
Efficacy Indicators								
Loans / Potential Users	23.04	23.31	22.00	22.01	21.91	19.81	22.45	-11.78
Number of Monographs/ Student	37.67	35.31	37.49	39.64	41.27	42.63	38.27	11.37%
Number of Monographs / Professor	283.23	257.09	291.37	315.93	374.64	388.38	304.45	27.57%
Number of Monographs / Potential User	30.89	29.14	31.32	33.28	35.18	36.24	31.96	13.38%
Number of Live Journals / Student	0.86	0.70	0.66	0.66	0.68	0.65	0.71	-8.28%
Number of Live Journals / Professor	6.44	5.09	5.16	5.24	6.19	5.95	5.62	5.76%
Number of Live Journals /Potential User	0.70	0.58	0.55	0.55	0.58	0.55	0.59	-6.49%
Entries / Potential User	203.62	224.70	223.51	230.90	218.68	260.28	220.28	18.16%
Library seating / Libraries	204.25	208.00	335.50	328.25	347.50	435.25	284.70	52.88%
Users Training / Potential Users	0.25	0.36	0.30	0.46	0.40	0.57	0.35	61.51%
Training Hours / Users Training	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.10	0.06	0.14	-57.96%
Training Hours / Potential Users	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.05	-30.85%
New Acquisitions / Potential Users	6.00	3.01	4.57	3.81	3.14	2.56	4.11	-37.55%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

Table 9. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat de Girona (UdG)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (4)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (5)
General Data								
Students	9,585	10,389	10,962	11,375	11,712	11,541	10,805	6.82%
Professors	692	709	725	761	763	775	730	6.16%
ASP	296	300	339	341	358	378	327	15.67%
Potential Users	10,573	11,398	12,026	12,477	12,833	12,694	11,861	7.02%
Resources								
Facilities								
Library Centres	7	7	5	4	4	4	5	-25.93%
Library Square Metres	2,567	2,902	2,902	3,283	3,283	3,433	2,987	14.92%
Library seating	655	680	680	692	692	692	680	1.79%
Computerized/multimedia seats	27	36	37	39	39	72	36	102.25%
Activity								
Entries	780,079	923,546	946,311	916,781	903,234	805,153	893,990	-9.94%
Database Consultation	nd	nd	nd	nd	25,545	68,186	25,545	166.93%
Loans	109,045	131,516	204,268	173,179	153,779	150,176	154,357	-2.71%
In-library loans	355,398	441,106	464,938	489,090	447,331	371,036	439,573	-15.59%
Training Course Attendees	1,568	1,387	936	942	1,408	1,254	1,248	0.46%
Training Hours	76	79	78	138	101	234	94	147.72%
Titles								
Number of Monographs	109,316	132,026	149,273	169,087	187,507	211,964	149,442	41.84%
Number of Acquisitions	14,314	15,610	17,244	22,573	18,420	18,217	17,632	3.32%
Number of Live Journals	2,989	2,102	2,189	2,673	2,695	2,951	2,530	16.66%
Number of Databases	nd	nd	nd	60	75	96	68	42.22%
Personnel (P)								
Library Staff	30	30	30	30	30	33	30	10.00%
Other Staff	16	16	16	21	21	26	18	44.44%
FTE Scholarship Holders *	9	10	10	8	10	11	9	17.02%
Total	55	56	56	59	61	70	57	21.95%
Financial Information (in thousands of PTA)								
Total Spending on Monographs	48,396	47,392	52,509	58,429	78,212	71,184	56,988	24.91%
Total Spending on Journals	18,134	27,274	35,474	35,370	40,146	44,274	31,280	41.54%
Total Spending on DB and Electronic Information	3,565	4,271	6,489	7,322	8,451	8,444	6,020	40.28%
Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)	70,095	78,937	94,472	101,121	126,809	123,902	94,287	31.41%
Maintenance Costs (MC) (1)	166,786	47,326	37,568	26,222	18,872	28,673	59,355	-51.69%
Personnel Costs (PC)	127,652	133,126	133,353	161,085	167,270	175,714	144,497	21.60%
Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)	364,533	259,389	265,393	288,428	312,951	328,289	298,139	10.11%
Chapter I, University (2)	3,248,476	3,451,396	3,621,735	3,897,459	4,274,847	4,762,956	3,698,783	28.77%
Total UdG Budget (3)	4,079,645	4,471,737	4,906,655	5,289,567	5,677,194	6,367,970	4,884,960	30.36%

(1) MC has been calculated as the difference between TCLS and the addition of PC and AC

(2) DURIS data

(3) DURIS data, Data corresponds to the initial expense budget

(4) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(5) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(*) Full Time Equivalent

