CAUL Meeting Papers (2004/2)

12-14 September
Hobart

Group Meetings 2.00 - 5.00 12 September
Hot Topics 9.00 - 5.00 13 September
CAUL Dinner 7.00 - 11.00 13 September
Business Meeting 9.00 - 1.00 14 September
Teaching & Learning Seminar 2.00 - 5.00 14 September

Venues:
Hadley’s Hotel, Hobart
Dinner @ Mure’s Upper Deck
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CAUL Meeting 2004/2
13-14 September, 2004

Hadley’s Hotel, Hobart

Agenda

615. Introduction & Welcome. Madeleine McPherson

616. Attendance & Apologies. Expected to attend:

From CAUL: Helen Livingston, Deakin University; Delegates for CAUL members: Ralph Kiel, University of Western Australia; Stuart Whelan, Australian Catholic University;

From CONZUL: Michael Wooliscroft, University of Otago; John Redmayne, Massey University; Ainslie Dewe, Auckland University of Technology;

Guests: Professor Daryl Le Grew, Vice-Chancellor, University of Tasmania; Kay Raseroka, IFLA President; Dr James Dalziel, MAMS Project; Ms Jenny Rayner, State Library of Tasmania; Richard Dearden & Christine Goodacre, University of Tasmania;

Apologies: John Arfield, University of Western Australia; Chris Sheargold, Australian Catholic University; Janet Copsey, University of Auckland; Sue Pharo, University of Waikato; Denise Kirkpatrick, Monash University; Dr Evan Arthur, DEST;

617. Arrangement of the agenda. Items will be starred for discussion. For those items not starred, all items for noting will be considered noted, and all recommendations will be considered approved.

618. Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting, 1-2 April, 2004. (Paper appended)

619. Minutes of Executive Meetings, 6-7 June and 12 August, 2004. (Papers (2) appended)

620. Business arising from previous meetings, not otherwise listed on the agenda.

621. CAUL Membership & Representation.
   a) CAUL Elections 2004. Eve Woodberry
   
   b) Membership of CAUL Working Groups & Ad Hoc Committees. The Executive has drafted a set of guidelines for establishment and membership. Madeleine McPherson. (Paper appended)
      
      Recommendation to CAUL: That CAUL members accept the guidelines.

STRATEGIC PLAN

622. Review of the Strategic Plan. Madeleine McPherson
Support for Research

623. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). John Shipp, Madeleine McPherson
   a) ADT. Hot Topic. Andrew Wells
   b) APSR. Hot Topic. Vic Elliott
   c) ARROW. Hot Topic. Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   d) *MAMS Project. Hot Topic. James Dalziel (Papers (3) appended)

624. ADT (Australian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells, Alex Byrne (Paper appended)

625. CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC). Heather Gordon (Papers (2) appended)
   a) CEIRC Strategic Directions. Heather Gordon. (Papers (2) appended)

626. AARLIN (Australian Academic Research Libraries Information Network). Earle Gow

627. Scholarly Communication Working Group. Andrew Wells


629. CAUL Statement on Open Access. Madeleine McPherson (Paper appended)

Support for Teaching & Learning

630. Information Literacy Working Group. Ruth Quinn (Paper appended)
   a) Best Practice Characteristics for Developing Information Literacy in Australian Universities. Guidelines have been developed by the ILWG, for approval by CAUL. Ruth Quinn (Paper appended)

631. Services to Offshore Students. Alex Byrne


Management for Best Practice


635. Client Surveys. Comparison of Rodski and LibQual+. Alex Byrne (Paper appended)


637. Statistics Focus Group. Derek Whitehead. (Papers (2) appended)
   a) CAUL Statistics Web Site Proposal. Derek Whitehead (Paper appended)

638. Standards. (A standing item) Maxine Brodie, Derek Whitehead, Janine Schmidt.

Advocacy & Communication

639. Copyright. Eve Woodberry. (Paper appended)

640. Relationships with other Organisations. At the request of members, the Executive reviewed the organisations with whom CAUL might have a formal or an informal relationship. Organisations considered include CHASS, FASTS, SPARC, COUNTER,
ICOLC, IFLA, ALCC, ADA, CNI, RLG. Actual decisions will be made in the context of the budget. Madeleine McPherson

Recommendation to CAUL: that the following guidelines be applied when recommending that CAUL become a member of an organisation:

1. The CAUL strategic plan should guide the decision.
2. The benefit must be direct and relate to CAUL’s strategic plan.
3. CAUL should belong to organisations for transactional reasons or direct material benefit, not for affiliate or common goal reasons.
4. Alliances are important, but if not of direct benefit, CAUL should offer to be an associate or affiliate with respect to communication, exchange of newsletters etc

a) CAUL Regional and Sectoral Groups.  
ACTUAL, QULOC, UNISON (Papers (3) appended), CAVAL, UniLibraries SA (Paper appended), WAGUL, Go8, Go5, LATN, New Generation Universities Group, Distance Education Providers. These groups may report to CAUL on their current activities.

b) CONZUL. A joint meeting with CONZUL will be held in Auckland, 6 April, 2005.

c) CAUDIT & ACODE. EDUCAUSE 2005 will be held in Auckland, 5-8 April.


e) JULAC. John Shipp

f) CASL.

g) *IFLA. Kay Raseroka, President of IFLA, will address the meeting.

h) Türk-ANZAC Research Libraries Conference. Gulcin Cribb, Alex Byrne (Paper appended)

i) SCONUL. There has been some discussion about a SCONUL tour of Australia, to coincide with the CAUL meeting in Brisbane in September, 2005. Gaynor Austen.

641. CAUL Meetings

a) CAUL Meeting 2005/1. Auckland, New Zealand, 4 April, prior to the EDUCAUSE Workshops and Conference 5-8 April.

b) CAUL Meeting 2005/2. Griffith University, Brisbane, September. Janice Rickards

c) CAUL Meeting 2006/2. It is proposed that the meeting be held in Perth, in conjunction with ALIA 2006. Imogen Garner

CAUL Administration

642. CAUL Finances. Derek Whitehead (Paper appended)

a) CAUL Budget 2004. Derek Whitehead (Paper appended)

b) CAUL Budget 2005. Derek Whitehead (Paper appended) Members should confirm which organisational memberships CAUL should retain or take up.

643. Executive Officer’s Report. Diane Costello (Paper appended)

644. Other business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th># pax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-2</td>
<td>CAUL Executive &amp; CEIRC meeting with ProQuest</td>
<td>CAUL Executive, Boardroom at Hadley's</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6</td>
<td>CAUL Executive, Boardroom at Hadley's</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>New Generation Universities Libraries Group, Bowen Room at Hadley's</td>
<td></td>
<td>Definite: Doreen Parker, Liz Curach, Anita Crotty, Stuart Whelan (for Chris Sheargold), Alan Brady, Alison Ransome, Graham Black. Heather Gordon, To be confirmed: Jeff Murray</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30-5.30</td>
<td>LATN, Bowen Room at Hadley's</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imogen Garner, Gaynor Austen, Craig Anderson, Alex Byrne (and Kay Raseroka), Ainslie Dewe, Alan Bundy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>DE Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Innovative Group of Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Go8 informal meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Information Literacy Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>Informal dinner @ Maldini's restaurant, 31-35 Salamanca Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday 13 September**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th># pax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Best Practice Working Group, Regency Room at Hadley's</td>
<td></td>
<td>Members: Ransome, Benton, Schmidt, Whitehead, McKinlay, Curach, Quinn, Cribb.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10.30</td>
<td>9.00 Welcome – Madeleine McPherson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hot Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.05 Internet Use by the General Public – Janine Schmidt &amp; Andrew Wells (15m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.20 Deep-linking on Web Sites – Derek Whitehead and Cathrine Harboe-Ree (20m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ARIIC Reports –</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.40 ARROW – Cathrine Harboe-Ree (30m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.10 APSR – Vic Elliott (20m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10.30 Welcome by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Tasmania</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.15</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-1</td>
<td><strong>Hot Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.15 ADT – Andrew Wells (45m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00 MAMS – James Dalziel, Macquarie University (60m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td># Pax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td><strong>Hot Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 Developments in Open Access &amp; Journal Publishing; CAUL draft statement on open access – Madeleine McPherson (30m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.30 Dealing with Legal Authorities on Campus – Alex Byrne (30m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.30</td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30-5</td>
<td><strong>Hot Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AUQA BOF</strong> Cliff Law; Gaynor Austen; Graham Black; Anita Crotty; Michael Wooliscroft; Helen Livingston;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>CAUL dinner @ Mure's Upper Deck, Victoria Dock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>CAUL Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tea Break 11-11.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>Seminar on Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Tea Break 3.30-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CAUL Meeting 2004/1
1-2 April, 2004

University of New South Wales

DRAFT MINUTES
(updated 7/6/04)

585. Introduction & Welcome. Madeleine McPherson welcomed members attending their first meeting as CAUL member – Craig Anderson, RMIT University; Graham Black, Central Queensland University; Anita Crotty, University of Canberra; Linda O’Brien, University of Melbourne.

Professor Rory Hume, Vice-Chancellor of the University of New South Wales and Chair, ARIIC, welcomed members to the University.

586. Attendance & Apologies.

From CAUL:
Chris Sheargold, ACU
Vic Elliott, ANU
Gulcin Cribb, Bond U
Graham Black, CQU
Shirley Oakley, CSU
Imogen Garner, Curtin U
Sue McKnight, Deakin U
*Dan Archibald, ECU
Bill Cations, Flinders U
Janice Rickards, Griffith U
John McKinlay, JCU
Earle Gow, La Trobe U
Maxine Brodie, Macquarie U
Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Monash U (Friday)
*Geoff Payne, Monash U (Thursday)
Margaret Jones, Murdoch U
Ruth Quinn, NTU
Gaynor Austen, QUT
Craig Anderson, RMIT U
Alison Ransome, SCU
Derek Whitehead, Swinburne U
*Paul Wilkins, U Adelaide
#Alan Brady, U Ballarat
#Anita Crotty, U Canberra
Linda O’Brien, U Melbourne
Eve Woodberry, UNE, Deputy President
Andrew Wells, UNSW
Cliff Law, UNSW@ADFA
Lynne Benton, U Newcastle
Janine Schmidt, UQ
Madeleine McPherson, USQ, President

John Shipp, U Sydney
Linda Luther, U Tasmania
Alex Byrne, UTS
Heather Gordon, USC
John Arfield, UWA
Liz Curach, UWS
Felicity McGregor, UoW
Doreen Parker, VU
#Acting Director
*Delegate of CAUL Member
In attendance:
Diane Costello, CAUL

From CONZUL:
Sue Pharo (U Waikato)

Guests:
Professor Rory Hume, Vice-Chancellor,
UNSW
Jan Fullerton, NLA
Dr Warwick Cathro, NLA
Peter Green, Curtin U
Dr James Dalziel, Macquarie U
Denis Mearns, IDP Education Australia
Steve Scholtz, IDP Education Australia
Martin Carroll, AUQA
Margie Jantti, UoW

Apologies:
Alan Bundy, UniSA
Jeff Owens, UND
Jeff Murray, ECU
Ray Choate, U Adelaide
587. **Arrangement of the agenda.** Items were starred for discussion. For those items not starred, all items for noting were considered noted, and all recommendations considered approved.

588. **Minutes of previous CAUL meeting 2003/2 held 8-9 September, 2003 in Cairns.** The minutes were circulated with the agenda. They were accepted without further correction.

589. **Minutes of Executive Meetings held 24 October 2003, 18 November 2003, 17 February 2004.** Minutes of the three meetings were circulated with the agenda.

590. **Business arising from previous meetings, not otherwise listed on the agenda.**

   a) **IFLA Membership.** Alex Byrne announced that IFLA was reviewing its association membership categories, and differentiating national associations from other types of organisations. CAUL would be considered a national association. ALIA and ALA would have a broader role. SCONUL is an institutional member at the moment. He recommended that CAUL consider membership, which would cost EUR 1,000.

   John Shipp recommended that CAUL review all the organisations that CAUL could be members of, including the ones in which it currently has membership, and determine a framework for considering memberships strategically, rather than piecemeal. It was agreed to present a paper to the next meeting for consideration under the 2005 budget. *(Action: CAUL Executive)*

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

591. **Review of the Strategic Plan.** The action plan was circulated with the agenda. There was no further discussion.

592. **CAUL Achievement Award.** The President introduced Peter Green, Curtin University, presenting him with a cheque for $5,000 in recognition of his leadership of the WAGUL Authentication Project (WALAP), and contribution to achievement of a key CAUL strategy, to maximise access to the information resources and services required for the advancement of teaching, learning and research in Australian universities. The President read the citation, following which Peter discussed the challenges and progress associated with the project. [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/achievement2003green.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/achievement2003green.doc)

**SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH**

593. **ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee).** John Shipp reported to members on the potential future of ARIIC. The recent research reports propose a new over-arching research infrastructure committee. ARIIC may be subsumed under another organisation, potentially with a lower priority than grid computing etc. It has already moved away from library-type infrastructure into large-scale computing to support major databases. Broadband seems easier for government to understand than library content and infrastructure. DEST will continue to make the decisions, not ARIIC. Evan Arthur is preparing a paper on the future of ARIIC.

CAUL should consider what it would like the committee to achieve. The government has received good feedback from the Web of Science extension, and from the leverage in expanding it to other institutions. It is possible that funding will be available for content, but the products need to stand alone. It is highly likely that JSTOR will be funded for the Arts & Sciences collections I, II and III, to include an initial two year
subscription, for approximately AUD 2 million. Current subscribers may be catered for with credits for other products. It is unlikely that funding will be provided for library management problems such as storage. The newspaper digitisation project is very important, but unlikely to be funded under ARIIC. The focus should be on a suite of products that would have general applicability. The ARC is separately funding repositories projects.

Members discussed the library role in research infrastructure, noting that the library focus has been on collections, but at the national level, focus is on e-research (which is not clearly defined). It was suggested revisiting the documents from the May 2003 meeting. We need to think about traditional roles, but also assert ourselves in the changing climate eg metadata – nobody does it better than us. Many computing scientists think metadata is a waste of time – what are we doing to bring them to our point of view?

Professor Tony Hey, UK e-science project, believes that librarians have not been involved enough in the e-science agenda. It was suggested that CAUL develop a paper to enunciate a clear view on the role of libraries in e-science eg to create metadata, and comment intelligently on hardware requirements, as a basis for developing a policy on e-science and defining CAUL’s role in the current agenda.

It was suggested that CAUL or, preferably, ARIIC organise a conference / seminar to air these issues, to engage the ARC, CAUDIT, APAC (which has significant funds for e-repositories and whose work needs to be better understood) and other relevant communities. It was noted that Bernard Palethorpe (sic) made a presentation on middleware at the last ARIIC meeting. Geoff Dengate is planning a middleware conference in August at Griffith University and CAUL should be represented. The next NSCF conference will be held 1 June 2004 in Canberra, with Professor Gareth Roberts speaking on the research exercise in the UK. It was suggested that a clear report on all the projects be prepared for members, perhaps by the Scholarly Communication Working Group, to use as a briefing document within their own universities. (Action: CAUL Executive)

a) ARIIC Projects. Andrew Wells, Vic Elliott, Geoff Payne and James Dalziel made presentations on the goals and status of the four ARIIC projects.


b) Major issues being considered by ARIIC. John Shipp

i) National Joint Store. John Shipp reported on the paper circulated prior to the meeting. This latest initiative came from Professor Hume, the ARIIC chair. Unless great benefit can be proved, it unlikely that DEST will fund it.
It was suggested that it may be better for current stores to work more closely together perhaps assisted by some seed funding. The recent survey of CAUL members indicated a wide range of requirements, and all agreed to drop the proposal.

594. ADT (Australian Digital Theses) Program. A report from Andrew Wells was circulated with the agenda. This item was not separately discussed.

Recommendation to CAUL: That members note the report.

595. CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC) A report from Heather Gordon was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

Recommendation to CAUL: That members encourage datasets coordinators to respond to CEIRC offers by the due date.

596. AARLIN (Australian Academic Research Libraries Information Network). Earle Gow reported on the current status of the project. A written report was circulated with the agenda. A recent system crash concerned the vendors and prompted them to add more expertise to the local implementation. Geoff Payne joined the program in September for four months, and the progress has been significant since them. Susan Liepa has now joined as full-time project manager. Five sites Flinders, La Trobe, Monash, RMIT and Wollongong, will be going live in a limited way after Easter. ADFA, ECU, JCU, Murdoch, Swinburne, Adelaide and Canberra will be up before the end of the year. Others wish to start with the undergraduates later. A pilot with Canberra, La Trobe, Swinburne and Wollongong commences in semester two. The licence covers 340,000 FTE users, including undergraduates. A five year business plan is expected by May 2004. La Trobe is to support the project for the next two years; the National Library has been very supportive; a meeting of the full reference group will be held in July; both the ARC and DEST were pleased with the demonstrations.

Recommendation to CAUL: That members note the progress of the AARLIN project.

597. Scholarly Communication Working Group. This item was not discussed.

598. Open Access. IFLA Open Access Statement. Hot Topic. A proposal from Alex Byrne was included in the papers. The IFLA statement referred to was tabled at the meeting.

Recommendation to CAUL: That members

1. endorse the Statement and agree to link to it from our website
2. be encouraged to seek support for the Statement from their Academic Boards or other appropriate bodies within their universities and to identify ways in which their universities can demonstrate their responses to it.
3. consider what initiatives CAUL might pursue (or is already pursuing) in order to advance the aims of the Statement.

Alex Byrne noted that the Berlin statement doesn’t address those in poorer countries who don’t have access to network, whereas the IFLA statement is broader. He invited CAUL to support it, and take to academic boards, to show that very practical things that can be done to address the issues of access to scholarly communication in developing countries and to highlight the structural problems in scholarly publishing.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree discussed Monash plans for 2004, noting also the QUT initiatives in this area. The aim to increase Monash’s awareness of scholarly communication
issues. She is preparing a discussion paper explaining why the library is involved, including pricing and access issues, and the opportunity to transform the scholarly communication process through ICT. The discussion paper will be taken through a range of forums, and when endorsed, will be mounted on the web site linked to other statements.

She will invite the Monash community to endorse the strategic initiatives:

- e-publishing as distinct from repositories, open and affordable access;
- the suite of activities relating to digital repositories and other digital collections;
- other initiatives, such as the Library membership of BioMed Central and of SPARC;
- improve understanding of the equity issues, drawing on the IFLA statement and Berlin Declaration (more related to higher education) and on several other statements;
- aim to change the culture eg adding to ARROW, to change policies eg a memorandum of understanding with faculties to use the press and repositories, to change promotion requirement for academics to add to repositories;
- aim for the University to achieve better control of its IP;
- established a working group to create an information management strategy. The strategy is to help Monash to set the agenda rather than waiting for it to ask.

In discussing the recommendation, members noted the confusion about the term “open access” – one is the form of publishing where the payment is upfront eg the BioMed Central model, where the library is paying for authors to submit; another is looking at the needs of developing countries. It used to mean open access to collections. Now it relates to the open access movement. The most generally accepted definition is that of the Wellcome trust, which is used in the IFLA statement.

It was noted that access to health and agriculture journals is not well-known. Any statement should state what is already being done, highlighting the importance of these strategies. Members were happy to endorse, and generally agree with, the statement, but not necessarily promote it to the academic board. Some would use different tools more relevant to higher education within their own university.

Alex Byrne offered a revised recommendation which was accepted. That members

a) support the statement and agree to link to it from our website; (Action: DC)

b) be encouraged to raise the issues and pursue relevant strategies within their universities, and to identify ways in which their universities can demonstrate their responses to these issues; (Action: ALL)

c) consider what initiatives CAUL might pursue (or is already pursuing) in order to advance the aims of the statement. It was suggested that the SCWG might pick up and look at membership of SPARC and a range of initiatives, and look at a statement. (Action: AW)

599. *User Studies. Hot Topic.* Janine Schmidt outlined some of the purposes for, and tools to be used when undertaking user studies, and how the results might be used. She identified some results from various studies at the University of Queensland. In reference to potential collaboration in such research, she suggested that a CAUL working group be established to investigate implications of the completed research. (Action: CAUL Executive) http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/caul20041user-studies.ppt
**SUPPORT FOR TEACHING & LEARNING**

601. *Information Literacy Working Group.* A report from Ruth Quinn was circulated with the agenda. She referred to the information literacy assessment tool, advising members that the administration manual has been completed and is available, but the technical manual has not been finalised. The project research, Ralph Catts, has moved to the University of Stirling, and as he has been the only one really been involved, there is some concern that the work won’t be completed. Without the technical manual, it may be difficult to run the survey, and to process the data? It was agreed to invite Margaret Appleton to discuss with Dr Catts. *(Action: RQ)*

Ruth Quinn reported on the current size and composition of the ILWG, noting that only she and Liz Curach are CAUL members. The group has scheduled six teleconferences, for 2004, so she suggested that reducing the size of the group should make it both more productive and less expensive to operate.

It was proposed (Madeleine McPherson / Andrew Wells) that the ILWG be reconstituted to comprise no more than six plus chair nominated by CAUL, to include the leaders of projects approved by CAUL. The group should have the power to co-opt others. Agreed. Ruth will bring membership back to the Executive. *(Action: RQ)*

Recommendation to CAUL (Ruth Quinn / Liz Curach):

_That members support the Prague declaration._ Agreed.

It was noted that _Education for All_ is a UNESCO program.

602. **Guidelines for Library Services to Offshore Students.** A paper from Sue McKnight was circulated with the agenda. She reported that CAUL had approved in principle the guidelines in April, but requested greater generalisation. They were redrafted with support from John Rogan and Doreen Parker. She proposed that the document be received, and comments sent to her by the end of April.

Members welcomed the document and appreciated the work involved. It was suggested that the term “principles” be changed to “guidelines”. There was concern at what “basic level” means, and whether it could be used within the university to make it very basic. Some further elaboration is required. Subject to suggested editing, the document was accepted. [Later note: the final document is published at http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/OffshoreLibraryServices.doc]

Alex Byrne proposed that the LATN survey on the provision of library services to offshore students to be extended to all CAUL. Agreed. *(Action: AB)*

603. *University Library Australia.* A report from Alison Ransome was circulated with the agenda. Paul Wilkins suggested that, in the ULA protocols, “fines” be extend to “fines and similar charges” or “any penalties incurred.”

Monash would like the option to pursue large fines from the home institution, for such infractions as retaining the book till the end of the year, returning it but not paying the fine. It would prefer six-monthly reporting of delinquents. ANU would not agree to pay fines, but is happy use exclusion as a sanction. It is recognised that some local by-laws can extend the sanction to external infringements, but others can’t. The University
of Sydney changed its by-laws to permit this extension. It was suggested that members
examine local by-laws to see if this is possible.

Members agreed that the system should be kept “light”, noting that the problem is quite
small overall. The simplest approach is to impose local penalties and exclude
delinquent borrowers from the host institution, while reporting to the home institution
at least twice a year.

In discussing the inclusion of “property”, it was suggested that damage to property such
as PCs would be covered by other university rules, and recommended that ULA
protocols be limited to “library materials.”

Alison Ransome responded that the goal has always been to achieve a scheme that is
simple and works easily. CAUL has already agreed to basic indemnity for loss and
damage, but each host institution should first deal with the borrower. The general rule
is for the host to chase fines and impose them, but only replacement books are
indemnified. The host staff should be communicating with the home institution who
can take action. If the fine is high enough then the host could use a debt collection
agency.

Recommendation to CAUL: That CAUL approve a change of wording to clarify

Current wording:
Indemnity.
12. If a borrower is eligible to register then he/she is indemnified by their home library.

Additional wording:
The home library indemnifies, and will indemnify, the host institution for loss of, or
damage to, library materials as a result of their students or staff borrowing from the
other library. The borrower is responsible for any penalties incurred. Agreed.
(Permission: DC)

MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

604. Best Practice Working Group. A report from Felicity McGregor was circulated with
the agenda. She reported on outstanding issues.

Reference indicators – the CRIG group’s work culminated in the publication of
preferred reference indicators, with measures to be developed. This development
required resources, and the time lag meant that circumstances had changed. Lynne
Benton, Imogen Garner and Barbara Paton have completed a literature review, which
will be made available on the web site, with an outline of the project.
suggested a CAUL survey to discover which libraries use digital reference services,
whether measures should be identified, and which libraries would use them. Members
were asked that, when completing the survey, the question on potential use should be
considered carefully. Depending on the findings of the survey, they will address the
question of developing the measures. (Permission: BPWG)

The group is planning a seminar for expert practitioners to discuss the way forward, and
to attempt to tighten the process. It appears that some indicators are not used, or that
their use is not reported through the web site. (Permission: ALL)

a) Quality Workshop. Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Margie Jantti (University of
Wollongong) and Martin Carroll (Australian Universities Quality Agency) were
introduced by Felicity McGregor. Presentations will be made available on the web site. *(Action: DC)*


---

**605. Statistics Focus Group.** A report from Derek Whitehead was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

Recommendation to CAUL: *That members accept the report.*


**ADVOCACY & COMMUNICATION**

**607. *Copyright. A report by Eve Woodberry was circulated to members.***

  a) **Free Trade Agreement. Hot Topic.** Derek Whitehead outlined the main changes to copyright as a result of the Australia-US Free Trade Agreement, with a focus on the difference between fair use in education in the US and fair dealing and remuneration for copying in Australian universities. He referred also to the Digital Agenda Review, the actions against universities being taken by the music industry and the AVCC paper on use of the Internet in universities. He advised members of the current CLRC review of Crown Copyright, and referred members to the Creative Commons movement. [http://www.caul.edu.au/copyright/caul20041copyright.ppt](http://www.caul.edu.au/copyright/caul20041copyright.ppt)

**608. AICTEC Standards and Interoperability Committee (ASIC).** AICTEC is the Australian ICT Education Committee, reporting to MCEETYA. CAUL had already flagged its interest in ASIC, on behalf of ACODE/CAUDIT/CAUL. ASIC is chaired by Evan Arthur and is currently reviewing its terms of reference, and has recommended 3 members from the higher education sector: one from the combined CCA, one from the AVCC, and Geoff Payne, director of ARROW, who was invited due to his long standing interest in standards. One member is to be nominated by the NLA and CASL, and a range of other organisations are to be represented. Janine Schmidt advised members that she has been a member of this committee for some time. It was agreed that members require particular knowledge and expertise on the development of digital libraries and so CAUL should seek to maximise its representation. *(Action: MM)*

Maxine Brodie advised members that she currently chairs IT19 (as the ALIA representative) and will be Standards Australia’s representative on ASIC. She has offered to keep CAUL informed on standards issues and committees. This will added to future agenda. *(Action: DC)*

**609. CAUL Communication.** This item was not discussed separately.

**610. Relationships with Other Organisations.**

  a) **CAUL Regional and Sectoral Groups.** There were no reports, and this item was not discussed.
b) **CONZUL.** Sue Pharo brought greetings from New Zealand colleagues. Her report focused on politics and projects. CONZUL is progressing very well, and has achieved recognition for its effectiveness, helped by the appointment of an Executive Officer.

CONZUL made a successful bid for funds for electronic databases, and is now in negotiation with ISI and Elsevier. They have made closer links with the Crown Research Institutes.

The TEC performance based research fund has been stalled by privacy concerns in two universities. The libraries have been required to validate the publications included in the reports. This could be used to start a database of New Zealand research. The original $8m in funding is now being discussed in terms of $250m, and the notion of research activity has been broadened. A small group is working on a research library framework. CONZUL prefers to focus on content.

She welcomed Andrew Wells and Tony Cargnelutti to New Zealand to discuss CONZUL’s participation in the ADT Program. CONZUL-sys is now incorporated as LCONZ (Library Consortium New Zealand) and is now working on phase two of the project. The next meeting will be held at Massey’s Auckland campus in November and all CAUL members would be most welcome.

c) **CAUDIT & ACODE.** Madeleine McPherson reported that a joint Executive meeting will be held early June. It will be proposed that CAUL organise a metadata workshop for the EDUCAUSE conference, which is scheduled April 5-8 2005. All groups have some interest in the application of metadata in library management systems and learning management systems. Madeleine McPherson is representing CAUL on the conference steering committee. Janet Copsey chairs the program committee. Gaynor Austen is a member of the staff development working group – training for the e-professional of the future. The other two working groups have been discontinued.

d) **JULAC.** Study tour of Hong Kong and China. John Shipp reported that tour will run October 18-29, with participants able to attend the Shanghai International Library Forum beforehand. He asked for feedback on which universities to visit, particularly in Beijing or Shanghai; and suggested talking to IDP about their experience in China. Universities will be invited to talk about their student experience. The tour will visit only one institution per day, not for full day. Accommodation will be in 4-star hotels, although the option to stay in university guest houses may be open. Participants will need to travel as a group, and a guide may be employed to travel with the group. Accompanying persons must pay the full cost. The tour is open to personnel nominated by CAUL or CONZUL, HEW 8 or above are recommended.

e) **National Library of Australia.**

i) **Kinetica Redevelopment.** Warwick Cathro discussed the process leading to the replacement of the Kinetica software.

ii) **Peak Bodies Forum.** A meeting was held in Canberra on November 17. Minutes were circulated to participants. This item was not discussed.

f) **CHASS (Council for the Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences).** Madeleine McPherson asked whether members were interested in exploring membership further. It was agreed to take it up later as part of examination of all organisations
with which CAUL has a relationship. It was suggested that CAUL has a synergy with CHASS that it doesn’t have with FASTS.

611. CAUL Meetings

a) CAUL Meeting 2004/2, Hobart, September 13-14 (satellite meetings on September 12) Linda Luther has booked a conference room in the city rather than on campus. Accommodation has been booked at the same venue.

b) CAUL Meeting 2005/1. The current practice is to hold one meeting centrally, and the second more remotely. It was agreed to hold the first meeting in Auckland in conjunction with EDUCAUSE, which is 5-8 April, with a one-day business meeting, plus using the EDUCAUSE workshops as hot topics. ACODE is also considering holding their meeting in Auckland.

c) CAUL Meeting 2005/2. It was agreed to meet in Brisbane in September. It was noted that the international NTLTD conference will be held in Sydney, 28-30 September, but that it is unlikely that many CAUL members will attend themselves rather than sending staff.

