



# Draft IFLA Strategy Consultation Townhalls

Strategy Consultation Townhalls were organised based on the draft Strategy, as agreed by the Governing Board as a draft in its April meetings. In total, five townhall meetings were held on 21 May, 22 May, 23 May (all three in English), on 28 May (in French), and on 11 June (in Spanish).

During the townhall meetings, participants' feedback was collected through Mentimeter voting and comments.

This report summarises what we heard from the townhall participants both on the vision and explanations of how libraries globally contribute, as well as the impact areas and enabler. In particular, we asked for views on how clear and convincing these were, and then for direct comments around how we might improve them.

## 0. Townhall participants' input

Voting and commenting through Mentimeter application during the townhall meetings were anonymous.

In total, 64 townhall attendees participated in voting, although it should be noted that not all townhall participants voted:

- 21 May = 24 voters
- 22 May = 12 voters
- 23 May = 14 voters
- 28 May = 3 voters
- 11 June = 11 voters

In all townhall meetings together, 66 comments were contributed to the question about the vision and how libraries contribute globally, and 52 comments were left to comment on the impact areas and enabler.

## 1. Vision – voting results

Attendees were asked to score (in a scale from 1 to 5) the below statements:

- The vision and explanations of how libraries globally contribute are **clear**.

Townhall	Score
21 May (English)	3.8
22 May (English)	4.2
23 May (English)	4.2
28 May (French)	3.5

11 June (Spanish)	4.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.0</b>

- The vision and explanations of how libraries globally contribute are **convincing**.

Townhall	Score
21 May (English)	3.4
22 May (English)	4.0
23 May (English)	3.7
28 May (French)	3.3
11 June (Spanish)	3.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.6</b>

### Takeaways

- There tended to be better scores or clarity than for how convincing things were, which indicates a need to focus on the latter.*

## 2. Vision – comments

Attendees were asked what comments they had about the vision and explanations of how libraries globally contribute.

Overall, only positive comments were received. Those positive comments highlighted an importance of impact focus and a brevity of the vision statement that would make it easier to communicate with stakeholders in tie it into the work of associations.

17% of comments raised some concerns:

- I have some concerns to linguistically tying us so closely to climate related issues. I think it could cause issues for some with denying governments.*
- If we removed it [the vision] from the rest of the document, would it 'speak'?*
- The focus on 'development' makes it hard to see how some specialist areas directly relate to this goal. Digital scholarship? Knowledge management?*
- Confusion about the word "sustainable" - means different things as you pointed out earlier.*
- Sustainability is not the only reason for IFLA to exist.*
- Clear for us, librarians, but I think it would be important that it is clear for all people.*
- Not everyone may understand 'sustainability'.*

15% of comments contained some suggestions:

- Vision is short and clear. Would like the word "library" there though!*
- We need to also prioritize emerging library leaders as they play a huge role in sustainability of this vision.*
- What about the empowering potential of libraries - apart from sustainability?*
- I'd prefer information and knowledge in the inverse order.*
- Perhaps the broadly shared values of libraries are something to emphasize in an increasingly fractured and fragmented world?*

- *I believe that along with the knowledge and information management approach, research data management should also be incorporated.*

### **Takeaways**

- *We should look into explaining ‘sustainability’.*
- *We should look for a clearer place for ‘values’*

## **3. Impact Areas and Enabler - voting**

Attendees were asked to score (in a scale from 1 to 5) the below statements:

- The impact areas and enablers are **clear**.

Townhall	Score
21 May (English)	4.3
22 May (English)	3.4
23 May (English)	4.0
28 May (French)	4.0
11 June (Spanish)	3.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.9</b>

- The impact areas and enablers are **convincing**.

Townhall	Score
21 May (English)	4.0
22 May (English)	3.3
23 May (English)	3.6
28 May (French)	3.3
11 June (Spanish)	3.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.6</b>

### **Takeaways**

- *Once again, there were higher scores on how clear these were than for how convincing. Scores were quite scattered on how convincing the new strategy is however.*

## **4. Impact Areas and Enabler – Comments**

Attendees were asked what comments they had about the impact areas and enablers.

Overall, primarily positive comments were received. Several attendees shared they were happy to see the development of communities of practice included, as well as a focus on partnerships and impact.

19% of comments included some concerns related to wording or implementation:



- *Bothered by "deliver". Libs enable change within their institutions and facilitate change within their communities.*
- *How to make IFLA's reach truly global.*
- *What do we know about current makeup of volunteer groups (gender, geography, career stage) and is that ok?*
- *There's a lot about delivering change - preserving memories/texts/documents/books is an important part of what some of us do. How is that reflected in the strategy?*
- *They sound great and practical. Not sure about applicability.*
- *They sound really great, but I really hope that the partnerships and collaboration strategy will come out strongly when its implementation time.*
- *Action statements start with nouns -- I would have expected an active verb.*
- *Word enablers is tricky.*

25% of comments contained some suggestions:

- *Good to stick to just four impact areas, and the consistency of the approach makes it easy to follow.*
- *Perhaps the area 2 and 3 can change places?*
- *IFLA exists for its members yes, but also the 'greater good' making the case about why libraries matter - work that we can only do collectively. Perhaps something to consider more for both 2 and 3.*
- *"Un-bureaucratic" (as a goal) should be mentioned somewhere ;-)*
- *I like focus on 3 areas - people (communities), advocacy, and building the profession/libraries but perhaps revisit wording between 1 and 3 to make the difference between them clearer?*
- *Maybe a universal image (grow, tree.) would sharpen the SDG language?*
- *It works fine in English, but when it is translated into other languages, it may sound a bit cringe, so it needs to be semantically adapted beyond translation.*
- *To facilitate management with current challenges, it is important to consider multidisciplinary work.*
- *Perhaps it would be important to demonstrate the participation of the academy in the training of professionals in library science.*
- *It is important that in the deployment of the impact areas, the details of the regional particularities, the technological and academic contexts, and the emerging leaderships are considered.*

### **Takeaways**

- *We should potentially revisit the wording for use of verbs/nouns to make it consistent.*
- *We should explain more about the intention to develop 1–2-year plans containing more detail on implementation.*