Table 10. Basic Indicators. Universitat de Girona (UdG)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
Resources Indicators								
Personnel (P)								
Library P / Total Library P	0.55	0.54	0.54	0.51	0.49	0.47	0.52	-9.94%
Administrative P / Total Library P	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.36	0.34	0.37	0.31	18.85%
Scholarship Holders / Total Library P	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.14	0.16	0.16	0.16	-4.22
Total P / ASP (University)	0.19	0.19	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.19	0.18	5.09%
Budget								
TCLS / University Budget	8.94	5.80	5.41	5.45	5.51	5.16	6.22	-17.14%
Library P Cost / Chapter I Cost	3.93	3.86	3.68	4.13	3.91	3.69	3.90	-5.48%
Spaces								
Library Square Metres / Potential Users	0.24	0.25	0.24	0.26	0.26	0.27	0.25	7.52%
Library seating / Potential Users	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.06	-5.21%
Computerized Library seating / Total Library Seating	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.05	99.10%
Titles								
Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	2.67	1.74	1.48	1.65	1.95	1.61	1.90	-15.26%
Efficiency Indicators								
TCLS / Potential User	34,478	22,757	22,068	23,117	24,386	25,862	25,361.32	1.97%
TCLS / Loans	3,343	1,972	1,299	1,665	2,035	2,186	2,063.01	5.96%
TCLS / Entries	467	281	280	315	346	408	337.94	20.65%
PC / Loans	1,171	1,012	653	930	1,088	1,170	970.72	20.53%
PC / Potential Users	12,073	11,680	11,089	12,911	13,034	13,842	12,157.36	13.86%
PC / Entries	164	144	141	176	185	218	161.92	34.78%
Loans / Total Number of Library P	1,983	2,349	3,648	2,935	2,521	2,145	2,687.00	-20.16%
Potential Users / Total Number of Library P	192	204	215	211	210	181	206.47	-12.17%
Entries / Total Number of Library P	14,183	16,492	16,898	15,539	14,807	11,502	15,583.87	-26.19%
Total Number of Library P / Number of Libraries	7.86	8	11.2	14.75	15.25	17.50	11.41	53.36%
PC / TCLS	0.35	0.51	0.50	0.56	0.53	0.54	0.49	8.84%
AC / PC	0.55	0.59	0.71	0.63	0.76	0.71	0.65	8.94%
MC / TCLS	0.46	0.18	0.14	0.09	0.06	0.09	0.19	-53.18%
AC / TCLS	0.19	0.30	0.36	0.35	0.41	0.38	0.32	17.33%
AC / Potential Users	6,630	6,926	7,856	8,105	9,881	9,761	7,879.37	23.88%
TC / Library seat	556,539	381,454	390,284	416,803	452,241	474,406	439,464.39	7.95%
PC / Library seat	194,889	195,774	196,107	232,782	241,720	253,922	212,254.18	19.63%
MC / Library seat	254,635	69,597	55,247	37,893	27,272	41,435	88,928.79	-53.41
Efficacy Indicators								
Loans / Potential Users	10.31	11.54	16.99	13.88	11.98	11.83	12.94	-8.58%
Number of Monographs/ Student	11.40	12.71	13.62	14.86	16.01	18.37	13.72	33.85%
Number of Monographs / Professor	157.97	186.21	205.89	222.19	245.75	273.50	203.60	34.33%
Number of Monographs / Potential User	10.34	11.58	12.41	13.55	14.61	16.70	12.50	33.59%
Number of Live Journals / Student	0.31	0.20	0.20	0.23	0.23	0.26		8.44%
Number of Live Journals / Professor	4.32	2.96	3.02	3.51	3.53	3.81	3.47	9.75%
Number of Live Journals / Potential User	0.28	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.21	8.29%
Entries / Potential User	73.78	81.03	78.69	73.48	70.38	63.43	75.47	-15.96%
Library seating / Libraries	93.57	97.14	136.00	173.00	173.00	173.00	134.54	28.58%
Users Training / Potential Users	0.15	0.12	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.10	0.11	-7.34%
Training Hours / Users Training	0.05	0.06	0.08	0.15	0.07	0.19	0.08	129.14%
Training Hours / Potential Users	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	132.96%
New Acquisitions / Potential Users	1.35	1.37	1.43	1.81	1.44	1.44	1.48	-3.06%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

Table 11. Basic Quantitative Data Universitat de Lleida (UdL)	1995 1994-1995	1997 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (5)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (6)
General Data								
Students	8,327	8,520	9,154	9,106	9,501	9,526	8,922	6.77%
Professors	622	614	614	617	642	680	622	9.36%
ASP	193	205	207	232	235	251	214	17.07%
Potential Users	9,142	9,339	9,975	9,955	10,378	10,457	9,758	7.17%
Resources								
Facilities								
Library Centres (7)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0.00%
Library Square Metres	3,082	3,891	3,891	3,891	4,388	4,413	3,829	15.26%
Library seating	852	1,084	1,198	1,242	1,538	1,467	1,183	24.03%
Computerized/multimedia seats	34	73	85	114	116	120	84	42.18%
Activity								
Entries (1)	555,363	696,991	874,737	1,097,812	1,308,921	1,574,829	906,765	73.68%
Database Consultation	nd	nd	nd	nd	74,945	150,340	74,945	100.60%
Loans	69,242	102,304	103,017	117,021	148,365	127,199	107,990	17.79%
In-library loans	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Training Course Attendees	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	3,192	nd	nd
Training Hours	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	1,345	nd	nd
Titles								
Number of Monographs	61,168	133,392	140,257	158,560	162,618	187,424	131,199	42.85%
Number of Acquisitions	6,737	6,737	9,870	8,781	9,098	9,435	8,245	14.44%
Number of Live Journals	1,810	1,746	2,003	2,120	2,280	2,632	1,992	32.14%
Number of Databases	nd	38	42	49	86	114	54	112.09%
Personnel (P)								
Library Staff	17	17	17	24	24	24	20	21.21%
Other Staff	9	9	9	11	11	12	10	22.45%
FTE Scholarship Holders *	9	10	10	12	12	12	11	13.21%
Total	35	36	36	47	47	48	40	19.40%
Financial Information (in thousands of PTA)								
Total Spending on Monographs	32,800	49,344	67,078	62,451	58,216	72,583	53,978	34.47%
Total Spending on Journals	34,987	43,855	55,591	68,002	62,048	78,116	52,897	47.68%
Total Spending on DB and Electronic Information	4,912	9,533	11,405	14,743	17,746	19,559	11,668	67.63%
Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)	13,507	14,334	14,682	17,274	19,855	20,765	15,930	30.35%
Maintenance Costs (MC) (2)	72,699	102,732	134,074	145,196	138,010	170,258	118,542	43.63%
Personnel Costs (PC)	87,735	105,880	107,391	121,741	137,082	154,732	111,966	38.20%
Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)	173,941	222,946	256,147	284,211	294,947	345,755	246,438	40.30%
Chapter I, University (3)	2,635,295	2,875,755	3,026,175	3,190,811	3,352,221	3,594,495	3,016,051	19.18%
Total UdL Budget (4)	4,079,340	4,403,207	4,607,853	4,941,711	5,523,134	5,923,643	4,711,049	25.74%

(1) The number of incomers from 1995 to 1998 has been calculated from an increment between years' 1999 and 2000 data.

(2) MC of LDS in UdL represents 7.1% of the budget

(3) DURIS data

(4) DURIS data. Data corresponds to the initial expense budget

(5) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(6) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(*) Full Time Equivalent