612. CAUL Finances. Derek Whitehead spoke to the report circulated with the agenda. He reported a surplus last year, and projected this year if research funds are not spent. Felicity McGregor flagged that funding may be required if the research indicators go ahead. Funds may also be needed to get the technical manual completed for the Information Skills Survey. Another concern is the operation of the CAUL office, which has seen a significant increase in workload, especially relating to CEIRC, and which impinges on the general operation of the organisation, and on risk management. The Executive will bring a report to the next meeting. (Action: CAUL Executive)

a) CAUL Budget 2003. A report of expenditure against budget in 2003 was circulated with the agenda.

b) CAUL Budget 2004. A report of expenditure against budget to date in 2004 was circulated with the agenda.

613. Executive Officer’s Report. A report by the Executive Officer was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

614. Other business.

a) Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Diane Costello reported on the ICOLC proposal to establish a fund for the perpetual support of the SEP, by coordinating national contributions for 3 years at a level appropriate to the number and wealth of philosophy departments in the nation. For Australia, the suggested amount is USD 50,000 per year for three years. She invited members to give their philosophy departments the opportunity to express support, and perhaps contribute financially, to the “endowment.”

In discussion, members expressed the following: clearer information about the proposed management of the endowment is needed; refer the proposal to CHASS; subscription would be preferred to the endowment option; philosophy departments probably won’t be interested in investing; a subscription could be cheaper (or more expensive) if taken over commercially; would be of more interest if there were more Australian content; need to consider sustainability, especially considering the AustLit experience; it is a worthwhile resource; shows some
sustainability already, with philosophers committed to it, and only 1.75 FTE to run it; already has runs on the board, and is of a very high quality; if the subscription option is taken, then the library would be the most likely source of funds; if the model works it could be applied to other products; can libraries donate to trusts? some would have no difficulty as it is effectively a contribution to a perpetual licence.

Diane Costello will address these questions, and provide a briefing for CAUL to take to philosophy departments. (Action: DC)

b) Parliamentary Librarian, Parliament of Australia. Felicity McGregor reported that the position of the parliamentary librarian will be advertised soon, and there seems to be opposition to hiring a professional librarian in preference to a bureaucrat. She suggested writing to the speaker about the position. It was suggested that this be referred to ALIA, which is already taking an interest in this issue. (Action: DC)

c) ASIC and Stored Value Cards. Liz Curach reported that the Australian Securities and Investment Commission was inquiring into universities’ management of the funds held from students’ stored value cards used for photocopying, printing, etc and asked whether CAUL should take a shared position. She proposed running a quick CAUL survey to find out how the funds are handled by libraries eg held in a trust account, held in a general account, whether students can easily find how much money is left on the card, etc. The survey will also address whether the library holds the funds, or if they are being held by a third party vendor. (Action: LC)

Members thanked Andrew Wells for the organisation of the meeting. John Shipp added that the dinner at the Bayswater Brasserie was the level to which CAUL dinners should aspire, *vis a vis* food, space and ambience.

The meeting concluded at 12.45pm, to be followed by the Quality Workshop from 2pm to 5pm.
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Minutes

1172. Attendance & Apologies. Madeleine McPherson (President), Eve Woodberry
(Deputy President), Derek Whitehead, Cathrine Harboe-Ree. In attendance: Diane
Costello. Apology: Andrew Wells

1173. Minutes of the previous Executive Meeting – 2004/2, Sydney, 30 March 2004. The
draft minutes were circulated with the agenda. Correction: 157 b, discussed “with”
Connie Wilson. The minutes were accepted.

1174. Minutes of the CAUL Meeting 2004/1, Sydney, 1-2 April 2004. The draft minutes
were circulated with the agenda.

1175. Business arising from previous meetings not otherwise listed on the agenda. UTS
meeting with IDP, but it is not known exactly what was discussed. Diane Costello will
follow up. One of the items to be discussed is joint research. In addition, it was
agreed that a library presentation should be made at the IDP conference later this year.
(Action: DC)

1176. CAUL Elections 2004. Positions falling due for election in 2004 are the President
(Madeleine McPherson is able to nominate); two members (both Derek Whitehead and
Andrew Wells are able to nominate); CEIRC Committee (Heather Gordon and Sue
Dowling able to nominate); ADT Policy Reference Group (Janice Rickards is able to
nominate); Kinetica Advisory Committee (John Arfield is able to nominate). The
scheduling will allow the election for President to be finalised prior to the CAUL
meeting. (Action: DC)

1177. CAUL Committee Composition and Election. The ILWG membership composition
highlighted a lack of formal guidelines for the composition and election of CAUL
committees and working groups. Madeleine McPherson drafted guidelines for
commitee membership, standing groups and ad hoc working groups, established from
time to time to facilitate progress in CAUL’s programs. They do not relate to the
CAUL Executive, or groups representing consortial activities eg CEIRC.

- The Working Party convenor will be elected by CAUL members / proposed by the
  Executive, for a 2-year term.
- The convenor will select the members based on expertise and geographic
  considerations.
- There should be no more than 6 members of the group, although individuals may
  be co-opted from time to time.
Groups should be reviewed at least once every two years, ideally as a new convenor takes over.

The convenor should report to each CAUL meeting.

The report should include any budget requirements.

A budget item will be added to the reporting pro-forma. The guidelines will be presented to the next meeting of CAUL.  (Action:  DC, MM)

STRATEGIC PLAN

1178. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). Members reviewed the 2003-4 action items:

a) Item 4. Information literacy as a graduate attribute. Ruth Quinn will be asked for feedback. It was noted that Ralph Catts, the author of the Information Skills Survey and its impending technical manual, is coming back from Scotland to attend the information literacy conference at CQU this week.

b) Item 5. CCA joint project on linking LMS and IMS. It was noted that the vocabulary keeps changing. CCA will be invited to explore information as a strategic resource, along the lines of the JISC program http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=events_info_strat. JISC has an information strategy template. The DSTC paper on middleware was noted, as was the Daedalus report which was said to be very good.

c) Item 11. Digitisation of Australian research resources. This is the responsibility of all members, rather than CAUL as a group. The National Library is keen for universities to be involved in the preservation of cultural heritage.

Madeleine McPherson reported on her presentation to the council of the National Library of Australia, where she discussed the nature of CAUL, a cooperative organisation of 40 members, in contrast to the NLA which is a statutory authority with significant resources, able to set its own strategy; university strategies and directions are all different, and university resources are allocated at the behest of the vice-chancellor. Derek Whitehead has been invited to the Picture Australia advisory group. CAUL is driven by pressures in STM publishing, chiefly financial – one of the reasons for development of alternative forms of scholarly publishing. NLA is largely driven by cultural concerns, chiefly in the humanities and social sciences. Digital preservation is integral to the preservation of cultural heritage. Practices in universities may not be systematic and don’t necessarily support this.

d) Item 12. User Studies. In discussion of Janine Schmidt's presentation to CAUL on user studies, and the Strategic Plan action item, to conduct research into information-seeking behaviours and their impact on service models (building on Houghton / Steele research), the following was noted:

- Swinburne is conducting an investigation into who is using electronic journals.
- David Groenewegen, Monash, is studying published reports on user behaviour, and also what is being used at Monash.
- Monash has conducted a forum on the impact of electronic resources in teaching and learning. It is also conducting focus groups in collaboration with SIMS, and has noted that the findings do not agree with library perceptions eg post-graduates don't learn about the library from the Library - their
engagement with the library is actually quite low although they do use library resources.

- AARLIN has the potential to change the scenario considerably.
- Margaret Henty, ANU, did a major literature review into user behaviour as part of the research for "Changing Research Practices ...." by Houghton, with Steele & Henty.

The committee recommended calling for expressions of interest from CAUL institutions into conducting a review of data/information already being collected in member libraries, eg via EZProxy, with a view to mining the data in response to management and research inquiries, and compiling a bibliography of user studies for publication and ongoing updating (on the CAUL web site). The project will be funded from CAUL's research & development budget. (Action: DC)

c) **Item 17. Technical and Topical Framework for Sharing Management Information.** It is important to include a process whereby the information is actively collected and to ensure it is updated and refreshed with new materials. (Action: DC)

d) **Item 18. Review of CAUL statistical measures.** The CAUL Statistics Focus Group is trialling the collection of measures of use of electronic resources. The collection of 2003 data is underway.

e) **Item 21. Measures for library information and research services.** The BPWG has completed a literature review and is conducting a survey of CAUL regarding potential use of such measures.

**CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH**

1179. **ARIIC.** Derek Whitehead attended the meeting on May 31 for Madeleine McPherson. His report was circulated to members. Several items require further attention from the Executive. Research metrics and research evaluation was a key item of discussion.

a) **JSTOR.** John Shipp, following approval of funding by ARIIC, has asked that a quote be obtained for the four sections of JSTOR, with a view to negotiating some reduction in the total $1.6m. The NLA has expressed interest in being involved. Diane Costello will ask JSTOR for examples of access for national libraries, and for a discount for administration if CAUL handles the invoicing. (Action: DC)

b) **Quality and Accessibility Frameworks.** Ian Lucas is leading the Accessibility Framework activity. He has been referred to Jonathan Palmer, ABS regarding the proposed National Data Network. Evan Arthur spoke to this at the ARIIC meeting.

c) **Common Services Forum, Sydney, 13 August 2004.** The event is being organised by James Dalziel, Geoff Dengate and Katherine Schmutter (DEST). An international forum on institutional repositories is planned for October. This may clash with the study tour to China. (Action: CH-R)

d) **The idea lab.** August 16-17, DEST, AGIMO and multimedia Victoria. Industry and policy, covering same territory of web services, common services, etc.

e) **Open Access.** It was suggested that the Berlin declaration is more relevant to higher education than the IFLA statement. It was agreed that a statement on open access, targeted to DEST’s current thinking, be developed for inclusion in DEST’s Quality and Accessibility agenda. (Action: CAUL Executive)
1180. AARLIN. The AARLIN business plan has been circulated and participants have been asked for ongoing commitment to the program. A meeting is being held on July 16 to discuss management issues, and the form of the resulting organisation. The advantages of working collaboratively include only managing the data once. Independent users of the Ex Libris software could be included in this process, while staying outside the consortium. There is no doubt that, over the term of the project, a great deal has been learned. If there were funds left, a thorough evaluation of the project processes and the project itself would be valuable.

1181. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). The CEIRC committee is reviewing the CAUL office’s operations relating to CEIRC activities, with a particular view to risk management, and additional potential activities which could be undertaken, such as additional management reporting of the CEIRC program. Eve Woodberry reported that the proposed CEIRC strategic plan will be presented to the Executive committee. It identifies activities that the program wants to undertake, and resource implications, to feed into the review of the office operations. She stated that it would take CEIRC to a new stage of commercial operation. RMIT Publishing is being invited to the next meeting to discuss problems.

CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING

1182. National Learning and Teaching Fund. The closing date for response to the discussion paper has been extended to June 18. Cathrine Harboe-Ree circulated an updated version of the response. Madeleine McPherson will confirm its readiness for submission to DEST and circulation to CAUL. (Action: MM, DC)

MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

1183. Standards. This is a standing item. A report from Derek Whitehead on ASIC is listed under item 1187(b) below.

COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY

1184. Copyright.

a) ALCC. Eve Woodberry reported on the JSCOT presentation, attended by Jennefer Nicholson and Colette Ormond from ALIA, and Dr Matthew Rimmer from the Law Faculty at ANU. Derek Whitehead reported that Peter King was very strongly in favour of a regime balanced more towards the creators. The Senate Select Committee held round tables instead of formal hearings. Tom Cochrane attended on behalf of ADA/ALCC. It is thought that JSCOT will report by August.

Eve Woodberry advised members of the replacement for Miranda Lee at the ALCC: Sarah Waladan, a Science/Law graduate from Deakin University, completing an LLB honours, and finishing a Masters of Public Policy and Management. Her work experience has been with Victoria Legal Aid, though she has had stints in the Attorney-General's Department and the Australian Government Solicitor. Sarah is due to commence duties on 28 June.

Recommendations from the Philips Fox report into the Digital Agenda Act include the definition of a library, some very pragmatic inclusions which makes it easier for libraries eg only one notice required instead of two, and a recommendation about caching being remunerable. This is also an issue with the FTA. The FTA will over-ride anything in the Philips Fox report. It is thought that any issues not
taken care of under the FTA will be brought back on to the agenda next year, along with CLRC reports.

The ALCC includes the NLA, CASL, CAUL, ALIA, FLIN, the National Archives.

1185. Communication. (Standing item)

a) CAUL Communication Strategy & Guidelines.

b) President’s Report. Madeleine McPherson joined members of the council of the National Library for lunch on June 4, a brief report of which is included in item 1178c above. She and Diane Costello met with Simon Kent, Higher Education adviser to Jenny Macklin, Opposition spokesperson for education. She will circulate a report to CAUL. (Action: MM)

c) Communication with CAUL.


e) CAUL Report 2003. A draft of the report is in progress. (Action: DC)

f) Executive Officer’s Report. A report is appended to these minutes.

1186. Government Inquiries.

a) Progress and future direction of life-long learning inquiry - Parliament of Australia Senate Committee. Submissions to the inquiry are due 18 June 2004. Issues to be covered in the CAUL submission are: university libraries have always been a resource for people pursuing informal study and research; need both the technology and the training; licensing barriers; the public used to know that they could visit a university library and browse among the collection; electronic access won’t be available unless national site licences are put in place; include a reference to the IFLA statement. Madeleine McPherson will draft a response. (Action: MM)

1187. Relationships with other organisations. At the CAUL meeting in April, it was agreed that the Executive would prepare a document on the organisations with whom CAUL might have a formal or an informal relationship, with proposals as to which CAUL should foster a relationship with and any costs that might be associated with this relationship. Organisations to be considered include CHASS, FASTS, SPARC, COUNTER, ICOLC, IFLA, IFLA Copyright Committee, ALCC, ADA, CNI, RLG. A first draft has been prepared. Note that most of the Group of Eight are funding CAUL’s SPARC subscription for 2004.

Are the organisations listed core business for CAUL? CHASS and FASTS are deemed not. Which organisations pursue agendas related to CAUL’s strategic plan, provide direct benefit to CAUL, contribute to CAUL’s understanding of the issues, or deliver a service which informs CAUL’s decisions?. Does CAUL become a member of library organisations?

Some issues are CAUL’s core business, and by being a member, CAUL has a say in their strategic directions eg ICOLC, COUNTER, ALCC – but not necessarily ADA. The strategic plan is all about higher education, not about broader issues. Any memberships are an additional cost to members. Membership of SPARC was not based on the principle, rather the cost, and this was dealt with by individual members volunteering to sponsor it. Eve Woodberry has been invited to be on the ALIA Copyright Committee. The IFLA Copyright Committee is funded by the ALCC, and
nominated by ALIA. Would CAUL be better limiting its advice on copyright to those issues related to higher education only? Diane Costello will draft guidelines for further discussion. (Action: DC)

a) JULAC. The study tour is being organised by John Shipp. An outline of the tour was given at the CAUL meeting, but no further detail is available.

b) CAUDIT & ACODE. It was recommended that Andrew Treloar give a presentation to CCA at the December meeting. The metadata project should address the minimal shared elements.

i) EDUCAUSE 2005. Sky City, Auckland, 5-8 April, 2005. Keynote speakers have been identified. Planning is well underway.

ii) Joint Executive Committee. The next meeting is in Melbourne on December 6. Madeleine McPherson has offered her apology for the meeting.

iii) Workshop sponsored by WebCT. ACODE and CAUDIT have been in discussion with WebCT regarding possible collaborative investigation of an area of shared interest. ACODE/CAUDIT are proposing to hold a one-day workshop sponsored by WebCT on the strategic planning for learning management systems. The workshop will be held in Sydney following the WebCT conference. Note that although the workshop is sponsored by WebCT, it is intended that the outcomes would be generally applicable. CAUL will receive an invitation to the workshop.

iv) AICTEC Standards and Interoperability Committee (ASIC). Nick Tate (from CAUDIT) and Christine Goodacre (from ACODE, in the absence of Denise Kirkpatrick) were both happy to support the nomination of Derek Whitehead. He has provided a report of the first meeting, which was circulated to all members of the joint executive. Education.au and IMS and ASIC are all MCEETYA bodies, funded by DEST.

c) CONZUL. The University of Canterbury has formally joined the ADT. Madeleine McPherson may be able to attend the November CONZUL meeting in Auckland. (Action: DC)

d) CASL. Madeleine McPherson has been invited to address the CASL meeting in Cairns on July 9. Dagmar Schmidmaier is organising an indigenous collections seminar. Issues to be covered may include the role of the NLA in BAA2, Kinetica, the role of universities in cultural preservation, how universities are evolving, how universities are different from other collecting institutions.

e) CAVAL. Workshop on the Future of Consortia, 9-10 August, 2004, clashes with the AVCC Library Staff Development Conference. Diane Costello was invited to participate in the CAVAL program, but has commitments relating to the AVCC program. It was noted that it is limited to 15 invited participants, but that none of the CAVAL Board nor the CEIRC committee has been invited.

f) NSCF. The forum on “Changing Research Practices” was held in Canberra on June 1. The list of attendees and proposed outcomes were circulated with the agenda. It was noted that the “outcomes” don’t particularly reflect the discussions during the forum. The papers will be available from the NSCF web-site.


The forum was primarily about shifting government policy on research assessment. DEST is interested in policy development particularly about the role of digital
repositories. Gareth Roberts was particularly interesting because of his involvement in, and knowledge of, research assessment in the UK. Charles Oppenheim is tracking digital repositories. Evan Arthur gave a very lucid description of DEST’s thinking on quality and research.

If the government provided incentives, what would need to be in place in the area of digital repositories? ARROW will look at hosting services for those universities who don’t wish to establish their own, but it doesn’t reduce the need for institutions to develop their own policies and attend to cultural issues. It was recognised that if the government intends to mandate the deposit of research output into public repositories, it should make a statement very soon.

g) National Academies Forum. The NAF is holding a “Symposium on Measuring Excellence in Research and Research Training” in Canberra, 22 June 2004. Perhaps ask Vic Elliott or Cliff Law to attend. Eve will be in Canberra that day. (Action: DC)

1188. CAUL Meetings.

a) CAUL Meeting 2004/2, Hobart, September 13-14, with satellite meetings on September 12. Proposed items for the agenda include:

i) Teaching & Learning Forum. Andrew Wells will discuss with UNSW colleagues the role of libraries in teaching & learning. Possible speakers include: Christine Goodacre of the University of Tasmania; Craig McInnes of the University of Melbourne; Alan Smith of USQ.

At USQ, a distinction is made between on- and off-campus students for enrolment, teaching, services, etc but it is moving towards a hybrid model of a single core service with add-on services appropriate to the mode of teaching. This session should pick up any themes in CAUL’s strategic plan.

It would be useful to outline the role of the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund, and a UTas staff member was suggested. A library perspective should be included, the role of electronic resources in teaching & learning, the impact of changes in teaching & learning on the role of the library and the linkages between library systems and learning management systems. (Action: AW)

Potential speakers: Linda Luther and Christine Goodacre are planning an information commons at UTas; Brendan Scott on learning commons; Monash has a briefing paper on the subject, noting that its physical manifestation is important. DEST is funding capital developments for these facilities. Non-teaching resources that the students need to do their work should be co-located – amenities, library resources, assistance, quiet study & group spaces, etc. Libraries must focus on the social aspects of learning.

Include information literacy, particularly as a graduate attribute, as part of the teaching & learning agenda, particularly emphasising areas where there is room for development. New technologies allow a quasi-library experience, but it is still based on the old course pack model, rather than building in resources to support independent learning. WebCT-type software doesn’t allow students not enrolled in a course to use course materials. Andrew Wells will draft a specification for the workshop. (Action: AW)
ii) **Hot Topics.** Suggested by Janine Schmidt: Internet use by the general public (AVCC Guidelines) – a lower priority; streaming video – a lower priority for libraries; linking with Learning Management Systems (additional to the presentations from 2003.) Madeleine McPherson will invite members to suggest additional topics. *(Action: MM)*

iii) **Developments in open access and journal publishing** – Madeleine McPherson is contemplating a paper on the options, with what would/could happen under each one. Different communities have very different perspectives on open access.

iv) **DEST.** Suggest inviting Ian Lucas to the meeting re the quality and accessibility framework. Invite Evan Arthur to speak. *(Action: MM)*

v) **ARIIC Projects.** Provide an update at each meeting.

vi) **CAUL Budget for 2005.** Budget planning should include prioritising of projects and programs for 2005.

   (1) **CEIRC Strategic Plan.**

   (2) **Staffing of the CAUL office.**

   b) **CAUL Meeting 2005/1.** Auckland, 4 April, 2005, with committee meetings on the 3rd. [ICOLC is 11-13/4/05]

   c) **CAUL Meeting 2005/2.** Brisbane, September, 2005. Janice Rickards is seeking a venue, with a view to confirming a date.

1189. **Forthcoming Executive Meetings.**

   a) 2004 August 12 – Sydney. Madeleine McPherson will attend the middleware conference on the 13th.

   b) 2004 September 12 – Hobart, prior to CAUL 2004/2

   c) 2004 December 6 – Melbourne, in conjunction with the joint CCA Executive.

**CAUL ADMINISTRATION**

1190. **CAUL Finances.**

   a) **Audit of 2002 Accounts.** This audit is all but complete.

   b) **Audit of 2003 Accounts.** The audit began on March 8, and is almost complete.

   c) **CAUL Budget 2004.** It was suggested that CAUL membership fees be tracked against library budget movements, as part of the review of office staffing and support. *(Action: DC)* Expenditure to date has been updated. Research funds may be used for the user studies.

   d) **CAUL Budget 2005.** Members will be invited to consider expenditure for 2005 now, rather than waiting until the budget discussions in September. *(Action: MM)* Members will be advised that the CAUL reporting pro-forma will be expanded to include budgeting.

   An additional item will be the $100 registration fee for the CAUL domain “caul.edu.au”

1191. **Other business.**
a) **Digital Object Identifier.** John Mullarvey has written to Vice-Chancellors and Copyright Officers regarding CAL’s investigative projects with two universities using the DOI to compile teaching materials.

Madeleine McPherson reported on the genesis of the project. It was noted that individual articles were not used often enough to warrant setting up a system to measure them for remuneration purposes, and most were not remunerable under university licences. It was moving to on-demand textbooks. The steering committee includes Neil McLean and John Shipp.

Derek Whitehead attended a DOI session in Melbourne. He noted that course-packs can be made under part VB, which includes fair dealing rights, and the ability to link from LMSs. Most articles will fit into one of these categories. DOI isn’t the only permanent linking mechanism. He has recommended that Swinburne not participate.

Diane Costello reported that the INFORMIT licence imposes restrictions not present in any other licence. CAL is the body appointed by government to manage part VB copying, which it does by contract with the AVCC. *Vis a vis* the INFORMIT licence, use by universities is not additionally remunerable. This will be on the agenda for discussion with RMIT Publishing in July.

The meeting concluded at 3pm
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1192. **Attendance.** Madeleine McPherson (President), Eve Woodberry (Deputy President), Andrew Wells, Derek Whitehead, Cathrine Harboe-Ree. In attendance: Diane Costello.

1193. **Minutes of the previous Executive Meeting, 2004/3, 6-7 June 2004.** The minutes were accepted.

**a) Involvement with IDP.** Alex Byrne has met with IDP. He reported that the recent CAUL survey shows many gaps in the information obtainable in universities, and recommends that the information gathered be used as a baseline from which to move forward. He recommends using the information to identify areas of greatest risk and/or need in the services and resources provided to students in offshore campuses, and to identify areas amenable to CAUL action or institutional action. Even in the latter case, CAUL may be involved through the development of guidelines or tools for benchmarking.

He advised that LATN would be proposing a pilot to be conducted in, say, Hong Kong, whereby several institutions could collaborate on a joint information literacy program, targeted at a number of educational programs. IDP may be asked to fund the pilot, or participate or assist in some way. He noted that it would not be appropriate to introduce an entirely generic program, nor realistic to embed it in the curriculum. CAUL won’t be able to press universities to particular action but individual examples of best practice may be used to encourage better practice in identified areas.

He suggested that the EDUCAUSE program include representatives from AUQA and IDP to address this issue. (Action: MM) Because IDP is well-placed to gather and analyse information about offshore programs, Alex Byrne recommended that CAUL develop an agenda / framework from which to identify questions that IDP may help to answer. He suggested a working group, comprised of those from institutions with large offshore programs such as Monash, Curtin, UNSW, CSU to develop such a framework.

The stimulus for the original discussions with IDP arose from such questions as: how to study successfully at an Australian university; why information literacy is needed, different expectations of students, partly because of cultural differences. CAUL is interested because of concerns about the quality of library resources for offshore students.

Universities are establishing quality assurance for all offshore services and it is clear that students expect high quality library services. IDP’s research shows that library services form one of the key drivers of satisfaction. Competitiveness of the offshore market is a concern, especially if it results in reduced resourcing. CAUL should endeavour to show that appropriate funding of library services is an investment.
AUQA would expect graduate attributes to apply in the same way to offshore as onshore students. It was suggested inviting Felicity McGregor to address UoW’s audit of its Hong Kong services as a hot topic. *(Action: DC)* Derek Whitehead is giving a paper on this topic at the information literacy conference.

It was suggested that conducting information literacy sessions cooperatively could be useful if approached from the aspect of cultural differences. There is a logic in providing information literacy skills with language and research skills, part of a set of enabling skills. If there is a better recognition of the kinds of skills needed, the library could be a player, albeit a small one. It was suggested that academics dealing with international students be asked what would help to make teaching easier.

IDP plans to establish resource centres for use by multiple institutions and multiple programs, in India initially. It is not yet known how universities would view collaborative activity in such a highly competitive environment. It was noted that initiatives to teach offshore are done at the department level, rather than at the University level.

This issue is likely to be of concern to ACODE as well as CAUDIT and CAUL, and would be worthy of a longer EDUCAUSE session rather than just a paper. Pamela Leuzinger may be prepared to give a paper at the IDP international conference. *(Action: DC)*

**b) Open Access.** It was agreed that a statement on open access, targeted to DEST’s current thinking, be developed for inclusion in DEST’s Quality and Accessibility agenda. The article from The Economist was noted. [Access all areas.](http://www.economist.com/science/displayStory.cfm?story_id=3061258) Aug 5th 2004, and reprinted in *The Australian*, 11 August

Members discussed the draft prepared by Madeleine McPherson. It was agreed that it be concise and focussed on higher education, and to include a definition, based on that from the Budapest statement. It was agreed to note the creation of public policies, as well as their implementation.

Open access is part of a movement to improve access to scholarly output. There are several strands to the free or affordable access to scholarly communication, including institutional repositories. A CAUL statement should indicate that it supports all efforts towards this goal, of which open access is the most important. *(Action: DC)*

**1194. Minutes of the CCA Executive Meeting 7 June 2004.** The next meeting will be in Melbourne, and will be chaired by Eve Woodberry.

**a) Access to the Internet in Australian Universities.** It was noted that the only university that has really addressed it is the University of Queensland, but it is suspected that the approach is more restrictive than is required by legislation. Janine Schmidt suggested this as a hot topic for the next CAUL meeting, and Andrew Wells is willing to contribute. *(Action: AW)* Issues to be addressed include: the risk of the network being abused and university being consequently sued; balancing the need to give reasonable access to external users and protect the university. It was noted that Monash has 60,000 persons who are authorised to use the network...

**1195. Business arising from previous meetings not otherwise listed on the agenda.** There were no further items for attention.

**1196. CAUL Membership.** Members applauded the award of an ALIA Fellowship to Janine Schmidt, and proposed that the President write a congratulatory letter on their behalf. *(Action: MM)*
STRATEGIC PLAN

1197. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).

a) **Item 4. Information literacy as a graduate attribute.** A response from Ruth Quinn has been received. Cathrine Harboe-Ree circulated email correspondence between Debra Orr and Vivienne Bernath.

Ruth Quinn advised that Debra Orr and Graham Black met with Ralph Catts at the Lifelong Learning Conference in June to discuss his progress on the technical manual for the Information Skills Survey. He indicated his commitment to completing the project, and has agreed to complete all aspects of his work by the end of August.

b) **Item 12. User Studies.** A draft call for expressions of interest was circulated to the Executive for comment, then circulated to CAUL. The object of the survey is to identify areas in which to do further research.

A response was received from UNSW/UQ. It was agreed that the activities defined in Stage 1 of the proposal would be interesting, and could provide a useful resource, however the cost was higher than expected given the outcomes listed. It was confirmed that the outcomes needed to be better defined by the Executive. **(Action: CAUL Executive)**

The kind of work involved in tracking behaviour over time would cost far more than CAUL would be able to support. ARC linkage grants would be more appropriate. It was suggested that the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund might be tapped.

It was agreed that the survey needed to be better defined, to identify more clearly what will be of use to CAUL. It was agreed to start from the questions which needed to be asked in order to support management decisions: what management information do we need and why; what data do we need to collect over time to be able to answer these questions?

Derek Whitehead outlined a number of questions that can be answered from data available from library systems or EZProxy. The project should identify factors which would need to be tracked in order to provide useful information over time eg the usage of e-books, and then survey CAUL to find out whether they are collecting this information. An example would be: how many people use the bound periodicals collection? Some information would be more valuable if more libraries were collecting it.

Andrew Wells will discuss with Carol Tenopir: changes in user behaviour to inform decision making; different kinds of indicators of changes in user behaviour. **(Action: AW)**

David Groenewegen’s paper will be included on the CAUL web site. **(Action: CH-R, DC)**

Madeleine McPherson advised that she was working with Michael Middleton on a RAILS project (Research Applications in Information and Library Studies project). She tabled a document in which members of Charles Sturt University’s Library and Information Management group list the research they are doing and have done with users and information. It has become a focus of their research centre. It was suggested inviting Monash SIMS and CSU LIM to submit project applications.

c) **Item 17. Technical and Topical Framework for Sharing Management Information.** The request to CAUL for contributions to this information base has resulted in responses from JCU, VU, Bond and Griffith universities. All information has been added to the web site, under Case Studies and Useful Links. Most have have
not provided links to the documents, but have advised that they are available on request – in these cases, links are being made to the email of the University librarian.