Table 12. Basic Indicators. Universitat de Lleida (UdL)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
Resources Indicators								
Personnel (P)								
Library P / Total Library P	0.49	0.47	0.47	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.49	1.98%
Administrative P / Total Library P	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.25	2.02%
Scholarship Holders / Total Library P	0.26	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.26	-5.54%
Total P / ASP (University)	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.20	0.20	0.19	0.19	2.43%
Budget								
TCLS / University Budget	4.26	5.06	5.56	5.75	5.34	5.84	5.20	12.34%
Library P Cost / Chapter I Cost	3.33	3.68	3.55	3.82	4.09	4.30	3.69	16.57%
Spaces								
Library Square Metres / Potential Users	0.34	0.42	0.39	0.39	0.42	0.42	0.39	7.79%
Library seating / Potential Users	0.09	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.12	16.46%
Computerized Library seating / Total Library Seating	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.07	18.41%
Titles								
Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	0.94	1.13	1.21	0.92	0.94	0.93	1.03	-9.37%
Efficiency Indicators								
TCLS / Potential User	19,027	23,873	25,679	28,550	28,420	33,064	25,109.61	31.68%
TCLS / Loans	2,512	2,179	2,486	2,429	1,988	2,718	2,318.90	17.22%
TCLS / Entries	313	320	293	259	225	220	282.02	-22.15%
PC / Loans	1,267	1,035	1,042	1,040	924	1,216	1,061.76	14.57%
PC / Potential Users	9,597	11,337	10,766	12,229	13,209	14,797	11,427.67	29.48%
PC / Entries	158	152	123	111	105	98	129.66	-24.22%
Loans / Total Number of Library P	1,978	2,842	2,862	2,490	3,157	2,650	2,665.64	-0.59%
Potential Users / Total Number of Library P	261	259	277	212	221	218	246.06	-11.46%
Entries / Total Number of Library P	15,868	19,361	24,298	23,358	27,849	32,809	22,146.74	48.14%
Total Number of Library P / Number of Libraries	7	7	7	9	9	10	8.04	19.40%
PC / TCLS	0.50	0.47	0.42	0.43	0.46	0.45	0.46	-2.36%
AC / PC	0.83	0.97	1.25	1.19	1.01	1.10	1.05	4.86%
MC / TCLS	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.07	-8.27%
AC / TCLS	0.42	0.46	0.52	0.51	0.47	0.49	0.48	3.41%
AC / Potential Users	7,952	11,000	13,441	14,585	13,298	16,282	12,055.42	35.06%
TC / Library seat	204,156	205,670	213,812	228,833	191,773	235,688	208,848.89	12.85%
PC / Library seat	102,975	97,675	89,642	98,020	89,130	105,475	95,488.54	10.46%
MC / Library seat	15,853	13,223	12,255	13,908	12,910	14,155	13,629.96	3.85%
Efficacy Indicators								
Loans / Potential Users	7.57	10.95	10.33	11.75	14.30	12.16	10.98	10.77%
Number of Monographs/ Student	7.35	15.66	15.32	17.41	17.12	19.67	14.57	35.03%
Number of Monographs / Professor	98.34	217.25	228.43	256.99	253.30	275.62	210.86	30.71%
Number of Monographs / Potential User	6.69		14.06	15.93	15.67	17.92	13.33	34.49%
Number of Live Journals / Student	0.22	0.20	0.22	0.23	0.24	0.28	0.22	24.02%
Number of Live Journals / Professor	2.91	2.84	3.26	3.44	3.55	3.87	3.20	20.93%
Number of Live Journals / Potential User	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.25	0.20	23.57%
Entries / Potential User	60.75	74.63	87.69	110.28	126.12	150.60	91.90	63.88%
Library seating / Libraries	170.40	216.80	239.60	248.40	307.60	293.40	236.56	24.03%
Users Training / Potential Users	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	0.31	nd	nd
Training Hours / Users Training	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	0.42	nd	nd
Training Hours / Potential Users	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	0.13	nd	nd
New Acquisitions / Potential Users	0.74	0.72	0.99	0.88	0.88	0.90	0.84	7.25%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

Table 13. Basic Quantitative Data. Universitat Rovira i Virgili (URV)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (4)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (5)
General Data								
Students	9,968	10,400	11,052	11,227	11,835	12,139	10,896	11.40%
Professors	704	799	910	989	1,013	1,031	883	16.76%
ASP	249	272	280	286	292	309	276	12.04%
Potential Users	10,921	11,471	12,242	12,502	13,140	13,479	12,055	11.81%
Resources								
Facilities								
Library Centres	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	0.00%
Library Square Metres	3,469	4,442	4,442	4,442	5,322	5,287	4,423	19.52%
Library seating	806	806	1,277	1,777	1,777	1,304	1,289	1.20%
Computerized/multimedia seats	21	31	123	125	137	155	87	77.35%
Activity								
Entries	886,566	972,530	1,479,265	1,654,525	1,769,897	1,718,599	1,352,557	27.06%
Database Consultation	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Loans	67,839	104,611	106,179	135,382	136,801	131,779	110,162	19.62%
In-library loans	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Training Course Attendees	700	710	1,041	1,161	1,161	1,009	955	5.70%
Training Hours	170	219	191	199	199	199	196	1.74%
Titles								
Number of Monographs	103,170	126,403	143,319	163,801	171,097	210,234	141,558	48.51%
Number of Acquisitions	12,197	14,099	10,520	19,894	10,647	15,252	13,471	13.22%
Number of Live Journals	2,212	2,252	2,260	2,770	2,699	1,837	2,439	-24.67%
Number of Databases	nd	nd	nd	34	55	59	45	32.58%
Personnel (P)								
Library Staff	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	0.00%
Other Staff	10	10	10	10	10	11	10	10.00%
FTE Scholarship Holders *	30	30	30	30	30	29	30	-3.33%
Total	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	0.00%
Financial Information (in thousands of PTA)								
Total Spending on Monographs	28,010	29,284	18,003	27,596	57,516	51,725	32,082	61.23%
Total Spending on Journals	42,939	42,232	47,225	48,200	56,235	51,341	47,366	8.39%
Total Spending on DB and Electronic Information	4,255	1,163	1,292	1,905	18,872	27,361	5,497	397.71%
Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)	75,204	72,679	66,520	77,701	132,623	130,427	84,945	53.54%
Maintenance Costs (MC) (1)	9,190	10,810	10,000	12,000	13,100	14,400	11,020	30.67%
Personnel Costs (PC)	125,653	141,717	148,714	155,485	178,466	203,908	150,007	35.93%
Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)	210,047	225,206	225,234	245,186	324,189	348,735	245,972	41.78%
Chapter I, University (2)	3,331,138	3,820,045	4,017,018	4,188,334	4,386,949	4,673,888	3,948,697	18.37%
Total URV Budget (3)	4,720,793	5,172,526	6,122,406	6,204,331	6,520,479	8,747,078	5,748,107	52.17%

(1) Estimated data. Data has been estimated from the median of the percentage of MC/ LSTC of the rest of Universities.

(3) DURIS data

(3) DURIS data. Data corresponds to the initial expense budget

(4) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(5) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(*) Full Time Equivalent

Table 14. Basic Indicators. Universitat Rovira i Virgili (URV)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
Resources Indicators								
Personnel (P)								
Library P / Total Library P	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.00%
Administrative P / Total Library P	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.15	10.00%
Scholarship Holders / Total Library P	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.43	0.45	-3.33%
Total P / ASP (University)	0.27	0.25	0.24	0.23	0.23	0.22	0.24	-11.02%
Budget								
TCLS / University Budget	4.45	4.35	3.68	3.95	4.97	3.99	4.28	-6.87%
Library P Cost / Chapter I Cost	3.77	3.71	3.70	3.71	4.07	4.36	3.79	15.02%
Spaces								
Library Square Metres / Potential Users	0.32	0.39	0.36	0.36	0.41	0.39	0.37	7.28%
Library seating / Potential Users	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.14	0.14	0.10	0.11	-8.00%
Computerized Library seating / Total Library Seating	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.12	0.06	92.79%
Titles								
Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	0.65	0.69	0.38	0.57	1.02	1.01	0.66	51.63%
Efficiency Indicators								
TCLS / Potential User	19,233	19,633	18,398	19,612	24,672	25,872	20,309.62	27.39%
TCLS / Loans	3,096	2,153	2,121	1,811	2,370	2,646	2,310.23	14.55%
TCLS / Entries	237	232	152	148	183	203	190.42	6.56%
PC / Loans	1,852	1,355	1,401	1,148	1,305	1,547	1,412.12	9.58%
PC / Potential Users	11,506	12,354	12,148	12,437	13,582	15,128	12,405.31	21.95%
PC / Entries	142	146	101	94	101	119	116.56	1.79%
Loans / Total Number of Library P	1,013	1,561	1,585	2,021	2,042	1,967	1,644.21	19.62%
Potential Users / Total Number of Library P	163	171	183	187	196	201	179.93	11.81%
Entries / Total Number of Library P	13,232	14,515	22,079	24,694	26,416	25,651	20,187.41	27.06%
Total Number of Library P / Number of Libraries	8	8	8	8	8	8	8.00	0.00%
PC / TCLS	0.60	0.63	0.66	0.63	0.55	0.58	0.61	-4.85%
AC / PC	0.60	0.51	0.45	0.50	0.74	0.64	0.56	14.16%
MC / TCLS	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05	-8.44%
AC / TCLS	0.36	0.32	0.30	0.32	0.41	0.37	0.34	9.86%
AC / Potential Users	6,886	6,336	5,434	6,215	10,093	9,676	6,992.80	38.38%
TC / Library seat	260,604	279,412	176,377	137,977	182,436	267,435	207,361.44	28.97%
PC / Library seat	155,897	175,828	116,456	87,499	100,431	156,371	127,222.00	22.91%
MC / Library seat	11,402	13,412	7,831	6,753	7,372	11,043	9,353.94	18.06%
Efficacy Indicators								
Loans / Potential Users	6.21	9.12	8.67	10.83	10.41	9.78	9.05	8.04%
Number of Monographs / Student	10.35	12.15	12.97	14.59	14.46	17.32	12.90	34.22%
Number of Monographs / Professor	146.55	158.20	157.49	165.62	168.90	203.91	159.35	27.96%
Number of Monographs / Potential User	9.45	11.02	11.71	13.10	13.02	15.60	11.66	33.77%
Number of Live Journals / Student	0.22	0.22	0.20	0.25	0.23	0.15	0.22	-32.30%
Number of Live Journals / Professor	3.14	2.82	2.48	2.80	2.66	1.78	2.78	-35.95%
Number of Live Journals / Potential User	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.22	0.21	0.14	0.20	-32.56%
Entries / Potential User	81.18	84.78	120.84	132.34	134.70	127.50	110.77	15.11%
Library seating / Libraries	100.75	100.75	159.63	222.13	222.13	163.00	161.08	1.20%
Users Training / Potential Users	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.08	-4.58%
Training Hours / Users Training	0.24	0.31	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.20	0.22	-8.49%
Training Hours / Potential Users	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	-9.23%
New Acquisitions / Potential Users	1.12	1.23	0.86	1.59	0.81	1.13	1.12	0.91%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

Table 15. Basic Quantitative Data. Addition of the University System	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (3)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (4)
General Data								
Students	169,148	170,980	171,484	170,251	171,948	169,507	170,762	-0.74%
Professors	11,108	11,737	12,103	12,360	12,415	12,560	11,945	5.15%
ASP	4,989	5,151	5,385	5,535	5,630	5,826	5,338	9.14%
Potential Users	185,245	187,868	188,972	188,146	189,993	187,893	188,045	-0.08%
Resources								
Facilities								
Library Centres (7)	70	70	68	64	65	64	67	-5.04%
Library Square Metres	70,597	81,247	91,406	91,869	102,142	107,067	87,452	22.43%
Library seating	13,727	14,421	16,512	17,137	17,400	18,084	15,839	14.17%
Computerized/multimedia seats	717	860	1,157	1,289	1,491	1,853	1,103	68.03%
Activity								
Entries (1)	16,661,280	16,924,279	22,198,747	22,385,713	22,616,051	21,108,870	20,157,214	4.72%
Database Consultation	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Loans	1,507,396	1,608,259	1,758,258	1,861,889	1,838,498	1,737,696	1,714,860	1.33%
In-library loans	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Training Course Attendees	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	17,715	nd	nd
Training Hours	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Titles								
Number of Monographs	3,083,641	3,298,732	3,127,952	3,452,624	3,596,768	3,780,525	3,311,943	14.15%
Number of Acquisitions	159,385	136,086	155,326	162,288	154,497	158,891	153,516	3.50%
Number of Live Journals	31,006	31,575	32,169	34,497	39,756	40,349	33,801	19.37%
Number of Databases	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Personnel (P)								
Library Staff	394	401	407	422	421	423	409	3.42%
Other Staff	242	295	312	276	276	284	280	1.36%
FTE Scholarship Holders *	220	225	257	229	232	228	233	-1.98%
Total	856	921	976	927	929	935	922	1.43%
Financial Information (in thousands of PTA)								
Total Spending on Monographs	541,872	547,216	537,767	513,270	601,336	688,423	548,292	25.56%
Total Spending on Journals	676,156	779,850	922,263	1,016,939	1,013,966	1,164,239	881,835	32.02%
Total Spending on DB and Electronic Information	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Total Spending on Acquisitions (AC)	1,230,760	1,342,033	1,479,216	1,554,179	1,689,244	1,995,594	1,459,086	36.77%
Maintenance Costs (MC) (2)	810,017	571,653	691,627	595,922	526,250	722,926	639,094	13.12%
Personnel Costs (PC)	2,404,356	2,656,226	2,701,135	2,790,629	2,875,180	2,929,696	2,685,505	9.09%
Total Cost of Library Services (TCLS)	4,445,133	4,569,912	4,871,978	4,940,730	5,090,674	5,648,216	4,783,685	18.07%
Chapter I, University (1)	59,030,812	64,144,824	65,779,296	69,269,749	72,420,422	77,133,644	66,129,021	16.64%
Total Universities Budget (2)	98,542,538	107,463,043	113,053,497	111,921,502	116,729,172	126,195,379	109,541,950	15.20%