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1198. ARIIC.  Eve Woodberry reported that the government has approved funds for JSTOR, the first genuine National Site Licence, including the University of Notre Dame, for Arts & Science I, II and III for 2004-6.  Other collections were not affordable within the total funding of USD 1.9m.  The funding was predicated on the proposition that no-one had purchased the collections, so those who had purchased any collections will be able to reallocate their portion to other collections.

It was noted that representatives of the four ARIIC projects were intended to meet four times a year, and feed into ARIIC deliberations. Members agreed on the benefit of all projects reporting regularly to CAUL.  It was suggested that a FRODO meeting be held in September in conjunction with CAUL.  (Action: CH-R, AW)

1199. AARLIN.  It was noted that there were 12 confirmed and two possible further participants, consequently AARLIN will continue as planned.  DEST funded a perpetual licence for all members, however if a former participant rejoins, they will need to purchase an individual licence. Members will contract with La Trobe University to provide a service.  It was recognized that AARLIN is an important project for CAUL’s credibility with government.  It is considered that the software is now very good and will be even better with the next release. Both Swinburne and UNE have launched and are very happy with the service.

1200. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).  Eve Woodberry reported on a discussion with RMIT Publishing regarding their content and licences. Sue Dowling has compiled a second list of issues outstanding with ISI web of science.  The CEIRC committee is reviewing the CAUL office’s operations relating to CEIRC activities, with a particular view to risk management, and additional potential activities which could be undertaken, such as additional management reporting of the CEIRC program.

It was noted that CEIRC is run as a lean, efficient organisation, with a very low ratio of total costs to turnover, but that more information about return on investment and strategic analysis is desirable to put CEIRC on a more business-like footing. An increase in output will require resources, and have a financial impact.

It was determined that the program has very high value and high risk, with the main risk not financial but operational, because of its “single point sensitivity.” Another risk is of fragmentation within CAUL, the possibility of members staying outside or joining with other groups such as the Go8.  It is deemed that the balance of external members balance is fine, with CAUL priorities clearly the driver within the program.

It was noted that CEIRC is not a commercial entity but is a vehicle for communication with vendors.  The Strategic Directions document shows some of the risks, and it is very useful to have this articulated. It was that the document should be presented to CAUL, as a major item for the CAUL meeting. An executive summary should outline the tensions and key issues, which areas CAUL should consider or address, focus on what kind of organisation members want CAUL to be, and what CEIRC should be, what resources will be required to fulfil this role?  (Action: EW)

1201. Report from the Science and Technology Committee of the United Kingdom House of Commons, "Scientific Publications: Free For All?". CAUL made a submission to this inquiry, and was quoted in the report. It was agreed that it should be advertised widely and can be used to provide supporting arguments.
CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING

MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

1202. Standards. This is a standing item. Derek Whitehead reported that there were no real library standards. In the higher education sector, the trend is to adopt the IEEE standard as a core standard for metadata. It was noted that the best model was to use the smallest generic set possible. It was noted that Maxine Brodie will be addressing this through IT19. ARROW is addressing metadata, and is involving Jon Mason from education.au.

1203. Virtual Reference. The Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA) has suggested that some approaches to virtual reference might be investigated with CAUL. It was agreed to communicate any proposals to CAUL without necessarily endorsing it, recognising that other universities may be interested. (Action: DC)

Monash was involved in the pilot run by the National Library but found it expensive for low use. Monash uses online chat, and the King’s College, London uses email. UNE now handles research questions differently for distance education students, responding with search strategies rather than the search results.

1204. ARL LibQUAL+. Steve Hiller will be visiting Australia from November 19 to January 18. A brief discussion was held on the Rodski versus LibQUAL within CAUL. It was agreed that continuity was important. Diane Costello will ask Felicity McGregor to address the continuation of Rodski at the CAUL meeting. (Action: DC)

COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY

1205. Copyright. Eve Woodberry reported on the release of the JSCOT report, where CAUL and the AVCC were quoted. The major concern is that Australia will be locked into changing copyright every time the USA does. Sarah Waladan has commenced as ALCC copyright officer. There will be an ALCC meeting at the Gold Coast alongside ALIA.

Eve Woodberry will participate in the IFLA copyright working group next week. She also attended the CLRC forum on crown copyright recently. The main discussion was on the social justice issue and the reports of consultancies performed for government. VISCOPY claims that photographs deposited in the National library were used without permission in PictureAustralia. IPRIA – the Intellectual Property Research Institute of Australia – is conducting project on digitising by cultural institutions, and are interested in working on copyright for education. CAL also has funds for research purposes.

1206. Communication. (Standing item)

a) President’s Report. A report is appended to the minutes.

b) Public Relations/Media Reports. Campus Review article by Garry Carnegie. Professor Carnegie had previously recommended that CAUL issue a statement, but it is not clear to what forum it would be addressed. It was suggested that it would be most profitable to address it to the accounting community. Derek Whitehead will draft a statement and consider the forum in which it might be raised. (Action: DW)

c) CAUL Report 2003. A draft of the report is in progress and will be circulated to the Executive. 2003 statistics are not yet available. (Action: DC)

d) Executive Officer’s Report. A report is appended to this agenda. CAUL is holding funds received for subscriptions which have been written off by the vendor, and it was confirmed that it they would be refunded to the CAUL members who paid them. (Action: DC)
1207. Government Inquiries.

a) National Learning and Teaching Fund. The CAUL submission was prepared by Cathrine Harboe-Ree. It has been sent to DEST, and circulated to CAUL.

b) Progress and future direction of life-long learning inquiry. The CAUL submission was prepared by Madeleine McPherson. It has been sent to DEST.

1208. Relationships with other organisations. At the CAUL meeting in April, it was agreed that the Executive would prepare a document on the organisations with whom CAUL might have a formal or an informal relationship, develop a set of principles, and make recommendations as to which CAUL should foster a relationship with. A draft was discussed.

Members discussed whether CAUL is a cooperative which in practical terms focuses on matters of immediate interest to members, or whether it should join associations which advocate certain values. There was concern that taking up membership in a range of other organisations could contribute to fee creep and not be of direct benefit to members.

Members concluded the following:

1. The CAUL strategic plan should guide the decision.
2. The benefit must be direct and relate to CAUL’s strategic plan.
3. CAUL should belong to organisations for transactional reasons or direct material benefit, not for affiliate or common goal reasons.
4. Alliances are important, but if not of direct benefit, CAUL should offer to be an associate or affiliate with respect to communication, exchange of newsletters etc (Action: DC)

SPARC membership is a gesture of support but there is not a clear direct benefit. COUNTER, ICOLC, ALCC are clearly of direct interest. IFLA is a federation of professional associations, and more suited to ALIA. CHASS, FASTS etc are bodies like CAUL. It was noted that the recommendations will rule out a whole class of organisations with whose roles CAUL has much in common.

a) JULAC. Details were circulated by John Shipp to CAUL on July 12.

b) CAUDIT & ACODE.

i) EDUCAUSE 2005. Sky City, Auckland, 5-8 April, 2005. It was noted that the planning was progressing well. The program committee would like more workshops. 3 of the 6 keynote speakers have been confirmed. Sponsorship is progressing very well.

(1) Metadata Workshop. Derek Whitehead circulated a proposal, prepared with Christine Goodacre and Maree Gosper, to the ACODE, CAUDIT and CAUL Executive.

ii) Joint Executive Committee. The next meeting will be held 6 December in Melbourne. CAUL will host the meeting, to be chaired by Eve Woodberry.

c) CONZUL. CAUL CONZUL meeting in Auckland in April 2005. University of Canterbury has joined the ADT. AUT, University of Auckland and the University of Canterbury are using Rodski. It is not known whether they have access to CAUL data.

d) CASL. Madeleine McPherson attended the CASL meeting in Cairns in July. Linda Luther has raised the possibility of a more formal meeting between CASL and CAUL or the CAUL Executive. The new Research Library Network in the UK has been
announced, led by the British Library, and it is an interesting model. FRODO provides a very good bridge to the National Library. Janice van de Velde from the State Library of Victoria attended the last meeting of the CAUL Statistics Focus Group. It was suggested inviting the local state librarian to each CAUL meeting, starting with Siobhan Gaskell, and acknowledge that not all the agenda will be of interest. (Action: MM) It was agreed to promote a regional relationship with the state libraries as far as possible eg through the regional group of CAUL members.

e) SARIS. Diane Costello reported on the visit to Australia by South African colleagues, Roy Page-Shipp and Monica Hammes.

f) National Library of Australia.
   i) National Resource Sharing Working Group. This group has been wound up. It had originally been intending that ALIA take over this responsibility, although its main interest has been in the voucher system. It was agreed that the National Library was the natural successor to ACLIS with respect to document delivery, and it is an area which does need continuing coordination. The National Library maintains the NRS directory, and the Kinetica document delivery system. Madeleine McPherson will discuss with Jan Fullerton in September. (Action: MM) Diane Costello will discuss with Liz Curach. (Action: DC)

   ii) Kinetica Funding. It was noted that funding from DEST was unlikely. It was agreed to survey CAUL to find out who provides free end-user access to Kinetica, and what is the level of use. (Action: MM)

1209. CAUL Meetings.

a) CAUL Meeting 2004/2, Hobart, September 13-14, with satellite meetings on September 12. It was agreed to trial the distribution of meeting papers electronically. There would entail a single PDF document including all papers in agenda order as would normally be in the printed set. A blank page will be inserted at the end of odd-numbered documents to facilitate double-sided copying and tagging of pages. (Action: DC) Proposed items for the agenda include:

   i) Teaching & Learning Forum. Suggestions for inclusion were: case studies, connection to the Nelson reforms, linking with learning management systems, government/policy, embedding information skills, the Lynch / McLean paper and an overview of the technology. (Action: AW) Madeleine McPherson is preparing a paper for the WebCT conference addressing flexible learning, linking LMS and ILMS, how will these be linked with teaching. Lynne Benton’s presentation at the AVCC conference would be valuable. Richard Dearden from the University of Tasmania may be invited to do a case study of embedding information literacy into a medicine program. Professor Yoni Ryan, Monash, has done some work on teaching librarians to teach; Denise Kirkpatrick who is attending the CAUL meeting may be able to pick up on this. (Action: AW)

   ii) CAUL Budget for 2005. Budget planning should include prioritising of projects and programs for 2005. Eve tabled her draft of copyright activities for 2005. CEIRC renewals will be able to be handled, as in 2003, within the CAUL office without additional staff because it becomes the highest priority for that time. The review of staffing in the office will be held over formally until the pattern of workloads has been re-established. Rachelle Morgan, the administrative assistant is virtually fully trained, and has begun to track her time.

   iii) Hot Topics.
(1) Audit of Hong Kong campus of UoW. Felicity McGregor. (Action: DC)

(2) Internet Use by the General Public. Janine Schmidt and Andrew Wells. (Action: AW)

(3) DEST. Evan Arthur or Ian Lucas on the quality and accessibility framework. (Action: DC)

(4) ARIIC Projects Update. ARROW, APSR, MAMS, ADT. Ask John Shipp to chair this session. (Action: DC)

(5) Developments in Open Access and Journal Publishing. Madeleine McPherson will look at the different business models being tested.

(6) Dealing with Authorities on Campus. Alex Byrne.

(7) Deep-linking on web sites. Cathrine Harboe-Ree and Derek Whitehead.

(8) AUQA Reviews. Cliff Law suggested further case studies on AUQA reviews. It was noted that the AUQA web site includes all information about past and future audits. Gulcin Cribb has prepared a document showing all the library and IT recommendations and may be prepared to share it with members. Diane Costello will facilitate a birds-of-a-feather session on the Sunday. (Action: DC)

iv) Other items:

(1) The participation of Kay Raseroka, President of IFLA, in the meeting.

(2) Siobhan Gaskell, CASL member from Tasmania. It was suggested that CASL members be invited to CAUL meetings held in their state, and that CAUL regional groups consider including their local CASL member in their activities. (Action: DC, MM)

(3) Alex Byrne will propose that CAUL consider taking direct membership of IFLA.

(4) The proposed Türk-ANZAC Research Libraries Conference. Gulcin Cribb will provide an updated draft proposal.

b) CAUL Meeting 2005/1. Auckland, 4 April, 2005, with committee meetings on the 3rd. It was noted that the costs of Sky City are being exacerbated by the add-ons now being included. It was noted that Sky City is in the centre of Auckland, so that other options may be just as practical for those attending both CAUL and EDUCAUSE meetings. (Action: DC)

c) CAUL Meeting 2005/2. Brisbane, September, 2005. Janice Rickards is seeking a venue, with a view to confirming a date. Gaynor Austen has advised that SCONUL is contemplating a study tour to Australia about this time.

d) CAUL Meeting 2006/2. Perth, September, 2006. ALIA 2006 Biennial Conference in Perth. Imogen Garner has offered to host at Curtin University. It was agreed to propose this to CAUL at the meeting. (Action: DC)

1210. Forthcoming Executive Meetings. The following are confirmed dates.

a) 2004 September 12 – Hobart, prior to CAUL 2004/2

b) 2004 December 6-7 – Melbourne, in association with the joint CCA Executive (Monday 6 December, from 1pm)
CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1211. CAUL Finances.

a) Audit of 2002 Accounts. This audit is complete, and requires signatures of the Executive. The auditors will be asked to include a note explaining “gain on foreign exchange.” (Action: DC) In response to a question regarding keeping CEIRC subscriptions separate from CAUL’s operational accounts, Diane Costello reported that separate AUD accounts had been maintained from 1998 to 2000 but that University finance departments had great difficulty dealing with a single entity with two accounts. The CAUL office was frequently required to transfer funds between the accounts to correct deposits made into the wrong accounts.

b) Audit of 2003 Accounts. The audit began on March 8, is now complete, and requires signatures of the Executive. It was agreed to circulate the audit reports to CAUL following final confirmation by the Executive. Both audit reports will be signed off at the next Executive meeting. (Action: CAUL Executive)

c) CAUL Budget 2004. Expenditure has been updated. It was suggested that CAUL membership fees be tracked against library budget movements, as part of the review of office staffing and support. (Action: DC)

d) CAUL Budget 2005. Diane Costello will circulate a draft with the CAUL meeting papers incorporating any claims included in reports to CAUL from working groups and representatives. (Action: DC)

1212. Other business.

a) ADT / ETD. Andrew Wells reported on the planning for ETD2005, the Electronic Theses and Dissertations conference in Sydney. He advised that a conference organiser has been appointed and a draft budget developed. 2-300 delegates are expected. Adobe has already been secured as a sponsor, and UNESCO will be approached to sponsor the inclusion of regional countries. UNSW staff are spreading the word at a variety of meetings and conferences.

b) AVCC / ISI Web of Science Contract. At least one CAUL member suggested that the Executive should have played a stronger role in the AVCC Web of Science negotiations and agreement. It was noted that usage data is now included as a factor in cost allocation, and the Go8’s cost all increased significantly. It was noted that most members advised their Vice-Chancellors against signing a 5-year licence, without success.

c) CAUL Statistics. CAVAL has submitted a proposal to develop a system for the collection, analysis and display of CAUL statistics. The proposal builds on the recommendations which came out of the 2003 survey of CAUL members. The impetus arises from the opinion of members that CAUL statistics lack the functionality they require.

Derek Whitehead reported that a first version had been discussed at a meeting of the CAUL statistics focus group, and tabled an updated version. Bibliostat has also provided a number of quotes in the past but the product cannot be used on a public web site and the annual cost is very high.

The preferred option is to use the ARL software as a basis if possible. The University of Virginia runs the ARL site, and is happy to share the software but are not prepared to perform the work required to adapt to CAUL’s requirements. This option requires a licence for SAS, but its licence is expensive. It might be possible to invite a university which holds a SAS licence to host the service, but this option is not recommended.
The alternative is that CAVAL develop the software and host for a period of time. The CSFG recommended that the costs be front-loaded, with a lower annual cost. CAVAL has very slightly reduced the annual cost for collecting and presenting the software to compensate for those tasks which will be reduced or no longer required with the proposed system.

CAVAL has proposed costs for developing an open source-based solution which provides automated data input and online analysis and display. The development cost seems reasonable compared with the other options, however the annual cost is far too high. It was agreed to request a much clearer statement of the ongoing costs and benefits and to check the 2003 data collection proposal to compare the task lists and the estimated cost of each. (Action: DC, DW)

The development will greatly enhance the current presentation. Recommend that we accept the direction in principle and negotiate on the price, but need to know what is an acceptable price.

It was noted that the current Excel presentation allowed members to use the statistics in a variety of ways, some of which may be unique. It was noted that those who provided the positive comments on the pilot site were CAUL members’ statistics representatives.

It was suggested that CAVAL may wish to build on this development to become a local provider of library statistics, and that they may wish to fund some of the development.

The upfront costs could potentially be paid from CAUL’s reserve funds. The current proposal could increase membership fees by $500 per year. Papers for the CAUL meeting should include two proposals to CAUL, one from CAVAL regarding the development of the system and one with options for CAUL to pay for it. (Action: DW)

Derek Whitehead noted that the CSFG had determined that it is not yet feasible to collect usage data on a systematic national basis.

The meeting concluded at 4.55pm
DRAFT Guidelines for CAUL Committee Composition and Election

The ILWG membership composition highlighted a lack of formal guidelines for the composition and election of CAUL committees and working groups.

The Executive approved the following guidelines for committee membership, standing groups and *ad hoc* working groups, established from time to time to facilitate progress in CAUL’s programs.

The guidelines do not apply to the CAUL Executive, or groups representing consortial activities eg CEIRC.

- The Working Party convenor will be elected by CAUL members / proposed by the Executive, for a 2-year term.
- The convenor will select the members based on expertise and geographic considerations.
- There should be no more than 6 members of the group, although individuals may be co-opted from time to time.
- Groups should be reviewed at least once every two years, ideally as a new convenor takes over.
- The convenor should report to each CAUL meeting.
- The report should include any budget requirements.

A budget item has been added to the reporting pro-forma.

June, 2004
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MAMS Requirements Gathering

James Dalziel
Professor of Learning Technology and Director,
Macquarie E-Learning Centre Of Excellence (MELCOE)
james@melcoe.mq.edu.au

www.melcoe.mq.edu.au
Overview

• Content Management System Technologies presentation for ACODE
• Background to MAMS requirements gathering
• Simple voting on requirements
• Open Feedback
• Homework task: Detailed “spending” on requirements
Content Management Systems

• Recent presentation for ACODE Content Management Systems workshop
  – See other slides
MAMS Requirements Gathering

- MAMS = Meta Access Management System
- An initiative of Backing Australia’s Ability
  – Funded by DEST under SII – 2004 to 2006
- Overview of MAMS provided at previous CAUL meeting – see:
- Key project requirement for 2004 is gathering requirements from users – eg, CAUL
MAMS Requirements Gathering

(1) Voting on access and identity interest areas – 4 votes

Single-Sign-On               Shared whiteboard
Virtual Organisations       Messaging
AV conferences             User preferences (eg accessibility)
Anonymous access           Presence
Visiting academics          Attribute management
Calendaring                 DRM & Repository Management
Federation policy           Accountability/Audit

(2) Open comments on access and identity
MAMS Requirements Gathering

(3) Homework task: Detailed “spending” on requirements

Please email to

james@melcoe.mq.edu.au

or fax to

02 9850 7568

Attn: James Dalziel
**Instructions for use:**

On the next worksheet, you will find a number of IT capabilities/services that the Meta-Access Management System (MAMS) project could develop (or suggest an existing solution) for your organization. Therefore, it is important that you tell us what kind of capabilities you need. In order to prioritize our requirements for MAMS, we give you $100 (virtual) for you to ‘spend’ on the following capabilities.

**For example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single sign on within your organisation (SSO)</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous access to licensed information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous access to remote information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total spent:**

This means that you are most interested in "SSO" ($40), but would even be happier if we would develop both "anonymous access to licensed information” AND "virtual organisations” ($25+$35=$60).

[Start prioritizing requirements]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Description: You can spend $100 of development across these items. Where would you invest your money?</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Authentication</td>
<td>A person from the institution is able to sign on from a single access point but using a choice of various forms of authentication with different levels of security, trust or scope. For example: basic password, one-time password, Kerberos. Some forms of authentication provide more capabilities to the person than others because of their greater strength of security.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Single Sign-On</td>
<td>A person from the institution has access to all intra-institutional applications (such as the portal, learning management system, email, research computing/HPC/Grid, library catalogue, e-journals, and digital repositories) following a single sign-on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anonymous access to licensed information</td>
<td>An authenticated person from the institution is able to access licensed information resources available to &quot;active members of the community&quot; without disclosing their identity or personal information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anonymous access to remote information</td>
<td>An authenticated person from the institution is able to access an information resource at a remote institution, where access is limited to people associated with a particular group at the home institution, without disclosing their identity or personal information to the remote institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Virtual Organisations</td>
<td>An application used by an authenticated person at the institution is able to consume a Web Service provided by a remote institution, where access is limited to agents of users with particular characteristics (such as teachers of shared courses) without disclosing the identity of the user or their personal information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Account stacking</td>
<td>A person from a remote institution visiting local institute L is able to access information resources at institute L as a consequence of being authenticated by the remote institute R. The person may also be allowed access to resources at their institution R.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reverse account stacking</td>
<td>Disallowing users from taking on multiple roles within a single transaction. For example: not being both the beneficiary and the approver of an expense claim.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Certificate Authority</td>
<td>An institution issues and manages public/private keys on behalf of students and staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Digital Signatures</td>
<td>A person from the institution is able to digitally sign their documents and emails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Grid use</td>
<td>A person is able to: execute a program on one or more available computers to reduce the overall time spent processing data, locate and remote access to computing resources such as processing power, storage, and bandwidth, monitor and control a program running on one or more computers through the Grid computing service, access Grid information services, such as reading, querying or publishing information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rights Managed</td>
<td>A person can manage the creation and allocation of rights policies against resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rights Enforcement</td>
<td>A person is prevented from using an information resource in a way in which it conflicts with rights policies governing use of the resource.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rights Managed Access with Agreement Auditing</td>
<td>A person can gain access to a rights-managed information resource provided that they both meet the criteria stated in the rights policies for the resource, and agree (‘click OK’) to abide by rules applying to its usage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Applications can access information about the nature of the activity a person is currently engaging in, such as the module or activity that a student is accessing within a learning system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Applications can access information about the nature of the activity a person is currently engaging in, such as the module or activity that a student is accessing within a learning system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>User Preferences</td>
<td>Applications in the federation can access machine-readable information about users' personal preferences, such as their accessibility needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Federated search</td>
<td>Persons can find information resources across the federation, including multiple types of repository, learning objects, assets, e-conservancy, harvested metadata, and so on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Metadata management</td>
<td>Metadata can be used to facilitate discovery and indexing of resources across the federation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Identify objects</td>
<td>Applications in the federation can request, register and deregister identifiers for objects such as information resources, enabling persistent identification of objects held by other partners in a federation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Resolve objects</td>
<td>Applications in the federation can resolve to an object (including resolution to an appropriate copy) based on persistent identifiers and/or metadata.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>Persons and applications can deposit objects for long-term storage, and manage archiving, replication and destruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>De-Provisioning</td>
<td>Applications can provision and be provisioned with identity and business information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Backup and replication</td>
<td>Applications are capable of backup, replication, synchronization, to support fail-over.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Source control</td>
<td>Persons can manage source code to facilitate collaborative software development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mapping of attributes</td>
<td>Applications in the federation can access services that provide cross-mapping of values in different namespaces, such as mapping your directory attributes to someone else’s attributes within the federation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Attribute management</td>
<td>Persons and applications in the federation can (self-service) manage basic directory information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Privacy/Attribute release policies</td>
<td>Persons can manage policies for the release of privacy/attribute information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>Persons and applications can gain information, where appropriate, about the on-line status and availability of another person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Service Registry</td>
<td>Persons and applications can discover what services (e.g. web services, repositories) are available within the federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning Pathways</td>
<td>A person at the institution can gain information about available learning opportunities across the federation, either to reach a particular learning goal, or based on prior achievements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Remote connect</td>
<td>Allowing remote connect, where another trusted peer can control your PC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>All conferencing</td>
<td>All conferencing in the federation are in real-time audio and video communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Messaging</td>
<td>A person or application can broadcast a message to users and groups within a federation using communication methods (email, SMS, chat) appropriate to the recipient, federation partner, and context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>Persons can manage the allocation of resources against time, such as rooms, people and equipment, and for arranging meetings with other persons in the federation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>Persons in the federation can engage in real-time text communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>Persons in the federation can engage in asynchronous collaborative messaging, as offered by Web forums and message boards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Web-based email</td>
<td>Persons in the federation can use the email service via a web-based interface.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Whiteboards</td>
<td>Persons in the federation can collaboratively use whiteboards and virtual whiteboards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Collaborative editing</td>
<td>Persons in the federation can collaboratively create and edit documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Annotation &amp; Rating</td>
<td>Persons in the federation can annotate and rate resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sharing desktop windows</td>
<td>Sharing desktop windows (including web browsers) with trusted peers, e.g. your excel page can be shared during a telephone conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give us more input - what would you add? Send your results and remarks to nsultana@melcoe.mq.edu.au
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Confusion

• Repository/content management confusion is not limited to education and e-learning, but extends to:
  – enterprise website management and portals
  – document/intranet management
  – library digital repositories
  – digital asset management for both text and non-text (eg, images, video, audio, etc.) items
Confusion

- Educational organisations have procured (or built) different systems for managing:
  - university web pages
  - learning object repositories
  - copyright and digital rights
  - delivery and tracking of learning content
  - authoring and structuring of content
  - searchable repositories/archives, etc
Content Management and Roles

• Much of the content management problem is about people and roles, not just technology

• Who owns content management at your institution?
  – Public relations (central website)
  – Library (books, e-reserve, copyright, e-print repository)
  – E-learning (learning objects, e-portfolios, forum text)
  – Faculties/Departments (local websites, FAQs)
  – Academics (files on computers, network drives, blogs)
  – University Press/Printery (published books, coursepacks)
  – IT Services (infrastructure support for any of the above)
  – Students…. 
Content Management and Roles

• What about data management?
  – Student records, large datasets, network logs, etc

• What about metadata?
  – Library catalogue, learning object metadata, e-prints and harvesting, federated search, etc

• What about “office” productivity content?
  – Email, calendar, contacts, intranet documents, administrivia, etc
Content Management and Roles

• As a large scale “knowledge enterprise”, the complexity and diversity of university content management should come as no surprise

• Even still, we rarely grasp the full scope of the problem
# Convergence of Higher Education Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Services</th>
<th>GRID COMPUTING</th>
<th>SCHOLARLY INFORMATION</th>
<th>E-LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User Interfaces</td>
<td>User Interfaces</td>
<td>User Interfaces</td>
<td>User Interfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common services</td>
<td>Common services</td>
<td>Common services</td>
<td>Common services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Repositoryware”**

- Enterprise Info DBs
- Datasets Repositories
- Knowledge Repositories
- LO Repositories
Content Management and Roles

• The problem of “cultural interoperability” across IT Services, Grid, Library, E-learning
  – Different language
  – Different historical roles
  – Different cultures and work practices
  – Different past technology experiences

• We need to move beyond our silos, and begin sustained dialogue across domains
Lessons from COLIS

• COLIS (Collaborative Online Learning and Information Services) involved a range of university (5+) and industry partners (12+)
• Focus on open standards (especially IMS)
• Created a “Demonstrator” to illustrate integration of portal, e-learning and library systems
  – Difficulty of working out the system “chunks”
  – Overlap between vendor systems
Systems Chunks in COLIS Learning Space
Application Integration

- Content Management
- Library E-Services
  - E-Reserve
  - E-Journals
- Learning Content Management
- Integration Services
- Learning Management
- Digital Rights Management
- Directory Services
Systems Chunks in COLIS –
The Content Management Problem

- Content Management
- Learning Content Management
- Learning Management
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- Digital Rights Management
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Lessons from COLIS

• Examples of COLIS content management functions
  – Learning Object authoring (structure and metadata)
  – Metadata authoring (eg, LOM, ODRL, etc)
  – Workflow for authoring and approval
  – Search (keyword, metadata field-based, federated)
  – Harvest metadata
  – LO package (zip) delivery (download, SOAP transport)
  – LO “content” delivery (via URL to students)
  – Rights management (copyright notices, group restrictions)
  – Access logs and audit (based on access/identity information)
Content Management Technologies

• COLIS functions
  – Learning Object authoring
  – Metadata authoring
  – Workflow for authoring/approval
  – Search (MD)
  – Harvest metadata
  – LO package delivery
  – LO “content” delivery
  – Rights management
  – Access logs and audit

• Other e-learning functions
  – Asset and/or page authoring
  – Learning Object sequencing/templates (IMS SS, SCORM)
  – Learning activity sequencing/templates (IMS LD, LAMS)
  – Content stored in XML, allow for dynamic rendering (eg, Web, CD-ROM, PDA)
  – Single source storage
  – Version control, check in/out
  – Search (inside content)
  – Assessment authoring
  – Secondary usage metadata
Content Management Technologies

• Other digital repository functions (from ARIIC repositories)
  – Content ingestion/technical metadata auto-creation (eg, images)
  – Detailed metadata control, cataloguing, etc
  – Customisable content/metadata submission workflow
  – Persistent, unique, resolvable identifiers
  – Flexible search result delivery and presentation
  – Federated access and automated access policy (inc anonymity)
  – Preservation and archiving