(1) DURIS data

(2) DURIS data. Data corresponds to the initial expense budget

(3) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(4) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(*) Full Time Equivalent

Table 16. Basic Indicators. Agregació del sistema universitari	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
Resources Indicators								
Personnel (P)								
Library P / Total Library P	0.46	0.44	0.42	0.46	0.45	0.45	0.44	1.84%
Administrative P / Total Library P	0.28	0.32	0.32	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.08%
Scholarship Holders / Total Library P	0.26	0.24	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.25	-3.34%
Total P / ASP (University)	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.17	-7.14%
Budget								
TCLS / University Budget	4.51	4.25	4.31	4.41	4.36	4.48	4.37	2.43%
Library P Cost / Chapter I Cost	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.03	3.97	3.80	4.06	-6.54%
Spaces								
Library Square Metres / Potential Users	0.38	0.43	0.48	0.49	0.54	0.57	0.46	22.64%
Library seating / Potential Users	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.08	14.33%
Computerized Library seating / Total Library Seating	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.07	49.44%
Titles								
Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	0.80	0.70	0.58	0.50	0.59	0.59	0.64	-7.14%
Efficiency Indicators								
TCLS / Potential User	23,996	24,325	25,781	26,260	26,794	30,061	25,431.33	18.20%
TCLS / Loans	2,949	2,842	2,771	2,654	2,769	3,250	2,796.77	16.22%
TCLS / Entries	267	270	219	221	225	268	240.42	11.30%
PC / Loans	1,595	1,652	1,536	1,499	1,564	1,686	1,569.12	7.45%
PC / Potential Users	12,979	14,139	14,294	14,832	15,133	15,592	14,275.46	9.22%
PC / Entries	144	157	122	125	127	139	134.95	2.85%
Loans / Total Number of Library P	1,761	1,746	1,801	2,009	1,979	1,858	1,859.24	-0.04%
Potential Users / Total Number of Library P	216	204	194	203	205	201	204.30	-1.64%
Entries / Total Number of Library P	19,464	18,376	22,745	24,149	24,345	22,576	21,815.56	3.49%
Total Number of Library P / Number of Libraries	12	13	14	14	14	15	13.70	6.61%
PC / TCLS	0.54	0.58	0.55	0.56	0.56	0.52	0.56	-7.58%
AC / PC	0.51	0.51	0.55	0.56	0.59	0.68	0.54	25.71%
MC / TCLS	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.10	0.13	0.13	-4.95%
AC / TCLS	0.28	0.29	0.30	0.31	0.33	0.35	0.30	16.18%
AC / Potential Users	6,644	7,143	7,828	8,260	8,891	10,621	7,753.35	36.98%
TC / Library seat	323,824	316,893	295,057	288,308	292,567	312,332	303,329.79	2.97%
PC / Library seat	175,155	184,192	163,586	162,842	165,240	162,005	170,203.10	-4.82%
MC / Library seat	59,009	39,640	41,886	34,774	30,244	39,976	41,110.79	-2.76%
Efficacy Indicators								
Loans / Potential Users	8.14	8.56	9.30	9.90	9.68	9.25	9.11	1.46%
Number of Monographs/ Student	18.23	19.29	18.24	20.28	20.92	22.30	19.39	15.01%
Number of Monographs / Professor	277.61	281.05	258.44	279.34	289.71	301.00	277.23	8.75%
Number of Monographs / Potential User	16.65	17.56	16.55	18.35	18.93	20.12	17.61	14.27%
Number of Live Journals / Student	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.20	0.23	0.24	0.20	20.29%
Number of Live Journals / Professor	2.79	2.69	2.66	2.79	3.20	3.21	2.83	13.65%
Number of Live Journals / Potential User	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.18	19.53%
Entries / Potential User	89.94	90.09	117.47	118.98	119.04	112.35	107.10	4.89%
Library seating / Libraries	196.10	206.01	242.82	267.77	267.69	282.56	236.08	19.69%
Users Training / Potential Users	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Training Hours / Users Training	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Training Hours / Potential Users	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
New Acquisitions / Potential Users	0.86	0.72	0.82	0.86	0.81	0.85	0.82	3.57%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