• Other dataset repository functions (from Grid, SIS, etc)
  – Scalable and distributed computational analysis and storage capacity
  – Management of “state” during long computations
  – Change control and audit (eg, student marks)
## Roles and CM Technologies Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT Services (Website)</th>
<th>E-learning</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Grid/HPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoring</strong></td>
<td>Website page templates</td>
<td>LO author and structure</td>
<td>Content ingestion, MD author</td>
<td>Create/modify datasets, results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workflow</strong></td>
<td>Website approvals</td>
<td>Instructional team manage</td>
<td>Flexible MD submission</td>
<td>Analysis templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content storage</strong></td>
<td>XML rendered into outputs</td>
<td>Packaging of objects</td>
<td>Secure file system</td>
<td>Large databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search</strong></td>
<td>Unstructured page search</td>
<td>Keyword, some MD</td>
<td>Detailed metadata</td>
<td>Numerical, comp services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Web pages via web server</td>
<td>URL or LMS, tracking, assessment</td>
<td>URL, copyright</td>
<td>Outputs of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access/rights</strong></td>
<td>Public, unrestricted</td>
<td>Name/password</td>
<td>IP address, copyright notice</td>
<td>Strong authentication (eg PKI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Example: Corporate CMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Services (Website)</th>
<th>E-learning</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Grid/HPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoring</strong></td>
<td>Website page templates</td>
<td>LO author and structure</td>
<td>Content ingestion, MD author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workflow</strong></td>
<td>Website approvals</td>
<td>Instructional team manage</td>
<td>Flexible MD submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content storage</strong></td>
<td>XML rendered into outputs</td>
<td>Packaging of objects</td>
<td>Secure file system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search</strong></td>
<td>Unstructured page search</td>
<td>Keyword, some MD</td>
<td>Detailed metadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Web pages via web server</td>
<td>URL or LMS, tracking, assessment</td>
<td>URL, copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access/rights</strong></td>
<td>Public, unrestricted</td>
<td>Name/password</td>
<td>IP address, copyright notice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Example: LO Repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Services (Website)</th>
<th>E-learning</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Grid/HPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoring</strong></td>
<td>Website page templates</td>
<td>LO author and structure</td>
<td>Content ingestion, MD author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create/modify datasets, results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workflow</strong></td>
<td>Website approvals</td>
<td>Instructional team manage</td>
<td>Flexible MD submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content storage</strong></td>
<td>XML rendered into outputs</td>
<td>Packaging of objects</td>
<td>Secure file system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search</strong></td>
<td>Unstructured page search</td>
<td>Keyword, some MD</td>
<td>Detailed metadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numerical, comp services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Web pages via web server</td>
<td>URL or LMS, tracking, assessment</td>
<td>URL, copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outputs of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access/rights</strong></td>
<td>Public, unrestricted</td>
<td>Name/password</td>
<td>IP address, copyright notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong authentication (eg PKI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

CAUL Meeting 2004/2
Agenda item 623(d)
## Example: Corporate LCMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT Services (Website)</th>
<th>E-learning</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Grid/HPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoring</strong></td>
<td>Website page templates</td>
<td>LO author and structure</td>
<td>Content ingestion, MD author</td>
<td>Create/modify datasets, results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workflow</strong></td>
<td>Website approvals</td>
<td>Instructional team manage</td>
<td>Flexible MD submission</td>
<td>Analysis templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content storage</strong></td>
<td>XML rendered into outputs</td>
<td>Packaging of objects</td>
<td>Secure file system</td>
<td>Large databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search</strong></td>
<td>Unstructured page search</td>
<td>Keyword, some MD</td>
<td>Detailed metadata</td>
<td>Numerical, comp services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Web pages via web server</td>
<td>URL or LMS, tracking, assessment</td>
<td>URL, copyright</td>
<td>Outputs of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access/ rights</strong></td>
<td>Public, unrestricted</td>
<td>Name/ password</td>
<td>IP address, copyright notice</td>
<td>Strong authentication (eg PKI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Example: Institutional Repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT Services (Website)</th>
<th>E-learning</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Grid/HPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoring</strong></td>
<td>Website page templates</td>
<td>LO author and structure</td>
<td>Content ingestion, MD author</td>
<td>Create/modify datasets, results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workflow</strong></td>
<td>Website approvals</td>
<td>Instructional team manage</td>
<td>Flexible MD submission</td>
<td>Analysis templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content storage</strong></td>
<td>XML rendered into outputs</td>
<td>Packaging of objects</td>
<td>Secure file system</td>
<td>Large databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search</strong></td>
<td>Unstructured page search</td>
<td>Keyword, some MD</td>
<td>Detailed metadata</td>
<td>Numerical, comp services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Web pages via web server</td>
<td>URL or LMS, tracking, assessment</td>
<td>URL, copyright</td>
<td>Outputs of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access/rights</strong></td>
<td>Public, unrestricted</td>
<td>Name/password</td>
<td>IP address, copyright notice</td>
<td>Strong authentication (eg PKI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Grid computation system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT Services (Website)</th>
<th>E-learning</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Grid/HPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoring</td>
<td>Website page templates</td>
<td>LO author and structure</td>
<td>Content ingestion, MD author</td>
<td>Create/modify datasets, results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td>Website approvals</td>
<td>Instructional team manage</td>
<td>Flexible MD submission</td>
<td>Analysis templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content storage</td>
<td>XML rendered into outputs</td>
<td>Packaging of objects</td>
<td>Secure file system</td>
<td>Large databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>Unstructured page search</td>
<td>Keyword, some MD</td>
<td>Detailed metadata</td>
<td>Numerical, comp services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Web pages via web server</td>
<td>URL or LMS, tracking, assessment</td>
<td>URL, copyright</td>
<td>Outputs of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/rights</td>
<td>Public, unrestricted</td>
<td>Name/password</td>
<td>IP address, copyright notice</td>
<td>Strong authentication (eg PKI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## An ideal future unified system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT Services (Website)</th>
<th>E-learning</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Grid/HPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoring</td>
<td>Website page templates</td>
<td>LO author and structure</td>
<td>Content ingestion, MD author</td>
<td>Create/modify datasets, results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow</td>
<td>Website approvals</td>
<td>Instructional team manage</td>
<td>Flexible MD submission</td>
<td>Analysis templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content storage</td>
<td>XML rendered into outputs</td>
<td>Packaging of objects</td>
<td>Secure file system</td>
<td>Large databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>Unstructured page search</td>
<td>Keyword, some MD</td>
<td>Detailed metadata</td>
<td>Numerical, comp services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>Web pages via web server</td>
<td>URL or LMS, tracking, assessment</td>
<td>URL, copyright</td>
<td>Outputs of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/rights</td>
<td>Public, unrestricted</td>
<td>LMS name/password</td>
<td>IP address, copyright notice</td>
<td>Strong authentication (e.g. PKI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

• Confusion over roles, technology, marketplace, etc
• Need for “cultural interoperability” – dialogue
• Similarities and differences in functional requirements across different domains
• Overlaps and gaps in current systems
• Breadth of requirements for unified content management/repository infrastructure
## Section 2. Scholarly Communication

### Action 7. Continue the development of the Australian Digital Theses Program

### Responsibility ADT Policy Reference Group

### Time-line Ongoing

### Activity since last report

**ADT-ARIIC: Expansions and Redevelopment Project**

All relevant information posted on ADT-ARIIC page:


- ADT-Technical Committee [expanded, including Geoff Payne, ARROW Project Manager] – met 29 March 2004 to workshop technical specifications developed by Peter Green [Curtin].

- ADT Project Team [Fred Piper, Peter Green, Tony Cargnelutti] worked on refining specifications 30 March-2 April into Expression of Interest (EOI) document. During this time, meeting held with Julie Stevens to being exploring options on ProQuest's involvement in the project.

- EOI issued, closing date 14 May 2004. Project Team [now also including Fiona Bathgate (UNSW)] read all responses and unanimously chose one respondent.

- ADT-Technical Committee [expanded] met with preferred supplier in all day workshop to review responses to EOI specifications 5 July 2004. As result it was agreed that the supplier establish a test environment – specified by the ADT Project Team – to carry out a number of scalability tests. This was done under terms of an agreed MoU between the two parties. Deadline for completion set for 30 August 2004.

- ADT Policy Reference Group [expanded] met 12 July 2004. Main agenda item was progress report from the Technical Committee/Project Team on the Expansion and Redevelopment project. Policy Group accepted all recommendations, including project options with ProQuest. All documentation posted to the ADT CAUL meeting page: [http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/adt.html](http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/adt.html)

- Formal scalability testing report issued by preferred supplier 30 August. Project team met 1 September to review. Based on findings of report, and access to test server, the Project Team confirmed that all scalability issues had been resolved satisfactorily. Project Team notified both Technical Committee and Policy Reference Group of decision to formally move forward with preferred supplier. Supplier notified on 2 September 2004. Announcement pending. Contract preparation has begun.

- Project Team met 3 September to review technical
specifications. Peter Green will come to Sydney for week beginning 18 October. A further workshop with the supplier will be arranged during that time.

**ETD2005 Progress**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements since last report</th>
<th>ADT Program Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 CAUL members signed with Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 CONZUL member signed with Program [University of Canterbury, Christchurch]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 active members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,554 ETDs available 2 September 2004 (2030 available on 16 March 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETD2004/NDLTD (Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations)**

Tony Cargnelutti attended NDLTD Board meeting 2 June 2004. Results of meeting include election of 2 ADT members for 3 year term – Alex Byrne & Tony Cargnelutti

Tony Cargnelutti also NDLTD Conference Committee Chair


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for forthcoming activity</th>
<th>ARIIC Expansion and Redevelopment Project remains highest priority.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning for ETD2005 also high priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business plan to be revised for CAUL2005/1 meeting. Budget to be revised. Issues affecting costs include maintenance of expanded metadata repository; potential reduction in support costs as libraries use institutional repository software (eg, D-Space, ARROW) instead of ETD software.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Recommendations to CAUL | Note the report |
## Contribution to Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contribution to Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchase and licensing of electronic information resources through the CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>CEIRC Convenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activity since last report


### CEIRC strategic planning

The CEIRC committee approved and submitted the CEIRC strategic directions document to the CAUL Executive. An executive summary and recommendations have been drafted to accompany the document for discussion at the CAUL September meeting.

### ARIC systemic infrastructure funds

Minister Nelson has approved expenditure of BAA funds for a national site licence for CAUL members for JSTOR, at a total cost of US$1.9m. This represents a 9% discount (or thereabouts) on price. The deal involves the following:

- Arts and Sciences I, II, III for the sector (39 institutions - which includes Notre Dame).
- Payment of the Archive Capital Fee (ACF)
- Payment of subscriptions for two full years of the AAF (2005, 2006)

### RMIT Publishing

Members met with Janette Wright and Paul Dourlay at the July meeting. We reviewed the service and communication issues relating to the RMIT web and content server and search interface upgrades; content issues including indexing, quality of scanned full-text, new content; and licence issues for the 3 licences for Bibliographic Databases Licence Agreement, Full Plus Text Licence Agreement, Informit Library User Licence Agreement and for specific issues including references to copyright legislation, ILL, course packs, alumni, ereserve. RMIT have agreed to re-title each licence to improve clarity of purpose. RMIT have agreed to allow alumni access to the Bibliographic and Informit Library licences at no additional charge. CAL will not agree this for the Plus Text agreement. ILL and document delivery conditions are fine for Bibliographic and Informit Library licences. CAL makes a distinction between ILL and document supply for the Plus Text licence agreement and will permit supply only insofar as allowed by the Australian Copyright Act. RMIT are working towards COUNTER compliance and statistics are available upon request.

---
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Also working towards OpenURL compliance and federated searching.

**Product negotiations**  
Discussions are currently underway with:  
- Gale  
- Thomson Financial  
- Springer – archive and lecture note issues still pending  
- Emerald – trial to the Management Extra portal will be offered in late 2004  
- Oxford University Press  
- ProQuest  
- Nature  
For more information see [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/offers.htm](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/offers.htm)

**CEIRC membership**  
The committee recommended to the CAUL Executive that the Therapeutic Goods Administration application for membership be approved.

**ICOLC Preferred Practices Update 32**  
Members agreed that vendors should be made aware of this document, including RMIT Publishing.

| Achievements since last report | Kluwer invoices have been issued.  
|                              | Springer licence has been signed and invoices issued by DA Information Services.  
|                              | Three letters have been created to respond to external membership enquiries including conditions and how to apply, approval notification, and confirmation of payment and admission to datasets listserv. |

| Publicity, reports, publications since last report | Sue Dowling surveyed the Datasets Coordinators about issues with Informit and with ISI (at the request of ISI). Sue compiled two reports, one about Informit issues that was distributed to RMIT Publishing prior to our meeting. The other report on ISI issues was distributed to Jeroen Prinsen, ISI who has asked for feedback and to the CAUL President for communication with the AVCC. Both reports are available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc-meetings.html](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc-meetings.html) |

| Plan for forthcoming activity | Next meetings are scheduled for 7 October and 2 December. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations to CAUL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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1. **Attendance.** Heather Gordon (Chair), Evelyn Woodberry, Gulcin Cribb, Sue Dowling, David Groenewegen, Diane Costello (CAUL), Tony Millett (CONZUL), Jacqui Porter (CSIRO) Apology: Jocelyn Priddey
   
   Guests: RMIT Publishing: Janette Wright and Paul Dourlay @ 11am

2. **Minutes of the previous meeting 22 April, 2004.** No changes to the minutes. Approved.

3. **Business Arising from the Previous Meeting, not otherwise listed on the agenda.**
   
   a) **ISI survey.** Sue Dowling was thanked for her work on the survey. She reported spending about 7 hours compiling the responses. In general there was less concern about problems, but strong concern about functionality. It was noted that there are many better interfaces now available. Sue will revise the report to emphasise the importance of the interface.

   Jeroen Prinsen has asked for feedback to assist him to make preparations for a Product Development Director to make a visit on the back of that report. The report should be available by July 19. *(Action: SD)*

   It was agreed to draft a letter for Madeleine McPherson to send with the report to the AVCC. *(Action: DC)*

   b) **CASL & ILL clauses.** Heather Gordon reviewed the Yale project database, in response to a request from a CAUL member that CEIRC provide more information on licences. Yale encourages vendors to add information, and libraries to make suggestions. CEIRC could draw vendors’ attention to the website, and advise Yale that they have been asked to provide updates. CEIRC will not establish its own database. Heather will provide Diane Costello with specific vendors’ names in order to contact them. *(Action: DC, HG)*

   c) **JCR and the Humanities.** In February, Diane Costello asked Bill Stinson for a written outline of the problem and his proposal for addressing it, pending taking up the issue with the relevant Academies. This was circulated to the CAUL Executive and CEIRC on May 4. Following a meeting with Linda Butler, and an investigation of the ARC funding guidelines there are no requirements for impact factors in any research funding criteria. It was agreed to report this back to Bill Stinson and the Datasets Coordinators and advise that CEIRC would take no further action. *(Action: DC)*

4. **CEIRC Planning.** Heather Gordon outlined the update procedure for the CEIRC Strategic Directions. It will be presented to the CAUL Executive prior to placing on
the agenda for the September CAUL meeting. Comments on the current draft included:

- SWOT 2. Weaknesses. Documentation is available, but that wasn’t necessarily understood at the time that the SWOT analysis was done. One of the reasons for preparing the document is to identify issues relating to the staffing structure of the CAUL Office. It is estimated that less than 1.0 FTE staff currently work on CEIRC activities.

- It was suggested that some universities were becoming more concerned that licences are being signed on their behalf. If universities delay signing a licence in order to obtain or respond to further legal opinion, this may be regarded as a potential threat, and may delay access to resources. It was noted that access to most products is made available by the vendor before a licence is signed.

- KPI 1.1.1. What does the take-up level of offers imply? How do we know if costing models are effective, enabling maximum participation? How does this measure the fragmentation – the number of members who purchase elsewhere, either on their own or in another group? The two main reasons for rejection of an offer are cost and relevance, not necessarily in that order. Action: collect and analyse responses to identify why members do not take up offers, or why they don’t renew. What would prevent members from participating in a CAUL offer? It was suggested adding this question to the survey regarding adding value.

- KPI 3.5 Need to identify factors that contribute value eg revenue, discount levels, etc The value of external membership to CAUL is measured and reported on.

The committee congratulated Heather Gordon and the team for their excellent work on this document. Heather Gordon will forward it to the CAUL Executive for consideration and approval to present to CAUL. (Action: HG) If approved, then specific activities will be costed and approved.

5. CEIRC Membership. An application has been received from the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA). The committee noted the products they were interested in, confirmed that most would be available to them, and approved the recommendation to the CAUL Executive. (Action: DC)

6. ARIC Systemic Infrastructure Funds. Eve Woodberry reported that ARIC supported the application for JSTOR funds and requested an updated quote. The quote includes the discount applicable if CAUL handles the invoicing of the universities. The National Library inquired about inclusion in the proposal and JSTOR was asked to cost their access. It is not clear which funds would be used to pay for the National Library’s access.

7. Contracts.

   a) Gale Licence. Diane Costello reported that she has scheduled a meeting with Maryce Johnstone who has replaced Robert Iannello at Gale. The licence is awaiting feedback from Gale.

   b) RMIT Publishing Licence. Diane Costello

   c) Cochrane. Diane Costello reported on the move to Wiley and the access provision for those who were subscribing through HCN.

   d) Thomson Financial. Gulcin Cribb referred members to two clauses in the licence: one to indemnify Thomson, on behalf of the University, against abuse of their system by staff or students of the University - and the second, to allow
Thomson or their agents to access and inspect computers on our network to investigate possible abuse. She suggested that CEIRC draft a letter to the vendor to advise them of a preferred form of wording, advising of concerns with the clauses, and offering a model that would be more appropriate. It should suggest that they reword, delete or make them compatible with Australian privacy laws. The Thomson representative has said that these represent mandatory requirements imposed on them by their 3rd party data suppliers. The AVCC recommends not allowing access to university networks without a court order. (Action: GC)

e) Oxford University Press. Diane Costello reported on changes to the OUP journals licence. It was confirmed that it will be signed and returned to OUP. (Action: DC) We are still waiting on revisions to the licence for the other OUP products.

8. Major Database Agreements.

a) Kluwer. Diane Costello reported that all but four institutions have double-checked and confirmed the final invoice amount, and have been invoiced.

b) Springer.
   i) Lecture Notes. Pending – information has been forwarded to David Elek, and a response is expected. Diane Costello will continue to follow up on the archive.

c) Cambridge University Press. Diane Costello reported that the invoice from CUP was yet to arrive.

d) Emerald. Diane Costello met with Bev Foster on June 11. Emerald Management Extra is a portal with additional content intended to be used for teaching. A trial will be offered in late 2004. The Emerald contract runs through 2006.

e) AVCC-ISI negotiations for Web of Science. The three year licence finishes in 2004. John Mullarvey has negotiated a five-year contract with an annual 4.5% increase. The four universities who don’t yet subscribe need to commit to buying a five-year back-set in order to join. Members are concerned that a five-year licence will limit their options if an alternative product is released. It was suggested that it is too early to determine if Scopus will provide an alternative to Web of Science.

f) Nature Publishing Group. Diane Costello is scheduled to meet with Antoine Bocquet on June 24. It was agreed to review the revised pricing based on the A new person is scheduled.


a) ABS AusStats & Census. Bill Stinson is still preparing the documentation. Diane Costello has discussed informally with Karen Vitullo, ABS.

b) RMIT Publishing. Janette Wright and Paul Dourlay were introduced to member of the committee.

Service Issues. Sue Dowling spoke to the compilation of service issues relating to the March/April system problems. The INFORMIT search interface has not supported the required level of demand during the training period at the beginning of semester since it was introduced in July 2003.

Janette Wright responded that problems were unexpected, as TeraText should have been able to cope with this demand. Information was being conveyed to subscribers as it was being received by RMIT Publishing, and there was no intention to either
deceive or obfuscate. Delays in the upgrade of the equipment exacerbated the problem.

There was frustration that the communication was inconsistent eg being told that there was going to be an upgrade, but no notification that it had happened. This can be addressed by providing a single source of information. It was suggested that regular status reports include what hasn’t happened as well as what has, and that Diane Costello be copied on responses so these can be circulated to all Datasets Coordinators.

Both web and content servers were upgraded in April. Parallel servers will be provided for training in second semester. Both content and web servers will be upgraded by the end of the year, under the assumption that they will need to cater for more than 1,000 users. RMIT Publishing was asked to provide further information on the setup of the parallel database. This information will be provided to Diane Costello when the site is available. (Action: JW)

User sessions were being logged on the assumption that users would resume their searches, but this was disenabled because it is not required by universities. Some databases won’t be available on WebSPIRS CDs next year, but WebSPIRS online will be supported at least to the end of 1995.

Other smaller service issues were raised, eg email alerts are not working, the sometime difficulties in contacting service staff, and the length of time to receive a response. Staffing in this area has been increased, and is being attended to. It was also noted that the new software is debugged as problem reports are received.

Adrian Richardson has advised SerialsSolutions that RMIT has two lists of titles, one for fully indexed titles, and one for partially-indexed titles. Paul Dourlay will also provide this information to TDNet. (Action: DC)

CAUL members are very keen for the product to work to keep access to the unique Australian content. RMIT acknowledges that the investment needs to happen upfront before the revenue flows to a better quality product.

Content issues.

INFORMIT Library allows more flexibility in delivering the content, because RMIT Publishing has a direct relationship with the publisher. This also allows licences which permit course pack use. Three groups of products, indexes, INFORMIT Plus eg Meditext, APAFT, AEI Plus, AGIS, Family and Society Plus Text, which have a bibliographic index and are linked to the full text, then INFORMIT Library which has 120 titles – 43 Australian journals plus conference proceedings and monographs published in Australia and republished – moving to full integration into INFORMIT search. The titles can be subscribed individually, by subject compilation or the full package.

It was noted that the scanned data coming from the National Library is often of poor quality. RMIT is trying to take more active control over the content and how it can be used, whereas the content is now effectively controlled by CAL. CAL does have the rights to publish the full content, but it is not made fully available because the National Library does not index it.

Some index providers may find commitment difficult because of increasing costs. Janette Wright outlined several subject areas that RMIT would be focussing on adding content to INFORMIT Library. Committee members approved the list. At the moment, URLs in INFORMIT Library are not persistent and access is only available via password.
RMIT is working towards COUNTER compliance. Currently, statistics are available on request.

**Licence issues.** The bibliographic and full-text licences are sub-licences of a head licence, and any changes need to be negotiated first with CAL. There is more flexibility in the INFORMIT Library licence. RMIT will try to amalgamate the first two. In general, RMIT Publishing is clarifying the labelling of its licences to identify better what each is used for.

The “payment of additional fee” has been removed from Clause 3(a)(ii)(E), and also deleted from the reference to alumni, confirming that remote access for alumni is permissible without the payment of any further charge. This may change in the future.

In consultation with CAL, the licences of newer products have been made more explicit with respect to groups of users who are not on site, or who have a different relationship with the subscriber.

RMIT was asked to clarify Clause 6 which seems to imply that no information can be used when preparing other works.

2(b) It was confirmed that it is permissible to link directly to a specific article for digital reserve, by linking to the INFORMIT site’s article rather than directly to the pdf. It was suggested clarifying this in the FAQ. CEIRC will provide suggested wording to clarify. *(Action: DC)*

It was pointed out that the education Statutory Licence allows universities to make coursepacks. CAL has stated that the licence is meant to emphasise that the subscriber must comply with the copyright laws. It was noted that the copyright laws are generally wider than the licence terms eg it is possible to print and distribute for remote and disabled users under the terms in the Copyright Act.

Clause 4(f) seems to exclude inter-library loan. It was confirmed that document delivery is permitted, directly from the electronic copy. CEIRC will provide some sample clauses that can clarify this. *(Action: DC)*

RMIT Publishing raised the possibility of using INFORMIT Library content in coursepacks, and adding a price premium for adding to electronic reserve or in print or CDROM coursepacks. It was noted that CEIRC licences generally included course pack use explicitly within the licence, and within the standard price model. CEIRC is concerned that content not be paid for twice. RMIT Publishing will consider this further. *(Action: JW)*

**Offer to CAUL.**

Paul Dourlay outlined the revised offer to CAUL. The previous pricing did not allow unlimited access at an affordable price. Subscribers requested recognition for subscribing to all databases through an appropriate discount. The options are to retain the existing pricing or change to the new model. There are no definitions for “small”, “medium” etc - the user level selected is available to a library of any size.

INFORMIT Library operates with an annual licence, with no access post-subscription. It was recommended that the vendor clarify whether it is an aggregation or a subscription model, as long-term access and subscription pricing will both be affected by the choice of model. Archiving has not been addressed. Back-files of journals will be included if available.

RMIT Publishing is working on OpenURL-compliance. It is a target for federated searching but not yet suitable as a source.
10. **Statistics.** David Groenewegen reported that the CAUL Statistics Focus Group (CSFG) had trialled the collection of data on sessions, downloads and expenditure on electronic resources. Most could collect session data from EZProxy quite easily, but collecting downloads was almost impossible. Not all vendors are COUNTER-compliant and every institution has different databases, so the total count may be meaningless, and it is a huge amount of work. While it is thought worth counting, it is possibly not worth the effort until the industry is more mature and fully COUNTER-compliant.

EZProxy log files may mean different things depending on how they are set up. Diane Costello reported on the relationship of CSFG to CEIRC to QULOC, noting that she and David Groenewegen were members of CSFG, and Jocelyn Priddey had been invited to be a corresponding member of CSFG while QULOC was working on statistics for electronic resources, ensuring that there was no duplication of effort. CEIRC does not have an official representative on the CSFG. It was agreed to recommend to the CSFG that COUNTER-compliant vendors be asked to output data in a format that can be easily downloaded as a standard format. (Action: DC)

It was suggested that a service which aggregated institutional user statistics on a monthly basis, providing graphical reports and trend information would be really valuable.

11. **Involvement of Datasets Coordinators & CEIRC Working Groups.** Datasets Coordinators on the committee here report on issues not covered so far, or which have been raised by Datasets Coordinators, or which are emerging issues for the group.

Sue Dowling reported on the large number of list messages relating to systems problems, covering 8 different vendors. It was recognised that the list was an appropriate place to establish if the system problem was local or universal, but that the ensuing stream of messages which may be confirming that the problem is local might better be sent only to the sender, rather than to the list. If the problem proves to be universal, then the vendor should be approached for action. (Action: SD)

David Groenewegen reported that the pricing of Oxford Scholarship Online and Oxford Reference Online continued to be of concern, and ongoing access was seen as an issue. Diane Costello reported that there were 9 subscribers to OSO and 21 to ORO.

Sue Dowling will circulate the CEIRC meeting agenda prior to the meeting to seek feedback. (Action: SD)

a) **QULOC Statistics Working Group.** Jocelyn Priddey reported that this group will be doing no further work on the statistics available from CEIRC vendors, as per the agreement at the last CEIRC meeting. This item will be removed from the agenda. (Action: DC)

12. **CEIRC Position Papers.**

13. **Relationships with other organisations.**

a) **CASL / National Library of Australia.**

b) **ICOLC.** The next meeting in North America will be held in Boston, MA April 11-13 2005. Diane Costello advised that if her holidays took her to Europe in October, she may attend e-ICOLC in Barcelona.
i) **Draft ICOLC Preferred Practices Update 32.** Members agreed that it was a very useful document and that it should be promulgated widely to the vendor community, including RMIT Publishing. (Action: DC)

ii) **Negotiations with “international” vendors.** Diane Costello reported on her response to a list message regarding negotiations with “overseas vendors.” It will be made available on the web site. (Action: DC)

c) **CAVAL. Future of Consortia. 9-10 August 2004.** Diane Costello reported that she had received an invitation to this limited 15 person event, but was unable to attend due to a clash with the AVCC’s Library Staff Development Conference. It was noted that other invitees currently include Kate Nevins (Solinet), Catherine Nicholson (UK), Karen Vitullo (ABS Library), and “people from the National Library of Australia, Australian and New Zealand universities and public library networks, special library consortia and JULAC”. It was not know which CAUL members had been invited, though none on the Executive or CEIRC were included.

d) **Peak Bodies Forum.** National Site Licensing Forum, 8 December, 2004. The Peak Bodies Forum is convened and hosted by the National Library and includes representatives from all national library organisations. CAUL has been represented by Madeleine McPherson and Eve Woodberry. The forum is to investigate the higher level conditions that will allow all libraries to participate in national site licences, along the lines of the New Zealand agreement, rather than licensing *per se*.

14. **CEIRC Budget.** Diane Costello explained that the figures had not been updated for this meeting because the book-keeper had been unavailable. Expenditure is currently running under budget. Expenditure looks low because some early year expenses were included in 2003 expenditure. The line item for the CAUL industry Think Tank is retained even in those years when there is no Think Tank, and is always a cost-neutral item. It should be addressed in the operational plan.

15. **Next Meetings.** 7 October, 2 December (formerly 25 November, change of venue confirmed)

16. **Other Business.**
   a) **National University Finance & Procurement Conference, Adelaide, 19-21 July 2004.** [Includes case study on Australian Research Libraries Consortium] Last year, Libby Reilly, from UTS, attended the conference and reported back to CEIRC [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/AuPC.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/AuPC.doc). It was suggested that the ARLC may be ARLAC, convened by Jill Wilson. David Groenewegen will ask if she is presenting at the conference. (Action: DG)
   b) **Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.** Tony Millett asked about the progress of the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Diane Costello will follow up, especially now that SPARC has issued a press release in support of ICOLC’s involvement. (Action: DC)

The meeting concluded at 3.15pm
Executive Summary: CEIRC Strategic Directions

Purpose

In 2003, after attending the CAVAL Forum on Consortia in the Next 25 Years and reading various articles about consortia including Tom Peter’s article “Consortia and Their Discontents”, Heather Gordon presented a discussion paper to the CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC 2003/5 - Sydney - 25/11/03). The purpose of the paper was to encourage discussion about the future direction of CEIRC and the benefits to CAUL. The paper posed questions and issues about goals, funding models, governance and membership. The Committee then agreed to complete a SWOT analysis to examine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing CEIRC grouped under the following categories:

- Systems and Innovation (includes technology, resources, processes or operations, and potential for innovation and improvement in regard to these)
- People and Learning (includes staff skills, expertise, initiative, culture for CAUL staff and CEIRC committee membership)
- Clients and Community (includes client relations, expectations and accountabilities for CAUL members, and external participants)
- Governance (includes internal reporting and planning, monitoring contracts and agreements, policies, responsibilities, record keeping databases, etc)

The SWOT analysis was to be used in drafting a strategic directions document for presentation to CAUL. After completing the SWOT analysis, the Committee agreed to include an overview of the current CEIRC office operations to put the strategic directions into context. The overview was also included to provide the CAUL Executive with information about the existing support requirements for CEIRC activities. The CAUL Executive Officer has been keeping a log of the time spent on CAUL and CEIRC duties and this information, along with the overview, may be useful for the CAUL Executive’s review of the CAUL office.