Table 17. Indicators of Resources: Personnel (P) Library P / Total Number of Library P	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UAB	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.32	0.33	-2.52%
URV	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.00%
UB	0.44	0.38	0.35	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.41	7.30%
University System (3)	0.46	0.44	0.42	0.46	0.45	0.45	0.44	1.84
UdG	0.55	0.54	0.54	0.51	0.49	0.47	0.52	-9.94%
UdL	0.49	0.47	0.47	0.51	0.51	0.50	0.49	1.98%
UPC	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.58	0.55	6.48%
UPF	0.68	0.68	0.67	0.67	0.66	0.64	0.67	-5.11%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 18. Indicators of Resources: Personnel (P) Other P (excl. Scholarship Holders) / Total #of Library P	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
URV	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.15	10.00%
UPC	0.24	0.25	0.24	0.23	0.24	0.23	0.24	-3.66%
UdL	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.25	2.02%
UB	0.24	0.35	0.34	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.30	-7.34%
University System (3)	0.28	0.32	0.32	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.30	0.08%
UPF	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.36	0.33	10.46%
UdG	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.36	0.34	0.37	0.31	18.85%
UAB	0.39	0.39	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.41	0.40	2.49%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 19. Indicators of Resources: Personnel (P) Scholarship Holders / Total # of Library	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPF	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
UdG	0.16	0.18	0.18	0.14	0.16	0.16	0.16	-4.22%
UPC	0.21	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.18	0.21	-12.68%
University System (3)	0.26	0.24	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.24	0.25	-3.34%
UdL	0.26	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.26	0.25	0.26	-5.54%
UAB	0.27	0.28	0.28	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	-0.55%
UB	0.32	0.27	0.31	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.29	-2.71%
URV	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.43	0.45	-3.33%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 20. Indicators of Resources: Budget Total Cost LS / Total University Budget	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPC	3.02	2.63	2.99	2.77	2.90	3.21	2.86	12.13%
URV	4.45	4.35	3.68	3.95	4.97	3.99	4.28	-6.87%
University System (3)	4.51	4.25	4.31	4.41	4.36	4.48	4.37	2.43%
UB	4.41	4.73	4.82	4.90	4.51	4.53	4.67	-3.15%
UAB	4.68	4.31	3.90	4.62	4.51	4.97	4.40	12.78%
UdG	8.94	5.80	5.41	5.45	5.51	5.16	6.22	-17.14%
UdL	4.26	5.06	5.56	5.75	5.34	5.84	5.20	12.34%
UPF	6.96	5.63	7.05	5.81	6.32	5.99	6.35	-5.74%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 21. Indicators of Resources: Budget Personnel Cost / Chapter I Cost (%)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPC	2.98	2.82	2.72	2.62	2.55	2.45	2.74	-10.54%
UdG	3.93	3.86	3.68	4.13	3.91	3.69	3.90	-5.48%
UAB	4.17	3.95	3.88	3.95	3.84	3.80	3.96	-4.09%
University System (3)	4.07	4.14	4.11	4.03	3.97	3.80	4.06	-6.54%
UB	3.96	4.42	4.56	4.33	4.25	4.06	4.31	-5.70%
UdL	3.33	3.68	3.55	3.82	4.09	4.30	3.69	16.57%
URV	3.77	3.71	3.70	3.71	4.07	4.36	3.79	15.02%
UPF	8.77	8.26	7.81	7.44	7.30	5.91	7.92	-25.32%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 22. Indicators of Resources: Spaces Square Metres / Potential User	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdG	0.24	0.25	0.24	0.26	0.26	0.27	0.25	7.52%
URV	0.32	0.39	0.36	0.36	0.41	0.39	0.37	7.28%
UdL	0.34	0.42	0.39	0.39	0.42	0.42	0.39	7.79%
UPC	0.20	0.33	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.45	0.31	44.70%
University System (3)	0.38	0.43	0.48	0.49	0.54	0.57	0.46	22.64%
UAB	0.48	0.51	0.63	0.65	0.64	0.64	0.58	10.34%
UB	0.42	0.45	0.51	0.52	0.62	0.66	0.51	30.19%
UPF	0.75	0.65	0.78	0.74	0.92	0.87	0.77	14.08%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 23. Indicators of Resources: Spaces Library seating / Potential User	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdG	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.06	-5.21%
UPC	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.05	55.37%
UB	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.08	5.21%
University System (3)	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.08	14.33%
URV	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.14	0.14	0.10	0.11	-8.00%
UAB	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	9.87%
UdL	0.09	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.15	0.14	0.12	16.46%
UPF	0.13	0.12	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.19	0.15	30.23%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 24. Indicators of Resources: Spaces Computerized Library seating / Total Library seating	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1998 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdL	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.07	18.41%
UPC	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.11	0.10	0.07	38.60%
UB	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.07	38.09%
University System (3)	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.07	49.44%
UdG	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.05	99.10%
UAB	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.11	0.05	103.17%
UPF	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.11	3.62%
URV	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.12	0.06	92.79%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 25. Efficiency Indicators Total Cost LS / Potential User (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdG	34,478	22,757	22,068	23,117	24,386	25,862	25,361.32	1.97%
URV	19,233	19,633	18,398	19,612	24,672	25,872	20,309.62	27.39%
UPC	19,732	18,738	22,095	21,096	23,181	27,044	20,968.57	28.97%
UB	20,026	23,069	24,021	25,125	24,463	28,191	23,340.88	20.78%
University System (3)	23,996	24,325	25,781	26,260	26,794	30,061	25,431.33	18.20%
UAB	26,109	25,158	27,568	28,200	27,433	31,128	26,893.43	15.75%
UdL	19,027	23,873	25,679	28,550	28,420	33,064	25,109.61	31.68%
UPF	81,162	70,672	66,793	60,136	61,904	59,245	68,133.41	-13.05%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 26. Efficiency Indicators Total Cost LS / Loans (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdG	3,343	1,972	1,299	1,665	2,035	2,186	2,063.01	5.96%
UAB	2,454	2,325	2,285	2,262	2,322	2,542	2,329.40	9.13%
URV	3,096	2,153	2,121	1,811	2,370	2,646	2,310.23	14.55%
UdL	2,512	2,179	2,486	2,429	1,988	2,718	2,318.90	17.22%
UPF	3,523	3,031	3,036	2,732	2,825	2,991	3,029.63	-1.28%