The attached strategic directions document includes the operational overview, SWOT analysis, summary of key areas of strength and risk, and strategic goals and actions to address those key areas. The Committee felt that a CEIRC strategic directions document would increase our and all CAUL members, Dataset Coordinators, and CEIRC external participants’ understanding of CEIRC operations; and would provide future directions for CEIRC in accordance with the CAUL strategic plan.

The Committee decided not to review the CEIRC Terms of Reference as these had been revised in October 25, 2002. Using the Terms of Reference, the Committee drafted a simple mission statement for use with the strategic directions document. The mission statement is a short statement of the overall purpose of CEIRC:

To provide recommendations and advice to CAUL on matters relating to electronic information resources; and to oversee the cost-effective acquisition of e-resources and services through consortium negotiations on behalf of CAUL.

Four Key Result Areas

After completing the SWOT analysis, the major strengths and risks were summarised and from this 4 key result areas were identified. The 4 key result areas include:
1) **Member fragmentation issues** -- Factors contributing to member fragmentation: costing models and conditions may not be competitive; products may not be relevant to members; other buying groups may offer better price and conditions.

2) **Business continuity issues** -- Factors contributing to business continuity issues: need to improve risk management processes, analysis and reporting; staffing single point sensitivity; wide range of knowledge and expertise of datasets coordinators; availability and access to operational documentation.

3) **Future growth and development issues** -- Factors contributing to future growth and development of CEIRC: growth vs maintenance; expansion of external membership; continuation of opt in opt out purchasing model; emergence of, and competition from, other buying clubs and consortia; pressure from external organisations; support from CAUL.

4) **Communication and marketing** -- Factors contributing to communication and marketing: managing expectations of stakeholders, eg CAUL, datasets coordinators, others; no established turnaround times for agendas, minutes and papers; currency and navigation issues with the CAUL website; no return on investment reports; influence and actions of external organisations (AVCC, DEST); autonomy/authority of local vendor representatives.

A goal statement was developed for each key result area with actions, timeframes and key performance indicators. This information is available under section 4.2.

**Key Recommendations**

1. That CAUL approve the attached CEIRC Strategic Directions document.
2. That CAUL authorise the CEIRC to draft an operational action plan for 2005 and for 2006 based on section 4.2 Strategic Directions.
3. That CEIRC draft an appropriate budget to support the approved operational action plan.
4. That the CAUL Executive consider the requirements of CEIRC as part of the review of the CAUL Office and provide adequate staffing to support the approved strategic directions document and operational plans.
5. That the CEIRC Strategic Directions document is posted on the CAUL website.

Heather Gordon
1 September 2004
CEIRC
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1. **CEIRC OFFICE OPERATIONAL OVERVIEW**

(Current to April 22, 2004)

**Membership**

Currently there are 39 CAUL members including Notre Dame, but not including UNSW@ADFA; and 29 external participants including CSIRO and 8 CONZUL libraries. All CEIRC members are listed on the CAUL web site at [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ds-coord.htm](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ds-coord.htm). Additional information on the year in which each participant joined CEIRC is not readily available. However, in 2003, five new external participants became members of the consortium.

CAUL members are the only voting members. All formal CEIRC decisions belong to CAUL. Since 1998, CONZUL and the CSIRO each have a representative on the CEIRC committee. Other external participants have no representation on the committee, have no voting rights, and are not guaranteed rights of participation in any particular product offer. While CEIRC does not solicit membership by external organisations, the committee carefully considers all applications, and recommendations for membership are forwarded to the CAUL Executive for approval. The value of having external participants includes the additional income received from the levy ($36,000 in 2004) and the additional members may increase the CEIRC buying power and strengthen the CEIRC bargaining position, resulting in better access conditions and lower costs for all members. The workload to bring on new participants is also relatively low. Therefore, there is a cost-benefit to having external participation.

CONZUL members are very much like CAUL members in the number and range of products purchased. CSIRO tends to work on its own for the purchase of e-journals, buying CEIRC products for reference. The other external participants, including CSIRO and the New Zealand polytechnics, buy less than CONZUL, but still buy the e-journal packages (such as ACS, Wiley, Kluwer, Springer, OUP, Nature, etc), CISTI, SerialSSolutions, Ulrichs, GBIP, Cochrane, Britannica, PsycINFO and PsycARTICLES, Oxford English Dictionary, Oxford Reference Online, and BioMed Central. To date, only one external participant pays the levy but does not purchase any products. Apparently the participant finds the information exchange provided through the datasets listserve and the CAUL website worth the cost of the CEIRC membership.

No assessment about purchasing trends has been completed. Collating purchasing information, available from finance files in MYOB (accounting software), for each participant would take more resources than are currently available.

**CEIRC Budget**

At the September 2003 CAUL meeting, CAUL members voted to increase the CEIRC levy by 20%, therefore, the annual CEIRC levy is now $1,200 for CAUL members and $1,800 for external CEIRC participants. However, each of the 8 CONZUL members and CSIRO only pay the CAUL levy.

Income for 2004 is $93,600 from the levy ($57,600 + $36,000) and $12,000 in short-term interest from foreign currencies. The interest is accumulated while waiting for invoices and payment to vendors and is deposited in the CAUL account.
In 2003, the CEIRC budget had an income of $79,378 ($72,500 from the levy and $6,878 in short-term interest from foreign currencies). The approved CEIRC budget was $97,500 and the actual expenditure was $83,799. The 2003 budget, therefore, was underspent by $13,701. However, it is important to note that even though the expenditure was less than the approved budget it still exceeded the 2003 income by $4,421. Therefore, CEIRC was not in a cost neutral position.

The 2004 CEIRC budget shows an income of $105,600 reflecting a 29% increase from the levy and a projected increase of 74.4% from interest from foreign currencies. The approved budget is $92,500 (5% decrease from 2003) and the budget expenditure is forecast as being $13,100 less than the income generated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC income as</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage of the CAUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC expenditure as</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage of the CAUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CEIRC 2004 budget breakdown is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003- Actual Expenditure</th>
<th>2004 - Approved Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>staffing (EO at 0.35 FTE</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 0.5 FTE assistant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC meetings</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOLC meetings</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.80%</td>
<td>99.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 2004, the membership levy alone is sufficient to cover the projected expenditures, with a $1,000 surplus for unbudgeted consumables. In 2003, identifiable consumable expenditures e.g. fax & postage totalled $575. CEIRC should consider what if any recommendations it wants to make for unexpended income such as interest earned from foreign currencies. Also no expenditure was made to conduct research in 2003. The most recent expenditure on research was $308 to La Trobe University, in 2002, for Christine Maher’s work on the archiving paper.

**Business Model**

CEIRC maintains an opt in/opt out business model, whereby, for any agreement no individual institution is compelled to participate if it chooses not to. Participants can also opt into an established deal at any time, even after the business contract is signed. This flexibility is important for many CEIRC participants. It allows participants...
additional time to identify and to review a product, and if needed, to budget to participate at a later date. For some agreements, vendors do require a minimum number of participants. If more participants join at a later date this may not mean that the actual offering price will be further discounted. Some vendors, however, may provide a discount in following years, e.g. Wiley.

If there is a discount applied by going through CAUL, then it has been handled through the CAUL Office. If there is no discount, then CEIRC participants are asked to apply directly to the vendor, e.g. EBSCO. Even if there is no discount, CEIRC still plays a valuable role by having the CAUL staff disseminate information to members. Without this, some members could miss out on direct communication with vendors.

Some vendor negotiations are not successful. Some agreements are concluded with some institutions not able to participate because the final conditions do not suit them. These conditions may be related to access, but are more likely to be price. However, sometimes the price is related to physical sites, so this could be viewed as an access license condition.

**Administrative Costs**

Staffing costs include 0.35 FTE of the CAUL Executive Officer’s time and a 0.5 part-time CEIRC assistant. In 2003, the Executive Officer kept a diary of CEIRC versus non-CEIRC activity by time for a period of 19 weeks, over which 35% of her time was spent on CEIRC activities. This is reflected in the 2003 and 2004 CEIRC budget. Staff time spent on CEIRC activities is not consistent throughout the year. Staff are very busy (approximately 70% of total time) from October through to January, finalising renewals, prices and vendor invoices; creating CEIRC invoices; receiving payments; and paying vendors. CEIRC activities during February and March are very quiet. The CAUL meeting is held usually in April, and a significant amount of the Executive Officer’s time is spent making arrangements and preparing documents for CAUL. End-of-year accounting in preparation for the CAUL audit also consumes significant time. The rest of the year encompasses a fairly steady flow of vendor offers, leading up to July, August, September when renewal information is released and responses collated. For a guide to the volume of activity, see the list of offers at [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/offers.htm](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/offers.htm).

There are 77 current products (although if some databases were listed separately eg the RLG databases, then there would be more). Some vendors bill institutions directly; some send a single invoice to CAUL e.g. Project Muse offers a 10% discount for the CAUL office to handle billing; and occasionally a vendor will use a subscription agent to handle the invoicing e.g., Springer uses DA. The CAUL Office handles the invoicing for 48 (63%) of these products. (See [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc-datasets-agreements.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc-datasets-agreements.xls) for a listing of all products, total costs, billing details). To date, it has been more cost-effective for the CAUL Office to handle the invoicing rather than outsourcing to a third party subscription agent.

Almost all agreements handled by CAUL are now on a calendar year subscription cycle. Most invoicing through CAUL is processed in November/December with payments to the vendor processed in January. The exceptions are CISTI which is paid monthly and invoiced quarterly, and Lexis Nexis which is paid monthly and invoiced annually. The only other invoices processed during the year are new products for
members wishing to start before the next calendar year; and late starters for current products. The subscriptions for late starters are pro-rated to fit within the calendar year cycle. The normal turnaround time from receipt of the vendor invoice to its payment is less than 60 days.

Invoices processed from October-December 2003 totalled USD 5.39m and AUD 412k. If CAUL handles the invoicing, there is a 60 day payment clause in the contract, to allow time for individual institutions to pay. The invoice creation process can be very quick, however, the institution’s internal payment processes may not be, so it does vary. The Executive Officer follows up with individual institutions if CAUL is handling the invoicing. The vendors do it if they are handling the invoicing. The Executive Officer spends a couple of hours per month on the follow-up. MYOB can produce statements, but these are only sent to institutions with accounts outstanding for greater than 60 days. The most time-consuming transactions involve short-payments, due mostly to a third (intermediary) bank extracting an extra fee (not insignificant) on the way to CAUL accounts. The amount received by CAUL’s bank is the amount on the invoice. If CAUL’s bank charges a receipt fee, then the CAUL budget absorbs that, but institutions are requested to pay all other short fees and transaction expenses. The approach is to try to convince the institution concerned to sort out future transactions with their bankers to avoid this situation.

For 2004, CAUL has handled USD 5.7m, EUR 1.36m and AUD 540k worth of invoices. CUP has yet to invoice CAUL in USD.

**Agreements/Contracts**
Vendor negotiations are conducted in the first instance by the CAUL Executive Officer with input from CEIRC committee members and dataset coordinators. Individual institutions do negotiate other clauses which, to date, has not had any negative impact on the other CEIRC participants. In particular, Wiley has negotiated individually with the CSIRO and UQ on top of the CEIRC contract.

94% of the contracts are for one year (72 out of 77). The exceptions are the larger e-journal packages such as Emerald, Wiley, Kluwer and Springer, and the Chemical Abstracts Service SciFinder Scholar. No contract exceeds 3 years.

Some contracts have a heads of agreement (this is the business contract that sets out payment conditions, etc as opposed to an access license which sets out user access conditions) signed centrally by the CAUL Executive Officer. Usually, in this case, individual institutions will sign their own user (access license conditions) agreement, eg Wiley, Oxford University Press.

The most common contracts require the individual institution to sign whether it is a business, or access agreement/license or both e.g., American Chemical Society Cochrane, Lexis/Nexis.

Some contracts only require CAUL Executive Officer to sign e.g., Kluwer.

Some contracts do not require any signatures e.g., Duke Mathematical Journal, Bowker, McGraw-Hill. However, these vendors may have terms and conditions that subscribers are expected to be familiar with and act in accordance with.

Further information, showing the number for each contract signing type is not currently available. This would require going through every license.
Negotiation Process
Most vendors are more conscious of issuing invoices and being paid than about the actual signing of a license. The Executive Officer always requests up front a copy of the license, so that if there is anything likely to stop institutions signing up, it is clear from the start. All license/negotiation work is handled by Executive Officer not by the office assistant.

In most cases, the vendor approaches the CAUL Office, either because they have found our web site, or found us through ICOLC, or because they have been referred to us by members. In a smaller number of cases, the Executive Officer approaches the vendor because Datasets Coordinators have expressed interest in a consortia approach to a new product, or a current product which may be obtainable more cheaply.

Before an offer is made available to Datasets Coordinators, CEIRC, and CAUL members, the Executive Officer will usually discuss with the vendor the type of information that members need e.g. content, license, pricing model and trial information. The Executive Officer will discuss with the vendor the range of pricing models that have been adopted, and those that members have not taken up and/or preferred in the past. Omissions and changes will also be discussed e.g. walk-in users, remote use, multiple sites, price-caps, etc. For new offers, negotiations can take up to a year depending on the length of the trial, e.g., Kluwer, Springer, Ovum. The turnaround time for renewals is normally 4-6 weeks.

The Executive Officer will refer complicated issues to the CEIRC committee for advice. If it is a big-ticket item, it will be placed on the CEIRC agenda, and any information about the offer will also be copied to CAUL. Although the Datasets Coordinators are CAUL nominees, it is not always clear that they understand some of the conditions or ramifications of the offers for the big-ticket items. For example, the CEIRC Chair communicated directly with the University Librarians about the recent Wiley contract, outlining the benefits of having maximum participation from CAUL members that lead to a decrease in the access fee from 3% to 1%. In most cases, however, offers are not referred to CAUL. Some CAUL members are on the datasets list, if they are not, it is assumed that they are content to leave the bulk of the processes to their Datasets Coordinator. Institutional responses are transmitted via the Datasets Coordinators. A vendor’s final offer has never been withheld from members. Offers generally lapse rather than are rejected. If an offer is rejected, it is probably because the appropriate pricing level and/or the minimum number of subscribers has not been achieved.

Resources
Staffing
35% of the CAUL Executive Officer, 0.5 of HEW 4 assistant

A half-time CEIRC position was created in June 1998. In June 2001, a separate half-time office support position was created, although for various reasons, this half has only been filled for an initial period of 16 months, and a later period of 3 months in late 2003 i.e. 19 out of a possible 33 months. These have been converted to a full-time CAUL position, with a new staff member commencing April 21, 2004. The existing staffing levels provide day-to-day support at the operational level. The Executive Officer is also responsible for maintaining the complete CAUL website.
There is insufficient staffing to collate information, and to conduct research and analysis.

**Documentation**

Most of the CEIRC current and archived documentation is on the CAUL web site. Email files, by product, are available from 1995 (including CEIRC from 1998). Excel files recording response details have been kept since 2002. Access files record subscriptions mostly from 2003, but including some earlier details.

The CAUL web site, email files and the office shared files for Excel, MSAccess and MYOB are housed on ANU servers which are backed up. Copies are also held on the Executive Officer’s laptop, and are also copied to disc. There are no backups for paper files, which are stored in the CAUL Office. Paper files that are not duplicated online are mainly originals of financial transactions (all of which have been audited except for the current year, and whose details are entered in MYOB) and any signed contracts (a copy of which is also held by the vendor). Very little else is held only on paper.

**Software/Systems Used**

- MYOB for financial transactions
- Excel for recording institutional responses
- Access for recording completed subscriptions
- Netscape Publisher 4.77 and WinFTP for the web site
- MsOutlook for email since May 2003; also used for calendar and task-list, PC-PINE for email 1995-2003.
- MSWord for almost everything else

The Executive Officer has identified the following developmental activities that if implemented would reduce the time to respond to members and vendors and would streamline existing workflow.

- web-based survey templates for requesting structured responses to offers, linked directly to a database
- web-based forms for members to update their own information on the web-site
- link from MYOB to subscriptions database to reduce data entry

While it is possible to use existing funding to hire a programmer to implement these activities, the Executive Officer does not have the time to scope the projects and to hire a contractor.

**Office Communication**

Most communication with vendors is with the Executive Officer and not with the office assistant. The Executive Officer primarily uses email in order to have a record of the communication. The telephone is used for initial discussions about a new product or with a new vendor. The Executive Officer also meets vendors in person while attending VALA and Sydney Online for the trade show, and ICOLC.

Communication with datasets coordinators and CEIRC members is generally by email. See the archive of the datasets list at

Communication with the CEIRC chair varies depending on the chair’s preference but usually is via email and deals with preparing for, and following up on, CEIRC meetings (5 per year).

**Risk Management**

CEIRC accounts are audited as CAUL accounts. Normally, the annual audit of the CAUL accounts start in late January, following reconciliation of December’s accounts, and are completed in time for a report to the first CAUL meeting of the year in March/April. In 2003, this schedule was interrupted because of complications with the foreign currency account and the GST. Account audit reports while validating CAUL office account-keeping processes, are not very helpful in the presentation of budgets and financial reports to CAUL. For these, the Executive Officer uses figures extracted from MYOB. The audit report merges all CAUL business into a single report, converting USD into AUD at an average annual amount, then adding this account to the AUD account. The volume of income and expenditure from datasets subscriptions overwhelms the CAUL management figures, hence the audit report does not present a clear picture of the actual state of CAUL. However, it is correct according to accounting standards.

The auditor has copies of the MYOB files, bank statements, MasterCard statements and complete access to the paper files. The auditor generally requests copies of specific paperwork based on samples taken from MYOB, including all the big-ticket payments. The CAUL Executive signs off the audit reports.

There has not been an operational audit, whereby, an auditor assesses risk management of any IT systems used, records retention and storage, privacy, disaster management processes, etc. However, some risk management elements such as physical facilities maybe covered under the ANU risk and disaster management processes.

There is a CAUL office procedure manual, compiled over time by the office assistants, that is updated when procedures are changed and new staff are inducted. The procedures mostly relate to handling responses to offers, maintaining the database, office communication, bank and financial transactions. Procedures are written when tasks reach critical mass, i.e., when they need to be repeated often enough to require a written procedure. Until then, procedures are adapted from previous methods, as recorded in correspondence and email files.

**Planning**

For the annual CEIRC budget, the Executive Officer makes an estimate of staffing costs and committee & ICO/LC meeting expenses, based on the previous year’s expenditure and the location of CEIRC committee members. The budget is presented via the CAUL Executive to CAUL as part of the CAUL budget. Although the CEIRC committee would take up any extraordinary expenditure, it essentially makes recommendations to the Executive.

The Datasets Coordinators may identify new products at their annual meeting in January. However, in 2003 the CEIRC Committee decided that offers would be accepted all year round, including December. (CEIRC 2003/5 Item 8)
Key planning is for the products annual renewal process, which, like all other office activities, is refined when it reaches critical mass. In 2003, the Executive Officer called for 2004 pricing from vendors before she went on leave in July, requesting responses by August at the latest. Renewal responses were to be finalised in September and October, with November for invoicing and vendor payments in January. Despite accrual accounting practices, university finance departments appear to be closing accounts early in December. The same schedule is anticipated for 2004. However, the Executive Officer recommends producing invoices/statements as part of the renewal process (to be finalised in October rather than November) in a bid to encourage CEIRC participants to respond more promptly. This method won’t work for all products, some of whose final pricing is based on the number of subscribers e.g., ACM and RLG.

2. **STRATEGIC (SWOT) ANALYSIS OF CEIRC**
   (Completed February 5, 2004)

   Purpose is to examine the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats facing CEIRC.

   **Strengths** – identify any policies, strategies, or practices established within CEIRC that relate to electronic information resources.

   **Weaknesses** – identify any significant threats or organisation constraints that might impact on the achievement of the CEIRC terms of reference.

   **Opportunities** – an event that may have a positive impact on CEIRC initiatives and practices. An event may be a trend, perception, development of process and may be external arising from sources or factors outside of CEIRC.

   **Threats** – events that are outside of CEIRC’s control and that might have a detrimental effect on CEIRC, therefore exposing CEIRC to risk.

   To document the SWOT analysis, group the issues into the following categories:

   1. **Systems and Innovation** (includes technology, resources, processes or operations, and potential for innovation and improvement in regard to these)
   2. **People and Learning** (includes staff skills, expertise, initiative, culture for CAUL staff and CEIRC committee membership)
   3. **Clients and Community** (includes client relations, expectations and accountabilities for CAUL members, and external participants)
   4. **Governance** (includes internal reporting and planning, monitoring contracts and agreements, policies, responsibilities, recordkeeping databases, etc)
SWOT 1: Systems and Innovation (technology, resources, processes or operations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Opt-in / opt-out model</td>
<td>• Not all vendors’ statistics are Counter compliant and that makes it difficult to use the statistics for purchase/renewal decisions, to market and communicate the benefits, to demonstrate return on investment, and to use as justification for external funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Costs are negotiable</td>
<td>• Difficult achieving equitable cost models eg ProQuest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• License clauses are negotiable</td>
<td>• Content is not as negotiable as cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing range and variety of resources and services becoming available as potential deals</td>
<td>• Limited ability to attract funding from external sources eg approaching DEST, AVCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established communication channels with vendors and Datasets Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vendors exploring funding models and are more willing to unbundle products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Statistics are more dependable, consistent, user friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving linkages between full text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities

- Moving to e-only access may simplify negotiations
- Influence vendors to improve:
  - archiving principles
  - license conditions
  - provision of statistics
  - innovations, eg open URL access
  - interfaces
  - content, especially more Australian/NZ content

Threats

- Unbundling may increase costs and may result in lower participation rates.
- Currency fluctuations may increase costs and may result in lower participation rates.
- Vendors lack of understanding of academic and/or Australasian market
- Pricing models may favour one group over another
- Vendor systems or changes may not be compatible with University systems, and hinder easy access for our clients eg vendor systems cookies; multiple site issues
- Vendor requirements may conflict with Australian and/or New Zealand legal requirements, eg vendor wants individual email addresses vs. AUS privacy legislation, internet security
- Loss-leader pricing (where the initial pricing offered by the vendor is unsustainable) may lead to unpalatable increases in later years e.g. Lexis Nexis and Blackwell Publishing
- Inadequate archival access and no access to subscribed material after material has been cancelled
SWOT 2: People and Learning (staff skills, expertise, initiative, culture for CAUL staff and CEIRC committee membership)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Longevity of CEIRC in various forms, started with the DAWG, then CEIRC in 1998</td>
<td>• CEIRC staffing is single point sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Officer’s involvement in ICOLC and association with the CNSLP and other international linkages</td>
<td>• Members access to the Executive Officer’s knowledge may be limited because of one-person office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience and reputation of CAUL Executive Officer</td>
<td>• Datasets coordinators change and knowledge may not be transferred within their institution. Impact is that datasets coordinators may take more time to respond to offers which may have a negative impact on CAUL Office workflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognition of CEIRC’s purchasing power by database vendors, other library groups and consortia.</td>
<td>• For datasets coordinators, level of knowledge &amp; decision making autonomy varies from institution to institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established process for handling agreements which works well.</td>
<td>• Difficult for some datasets coordinators to meet Executive Officer’s response deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can direct all inquiries to one individual, and that there is a process behind it which will work.</td>
<td>• Expertise/continuity of CEIRC committee may be lost when members change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAUL gets kudos because of international recognition of CEIRC as an active, efficient consortium.</td>
<td>• Documentation may be hard to find on the CAUL website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expertise of the datasets coordinators</td>
<td>• Difficult to maintain currency of the website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broad range of datasets coordinators &amp; CEIRC membership, so can get representation of various kinds for different purposes, regional, specialisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expertise of CEIRC as a whole because of its structure, and the way membership changeovers are managed from year-to-year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willingness to share information and help others in the group, eg through the datasets list.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fact that some organisations apply for external membership not to purchase produces but because of the information shared through the datasets coordinators listserv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advice given to CAUL by CEIRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge and files of the Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documentation on the web site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SWOT 2: People and Learning Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Change of committee membership brings new expertise and new knowledge</td>
<td>• Departure/reassignment of Executive Officer e.g if CAUL had different priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibility of using experienced, hard-nosed negotiators for significant agreements</td>
<td>• CAUL redirecting budget and resources from CEIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-opt former members of the committee to assist in particular projects</td>
<td>• Disruption to CEIRC business if committee members only able to serve for a short period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training for datasets coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Datasets coordinators to shadow Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issues papers, discussion papers on specific topics to educate the profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CEIRC staff and committee members to educate CAUL members and datasets coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educate other library sectors in consortial purchasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SWOT 3: Clients and Community (client relations, expectations and accountabilities for CAUL members, and external participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Well established culture of collaboration, including cross-sectoral and international</td>
<td>• Too much reliance on specific types of libraries to sustain collaborative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information exchange</td>
<td>• Insufficient staff to support and maintain consistent operational efficiencies throughout the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to add external participants</td>
<td>• Lack of written guidelines setting out roles and responsibilities for datasets coordinators and the Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good relationships with vendors and suppliers, trust and respect</td>
<td>• Expectations of CAUL and some datasets coordinators are unrealistic eg level of discounts expected, negotiating terms, services, costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear expectations for external participants</td>
<td>• Expectations &amp; demands of university governance or Alumni Office or other university community to provide services may be unrealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opt-in / opt-out purchasing model</td>
<td>• The account/ vendor representative in the local office of an international company may not have the authority and autonomy and this can cause delays impacting on workflow and communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• External participants can increase/enable buying power of CAUL members, and discounts for specific products</td>
<td>• Other consortia may be more attractive to members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discounts available even for very small numbers of participants</td>
<td>• Competitive push by government may force institutions to be less collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some discounts not dependent on the number of participants</td>
<td>• Vendors may by-pass CEIRC and go directly to individual institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased access to new products because vendors approach CEIRC because of its reputation</td>
<td>• Vendors may take advantage of existence of other buying groups, e.g. Go8, ATN, CAVAL, EPIC, ALIA, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CEIRC relationship with vendors may provide opportunities for CAUL to partner for R&amp;D</td>
<td>• Individual libraries pull out because they get a better deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• University hierarchy may decide to stay out of an agreement for competitive reasons, thereby, damaging CEIRC’s ability to achieve better terms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SWOT 4: Governance (internal reporting and planning, monitoring contracts and agreements, policies, responsibilities, recordkeeping databases, etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Low administrative costs</td>
<td>• No ability to easily report on return on investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Database of vendor proposals and agreements recorded on the web site</td>
<td>• Lack of analysis to demonstrate the benefits of CEIRC deals &amp; added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large number of agreements in place or under negotiation</td>
<td>• No ability to manipulate vendor proposals to easily pull out elements for analysis and comment eg ILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Checklist, sample clauses, exemplars of contracts all available on website</td>
<td>• Lack of induction kit for new committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience negotiating contracts</td>
<td>• Lack of induction kit for datasets coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Composition of the CEIRC including CAUL, datasets coordinators, CONZUL and CSIRO representatives</td>
<td>• Some confusion regarding the role of the CEIRC chair and the deputy chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reporting by CEIRC Chair to CAUL</td>
<td>• Agendas, minutes and papers may not be disseminated in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dissemination of minutes to CAUL and datasets coordinators</td>
<td>• Minutes aren’t released to CAUL and the datasets coordinators until they are formally approved at the next CEIRC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear documentation for external participation</td>
<td>• No formal risk management and reporting system in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regular face-to-face CEIRC meetings</td>
<td>• CAUL staffing levels may be insufficient to deal with CEIRC workloads at busy times of year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to invite vendors, publishers and others to the CEIRC meetings</td>
<td>• The number of external participants may overload the CAUL office staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CEIRC fees are increased when CAUL fees are increased</td>
<td>• CAUL is an unincorporated association, without legal protection other than through each university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To date, no adverse risks have been reported about CEIRC operations.</td>
<td>• To assess &amp; manage risk, more members may seek legal review of licences before signing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This may cause delays that may negatively impact on CEIRC operational workflows, and reduce the flexibility of CEIRC and libraries to negotiate with vendors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ARIIC funding</td>
<td>• Possible influence/ interference by AVCC in site licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to add additional external participants</td>
<td>• National site license may have a negative impact on existing and future CEIRC license agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing data that can be used for analysis</td>
<td>• No documented financial procedures in CAUL office for CEIRC activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibility of marketing CEIRC activities that have significant benefits to the sector, to CAUL, to the AVCC, DEST, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To contribute to the profession by sharing information re consortial management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To inform publishers and vendors about pricing and content, terms and conditions relevant to our members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee members can influence vendors regarding the development of alternative pricing models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broad terms of reference provide scope for the committee to focus on a wide range of industry issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. SUMMARY OF KEY AREAS OF STRENGTH AND RISK

Using the SWOT analysis, summarise the key areas of strength and risk facing CEIRC.

Major Strengths
- Buying group that uses an opt-in / opt-out purchasing model
- CEIRC terms of reference
- Knowledge and expertise of CEIRC, datasets coordinators, CAUL, CAUL Executive Officer
- Communication
- Culture of collaboration

Major Risks
- Reliance on vendor e-only products - access vs ownership, risk of not owning the product and of not having a tangible asset if the vendor goes broke or sells off parts of the company, and/or the database product, no access to backsets or archives
- Weakened conditions because of fragmentation of CAUL members
- Lack of CEIRC marketing including demonstrating return on investment
- Cost increases – product & administration, currency fluctuations, loss leader, pricing models
- Membership growth
- Unrealistic expectations of stakeholders
- Poor analysis and reporting of CEIRC activities and trends
- No formal risk management process in place
- Business continuity – availability and number of staff, change of personnel.