University System (3)	2,949	2,842	2,771	2,654	2,769	3,250	2,796.77	16.22%
UPC	2,628	2,360	2,558	2,445	2,890	3,559	2,576.08	38.15%
UB	3,382	4,346	4,439	3,867	3,795	4,828	3,965.58	21.74%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 27. Efficiency Indicators Total Cost LS / Entries (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Average 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
URV	237	232	152	148	183	203	190.42	6.56%
UdL	313	320	293	259	225	220	282.02	-22.15%
UPF	399	315	299	260	283	228	311.10	-26.83%
UB	236	286	183	193	174	256	214.40	19.18%
University System (3)	267	270	219	221	225	268	240.42	11.30%
UAB	242	234	237	242	255	289	241.93	19.39%
UPC	260	263	256	242	304	327	264.48	23.51%
UdG	467	281	280	315	346	408	337.94	20.65%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 28. Efficiency Indicators Personnel Cost / Loans (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdG	1,171	1,012	653	930	1,088	1,170	970.72	20.53%
UdL	1,267	1,035	1,042	1,040	924	1,216	1,061.76	14.57%
UAB	1,270	1,270	1,166	1,208	1,272	1,300	1,237.21	5.09%
UPC	1,318	1,289	1,202	1,241	1,334	1,509	1,276.56	18.21%
URV	1,852	1,355	1,401	1,148	1,305	1,547	1,412.12	9.58%
UPF	2,335	2,074	1,978	1,835	1,804	1,645	2,004.97	-17.95%
University System (3)	1,595	1,652	1,536	1,499	1,564	1,686	1,569.12	7.45%
UB	1,956	2,620	2,686	2,287	2,387	2,694	2,387.37	12.83%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 29. Efficiency Indicators Personnel Cost / Potential User (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPC	9,894	10,234	10,386	10,703	10,697	11,467	10,382.79	10.44%
UdG	12,073	11,680	11,089	12,911	13,034	13,842	12,157.36	13.86%
UdL	9,597	11,337	10,766	12,229	13,209	14,797	11,427.67	29.48%
URV	11,506	12,354	12,148	12,437	13,582	15,128	12,405.31	21.95%
University System (3)	12,979	14,139	14,294	14,832	15,133	15,592	14,275.46	9.22%
UB	11,583	13,910	14,538	14,859	15,390	15,730	14,055.85	11.91%
UAB	13,509	13,748	14,063	15,060	15,036	15,922	14,283.21	11.47%
UPF	53,784	48,344	43,503	40,380	39,536	32,588	45,109.55	-27.76%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 30. Efficiency Indicators Personnel Cost / Entries (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdL	158	152	123	111	105	98	129.66	-24.22%
URV	142	146	101	94	101	119	116.56	1.79%
UPF	264	215	195	175	181	125	205.92	-39.20%
UPC	131	144	119	123	140	139	131.25	5.53%
University System (3)	144	157	122	125	127	139	134.95	2.85%
UB	136	172	111	114	110	143	128.66	10.81%
UAB	125	128	121	129	140	148	128.56	14.92%
UdG	164	144	141	176	185	218	161.92	34.78%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 31. Efficiency Indicators Loans / Total Number of Library Employees	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UB	1,479	1,121	979	1,342	1,308	1,173	1,245.97	-5.89%
University System (3)	1,761	1,746	1,801	2,009	1,979	1,858	1,859.24	-0.04%
URV	1,013	1,561	1,585	2,021	2,042	1,967	1,644.21	19.62%
UPC	2,482	2,367	2,455	2,512	2,266	2,060	2,416.54	-14.76%
UdG	1,983	2,349	3,648	2,935	2,521	2,145	2,687.00	-20.16%
UPF	1,561	1,867	1,963	2,087	2,288	2,243	1,953.32	14.80%
UAB	2,022	2,082	2,308	2,402	2,328	2,393	2,228.35	7.38%
UdL	1,978	2,842	2,862	2,490	3,157	2,650	2,665.64	-0.59%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 32. Efficiency Indicators Potential User / Total Number of Library P	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPF	68	80	89	95	104	113	87.27	29.73%
UdG	192	204	215	211	210	181	206.47	-12.17%
UAB	190	192	191	193	197	195	192.68	1.41%
University System (3)	216	204	194	203	205	201	204.30	-1.64%
UB	250	211	181	207	203	201	210.28	-4.51%
URV	163	171	183	187	196	201	179.93	11.81%
UdL	261	259	277	212	221	218	246.06	-11.46%
UPC	331	298	284	291	283	271	297.31	-8.83%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 33. Efficiency Indicators Entries / Total Number of Library P	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdG	14,183	16,492	16,898	15,539	14,807	11,502	15,584	-26.19%
UAB	20,529	20,721	22,230	22,455	21,174	21,058	21,422	-1.70%
UB	21,227	17,038	23,771	26,831	28,511	22,155	23,476	-5.62%
UPC	25,061	21,200	24,845	25,345	21,577	22,443	23,606	-4.93%
University System (3)	19,464	18,376	22,745	24,149	24,345	22,576	21,816	3.49%
URV	13,232	14,515	22,079	24,694	26,416	25,651	20,187	27.06%
UPF	13,796	17,998	19,943	21,896	22,837	29,467	19,294	52.72%
UdL	15,868	19,361	24,298	23,358	27,849	32,809	22,147	48.14%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 34. Efficiency Indicators Total # of Library P / # of Libraries	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
URV	8	8	8	8	8	8	8.00	0.00%
UdL	7	7	7	9	9	10	8.04	19.40%
UPC	8	9	9	10	11	10	9.13	14.11%
University System (3)	12	13	14	14	14	15	13.70	6.61%
UAB	13	13	15	16	15	16	14.25	11.77%
UdG	8	8	11	15	15	18	11.41	53.36%
UB	18	22	22	19	19	19	19.96	-5.90%
UPF	23	23	22	22	21	20	21.95	-8.88%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 35. Efficiency Indicators Personnel Cost / Total Cost LS (%)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPC	0.50	0.55	0.47	0.51	0.46	0.42	0.50	-14.74%
UdL	0.50	0.47	0.42	0.43	0.46	0.45	0.46	-2.36%
UAB	0.52	0.55	0.51	0.53	0.55	0.51	0.53	-3.71%
University System (3)	0.54	0.58	0.55	0.56	0.56	0.52	0.56	-7.58%
UdG	0.35	0.51	0.50	0.56	0.53	0.54	0.49	8.84%
UPF	0.66	0.68	0.65	0.67	0.64	0.55	0.66	-16.87%
UB	0.58	0.60	0.61	0.59	0.63	0.56	0.60	-7.22%
URV	0.60	0.63	0.66	0.63	0.55	0.58	0.61	-4.85%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 36. Efficiency Indicators Maintenance Cost / Total Cost LS (%)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
URV	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05	-8.44%
UdL	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.07	-8.27%
UdG	0.46	0.18	0.14	0.09	0.06	0.09	0.19	-53.18%
UB	0.15	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.09	0.10	-8.79%
UPF	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.13	0.06	116.58%
University System (3)	0.18	0.13	0.14	0.12	0.10	0.13	0.13	-4.95%
UAB	0.12	0.10	0.15	0.15	0.17	0.15	0.14	10.09%
UPC	0.34	0.25	0.32	0.23	0.23	0.24	0.28	-12.91%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 37. Efficiency Indicators Acquisition Cost / Total Cost LS (%)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPF	0.27	0.26	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.32	0.28	15.27%
UPC	0.16	0.20	0.21	0.27	0.30	0.34	0.23	47.89%
UAB	0.36	0.35	0.34	0.32	0.28	0.34	0.33	1.75%
UB	0.27	0.28	0.29	0.30	0.34	0.35	0.30	17.72%
University System (3)	0.28	0.29	0.30	0.31	0.33	0.35	0.30	16.18%
URV	0.36	0.32	0.30	0.32	0.41	0.37	0.34	9.86%
UdG	0.19	0.30	0.36	0.35	0.41	0.38	0.32	17.33%
UdL	0.42	0.46	0.52	0.51	0.47	0.49	0.48	3.41%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 38. Efficiency Indicators Acquisition Cost / Potential User (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPC	3,066	3,774	4,639	5,610	7,039	9,090	4,825.66	88.36%