4. STRATEGIC OUTLOOK

4.1 CEIRC Mission

To provide recommendations and advice to CAUL on matters relating to electronic information resources; and to oversee the cost-effective acquisition of e-resources and services through consortium negotiations on behalf of CAUL.
4.2 Strategic Directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Result Area 1: Member Fragmentation</th>
<th>Timeframes</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors contributing to member fragmentation:</strong> costing models and conditions may not be competitive; products may not be relevant to members; other buying groups offer better price and conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> Members will participate in CEIRC for the cooperative purchasing of electronic resources.</td>
<td>1.1 Ongoing</td>
<td>1.1.1 Number of products that members take up and renew as a percentage of offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Oct 2005</td>
<td>1.1.2 Number of members that take up each product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Use different costing models to facilitate maximum participation of members.</td>
<td>1.3 July 2005</td>
<td>1.2 ROI communicates value to CEIRC participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Develop return on investment (ROI) reporting tools.</td>
<td>1.4 Ongoing</td>
<td>1.3 Survey results are included in CEIRC checklist, sample clauses for reference when negotiating contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Survey CEIRC participants to identify elements that would add value to any deal.</td>
<td>1.5 Ongoing</td>
<td>1.4 Decrease in non-participation rate for new and renewed offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Analyse and address members’ reasons for not participating in new offers and/or not renewing existing offers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.1 Quality and number of new products offered each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Proactively work with the marketplace to ensure that relevant and competitively priced products are offered to members.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.2 Same as 1.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Result Area 2: Business Continuity</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors contributing to business continuity issues: need to improve risk management processes, analysis and reporting; staffing single point sensitivity; wide range of knowledge and expertise of datasets coordinators; availability and access to operational documentation.</td>
<td>2.1 Sept 2005 2.2 March 2006 2.3 March 2005 2.4 Jan 2005 2.5 Feb 2005</td>
<td>2.1 System ensures compliance, and is applied at the strategic, operational and project level. 2.2.1 Risks are identified and level of risk is managed by priority and treatment strategies. 2.2.2 Business records are accessible, secured and backed up as appropriate. 2.3.1 Annual financial and operational plans are completed and accepted by CAUL. 2.3.2 Established turnaround times for operations are met. 2.4 Staff are available when required. 2.5.1 Induction kits are posted to the CAUL website. 2.5.2 Feedback from CEIRC members and datasets coordinators is positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal: Ensure that CEIRC activities are managed efficiently and effectively and minimise risk to CAUL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>2.1 Develop a risk management system for CEIRC operations. 2.2 Conduct a risk management audit. 2.3 Review and develop policies and procedures for CEIRC operational activities. 2.4 Review staffing requirements and draft recommendation to CAUL executive to ensure adequate and flexible staffing to meet workflows and workloads. 2.5 Prepare induction kits for datasets coordinators and CEIRC members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Result Area 3: Future growth and development

Factors contributing to future growth and development of CEIRC: growth vs maintenance; expansion of external membership; continuation of opt in opt out purchasing model; emergence of, and competition from, other buying clubs and consortia; pressure from external organisations; support from CAUL.

**Goal:** Determine future directions and priorities for electronic information resources and services.

### Actions

3.1 Identify projects and activities for short and long term objectives.
3.2 Draft a budget to support R&D activities, data collection and analysis.
3.3 Communicate to the CAUL executive for distribution to the AVCC all work completed by CEIRC (e.g. access, technical issues and functional enhancements) for AVCC negotiated products.
3.4 Survey datasets coordinators & external participants to identify and prioritise new products and services.
3.5 Monitor cost-benefit analysis of further expansion of external membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframes</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 January &amp; during year</td>
<td>3.1. Projects are completed on time and within budget and meet project goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 January</td>
<td>3.2. Budget is approved by CAUL and is expended according to established timeframes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 As completed January 2005</td>
<td>3.3. AVCC receives information prior to any re-negotiation and acknowledges receipt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 September &amp; during year</td>
<td>3.4. CEIRC negotiates agreements for identified products and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.1 CAUL executive approve external members nominated by CEIRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5.2 Value of external membership is reported to CAUL via annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Result Area 4: Communication and Marketing</td>
<td>Timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors contributing to communication and marketing: managing expectations of stakeholders, eg CAUL, datasets coordinators, others; no established turnaround times for agendas, minutes and papers; currency and navigation issues with the CAUL website; no return on investment reports; influence and actions of external organisations (AVCC, DEST); autonomy/authority of local vendor representatives.

Goal: All stakeholders understand and acknowledge the role of CEIRC and the value of CEIRC activities.

**Actions**

4.1 Identify and produce documentation that will promote and communicate CEIRC activities.
4.2 Publish a statement of benefits report annually on CAUL website and in CAUL annual report.
4.3 Document and promote roles and responsibilities of datasets coordinators, CAUL officers, CEIRC chair and deputy chair positions, and members.
4.4 Educate vendors and publishers about the Australasian higher education sector as it affects the provision of electronic information resources.

| 4.1 Oct 2005 | 4.1.1 Relevant documentation is available on CAUL website. |
| 4.2 Sept 2006 | 4.1.2 CEIRC strategic directions are relevant, current and support the CAUL strategic plan. |
| 4.3 Feb 2005 | 4.1.3 CAUL receives timely advice on emerging issues and trends. |
| 4.4 Ongoing | 4.2 Statement of benefits report is available and of use to stakeholders. |
|             | 4.3 Role statements are on the CAUL website. |
|             | 4.4.1 CEIRC is invited to participate on vendor and publisher advisory committees and focus groups. |
|             | 4.4.2 Vendors meet with CEIRC to resolve issues identified by dataset coordinators and CAUL. |
5. APPENDIX 1

CEIRC Terms of Reference and Mode of Operation

Revised 25 October 2002

CEIRC was established in 1998 to take the place of the AVCC SCIR Database Access Working Group. Participation is open to members of CAUL and CONZUL, the CSIRO, and (on approval) to external participants.

1. Terms of Reference

CEIRC is an advisory committee providing recommendations and advice to CAUL on matters relating to electronic information resources, such as cooperative purchasing, IT infrastructure, mirroring, archiving, publishers’ pricing models, license agreements, and intra-consortium cost-sharing models, etc. Strategic direction is provided by CAUL, on the recommendation of CEIRC after consideration of input from Datasets Coordinators. Within this context the terms of reference are:

(1) Advise CAUL on issues which may affect the delivery of electronic information services.

(2) Promote the role of CAUL as an initiator and coordinator of collaboration between university libraries to facilitate access to electronic information resources.

(3) Oversee the cost-effective acquisition of e-resources and services through Consortium negotiations on behalf of CAUL.

(4) Provide information to CEIRC participants on consortium purchasing proposals.

(5) Advise CAUL on appropriate mechanisms, policies and procedures for sharing consortium costs among participants.

(6) Support the development of standards in areas such as licensing, authentication and statistical reporting as these affect e-resources and services, and bring them to the attention of publishers, policy-makers, CAUL and Datasets Coordinators.

(7) Advise publishers and vendors on acceptable terms and conditions for the supply of products and services.

(8) Initiate, maintain and develop productive relationships with other consortia, both nationally and internationally.

2. Committee Membership

Three CAUL members – two elected by CAUL members, one nominated by the CAUL Executive. The CAUL Executive to nominate a Chair and a Deputy Chair from this group.

Two representatives of the Datasets Coordinators – a shortlist of four to be elected by institutional Datasets Coordinators. Two to be selected from the shortlist by the three
CAUL members on the committee. (This method of selection will provide an opportunity for Datasets Coordinators to be consulted and allow the CAUL members to take into account issues such as the need for a mix of geographic and institution size representation.)

One CSIRO representative – nominated by CSIRO
One CONZUL representative – nominated by CONZUL
CAUL Executive Officer ex officio

2a. External Participants.

1) Criteria to be applied in deciding external participation

The following criteria or principles are applied in deciding whether external organisations should be admitted to the CEIRC program:

a) The entry of external organisations as participants in the CEIRC program must advance or, at the very least, not damage the interests of CAUL members.

It follows that any candidates for admission should have teaching and/or research as their primary function and have roles or objectives similar or complementary to those of CAUL members or Australian higher education institutions in general. (Any participants who are likely to be perceived by vendors as disparate in character and hence possibly belonging to a different ‘market’ would prejudice CEIRC’s overall prospects for success in its various negotiations.) It is the application of this principle rather than the simple categorisation of organisation by type that should decide admission to the program. This principle should also span the ‘not for profit/for profit’ divide.

b) The admission of external organisations must not harm CAUL’s relationship with the AVCC or with kindred groups within such partnerships or coalitions as ICOLC or in possible one-to-one links with such networks as SOLINET or NELINET.

c) In some cases, the level of experience or expertise an external organisation might bring to CEIRC by participation in the program could be considered a strong argument for entry.

d) A condition of participation in the program would be payment of the participation levy. This levy would be payable for the life of any CEIRC negotiated agreements to which the external participants were party.

In the case of new external participants, an annual fee of $1,500 is payable. Since new participants derive immediate benefit from the infrastructure and expertise developed by CAUL over a number of years, it is reasonable that they should pay a modest premium over and above the standard levy.

2) Procedure

All requests for participation in the program are first considered by CEIRC and a recommendation made to the CAUL Executive. The final decision rests with the Executive.

Note: Participation in the program does not bring with it membership of the CEIRC committee. Participants’ personnel may join the datasets email list,
and may request participation in any of the agreements negotiated on behalf of CAUL. CAUL will then seek to include the participant in the agreement, but this is ultimately the decision of each individual vendor. Participation of external organisations will not be a necessary condition of CAUL’s agreements with such vendors.

See Guidelines for participation, for external organisations.
See also Database entry form, for external organisations.

3. Continuity of Committee Membership

Members hold office for two years with no more than two terms.

4. Structure

CEIRC establishes working groups or nominates individuals on an ad hoc basis to address specific issues or problems. The convenors of the working groups will generally be members of CEIRC. Members of CEIRC will be allocated specific responsibilities, such as leading discussion on a specific topic on a discussion list. A number of working groups are likely to involve Datasets Coordinators who are not members of CEIRC.

Working groups or individuals allocated tasks will be given deadlines to complete their task. There will be no standing working groups.

The financial support of working groups requires further investigation but it is initially recommended that the convenor's institution may be reimbursed for some of the time involved if it is a large project, otherwise it will be supported by the members' institutions.

CEIRC may enter into a contract with an individual to negotiate with relevant publishers and vendors under the guidance of CEIRC, as and if required.

5. Trials and Evaluations

The CAUL Office continues to be responsible for dealing with ad hoc proposals from vendors, for coordinating trials and evaluations and for liaising with CAUL members.

CEIRC holds discussions annually at the VALA and Online Conferences with a small and targeted number of vendors whose products are of interest but whose terms and conditions remain unsatisfactory for CAUL members.

6. Communication with CAUL

The Chair of CEIRC reports formally to the CAUL Executive on CEIRC activities in writing, and as necessary by attendance at an Executive meeting.

Following each CEIRC meeting the Chair of CEIRC circulates a briefing to CAUL members highlighting the issues discussed.

The Chair of CEIRC prepares a brief report on CEIRC activities for each CAUL meeting.
The minutes of CEIRC meetings should be made available on the CAUL web site as soon as committee members have had an opportunity to make any necessary corrections.

7. Involvement of Datasets Coordinators

Datasets Coordinators are encouraged to participate in CEIRC activities by:

(a) participating in the election of representatives on CEIRC

(b) participating in CEIRC working groups

(c) contributing to relevant discussion lists

(d) participating in an annual meeting with CEIRC members, organised in conjunction with VALA and Online, to exchange views and discuss issues of common concern. It is recommended that the meeting be convened and organised by one of the two Datasets Coordinators’ representatives on CEIRC, with the assistance of the CAUL Executive Officer.

8. CEIRC Finances

From 2004, the levy is $1,200 per calendar year. For new participants in the program, the levy is $1,800 per calendar year.
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CAUL STRATEGIC PLAN
2003-2004

(Revision date 22 October 2003)

Mission

The Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) is dedicated to improving access by the students and staff of Australian universities to the information resources that are fundamental to the advancement of teaching, learning and research.

In pursuit of this objective CAUL develops a national perspective on issues relevant to university libraries, provides a forum for discussion & collaborative action, and works to promote common interests.

CAUL is comprised of the university librarians or library directors of the universities eligible to be members of the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee.

Environment

The environment in which CAUL operates is characterised by:

- A changing student population, including increasing numbers of students who are time-poor;
- Changes in research practices facilitated by technology;
- Changes in teaching and learning practices facilitated by technology;
- A developing policy environment that puts research activity in a national perspective;
- Increasing requirements to demonstrate quality processes and outcomes;
- The steady maturing of alternative approaches to academic publishing;
- Continuing financial stringency.

Values – Collaboration and Partnership

No individual university library can meet the needs of its users by standing alone.

Collaboration and partnership are therefore themes which run throughout this Strategic Plan. Some partnerships will be local; others will be based on a particular community of interest. Regional groupings of university librarians meet in most states.

The CAUL Strategic Plan is predicated on an environment in which Australian university libraries will cooperate with each other to meet national needs for scholarly information, and to support the promotion of, and access to, Australian universities'
research output. By cooperating and collaborating with other national and international organisations CAUL will promote policies and influence practices that will benefit the Australian and the international scholarly community. In particular, close links are maintained with CONZUL (the Council of New Zealand University Librarians), and with CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology) and ACODE (Australasian Council of Open, Distance & E-Learning) as partners supporting teaching and learning.

Goals

The Strategic Plan charts how CAUL will meet its objectives. It outlines the following goals:
- optimising student learning outcomes;
- maximising the potential of libraries to contribute to graduate attributes;
- maximising the information resources available to researchers, and the facilitation of their access;
- promoting continuous improvement in university libraries, and
- advocating effective policies and an appropriate legal and regulatory environment.

I. CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING

GOAL: TO OPTIMIZE LEARNING OUTCOMES AND MAXIMIZE THE POTENTIAL OF LIBRARIES TO CONTRIBUTE TO GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES.

Rationale

In numerical terms, students are by far the heaviest users of libraries, and support for teaching and learning is a major responsibility. Developments in pedagogy and course design to accommodate a changing student population are being facilitated by technology. Libraries are no longer seen primarily as a place, but as a service which should be available to students whenever and wherever needed. The increased complexity of the information environment and emphasis on lifelong learning has developed an appreciation of the value of library information literacy programs. The emerging nexus between research and teaching will mean undergraduates will become exposed to research information and methods.

Objectives

a. Support universities in their approaches to teaching and learning
b. Develop best practice guidelines, curricula and evaluation instruments to ensure that information literacy activities improve learning throughout a course of study and equip graduates with information skills for lifelong learning
c. Facilitate access by members of the university community to the shared resources of Australian libraries through cooperative initiatives
d. Apply understanding of information-seeking behaviours to regularly inform and refine practice in information literacy programs and the library’s role in supporting learning
e. Recognise the research and teaching nexus and identify research information resources that can also be utilised in teaching and learning

Action – Ongoing

1. Continue to refine and clarify protocols for the streamlined operation of University Library Australia – the national borrowing scheme. (Action: ULA Working Group)
2. Promote the development of standards, protocols and systems that will ensure a responsive and robust information environment to support flexible learning (Action: CAUL representatives on Standards Australia IT/19, Information Literacy Working Group)

3. Gather reliable and consistent data about activities and resources used in information literacy across CAUL (Action: CAUL Statistics Focus Group, Information Literacy Working Group)

Action – 2003-4

4. Undertake research and evaluation in information literacy as a graduate attribute through:
   - Development of an information literacy assessment instrument
   - Development of evaluation measures which enable evaluation of library information literacy programs against university statements on graduate attributes
   - Working with ANZIIL and university staff to design research projects that will contribute to the development of best practice guidelines
   - Investigating the feasibility of deploying generic information literacy modules through collaborative effort
   - Other activities as proposed to CAUL (Action: Information Literacy Working Group)

5. Investigate a project to explore effective service delivery through linking learning management and information management systems (Action: CAUL, CAUDIT and ACODE Executives)

6. Holds a workshop on changes in teaching and learning and their implications for the provision of information services (Action: CAUL Executive)

II. CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

GOAL: TO MAXIMISE THE INFORMATION RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO RESEARCHERS AND TO FACILITATE THEIR ACCESS.

Rationale
In recent years CAUL member libraries, like their international counterparts, have found it increasingly difficult to meet their responsibilities to researchers. The reasons are global and several, but are chiefly related to the increasing volume and cost of academic publications. Collaboration is as valuable in supporting the provision of information as it is in research itself, and can contribute to national competitiveness.

It is recognised that the following objectives will also contribute significantly to teaching & learning. Promoting Australian research to the world is considered along with the universities’ access to global research.

Objectives
   g. A framework for the digitisation of Australian research resources.
   h. Sustainable models of access to research information vis a vis pricing, delivery, archiving, etc
   i. Participation of all interested members in the development of institutional digital assets repositories.
   j. A greater understanding of information-seeking behaviours.
   k. Influence the development of new models of publishing which are efficient and cost effective
I. Promote Australian-generated research in the global research environment

**Action – Ongoing**

7. Continue the development of the Australian Academic & Research Library Network (AARLIN) **(Action: E.Gow)**

8. Continue the development of the Australian Digital Theses Program. **(Action: ADT Steering Group)**

9. Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchase and licensing of electronic information resources. **(Action: CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee))**

**Action – 2003-4**

10. Contribute to the development and promotion of institutional digital assets repositories initiatives. **(Action: SCWG, ALL members)**

11. Contribute to the development of a national strategy for digitisation of Australian research resources across the wider cultural sector. **(Action: ALL Members)**

12. Seek Australian Research Council funding to conduct research into information-seeking behaviours and their impact on service models (building on Houghton / Steele research). **(Action: CAUL Executive)**

III. MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

**GOAL:** THE PURSUIT OF WORLD CLASS PERFORMANCE WITHIN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES THROUGH APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT, QUALITY AND BUSINESS EXCELLENCE.

**Rationale**

Quality assurance is a high priority for government, the AVCC and CAUL. CAUL will continue to develop strategies for enhancing the quality of university library services.

**Objectives**

m. Provide statistical information relating to Australasian university libraries to assist best practice management by CAUL members.

n. Facilitate benchmarking activity between members through the development of suitable instruments.

o. Facilitate sharing of management and planning information among CAUL members.

p. Facilitate the enhancement of knowledge and skills of members and their staff in best practice, benchmarking, quality management and performance measurement.

q. Explore the nature of future requirements for the Australasian university library workforce and the way in which these requirements may be met.

r. Provide insight into new developments in libraries and their environments which will assist in planning and implementing change.

**Action — Ongoing**

13. Collect and publish statistics on Australasian university library outputs and activities. **(Action: Statistics Focus Group)**

14. Conduct and publish the results of surveys and questionnaires which enable members to share collective knowledge and experience. **(Action: ALL Members)**

15. Continue to develop, extend, scope and cost a range of agreed performance indicators for CAUL members. **(Action: Best Practice Working Group)**
16. Review annually CAUL performance against its objectives and strategies.  
\textit{(Action: CAUL Executive)}

\textbf{Action – 2003-4}

17. Define a technical and topic framework for sharing management and planning 
information such as reports, instruments, RFIs, plans, position descriptions, and 
posting short summaries and URLs to a common web site, determine resourcing 
requirements and propose a course of action to CAUL eg on buildings, workforce, 
strategic plans, software specifications, etc \textit{(Action: CAUL Executive)}

18. Review the current CAUL statistical measures – presentation format, usefulness, 
use and users and present a plan and proposal to CAUL. \textit{(Action: Statistics 
Focus Group)}

19. Review the Rodski customer satisfaction surveys following the second cycle of 
use by members, in 2004. \textit{(Action: Best Practice Working Group)}

20. Review the document delivery indicator. \textit{(Action: Best Practice Working 
Group)}

21. Review and develop measures of the quality of library information and research 
services and develop measures to support them. \textit{(Action: Best Practice 
Working Group with Imogen Garner)}

\section*{IV. COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY}

\textbf{GOAL:} TO IDENTIFY AND EXPLOIT ALL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAUL TO 
PROMOTE AND RAISE AWARENESS OF THE ROLE OF 
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF 
HIGHER EDUCATION, RESEARCH AND THE NATIONAL 
INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE.

\textbf{Rationale}

University libraries work continuously towards greater effectiveness, improved levels 
of service and efficient use of resources. Their visibility, relevance and importance to 
the community-at-large, to their stakeholders and to the government is vital to their 
ability to support the learning, teaching and research activities of their institutions 
through improved services and resources, to avoid threats to the affordable flow of 
information and to help protect Australia's intellectual capital.

\textbf{Objectives}

s. Influence the legal and regulatory environment which has an impact on libraries 
and higher education.

t. Project a coherent CAUL perspective regarding key issues of national 
importance.

u. Advocate for the provision of national funding for infrastructure for learning and 
teaching.

v. Promote the role of university libraries as partners in university teaching, learning 
and research, as leading contributors to the national information resource, and 
partners in the information chain, uniquely placed to provide advice to 
government on issues such as copyright and access to information.

w. Publicise the benefits of collaborative and cooperative action undertaken by 
CAUL and its members for the national good.

x. Publicise the role of CAUL in fostering international collaboration.

y. Involvement of members in the activities of CAUL.

z. Appreciation by stakeholders of the role of CAUL and its members.

aa. Recognition of CAUL as a valued source of advice on matters relating to 
information services in higher education.
Action – Ongoing

22. Ensure CAUL representation on groups seeking to influence regulatory reform, especially in relation to copyright, telecommunications, higher education, etc. (Action: CAUL Executive & ALL Members)

23. Identify and cultivate influential contacts in the government, media and information industry by exploiting the networks of CAUL members. (Action: ALL Members)

24. Promote and market the interests and achievements of CAUL to government, the universities, the AVCC, etc (Action: CAUL Executive & ALL Members)

25. Respond to relevant federal and state government enquiries. (Action: CAUL Executive & ALL Members)

26. Contribute funds to support the Australian Libraries Copyright Committee. (Action: ALL Members; Allocate $20,000/year)

27. Identify opportunities and support collaborative proposals from members aimed at improving the quality of the national information infrastructure. (Action: CAUL Executive & ALL Members)

28. Ensure that all CAUL members are kept informed of the key activities of the CAUL Executive and CAUL Working Groups. (Action: CAUL Executive)

29. Monitor and review the effectiveness of the CAUL communication strategy. (Action: CAUL Executive)

30. Develop and promote the CAUL website as a source of information about higher education issues of relevance to university libraries. (Action: Executive Officer & ALL Members)

31. Publish details of Australian and international conferences, projects, documents, etc, to assist members to keep informed of the latest developments in higher education, libraries and information services. (Action: Executive Officer)

32. Update “new members’ checklist” and send to each new CAUL member. (Action: Executive Officer)

Action – 2003-4

33. Contribute to the three-year Review of the Copyright Amendment (Digital Agenda) Act (Action: Eve Woodberry & ALL Members)
STATEMENT ON OPEN ACCESS: DRAFT

CAUL’s mission is to improve access by the students and staff of Australian universities to the information resources that are fundamental to teaching, learning and research. Success in this mission is dependent on systems of academic publishing and communication that enable the rapid and affordable dissemination of the outcomes of research and scholarship, and on the preservation of the scholarly record for the future. CAUL supports all efforts towards this goal of which open access is the most important. CAUL recognises that:

Digital communications offer opportunities for the development of more efficient and effective systems of academic publishing.

Research is increasingly conducted globally by collaborations facilitated by grids of communications and computing power. Access to shared information resources will assist such endeavours.

Open access to the outcomes of research will enhance the profile of universities and national research programs, contribute to the further advancement of knowledge, and recognise the public contribution to the funding of research.

Maintaining the quality and authority of academic publishing and the integrity of the scholarly record is of critical importance through any evolution.

Access to information is a cherished value of libraries and librarians. It builds informed communities, lowers barriers to learning, and contributes to the elimination of social and economic disadvantage.

CAUL acknowledges declarations in support of open access from the OECD supported by the Australian government, from the World Summit on the Information Society, the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), universities and university groups, research funding organisations, and from many bodies dedicated to the advancement of knowledge and the building of open democratic societies.

In agreement with the intentions of these statements CAUL declares it will work towards:

Building the infrastructure, such as institutional repositories, that will advance open access.

Raising awareness of the principles and practice of open access publishing within CAUL institutions.

The generation and implementation of public policies that ensure fair use of copyrighted information for educational and research purposes.

Cooperation with the Australian government to improve access to scholarly information, and to maximise the amount of information in the public domain.

Madeleine McPherson
3 August, 2004 (draft), revised 12 August, 2004
An open access publication is one that meets the following two conditions:

1. The author(s) and copyright holder(s) grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, world-wide, perpetual (for the lifetime of the applicable copyright) right of access to, and a licence to copy, use, distribute, perform and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works in any digital medium for any reasonable purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship, as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.

2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in a suitable standard electronic format is deposited immediately upon initial publication in at least one online repository that is supported by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organisation that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, interoperability, and long-term archiving.

An open access publication is a property of individual works, not necessarily of journals or of publishers.

Community standards, rather than copyright law, will continue to provide the mechanism for enforcement of proper attribution and responsible use of the published work, as they do now.

This definition of open access publication has been taken from A Position statement by the Wellcome Trust in support of open access publishing and was based on the definition arrived at by delegates who attended a meeting on open access publishing convened by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute in July 2003.
### CAUL Strategic Plan

**Report to CAUL**

**Author:** Ruth Quinn  
**Date:** 1 Sep 2004  
**Date of previous report:** 8 March 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Support for Teaching and Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Action** | Undertake research and evaluation in information literacy as a graduate attribute through:  
• Development of an information literacy assessment instrument  
• Development of evaluation measures which enable evaluation of library information literacy programs against university statements on graduate attributes  
• Working with ANZIIL and university staff to design research projects that will contribute to the development of best practice guidelines  
• Investigating the feasibility of deploying generic information literacy modules through collaborative effort  
• Other activities as proposed by CAUL |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Information Literacy Working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Activity since last report | As agreed at the last CAUL meeting the membership of ILWG was reduced from 17 to 9 as a result of a recommendation to CAUL Exec that the group consist of those staff members currently active in the field. Current membership is: Wendy Abbot (Bond), Debra Orr (CQU), Bernie Lingham (Deakin), Judy Peacock (QUT), Deb Turnbull (UQ), Margaret Henty (ANU), Irene Doskatsch (UniSA), and myself. Hester Mountifield from University of Auckland has been nominated as the CONZUL rep and has joined us for one teleconference so far. Margaret Henty from ANU has resigned and recommended Karen Visser from ANU take her place. The smaller working group is much easier to manage.  
3 Teleconferences held in April, June and September – notes to be available from the CAUL website.  
Project: Best Practice guidelines. Approval sought and received from ACRL to adopt their equivalent publication to Australian conditions. Brochure has been designed with the aim of having it available from the CAUL webpage for downloading by library staff as required.  
Project: Information Literacy Assessment Tool – Ralph Catts has sent a copy of the Technical Manual to Debra Orr (CQU) – it is currently going through a final edit process. Still to come is information on the Analysis process that Ralph has indicated will be available very soon.  
Project: Educative role of Librarians. The current focus of this project is |

---

**CAUL Meeting 2004/2**  
**Agenda item 630**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Achievements since last report</strong></th>
<th>See above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</strong></td>
<td>Best Practice Characteristics for Developing Information Literacy in Australian Universities: a guideline. Copies of the draft distributed to the ANZIIL Forum on “Information Literacy: Strategies for Success”, held in Canberra 15 July. Find attached two versions: a 3-fold and a 2-fold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan for forthcoming activity</strong></td>
<td>Finalisation of web page. Further projects will be considered once the Assessment project is finalised. Potential topics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transition from University to workplace, or high school to University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribution of IL to students’ success at both the workplace and University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAUL budget implications</strong></td>
<td>Cost of teleconferences for 2005: max $3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations to CAUL</strong></td>
<td>1. That the brochure entitled: Best Practice Characteristics for Developing Information Literacy in Australian Universities: a guideline be endorsed by CAUL and made available for downloading from the CAUL website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. That the Information Literacy Working Group continue in its current form for a further 12 month period. (Background: at the CAUL meeting held in Cairns Sep 2003, it was recommended that a sunset clause be inserted into the group’s terms of reference, initially to the end of 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. That Karen Visser from ANU replace Margaret Henty (ANU) on the working group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation / Curriculum Planning and Development

Information literacy development:

C1. Includes goals and objectives consistent with those of academic programs, departments and the institution.
C2. Identifies measurable outcomes for the evaluation of programs.
C3. Anticipates current and future opportunities and challenges.
C4. Embeds information literacy into academic and vocational curricula.
C5. Results in a fusion of information literacy concepts and disciplinary context.
C6. Endorses and facilitates a collaborative approach and includes librarians, academics, curriculum developers, teaching and learning specialists, and others.
C7. Ensures collaboration continues throughout a program lifecycle from planning through to delivery, assessment of student learning, evaluation and revision.
C8. Reflects sound pedagogical practice, and in particular:
   - Emphasizes student centred learning.
   - Supports diverse approaches to teaching.
   - Incorporates appropriate information technology and other media.
   - Includes active and collaborative exercises.
   - Encompasses critical thinking and reflection.
   - Responds to multi-learning styles.
   - Builds on students’ existing knowledge.
   - Links information literacy to ongoing coursework and real-life experiences appropriate to discipline and course levels.
C9. Identifies the depth and complexity of competencies to be acquired on a discipline level, as well as at the course level.
C10. Sequences and integrates competencies of increasing complexity throughout a student’s academic career.