URV	6,886	6,336	5,434	6,215	10,093	9,676	6,992.80	38.38%
UdG	6,630	6,926	7,856	8,105	9,881	9,761	7,879.37	23.88%
UB	5,486	6,465	6,856	7,605	8,266	9,824	6,935.56	41.65%
University System (3)	6,644	7,143	7,828	8,260	8,891	10,621	7,753.35	36.98%
UAB	9,362	8,819	9,479	8,955	7,748	10,470	8,872.26	18.01%
UdL	7,952	11,000	13,441	14,585	13,298	16,282	12,055.42	35.06%
UPF	21,762	18,102	19,287	17,325	18,256	19,067	18,946.52	0.64%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 39. Efficiency Indicators Total Cost LS / Library seating (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdL	204,156	205,670	213,812	228,833	191,773	235,688	208,849	12.85%
URV	260,604	279,412	176,377	137,977	182,436	267,435	207,361	28.97%
UAB	333,927	287,577	279,758	284,758	279,820	307,088	293,168	4.75%
UPF	605,783	612,351	390,806	382,205	386,029	308,203	475,435	-35.17%
University System (3)	323,824	316,893	295,057	288,308	292,567	312,332	303,330	2.97%
UB	244,866	279,052	287,146	288,864	286,757	318,693	277,337	14.91%
UPC	465,915	443,291	373,163	355,529	383,272	330,101	404,234	-18.34%
UdG	556,539	381,454	390,284	416,803	452,241	474,406	439,464	7.95%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 40. Efficiency Indicators Personnel Cost / Library seating (PTA)	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdL	102,975	97,675	89,642	98,020	89,130	105,475	95,489	10.46%
UPC	233,632	242,106	175,402	180,375	176,856	139,965	201,674	-30.60%
URV	155,897	175,828	116,456	87,499	100,431	156,371	127,222	22.91%
UAB	172,778	157,147	142,712	152,075	153,373	157,077	155,617	0.94%
University System (3)	175,155	184,192	163,586	162,842	165,240	162,005	170,203	-4.82%
UPF	401,437	418,886	254,535	256,645	246,547	169,527	315,610	-46.29%
UB	141,636	168,257	173,779	170,830	180,401	177,821	166,981	6.49%
UdG	194,889	195,774	196,107	232,782	241,720	253,922	212,254	19.63%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 41. Efficacy Indicators Loans / Potential Users	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UB	5.92	5.31	5.41	6.50	6.45	5.84	5.92	-1.31%
UPC	7.51	7.94	8.64	8.63	8.02	7.60	8.15	-6.73%
University System (3)	8.14	8.56	9.30	9.90	9.68	9.25	9.11	1.46%
URV	6.21	9.12	8.67	10.83	10.41	9.78	9.05	8.04%
UdG	10.31	11.54	16.99	13.88	11.98	11.83	12.94	-8.58%
UdL	7.57	10.95	10.33	11.75	14.30	12.16	10.98	10.77%
UAB	10.64	10.82	12.06	12.47	11.82	12.25	11.56	5.91%
UPF	23.04	23.31	22.00	22.01	21.91	19.81	22.45	-11.78%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 42. Efficacy Indicators Number of Monographs / Potential Users	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPC	6	7	8	8	9	10	7.52	36.76%
URV	9	11	12	13	13	16	11.66	33.77%
UdG	10	12	12	14	15	17	12.50	33.59%
UAB	16	16	17	18	18	18	16.91	5.59%
UdL	7	14	14	16	16	18	13.33	34.49%
University System (3)	17	18	17	18	19	20	17.61	14.27%
UB	24	25	21	24	25	26	23.86	9.44%
UPF	31	29	31	33	35	36	31.96	13.38%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 43. Efficacy Indicators Number of Live Journals / Potential Users	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UPC	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.12	0.07	62.25%
URV	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.22	0.21	0.14	0.20	-32.56%
UV	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.16	0.16	0.10	66.93%
University System (3)	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.18	19.53%
UdG	0.28	0.18	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.23	0.21	8.29%
UdL	0.20	0.19	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.25	0.20	23.57%
UAB	0.31	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.32	0.32	0.32	-1.71%
UPF	0.70	0.58	0.55	0.55	0.58	0.55	0.59	-6.49%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 44. Efficacy Indicators Entries / Potential Users	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UdG	73.78	81.03	78.69	73.48	70.38	63.43	75.47	-15.96%
UPC	75.81	71.12	87.41	87.06	76.37	82.79	79.55	4.07%
UAB	108.02	107.73	116.18	116.56	107.48	107.77	111.20	-3.08%
UB	85.01	80.67	131.36	129.86	140.48	110.33	113.48	-2.77%
University System (3)	89.94	90.09	117.47	118.98	119.04	112.35	107.10	4.89%
URV	81.18	84.78	120.84	132.34	134.70	127.50	110.77	15.11%
UdL	60.75	74.63	87.69	110.28	126.12	150.60	91.90	63.88%
UPF	203.62	224.70	223.51	230.90	218.68	260.28	220.28	18.16%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 45. Efficacy Indicators Library seating / Library	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
URV	100.75	100.75	159.63	222.13	222.13	163.00	161.08	1.20%
UdG	93.57	97.14	136.00	173.00	173.00	173.00	134.54	28.58%
UPC	108.00	108.00	149.07	172.75	179.42	231.33	143.45	61.27%
University System (3)	196.10	206.01	242.82	267.77	267.69	282.56	236.08	19.69%
UdL	170.40	216.80	239.60	248.40	307.60	293.40	236.56	24.03%
UAB	191.31	217.69	278.79	302.31	285.57	315.38	255.13	23.62%
UB	376.50	376.50	334.72	339.44	325.11	333.56	350.46	-4.82%
UPF	204.25	208.00	335.50	328.25	347.50	435.25	284.70	52.88%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 46. Efficacy Indicators New Acquisitions / Potential Users	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1999 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UAB	1.08	0.84	0.67	0.62	0.52	0.61	0.75	-18.84%
UB	0.48	0.48	0.59	0.60	0.66	0.64	0.56	13.62%
UPC	0.34	0.26	0.37	0.35	0.62	0.73	0.39	88.70%
University System (3)	0.86	0.72	0.82	0.86	0.81	0.85	0.82	3.57%
UdL	0.74	0.72	0.99	0.88	0.88	0.90	0.84	7.25%
URV	1.12	1.23	0.86	1.59	0.81	1.13	1.12	0.91%
UdG	1.35	1.37	1.43	1.81	1.44	1.44	1.48	-3.06%
UPF	6.00	3.01	4.57	3.81	3.14	2.56	4.11	-37.55%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999

(2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999

(3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference

Table 47. Indicators of Resources: Titles Spending on Monographs / Spending on Journals	1995 1994-1995	1996 1995-1996	1997 1996-1997	1998 1997-1998	1998 1998-1999	2000 1999-2000	Average 1995-1999 (1)	Average Estimate 1995- 1999/2000) (2)
UB	0.35	0.31	0.24	0.13	0.20	0.18	0.24	-24.82%
UAB	0.98	0.72	0.48	0.42	0.35	0.37	0.59	-37.63%
University System (3)	0.80	0.70	0.58	0.50	0.59	0.59	0.64	-7.14%
UdL	0.94	1.13	1.21	0.92	0.94	0.93	1.03	-9.37%
URV	0.65	0.69	0.38	0.57	1.02	1.01	0.66	51.63%
UPF	1.03	1.07	1.25	0.90	0.92	1.09	1.04	5.58%
UdG	2.67	1.74	1.48	1.65	1.95	1.61	1.90	-15.26%
UPC	2.72	2.38	1.57	1.97	2.35	2.82	2.20	28.19%

(1) Average value of the five-years 1995-1999
 (2) Data variation of the year 2000 in relation to the five-years 1995-1999
 (3) Series are organized from small to large taking data from year 2000 as a reference