Staff involved with information literacy:

C11. Serve as role models, exemplifying and advocating information literacy and lifelong learning.
C13. Develop experience in curriculum development and expertise to develop, coordinate, implement, maintain, and evaluate information literacy teaching and learning.
C14. Receive and actively engage in systematic and continual professional development and training.
C15. Receive regular evaluations about the quality of their contribution to information literacy teaching and learning.
C16. Engage in outreach activities to advance information literacy by:
   - Participating in campus professional development training by offering or cosponsoring workshops and programs that relate to information literacy.
   - Sharing information, methods and plans with peers from other institutions.
   - Communicate a clear message defining, describing, and promoting information literacy and its value to stakeholders.

Information literacy assessment and evaluation includes:

C17. Curriculum effectiveness:
   - Establishes a process of ongoing planning and improvement.
   - Measures direct progress toward meeting goals and objectives.
   - Integrates with course and curriculum assessment, as well as, institutional evaluations and regional/professional accreditation initiatives.
   - Assumes multiple methods and purposes for assessment and evaluation, such as formative and summative, short term and longitudinal.
C18. Student outcomes:
   - Acknowledges differences in learning and teaching styles by using a variety of appropriate outcome measures, such as portfolio assessment, quizzes, direct observation, peer and self evaluation, and experience.
   - Focuses on student performance, knowledge acquisition and attitude appraisal.
   - Asesses both process and product.
   - Includes student, peer and self evaluation.
C19. Periodic review of all assessment and evaluation methods.

Best Practice Characteristics for Developing Information Literacy in Australian Universities: a guideline

This Guideline articulates the characteristics of quality teaching and learning of information literacy in Australian higher education.

These characteristics represent a synthesis of practices and principles. They are drawn from a wide variety of approaches to information literacy teaching and learning, ranging from standalone programs through to information literacy that is integrated in core university curricula.
Purpose and Use

The Guideline defines three levels of involvement. The first level sets out best practice from the perspective of those who are engaged in establishing the strategic directions of the university. The second level covers operational planning and administration. The third level covers implementation. Such a division should not be regarded as absolute: no level can exist independently of the others and overlap is to be expected.

Information literacy is the responsibility of all in the higher education sector; this Guideline will be of interest to university administrators, as those who provide policy, funding and infrastructure for information literacy development, and to librarians, IT specialists and academic staff as those who design and deliver curriculum and learning experiences.

While this document is intended for universities, the concepts encompassed within it are also applicable to other educational sectors and to industry and the community.

Considering the diversity of Australian universities, the Guideline should not be regarded as prescriptive. Rather, it proposes a range of practices and principles that can be used as an aid to establishing, developing, assessing or improving information literacy teaching and learning.

The Guideline supports and complements the fundamental principles and standards laid out in the Australian and New Zealand Information Literacy Framework (2nd ed), developed by the Australian and New Zealand Institute for Information Literacy (ANZIIL) and the Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL).

History

In the development of the Guideline, the contribution of a number of groups is gratefully recognised: ANZIIL, CAUDIT, Australian School Library Association and the ALIA Information Literacy Group.

For further information about information literacy, see:

http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/
http://www.anziil.org

This guideline is adapted from the Association of College and Research Libraries’ Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline, June 2003.

Council of Australian University Librarians
Information Literacy Working Group
May 2004
Summary
Since 2001, UTS has conducted three Library Client Surveys, using the Rodski Behavioural Research Group surveys in 2002 and 2003, and the LibQUAL+ survey in 2004. This report compares experiences with the two products. UTS found that LibQUAL+ provided a better measure of services, a more reliable methodology, and was better value for money. A better response rate was also achieved by using an online survey with a direct email approach.

About the survey
Rodski is essentially a behavioural research company which develops its own surveys. LibQUAL+ was developed by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in the USA. Both surveys were designed to be conducted by individual institutions and also to have benchmarking capabilities with like institutions. LibQUAL+ must be conducted during a controlled time period. Rodski could be conducted at any time through the year which provides increased flexibility but this lack of time control may introduce seasonal differences in activity levels and service needs which could become significant when using the data for benchmarking with others.

1. Categories
a. Rodski focused on 5 categories:
   - Communication
   - Service Quality
   - Service Delivery
   - Facilities and Equipment
   - Library Staff
b. LibQUAL+ focused on 3 categories:
   - Affect of Service
   - Information Control
   - Library as Place

2. Statements (variables) and scales
Both surveys supplied standard statements with some options for customisation.

a. Rodski had 38 statements and the option to include up to 15 local service quality assessment statements which clients were asked to rate twice – firstly to measure the importance of each of the statements to them, and secondly to measure their impression of the library’s performance on each statement. These were scaled 1-7, with 7 being the most favourable. There were two comments boxes at the end of the survey – one for general comments and one for “the one area we could improve on to assist you”?

b. LibQUAL+ had 22 standard statements and the option to select five local service quality assessment statements. For each of which the client was asked to rate three times – for the minimum, desired and perceived levels of service quality. These were all scaled 1-9, with 9 being the most favourable. There was an open ended comments box about library services in general.

See Appendix 1 for the actual statements used.

3. What did they measure and report on?

Adequacy
The two surveys measured similar, but subtly different “gaps”. Both surveys measured an adequacy gap. Rodski measured the gap between the importance and the performance score of each variable. It might be claimed that this gap is being calculated between scores on two opposed scales. Something can be very important but respondents might have a much lower expectation of performance. Rodski interpreted (and reported on) gaps of two or above as “significant” on this 7 point scale. (See Alex Byrne’s paper to CAUL April 2003 for a fuller critique of Rodski technique). LibQUAL+ measured the gap between the minimum score and the perceived score for each statement.
They did not attempt to interpret the results for each individual institution, but gave general guidelines and some basic aids such as highlighting negative adequacy gaps in red.

**Importance**
Rodski flagged items where the importance was greater than 6 out of a possible 7, and listed the top 10. They also reported on the least important.

**Performance**
Rodksi reported on the top 10 performing variables and the lowest 10 performing variables. They were firstly compared with the previous year’s highest and lowest results for the institution *(if the survey has been run more than once)*. It was noted if any of these were in the top 10 most important list and then compared with other libraries which have performed the survey and rated them in the “top” or “bottom” 50% of the whole group.

LibQUAL+ did not address these areas specifically but gave overall means and standard deviations for each question. After all the surveys were closed, norms were provided for the three sections – ie affect of service, etc - from all other participants (in the category of “university or college”). Each participant was given access to the notebooks of all other participants in the same period. It was up to the participating institution to extract their own comparisons.

**4. The Reports**
The report from Rodski was 25 pages in length, with a further 263 pages of appendices. The appendices included:
- Response statistics
- Overall scores
- Results by Library – separately for each campus*
- Results by Category – separately for each category ie undergraduate, staff etc*
- Results by Faculty – separately for each Faculty *
- Results by Library visit frequency- separately for daily, monthly etc
- Results by online visit frequency - separately for daily, monthly etc
- Results by Campus visit frequency- separately for daily, monthly etc

* For each of these categories it provided:
- Mean scores for each question text
- A table showing priority areas
- A summary worksheet showing the top 10:
  - Most important factors
  - Highest performing factors
  - Largest gaps
  - Lowest performing factors

Rodski included a considerable amount of interpretation of the results, including the top 10 significant gaps – ie where there was greatest room for improvement. They also included a prioritising tool called a “gap grid” for visual representation. Rodski provided a comparative scorecard for UTS vs the entire Rodski client database, in each of the five categories as mentioned in (1). This enabled a comparison with the highest, lowest and median performers. Rodski also provided a one page “discussion” which summarised their findings for UTS.

The report or “notebook” from LibQUAL+ was available immediately after the survey closed and was printable directly from the webpage by the institution. It was about 95 pages and was of a standard format, simply populated by the survey data. It does not include any interpretation of the results for the individual institution. It provided scores for overall, undergraduate, postgraduate, academic staff, other staff and library staff. For each of these categories it provided:
- A radar graph – where each axis represents the scores for one question.
- Mean scores for each question text.
- Standard deviations for each question text.
- A graph showing the core dimensions summary
- A bar graph of Library use

---

**UTS: Report to CAUL on Rodski, LibQUAL+ September 2004**
Table 1. Additional Client Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LibQUAL+ 2004</th>
<th>Rodski 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of visits</strong></td>
<td>Included in a graph</td>
<td>Rodski provided general information plus a comparison of Top 5 gaps when sorted by Visit frequency category – ie the top 5 gaps for those who visited daily, weekly, rarely etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online visit frequency</strong></td>
<td>Included in a graph</td>
<td>Rodski provided general information plus a comparison of the top 5 gaps when sorted by this categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus visit frequency</strong></td>
<td>Included in a graph</td>
<td>Rodski provided general information plus a comparison of the top 5 gaps when sorted by this categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td>Provided tables on respondent profiles etc</td>
<td>Rodski reported on the top 5 gaps (or “improvement categories”) of each of the demographic groups in the tables, with a detailed analysis in the appendices, ie by campus Library, by course level, by Faculty. They also identified common and unique gaps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Benchmarking with other institutions

As mentioned in 3.2, Rodski provided a built-in comparison with other libraries who had run the survey. The relativities were given in terms of in the top or bottom 50% or by quadrant.

The LibQUAL+ survey provided access to the other institution notebooks, the norms of the entire survey and an interactive environment for data analysis where institutions could mine institutional data for peer comparisons. (At the time of this report the latter “interactive environment” tool was not yet available for 2004).

6. Survey administration

Rodski had the option to be run as an online or paper-based report. UTS ran the Rodski survey as both a paper and online survey but received fewer than 200 online responses each year compared to the much better response to the paper survey. UTS used the Rodski survey in 2002 and 2003 and ran it for a period of one week at each of our three campuses. This involved extra staff resources to hand out the survey and to prepare publicity in the form of posters etc.

LibQUAL+ was designed as an online survey, but there are options to print out paper based versions if the client had a problem accessing it. LibQUAL+ provides a web-based survey management area where institutions can manage our own survey. LibQUAL+ host the survey url, store all the data collected on their servers, analyse the results and provide reports including raw data files (in Excel and SPSS formats) and interactive statistics page on the web site where participants can further manipulate the data and results. UTS used the LibQUAL+ survey in 2004 and ran it as an online survey only. The only staff member involved was the Library Business Manager who took some time to set up the survey customisation, send emails etc. This survey was conducted for a one month period. The only publicity used was via email and on our library webpage. A basic set of FAQ’s was provided by LibQUAL+ for institutions to link to or adjust and put on their own website, to forestall problems. All customisation was done directly on to the website.

7. Online communication

The LibQUAL+ survey involved directly emailing clients with a link to the survey. UTS chose to send emails to the entire staff body and the entire student body, rather than try to formulate a representative group and target them only. Once permission was received from the VC and the Registrar to send these emails, 4 emails were sent, spaced over the 4 week period. On the advice of LibQUAL+ users, the first email was a preparatory email. “The Library will be sending you a survey in the next few days…” This also included the aims, approximately how long it would take, and the fact that we would be offering some incentive prizes. We offered $30 book vouchers. The second, third and fourth emails asked the clients to participate in the survey together with a link to the survey site and apologised nicely if they had already completed it.

The technique of directly emailing to our entire client population resulted in a high number of responses and a good representation of the subsets of the population. Responses from Postgraduate students and Academic staff increased by 500% on the previous survey.
Both surveys provided substantial amounts of qualitative data in the form of comments.

### Table 2: Comparison of responses and comments for UTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>3,201 responses</td>
<td>1,553 responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>1400 comments</td>
<td>95 pages of comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excel/SPSS</td>
<td>Comments in excel or SPSS</td>
<td>Comments in word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort/Filter</td>
<td>Comments sortable and filterable by campus, faculty, client category, age group, sex.</td>
<td>Comments only sorted by campus. There were no other fields available to sort on. Required considerable massaging to get them into a format suitable for our purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For LibQUAL+, some clients commented on the actual survey. They thought the questions were repetitive and suggested they could do better. [The response from LibQUAL+ on this was that the survey methodology was extremely sound. There are a number of repetitions of similar type questions to verify the reliability of the survey]. A small number of respondents (fewer than 20) reported they could not get on the website to take the survey.

### 9. Problems with online

The LibQUAL+ survey server was located at the Texas A & M University in the USA. For about 36 hours this server was not able to be accessed as they succumbed to the SASSER worm virus, but no other problems with server access occurred.

Another problem which we faced was the lag time as USA was some hours behind and their service desk was not operational when UTS was active. At this time UTS was the only Australian site, but these support issues have been noted and only one instance of service support was needed during our trial.

### 10. Cost

Rodski 2003 cost more than AUD $9,000 but there is a cheaper option which costs about the same as LibQual+. LibQUAL+ is currently USD $2,250 per institution.

### 11. Overall impressions from UTS

Basically the two surveys measured similar areas, and both provided adequate feedback on Library services for the needs of UTS. Rodski did not do so well in providing useful and useable information for benchmarking with other institutions.

The Rodski survey provided much more interpretation of the results as opposed to LibQUAL+ which provided data plus standard deviations and norms and left the interpretation to the user. As there are many factors to be considered, it is probably of more value to the institution to interpret the data themselves, and being aware of exactly what was being compared.

LibQUAL+ provided a more reliable survey in terms of measuring the gap between performance and delivery on the same scale.

For UTS, LibQUAL+ had the edge in terms of having an extremely user-friendly interface, reasonable cost, comments provided in excel format, and a high response rate for a minimum of staff resources. The methodology of LibQUAL+ in using direct emailing was more successful than just having a survey available on a website.

Beth Marnane
UTS Library Business Manager
September 2004
Comparison of questions from Rodski survey 2003 and LibQUAL + 2004 for UTS. Some questions were customised for UTS in both surveys, so this list may not reflect exactly the same set of questions which other institutions used.

Rodski has 5 categories of questions, as mentioned in 1.1. For the purposes of comparison in this report they have been arbitrarily rearranged into the three LibQUAL+ categories.

Table 3. Comparison of questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect of Service</th>
<th>LibQUAL+ 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RODSKI 2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. C. Library staff describe clearly the services on offer.</td>
<td>1. Library staff who instill confidence in users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C Library staff provide clear &amp; useful feedback on my enquiries</td>
<td>2. Giving users individual attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C Library staff acknowledge and handle problems in a professional manner.</td>
<td>3. Library staff who are consistently courteous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. C Telephone calls are answered politely and in a timely manner.</td>
<td>4. Readiness to respond to users’ enquiries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SQ Requests for information are followed through.</td>
<td>5. Library staff who have the knowledge to answer user questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SQ Library staff do what they say they will do for me.</td>
<td>6. Library staff who deal with users in a caring fashion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SQ Library staff act on my suggestions and ideas.</td>
<td>7. Library staff who understand the needs of their users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SQ Library staff provide the services I need.</td>
<td>8. Willingness to help users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SQ Library staff provide accurate answers.</td>
<td>9. Dependability in handling users’ service problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SQ Library staff keep developing new services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SQ Library staff display initiative in their dealings with me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SD Library staff are readily available to assist me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SD Library staff are customer-focused.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SD Service desk staff respond in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SD Library staff give my enquiries appropriate time and attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SD Library staff help me at the computer workstation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. LS Library staff display professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. LS Library staff are friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. LS Library staff treat me fairly and without discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. LS Library staff take an interest in me and my needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Information control**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rodski 2003*</th>
<th>LibQUAL+  2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. C. Access to electronic databases is easily available.</td>
<td>1. Making electronic resources accessible from my home or office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C Information resources (books, electronic, etc) are easily accessed.</td>
<td>2. A library web site enabling me to locate material on my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C The Library keeps me informed about new services and resources.</td>
<td>3. The printed library materials I need for my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SD Materials are processed rapidly for inclusion in the collection</td>
<td>4. The electronic information resources I need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SD Prompt corrective action is taken regarding missing books and journals.</td>
<td>5. Modern equipment that lets me easily access needed information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SD Books and journals are reshelved quickly.</td>
<td>6. Easy-to-use access tools that allow me to find things on my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SD Library catalogue provides clear and useful information.</td>
<td>7. Making information easily accessible for independent use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SD Requests for items from other libraries are followed through promptly.</td>
<td>8. Print and/or electronic journal collections I require for my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SD The Library collection is adequate to my needs.</td>
<td>9. Extra - Availability of online help when using my library’s electronic resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SD I can access the electronic journals and databases I need.</td>
<td>10. Extra – Personalization features in the electronic library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SD The Library provides the self-service options I want in the Library.</td>
<td>11. Extra – Teaching me how to access, evaluate and use information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. SD The Library provides the online and remote self-service options I want.</td>
<td>12. Extra – Library keeping me informed about all of its services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SD Library web pages provide clear and useful information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. FE Resources and services are accessible for people with a disability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. FE Adequate signage exists within the Library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. FE Computer facilities/electronic equipment work well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. FE Number of computer workstations is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. FE Photocopying facilities are adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. FE Printing facilities are adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Library as place**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rodski 2003*</th>
<th>LibQUAL+  2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SD 17 Opening hours meet my needs.</td>
<td>1. Library space that inspires study and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FE Group study facilities are adequate</td>
<td>2. Quiet space for individual work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FE Lounge seating is adequate.</td>
<td>3. A comfortable and inviting location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FE Quiet study areas are adequate.</td>
<td>4. A haven for study, learning, or research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FE Library is a safe and secure place to study.</td>
<td>5. Space for group learning and group study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key to Rodski question categories coding*

C = Communication  
SQ = Service Quality  
SD = Service Delivery  
FE = Facilities and Equipment  
LS = Library Staff
CAUL Strategic Plan  
Report to CAUL

Author: Felicity McGregor

(Date: 1.9.04; Date of previous report: 21.3.04)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>BEST PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1. Review and develop indicators of the quality of library information and research services and develop measures to support them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Review the Rodski customer satisfaction surveys following the second cycle of use by members, in 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Best Practice Working Group (Felicity McGregor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>1. Trial and report by April 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. No plan for formal review unless CAUL decides otherwise. See Recommendation below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity and Achievements since last report</td>
<td>Performance Indicators for Digital Reference (Information and Research) Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The results of the Performance Indicators for Digital Reference Services survey have been posted to the CAUL website. Information from twenty three respondents has been included in the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project was discussed recently by UNISON. The minutes show &quot;It has been reported to the CAUL Best Practice Working Group that most respondents are interested in proceeding with developing performance indicators but would not be interested in taking a leading role. After some discussion it was suggested that the UNISON Reference Group scope a project to develop Performance Indicators for Digital Reference (Information and Research) Services based on the survey findings. Funding will be provided by UNISON. CAUL is advised that UNISON is instructing the Reference Group to scope and report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most participants have administered the survey more than once. Diane has advised that a new list has been established for discussion of Rodski (and other client surveys, following a recommendation from Bond).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The current agreement will expire on 31/12/04. Diane will contact members to seek commitment for the next 12 months. Stan Rodski is committed to providing and updating the CAUL portal free of charge. Libraries who don’t participate every year are still granted access to the portal in their non-participating year. Rodski has been receptive to suggested changes from members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LibQUAL+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Hiller, U. of Washington, will be in Australia from Nov 19 to Jan 18. Steve is interested in “connecting with Australia” and discussing assessment activities including LibQual+.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UTS has trialled LibQual+ and will report. LATN may be discussing LibQual+.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practice Web Pages

The results of the BPWG Survey of Top Performing Libraries in Client Satisfaction has been posted to the Caul Survey Register and linked from the Best Practice pages. Feedback on the usefulness of this survey has been positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</th>
<th>AVCC Library Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derek Whitehead and Felicity McGregor led a session on client relationship management – surveys and other feedback mechanisms - at this conference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan for forthcoming activity

See recommendations

Recommendations to CAUL

**Rodski:**

1. That CAUL members renew their commitment to the Rodski Client Satisfaction Survey, noting this is the only CAUL indicator enabling national benchmarking.

2. Agreed recommendations from Rodski librarians be forwarded via the BPWG to Rodski for comment and action. Eg catering for external students.

**Performance Indicators for Digital Reference (Information and Research) Services:**

That CAUL accept the proposal that the UNISON Reference Group will be funded to scope and propose a tight set of performance indicators, based on the CAUL survey findings and current international practice relating to Performance Indicators in Digital Reference (Information and Research) Services. It is suggested that a .5 Hew 6 staff member will be provided for 4 months to coordinate and support the Group to ensure a clear outcome with a pilot trial by interested libraries before the next CAUL meeting.
# CAUL Strategic Plan
## Report to CAUL

**Author:** Derek Whitehead  
(Date: September 2004; Date of previous report: April 2004)

"Cheap, useful, fairly valid."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>3 - Management for Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Collect and publish statistics on Australasian university library outputs and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Review the current CAUL statistical measures – presentation format, usefulness, use and users and present a plan and proposal to CAUL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Statistics Focus Group / Derek Whitehead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity since last report</strong></td>
<td>Since the last meeting of CAUL (in April 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The CAUL Statistics Focus Group has had an in-person meeting (on 6 August) attended by Derek Whitehead, Jocelyn Priddey, Diane Costello, David Groenewegen, Cathie Jilovsky, Stephen Gillespie and Gehan Aboud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The 2003 data collection has been completed and will be made available on the CAUL web site before the end of August 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The CSFG has pilot tested four proposed new measures, viz. number of logins, number of database searches, number of full-text retrievals, and expenditure on online resources. Three have proven impractical, and one (expenditure) will be collected in 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We considered a pilot website developed by CAVAL to provide enhanced functionality for the CAUL statistics, together with several versions of a proposal, and will provide a separate report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The CASL statistics coordinator, Janice Van de Velde, attended the August meeting, and is being copied into CSFG communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievements since last report</strong></td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</strong></td>
<td>2003 statistics; Minutes of the meeting on 6 August 2004; CAVAL report to the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan for forthcoming activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meet next in Sydney in conjunction with Online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review the 2003 data collection and finalise any changes to the collection instrument; send out requests for statistics early 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide an approach to dual sector university reporting – a TAFE deflator – which permits better comparisons between institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implement new method of data collection and presentation, subject to CAUL approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monitor COUNTER progress and re-consider new statistical measures when they become feasible – perhaps for 2005 data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Consider the issue of statistics for offshore and international services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations to CAUL</strong></td>
<td>That this report be accepted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAUL Statistics Focus Group
Meeting held Friday, 6 August, 2004
from 9.30 to 12.00
Swinburne Library

DRAFT Minutes (updated 17/8/04)

1. Attendance & Apologies. Derek Whitehead, chair; Cathie Jilovsky; Stephen Gillespie; Gehan Aboud; David Groenewegen; Diane Costello; Jocelyn Priddey. 
   Guest: Janice Van de Velde, State Library of Victoria.

2. Minutes of Meeting held 3 February, 2004. The minutes were accepted.

3. Business Arising from Previous Meetings.

4. Report on 2003 Data Collection. Cathie Jilovsky spoke to the papers circulated, including the draft of the 2003 statistics. The external eftsu column is still unfinished because the data has to be obtained from DEST. There is no data date on the DEST web site so it is not clear whether there is a single date or whether it is different for each institution. [Later note from Cathie Jilovsky confirms the staff date as March 31 and the student date as August 31] It is expected that the data collection will be completed by the end of August. Only one institution has not yet submitted its data. It was noted that DEST would continue to present static data as it does now despite the use of HEIMS which ensures that the data input to DEST is continuous.

   a) Rankings & Presentation of 2003 data. Cathie Jilovsky noted that she had included two rows for sub-totals of Australian and New Zealand data. Diane Costello recommended that the Australian and New Zealand rankings be kept separate. It was confirmed that expenditure for New Zealand should be reported in NZD, and that the relevant columns be sub-totalled, but not totalled. (Action: CJ)

   b) TAFE Numbers And Dual Sector Institutions. Derek Whitehead recommended that the university number of 720 hours per eftsu be used, a change from the current numbers of 540. It is possible to convert the data retrospectively. 22% is used at the conversion factor for copyright payment calculations. Derek Whitehead plans to work on a conversion number for TAFE to higher education students. At Swinburne TAFE students use approximately 11% of online resources. (Action: DW)

5. Development of the 2003 Deemed List for 2004 Data Collection. Diane Costello explained the purpose of the deemed list for the benefit of Janice. Cathie Jilovsky reported that more people completed the deemed list correctly this year. It was noted that several institutions do not use it. The first three packages noted by ANU weren’t started until 2004, although some individual institutions did start early. It was agreed that BioMed Central titles did not comprise a package, but were individual packages. The use of the deemed list only for complete packages should continue to be emphasised. (Action: CJ)

6. E-Metrics Trial Data Collection. Four measures were used to collect data on a trial basis. It was agreed that it is too early to collect this data in a consistent and cohesive fashion, but it does identify what we want to aim for. A very simple driver for this collection is that loans are reducing, and the usage data is needed to show where the usage has moved to. COUNTER-compliant vendor-supplied statistics are required for all services. EZProxy use is flawed. Monash has a software package developed locally to identify usage down to the faculty level. It has monitored only off-campus usage to date, but now monitoring on-campus usage. It was suggested that EZProxy use won’t necessarily map consistently against vendor-produced...
statistics. Both will be complicated by the use of federated searches, using systems such as AARLIN. Cross-search will potentially skew data dramatically because a federated search will conduct searches of more databases with the one search. It is highly likely that use of online resources is much greater than loans and in-house use of physical resources.

The number of downloads is likely to be the only really useful figure because of the difficulty of interpreting session and search data. The only measure that can usefully be applied right now is expenditure, which is also subject to interpretation. More universities are choosing to centralise funds for electronic resources. UQ maintains details of expenditure to support each faculty.

It was agreed to recommend including expenditure on electronic resources in the 2004 data collection. (Action: DW) It was agreed to include as a separate column, 51B, and not be optional for 2004.

It was agreed to include the University of Notre Dame for 2004. (Action: DC)

7. Proposal for CAUL Online Statistics. Cathie Jilovsky spoke to the proposal from CAVAL. She highlighted the two options – the first based on a SAS database (enterprise level statistical database whose licence is very expensive, AUD 30,000 upfront and an annual cost of AUD 15,000). There is potential for the site to be hosted by a university which holds a SAS licence already. CAVAL did look at using SPSS, but determined that an Open Source option, with local development, would be preferred.

System functionality indicates only being able to search across 7 institutions at one time, a limitation of the ARL service. It was agreed that this limitation should be investigated, and solutions to multiple-site comparisons found. (Action: CJ)

Need to be able to compare data across years; needs to include all the functionality required by CAUL in the first implementation.

Converting data from earlier years is made more complicated by the changes in the number of institutions and the different column definitions, so that data is more difficult to map. It was agreed to include this additional detail in the proposal.

The ARL Index Data isn’t relevant to CAUL because it includes the calculation of rankings of ARL institutions. It is multi-factor ranking. It was agreed that the URL of the site should be http://statistics.caul.edu.au/ (Action: DC)

In the initial year, the current system and the new system would function side-by-side. The first logical process would be the data input model. It is important to show how the two systems will overlap on an item-by-item basis. (Action: CJ)

It was suggested that the input process be described, to show some of the expertise, if any, required by the data entry person. Input would be via the web, with drop-down lists, showing the previous year’s data, with some automatic checking to flag potential problems. Input will be restricted to authorised personnel, but access will be fully open for readers. It was noted that the collection of data may happen over a period of time, and the working data should be able to be saved until it is ready to submit. An export function should permit dumping of data in the interim and at the end. (Action: CJ)

The costing of the input module should be included in the proposal. The proposal should address the priorities identified in the CAUL survey of 2003. The data definition should be included as part of the data entry process. (Action: CJ)

It was noted that definitions back to 1999 are now included on the web site. CAVAL possibly has electronic versions back to 1992. (Action: CJ, DC)

8. COUNTER. The first Draft of Release 2 of the Code of Practice was published on the COUNTER website during April, where it will be available for comments until September. Compliance with Release 2 will solve many of the practical problems associated with using the data. This includes having access to Excel files so that data doesn’t have to be reconfigured, and the presentation format which shows totals in the top rows so they can be stripped off for use.
There will still be problems because of the number of vendors who aren't yet COUNTER-compliant. It was recommended using only the data that are COUNTER-compliant.

It was agreed to include a column in the deemed list to identify which vendors are COUNTER-compliant. (Action: DC)

It would be useful to include a data collection instrument that everyone can use.

9. **Collaboration with CASL.** Derek Whitehead introduced Janice Van de Velde, who has responsibility for CASL statistics. It was suggested that there may be areas of cooperation with CAUL. The CASL performance group is looking at potential areas for measurement at both the state level and the public library level. Identifying both quantitative and qualitative measures to be used. CASL will concentrate on information literacy, separate from IT literacy, early literacy, partnerships with education and cultural sectors, on-site visits (some have formulae for door counts), donated material (some measure dollar value), all do customer service surveys, % and dollar value of collections digitised, number of participants in Kinetica, PictureAustralia, etc, the number of libraries complying with indigenous protocols, expenditure on consortial purchases etc

CAUL’s reasons for collecting the data are that they are politically useful and comparable, and it now uses the motto “cheap, useful and fairly valid.” It is recognised that they are not going to be completely comparable across institutions.

Derek Whitehead has identified some areas of CAUDIT data collections that overlap with CAUL’s eg computer laboratories, open access computers.

It was agreed to add Janice to the CSFG list. (Action: DC)

10. **Next Meeting.** The next meeting will be held in Sydney in conjunction with Online. (Action: DC)

a) **Counting International Campuses and Services.**

11. **Other Business.**

The meeting concluded at 12.15pm
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Proposal

CAUL Online Statistics

Cathie Jilovsky
Information Services Manager

18th August 2004
1 Introduction

This is a proposal for the development and provision of an online statistical website for Australian and New Zealand academic library statistics. The resulting service will enhance the existing functionality and also provide a platform for enabling significant improvements to be made to the collection and publication processes for the CAUL statistics.

Earlier versions of this proposal have been considered by the CAUL Statistics Focus Group and the CAUL Executive. Feedback from these groups has been incorporated.

2 Background

Statistics have been collected annually for the Australian University Library community since 1953, and were originally published in "News Sheet of the University and College Libraries Section, Library Association of Australia". They are now published annually in print form in the journal AARL, and all data back to 1983 has been made available on the CAUL web site as Excel spreadsheets. The data includes New Zealand University libraries.

CAVAL has been managing the annual collection and publication of the Australian and New Zealand academic library statistics for CAUL since 1992. During this period CAVAL has also undertaken the retrospective conversion of data from earlier years into Excel format and has provided statistical consultancy services to CAUL, universities and a range of other clients.

CAUL’s contract with CAVAL was renewed in November 2003 for a further five years. The proposal included an outline of possible additional projects, one of which was “to develop an online statistical website for the CAUL Statistics, based on the existing ARL site”. The well-known Association of Research Libraries (ARL) online statistics website has long been considered a desirable model. This site was developed and is maintained by the University of Virginia.

In 2003, the CAUL Statistics Focus Group conducted a survey to identify gaps and improvements within the statistical gathering questions and to gather feedback from CAUL libraries on their future requirements and usability of the statistics. Analysis of the survey data indicates strong support from CAUL members for the expansion of functionality of the current CAUL statistics web site, with the strongest support being for online benchmarking.

The following improvements were supported by the indicated percentage of respondents:

- Produce graphs and tables from the data 87.7%
- Develop flexible comparison of selected libraries across selected years 85.7%
- Create data sub-sets for comparison 83.9%
- Download the data year by year in spreadsheet format 80.7%
- Conduct online quantitative benchmarking 80.4%

An alternative statistical service, BIBLIOSTAT, which includes an online component, was investigated by CAUL and CAVAL in 2002. However for a number of reasons, including
a very high annual cost and the overseas hosting of the service, taking up the service has not been seriously considered.

In 2003 CAVAL established a partnership with the ARL. This has enabled CAVAL to work with the ARL and the University of Virginia to develop a pilot CAUL Online Statistical site. This proposal addresses the upgrading of the pilot site into a live service for CAUL.

3 Objectives

- Development and provision of an online statistical website
- Implementation of enhanced functionality incorporating the recommended outcomes from the CAUL 2003 Statistics survey
- Improvements to the collection and publication processes for the CAUL Statistics
- Provision of a sustainable online statistical service for CAUL

4 Methodology

4.1 Pilot CAUL online statistical web site

The ARL Statistics Web site is at http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/arl/. This site contains data back to 1962 and allows the user to review the library data collected by ARL, generate rankings of institutions by selected criteria, create graphs from the data, generate summary statistics for all ARL libraries, download the data by year in spreadsheet format and review the ARL index and membership criteria. The site was developed by and is maintained and hosted by the University of Virginia.

CAVAL began discussions with the ARL about possible approaches for creating a similar site for CAUL several years ago. More recently, ARL and the University of Virginia supplied CAVAL, as the preferred developer of an Australian online statistical web site, with background details on the construction of the site and copies of the scripts used.

Following the endorsement by the CAVAL Board of a formal partnership between CAVAL and ARL in mid 2003, the CAVAL Information Services Manager visited the ARL offices in early 2004 with the objective of furthering the details of the partnership. Discussions with the ARL and the University of Virginia led to the development of a CAUL online statistics pilot site by the University of Virginia. This site, at http://fisher.lib.virginia.edu/test/caul/ was made available in May 2004. It incorporates a sub-set of the data (11 data elements) for the 10 years (1994 to 2003).

Staff from CAUL and CONZUL libraries who are responsible for the statistical data collection have been encouraged to use the pilot site. The demand for such a service is clear from the feedback received.

“people here think the site is a great idea”
“I would like to see some of the qualitative statistics up, eg % of expenditure on library resources, etc. Statistics that measure more than sheer numbers, there are a number of these included in the rankings table”

“I found the site really easy to use - being able to select different categories is quite useful. The download worked okay - can’t wait to have all of the data available - it is a useful way to do comparisons between libraries”.

“This is excellent and really makes the stats a lot more useful and easy to manipulate. …. The key use [will be] as an external benchmarking tool”.

4.2 System design
The ARL online statistics site and the pilot CAUL online statistics site consist of HTML forms/pages, CGI/PERL scripts, and a set of data stored in SAS v.8, all running on an IBM RS6000 server using Apache as the webserver. Choices executed on the form are parsed by the CGI scripts and used to generate SAS code that is run in the background on the server; the output from these SAS programs are written to standard output and temporary directories on the server, and passed back out in HTML written by still other components of the CGI scripts. This model requires a licensed copy of SAS running on a UNIX box.

Following analysis of the ARL system and scripts by CAVAL IT staff, along with advice from the University of Virginia technical staff, SAS Australia and a local Melbourne software development company, it has been determined that there are two alternative ways of designing and constructing a system for CAUL –

(i) Modification of existing scripts provided by the University of Virginia in conjunction with the implementation and data loading on a SAS server
(ii) Development of a custom solution combining a relational database to provide back-end data storage and manipulation functionality combined with the development of a web front-end to serve the data.

Although the University of Virginia is not able to provide either consultancy or development services to CAVAL for the migration of the pilot into a live site, they are very willing to share information about their service and provide advice.

Utilization of the SAS option requires less development to form the CAUL web site as the ARL scripts provide most of the detail. However SAS licenses, both to purchase and to maintain, are very expensive and the costs of these are greater than the savings in development time. The development of a SAS based system would require that CAVAL either train an employee to become a SAS advanced user, engage a subcontractor with this knowledge or utilize SAS consultancy services.

The database option could be developed using Open Source products (MySQL and Linux). The benefits include no license costs and low hardware specification requirements. However, the cost of developing the “front end” is higher, as more development time will be required. Although the ARL scripts can still be used to provide the major part of the functionality, code will have to be written to communicate with the MySQL database.
After consideration of both the financial and technical aspects CAVAL recommends that the OpenSource option be used. Although additional programming will be required to interface with the ARL scripts, the resulting system will be cheaper to develop and operate, and will offer greater flexibility for the future.

4.3 System Functionality
Five of the six functional areas of the ARL Online Statistics site have been incorporated into the CAUL Online Statistics prototype site. The sixth ARL functional area, the calculation of and ranking by the ARL Index Data (volumes held, volumes added gross, current serials, total library expenditures, and total staff, as published annually in the US Chronicle of Higher Education) is not relevant to the CAUL community. It is proposed that the CAUL production site retain these five components.

4.3.1 Institutional Data
The ARL site and the CAUL prototype site allow the selection of an unlimited number of variables for up to seven institutions. The report displays the requested information for a selected year. It is proposed that the CAUL live site will allow up to ten institutions to be selected. The limit of ten may be able to be increased, subject to usability testing and satisfactory screen display of the results.

4.3.2 Ranked Lists
Allows the selection of the variable to be displayed, the year, and the order in which to sort the results. A ratio can be calculated by selecting both a numerator variable and denominator variable. Results are displayed for all the institutions in the dataset in ranked order.

4.3.3 Summary Statistics
Provides descriptive statistics for all of the institutions in the data set. The user must select the year and the variable to be displayed. Either a single variable can be selected or a ratio can be calculated by choosing one variable as a numerator and another as a denominator. The mean and the median for the selected variable or ratio can also be displayed. Results are displayed for the top five and bottom five institutions for the variable or ratio selected.

4.3.4 Graphs
The ARL site and the CAUL prototype site allow the production of a graph for one institution (or median institution value) and up to seven variables, or up to seven institutions and one variable. For one institution and multiple variables, a range of years, one institution (or median institution value), and up to seven variables can be selected. For multiple institutions and one variable, a range of years, up to seven institutions, and one variable or ratio must be selected. It is proposed that the CAUL live site will allow up to ten institutions to be selected. The limit of ten may be able to be increased, subject to usability testing and satisfactory screen display of the results.

4.3.5 Download Data
Allows the user to extract and download a subset of the data by selecting the institutions, geographic regions (i.e. one or more Australian States or New Zealand), variables, and year(s) for which the data is required. The complete set of data for regions or institutions, variables and years may also be downloaded. The requested dataset is delivered in a comma-delimited format, and may be viewed in Microsoft Excel. Institutions (either all
institutions or the median institution value) or regions (not both), years, and variables must be selected.

4.3.6 Future Online Functionality
The online statistics site may be further developed to streamline the data collection process and enable further benchmarking between libraries. The following potential features have been identified.

4.3.6.1 Retrospective data import
Initially, it is proposed that the most recent 10 years data will be exported out of the current Microsoft Excel files and imported into the Online Statistics server. One of the objectives of the CAUL Statistics Focus Group has been to minimize changes in order to maintain consistency over time and this will make the importing of the 1994 to 2003 data relatively straightforward.

Should CAUL members express interest in a larger data set, CAVAL will be able to import retrospective data at additional cost. Although the 1983 to 1993 data exists in Excel form, the conversion of this data will be complex as there are many variations in data column numbers and definitions as well as institutional names.

The data files for 1969 to 1982 were created in various mainframe versions of SPSS. These files have been converted from magnetic tape to disk and are stored on the CAVAL file server. Further work will be required to convert each file firstly into SPSS for Windows format, then into Excel format and finally into the online database.

4.3.6.2 Input Module
The online statistical facility will provide a platform for improving the data collection process. An online input form is an obvious component, to replace the current cumbersome Microsoft Excel data spreadsheets. The input module would be designed to efficiently manage the data collection process.

Proposed features

- one logon per contributing institution
- data can be entered over multiple sessions, and will only be added to the database when the “Submit” option is selected
- online data validation, with warnings when data is ‘out of range’
- comparison with the previous years data during input, with warnings of a variation of more than 10% and an override option
- online instructions and definitions
- data submitted can be saved as an Excel file for local record-keeping
- facility to enter comments

4.3.6.3 Expanded Data Download Options
The facility to download statistics from the Online site in addition to the graphs and tables that the Online service will provide is another potentially useful facility. The extract of raw data may then be used for further local calculations.

4.3.6.4 Comparison and benchmarking
The online system may be developed to compare and display statistical data dependant on user selected variables.
4.4 System Hosting

It is proposed that the system be hosted by CAVAL. This service will include system operation and maintenance including, hardware, operating system, database, web server and network components.

The system will be available via the URL <statistics.caul.edu.au>.

CAVAL is connected to the VRN (Victorian Regional Network) via La Trobe University, which will provide adequate bandwidth for this hosting scenario. There would be minimal network usage charges for the system, as CAVAL is only charged for downstream traffic through the VRN (i.e. downloading). The service would be supported from 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday, with downtime availability dependent on the above external service providers (La Trobe University Information Technology Services and the VRN).

4.5 Project Management

CAVAL will provide project management for all aspects of the development and implementation processes, and for overseeing the operational system. The University of Virginia technical staff will be consulted as and when required. Regular progress reports will be provided to the CAUL Statistics Focus Group.

4.6 Development Schedule

CAVAL could commence the development of the Online site approximately one month after acceptance of this proposal by CAUL. The Online system would be ready for testing two months later. Should CAUL decide to incorporate the Input module into the initial development, every endeavour will be made to have the input module ready for testing by December 2004, so that it can go into production for the collection of the 2004 data, which is scheduled to commence in February 2005.
5  Fees

5.1 Development

Online site plus Data input module

Hosted service setup fee $10,584

Includes hardware purchase and installation; hosted service setup and configuration; database and web setup.

System development $26,999

Incorporates detailed system design using ARL scripts; development programming and web-site configuration; data conversion and loading, system testing and project management

TOTAL $37,583 (ex GST)

5.2 Operations – annual cost

Online site plus Data input module

Hosted service fee $7,970

Incorporates operation of hosted service; hardware, system, network, web and database maintenance; internet traffic costs

System maintenance $4,640

Incorporates software maintenance, fine-tuning of system functionality and operations, liaison with the ARL and project management.

TOTAL $12,610 (ex GST)

The annual cost will be increased cumulatively each year by the CPI figure as measured for the commencement of each year

5.3 Current annual cost

The current contract covers the Annual Collection and Publication of the CAUL Statistics from 2003 to 2007. The base price is $19,000, being the price for the collection of the 2003 statistics, to be undertaken during 2004. This fee will be increased cumulatively each year by the CPI figure as measured for the commencement of each year.

5.4 Integrated annual cost

The development and implementation of the Data input module would reduce the annual cost of the annual Collection and Publication process to $15,000.

The following table shows the proposed charges for the remainder of the current contract term, assuming the development begins in 2004 and becomes operational in 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Data year</th>
<th>Collection &amp; Publication</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE: all prices exclude GST and annual CPI increases.

### 6 Terms and conditions

#### 6.1 Development
Progress payments will be invoiced as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online plus data input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On acceptance of proposal</td>
<td>10% $3,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On commencement</td>
<td>20% $7,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At end of month 1</td>
<td>20% $7,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At end of month 2</td>
<td>20% $7,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On completion of testing</td>
<td>20% $7,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On commencement of live operation</td>
<td>10% $3,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% $37,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.2 Operations
One annual payment will be invoiced at the commencement of each calendar year.

#### 6.3 GST
GST of 10% will be added to all invoices

#### 6.4 Variations
Any variations to the details of this proposal entailing additional work will be quoted for and invoiced separately.

### 7 Acceptance
Signed by ________________________________ (name)

______________________________ (title) for and on behalf of CAUL

on ________________________________ (date)
8 About CAVAL Collaborative Solutions

CAVAL Collaborative Solutions (CAVAL) is a consortium owned jointly by the Vice-Chancellors of the Victorian universities and the State Library of Victoria. Established in 1978, CAVAL provides services to its members and is a long-standing provider of services to the information and knowledge sectors throughout Australia.

CAVAL provides the following services to the Australasian information sector and beyond -

*Consultancy services*
Intranet development and content management, information audit, KM strategy development, scenario planning, social research, database maintenance, statistics, information and records management systems.

*Information Management and Access*
Metadata, cataloguing, thesaurus development, records management and document delivery services.

*Professional Development and Training*
CAVAL offers a program of practical hands-on courses, seminars and workshops that enhance the knowledge and update the skills of information professionals. These include metadata, risk management and recovery, managing electronic records, preservation, using and evaluating e-resources, information auditing and cataloguing. New programs will be offered this year on intranet development and management and communities of practice. As a Registered Training Organisation (RTO) CAVAL is able to offer educational credit for selected courses.

*Multilingual Solutions*
Solutions can be provided in over fifty languages. These languages are applied to translations, transliterations, metadata, abstracting, research, reference services and document delivery.

*Product Support and Management*
CAVAL provides Support and Management services for a range of software products, along with associated Help Desk, configuration and training services. CAVAL has established consortia for several products and is well placed to provide consortia and management services for other products and services.

*Preservation and Storage*
The CARM (CAVAL Archival and Research Materials) store has a one million volume storage capacity for low-use research materials as well as short-term storage. Materials are stored in a humidity and temperature controlled environment and are fully retrievable.

8.1 CAVAL’s Statistical services
CAVAL Collaborative Solutions collects and publishes the annual library statistical collection for a number of groups of libraries. This enables them to create historical collections of data that can assist in management decisions, in benchmarking and in making submissions for grant monies. VATL (Victorian Association of TAFE Librarians) and CAUL are current customers of this service.
CAVAL offers consultancy services such as data collection, data verification, data publication and specialised statistical analysis for libraries. CAVAL staff have expertise in SPSS and Excel. Recent customers of these services include the National TAFE Working Group, Hong Kong Polytechnic and Curtin University.
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# CAUL Strategic Plan

## Report to CAUL

**Author:** Eve Woodberry

**Date:** 1 September 2004

**Date of previous report:** March 2004

### Section
Advocacy, Marketing, Communication

### Action
- Present CAUL position to copyright meetings, references and inquiries.
- Represent CAUL at meetings involving copyright issues in various forums.

### Responsibility
- Represent CAUL and provide feedback to members on issues relating to copyright at a national and international level.
- Represent CAUL on the ALCC.
- Respond to copyright references and reports on behalf of CAUL.
- Keep CAUL members advised of AVCC negotiations and developments regarding relationships with CAL, Screenrights and other copyright collecting agencies.
- Circulate to CAUL matters of interest and developments in copyright legislation.

### Time-line
As required

### Activity since last report
- Provided written responses to:
  - Joint Standing Committee on Treaties (JSCOT)
  - Senate Select Committee on the Australia-US Free Trade Agreement
- Represent CAUL at the CLRC Crown Copyright Forum at the State Library of NSW.
- In conjunction with ALIA representatives present the libraries position to the JSCOT, Parliament House, Canberra.
- Attended the IFLA Copyright and Other Legal Materials sessions as the Australian representative, Buenos Aires, August 2004.

### Achievements since last report

### Publicity, reports, publications since last report
Submissions to JSCT and SSC.

### Plan for forthcoming activity
Represent CAUL at the ALCC meeting on 21st September on the Gold Coast.

### CAUL budget implications
- ALCC membership for 2005 - $20,000
- ALCC meeting in 2005 in Canberra
- ALIA Copyright Committee meeting in Canberra
- CLRC forum in Sydney (possibly).
- Griffith University annual copyright seminar in Brisbane (February)

### Recommendations to CAUL
CAUL continue to contribute $20,000 to the operation of the ALCC in 2005.

---

This page is intentionally blank.
UNISON

University Librarians in the State of NSW

Minutes of the UNISON Committee Meeting
Held at the Auchmuty Library, University of Newcastle
Friday 20th August 2004

PRESENT: Ms Lynne Benton (LB), University of Newcastle, (Chair)
Mr Greg Anderson (GA), University of Newcastle
Mr John Shipp (JS), University of Sydney
Mr Andrew Wells (AW), University of NSW
Mr Vic Elliott (VE), Australian National University
Ms Shirley Oakley (ShO), Charles Sturt University
Ms Helen Mandl (HM), University of Wollongong
Ms Fides Lawton (FL), University of Technology, Sydney
Ms Jennifer Peasley (JP), Macquarie University
Ms Katie Wilson (KW), INN-Reach

APOLOGIES: Ms Liz Curach (LC), University of Western Sydney
Ms Eve Woodberry (EW), University of New England
Dr Stephen Oakshott (SO), Australian Catholic University
Ms Anita Crotty (AC), University of Canberra
Ms Alison Ransome (AR),
Mr Alex Byrne (AB), University of Technology, Sydney
Ms Maxine Brodie (MB), Macquarie University

IN ATTENDANCE Ms Alison Rigby (AR), University of Newcastle – Virtual Reference Group
Ms Katie Battiston (KB), University of Newcastle - Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Apologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Business Arising from Previous Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University Librarians Forum**

Andrew advised that the ULF will be available to all interested staff. It will be held on October 2nd at UTS. Fides Lawton will book an appropriate space at UTS for use.

It was suggested that 4 presentations be given about current relevant issues.

Nominations were

Andrew Wells – ARROW update
Alex Byrne – International Issues
Eve Woodberry – Copyright and the FTA
Lynne Benton – Teaching and Learning Reforms

An open forum will be held after the presentations to allow attendees to pose questions to University Librarians in regards to relevant issues of projects, management and careers, similar to the forum held at the AVCC Library Conference in Canberra.

Katie Battiston will develop a scope for the ULF and distribute to UNISON members for review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>UNISON Reference Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynne introduced Alison Rigby who provided an update from the UNISON Reference Group. The first RG meeting was held at UNSW where discussion centred around</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• advantages and disadvantages of virtual reference systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• cost and potential of services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• statistics gathering to inform staffing and training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• additional services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• training and promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next meeting is scheduled for 10\textsuperscript{th} September at the University of Wollongong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne advised that the recent survey regarding Digital Reference Performance Measures has continued to be added to. It is difficult to apply the survey to changing services. It has been reported to the CAUL Best Practice working group that most respondents are interested in proceeding with developing performance measures but would not be interested in taking a leading role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After some discussion it was suggested that the UNISON Reference Group scope a project to develop Digital Reference Performance Measures. Some funding will be provided by UNISON. CAUL will be advised that UNISON is instructing the Reference Group to scope and report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>BONUS / INN-Reach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katie Wilson advised that the name selected for the INN-Reach program is BONUS – Books of NSW Universities. Site coordinators have met for some orientation sessions, and to discuss policies and circulation parameters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A delay in the delivery of some hardware has pushed back the launch date. The hardware delivery from the US is now expected at the end of August. As soon as the servers are in place data can be loaded for testing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material delivery options have been investigated and it was advised that Australia Post quotes are significantly lower than other couriers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central information and FAQ's are being developed. Some background information will be published on the UNISON web site. More detail will be published on local institutions web</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sites.

Based on the revised implementation dates Shirley Oakley advised that CSU may be able to participate from the outset rather than delaying their involvement until next year. Shirley will discuss with UNILINC.

Following a query from Greg Anderson, Andrew Wells advised that UNSW expects to move to Aleph 16 over the summer, but this is yet to be confirmed.

Greg advised that some costs have been revised in the MOU. The current expected hardware cost is $24K between 4 partners. Newcastle is currently reconfiguring disk space to accommodate the system requirements.

Fides Lawton enquired as to when the partners could expect invoices to begin arriving. Greg advised that he is waiting on confirmation from III but it is anticipated that invoices will arrive later this year. Newcastle will manage the accounts and charge partners accordingly.

Following a query about promotion, Fides Lawton offered for the UTS design team to design the BONUS logo.

Lynne advised that a draft media release has been prepared for release by UNISON and invited comment. Lynne suggested that the title of the release needs to focus more on the student aspect of the system. Andrew suggested that the fact that the system is a trial needs to be emphasized earlier in the piece. Vic Elliott suggested that the first paragraph needs to be more attention-grabbing. Katie Wilson suggested that the unmediated nature of the system needs to be emphasized more. Fides suggested that the release needs to show how BONUS differs from standard Interlibrary Loans.

Katie Battiston to redraft media release based on comment from UNISON members.

NOTE: Full INN-Reach Report attached as appendix.

6. Offsite Storage

Jennifer Peasley advised that the National Library tender process has been delayed by the Ministry of Arts approach. It is hoped that an answer will be available soon.

Andrew advised that UNSW hopes to have a few more years at the Homebush site. UNSW has started charging for space. Libraries are huge consumers of space and it is not necessarily cost-effective management.

Lynne asked whether Andrew believed this was a Group of 8 approach. A new budget model has been proposed for Newcastle by the University’s new VC who is coming from a Great 8 institution. Andrew offered to keep UNISON updated with the UNSW space budget model.

Vic suggested that it is the nature of Libraries that there is a redundancy of space. Space
charging will impact on collection development and offsite storage.

Greg advised that there is local storage available at Newcastle but the money for this should not come out of the Library budget, it should be part of the University budget.

Shirley advised that the CSU library currently has too much space available and is being asked to share with faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th><strong>Electronic Theses and Dissertations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew advised that the ETD Conference committee is doing great work; a program is currently being developed and sponsors and international support being investigated. Volunteers for the conference committee are welcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg asked for an update on where everyone is with ADT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew advised that UNSW is advising patrons to seriously consider other options. Workflows for digital thesis submission via ARROW are being developed. The PROQUEST system is also looking promising. An ADT business plan recommending a review is being developed in December / January and will be taken to CAUL in April 2005.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew suggested that selection of software for local submission of theses is a decision that should be made locally. There are a number of options available. UNSW is currently comparing various submission software packages. UNSW staff had training in ARROW the week of 9th August; ETD software is being decommissioned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John suggested that some institutions that have made electronic submission of theses mandatory may have created some problems for themselves. Sydney University has stepped back from ADT and may now look at Innovative Media Management Module.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Mandl advised that Wollongong has made electronic submission mandatory and find that the biggest problem is the amount of time spent solving submission problems e.g. converting files, removing copyright material. There are approximately 30 available online currently and 50 waiting to be converted and uploaded. A Content Management and Learning Management project is underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew advised that the aim of UNSW is to get the user to complete as much of the process as possible. UNSW is approaching mandatory submission very slowly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th><strong>CAUL pre discussion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew is putting together a teaching and learning forum. Lynne is presenting a Reforms paper. Some case studies are being presented e.g. ARIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th><strong>CEIRC Report</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eve Woodberry not present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andrew advised that Heather Gordon has developed a substantial paper to go to CAUL. The paper focuses on a sustainable way forward, the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The paper also identifies risks that need to be addressed by CAUL including a recommendation to have a contingency plan in place.

John commented that it has grown from a couple of programs to a large number. Credit to Diane Costello.

Vic advised that there has been some concern on the part of ANU of the responsibility for CEIRC. With CAUL not being incorporated, ANU would be exposed to any legal proceedings, not CAUL.

John advised that over $3 million per year goes through CEIRC.

Andrew advised that CEIRC is a substantial part of the next CAUL meeting agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>Other Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John provided an update on the status of the JSTOR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 11. | Meeting closed 12pm |
**Hardware**

Two servers have been ordered from SUN systems - the central system server and the Direct Consortial Borrower (DCB) server to store data from the two Aleph library systems (UNSW, CSU). SUN systems are sponsoring the central server. Delivery is expected late August.

**Delivery options**

A major component of an INN-Reach system is the physical delivery of items among libraries. The University of Newcastle provided a quote from Australia Post that estimated overnight delivery from Newcastle to Sydney, and 2nd day delivery from Newcastle to all other NSW country locations. Other BONUS participating libraries also use Australia Post for delivery. For comparison, additional quotes were obtained from four commercial courier services. All rates quoted are much higher than Australia Post for a similar delivery time. It is proposed to extend the services of Australia Post for the BONUS project.

**Publicity and information**

Proposals for publicity and information include the following:

- a background paper on the UNISON website
- a media release from UNISON
- FAQs on the BONUS central server Web site with links between each participating library
- Circulation statistics on the BONUS central server Web site

**Training**

Innovative Interfaces will provide onsite hands-on training for all participating libraries in the use of the system on October 5 and 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May/June</td>
<td>Signoff on software licence agreement and MOU between participants and Innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Hardware ordered from SUN (2 Servers) and preparation of the Newcastle site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naming competition for the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August/Sept</td>
<td>Installation of hardware and loading of software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profiling and loading of test data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of publicity/marketing strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Loading of records into central database, loan rule implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System testing and trials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

Background
The University of New South Wales, University of Technology Sydney, the University of Newcastle and Charles Sturt University Libraries in association with UNILINC Pty Limited, have agreed to undertake a research study using the Innovative Interfaces INN-Reach resource sharing system over a two year period. The INN-Reach system allows clients to search the combined holdings of the participant libraries and request a book to be delivered to their preferred pickup location within a few days. For example, a student from UTS can request a book from the University of Newcastle collection to be delivered to the University of NSW. The book could be returned at the UTS Kuring-gai Campus library where the loan is discharged and the item returned to Newcastle.

Patron and item data are seamlessly exchanged between the participant libraries and a central database, without the need to re-key records or register patrons as reciprocal borrowers. The software will also select the supplying library if more than one copy is available to ensure that the lending ratio is evenly balanced across the partners. Detailed lending and collection usage statistics, client feedback and cost/benefit analysis will be undertaken as part of the research study to inform collaborative resource sharing initiatives between the University libraries of NSW and the ACT.

Although books can be borrowed from other libraries using the Inter Library Loan system, requests require staff mediation and charges which restricts the service to higher degree students and staff. The INN-Reach system will operate on a gratis basis for clients with the four participants sharing the cost of the software licence. UNISON (University Librarians in the State of NSW) is funding a Project Officer and SUN systems are sponsoring the central server. Significantly, the service will be available to all students and staff, including undergraduates who are major users of book collections. The University of Newcastle will host the servers and support the software and operating system. The trial should be up and running by November 2004 with Charles Sturt joining in early 2005.

Naming competition
During July 2004 staff from all libraries involved with the project contributed creative and original names for the INN-Reach system. The project’s Steering Committee voted and the winning name is BONUS (Books Of NSW Universities), contributed by Marion Wilson from the University of Newcastle Library. The name is unique, captures the spirit of the project, and is a clever acronym.

Project implementation
Site coordinators from each library, representatives from UNILINC, who manages the Charles Sturt library system, as well as related staff from each library, and the Project Officer have met twice to plan the project implementation. The first meeting included two three hour INN-Reach orientation/consultation sessions conducted by Tim Auger, INN-Reach Manager from Innovative Interfaces, using WebEx Web conferencing software. The second meeting included discussions on the profiling worksheets for each library and the central server, delivery options, and requirements for extracting sample data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Onsite training of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full data load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Launch of system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Great Library ‘BONUS’ for Staff and Students

Four New South Wales universities are collaborating to implement a research project that will trial an automatic requesting system that allows staff and students to request a book through the online catalogues of the participating Universities libraries and have it delivered to their chosen library within a few days.

For example, a student from Charles Sturt University in Bathurst may find a book they require in the collection at the University of Newcastle and in a couple of mouse-clicks, request the book to be delivered to a Charles Sturt Library. Similarly, the item can be returned at any of the participating University Libraries and it will be returned to its home library.

The BONUS (Books of NSW Universities) system is a collaborative project setup between The University of New South Wales, University of Technology Sydney, the University of Newcastle and Charles Sturt University libraries in association with the library consortium UNILINC. Although similar systems have been operating in North America this trial is an Australian first, allowing patrons to request items without library staff intervention. This has the added benefit of providing the service at a fraction of the cost compared to a traditional inter library loan.

The University of Newcastle Librarian Lynne Benton says the BONUS system will allow both staff and students access to the combined book collections of four university libraries in a convenient and timely manner, dramatically increasing the resources readily available to students.

“It will be a free service with the four participating Universities sharing the cost of the software licence, and it will be available to all their students and staff, including undergraduates who are significant users of book collections”

A central database will allow records to be exchanged between the libraries without having repeated data entry by staff, currently a time-consuming practice.

If more than one copy of the requested book is available, the software will choose the best location to request from, ensuring that the lending ratio is evenly balanced and that no one library becomes more heavily used than another.

Detailed usage statistics, client feedback and cost/benefit analysis will be undertaken as part of the research study to inform collaborative resource sharing initiatives between the University libraries of NSW.

The University of Newcastle will host the servers and support the software and operating system.

It is anticipated that the BONUS system will be launched in November 2004.

The trial is being supported by UNISON (University Librarians in the State of NSW), Innovative Interfaces Inc. and Sun Microsystems.

For interviews: Executive Director Education Services and University Librarian, Lynne Benton on (02) 4921 5853.
University Librarians Forum Scope

An opportunity for any interested staff to attend presentations by UNISON members about current relevant hot topics. An open panel session will be held after the presentations to give attendees the opportunity to pose questions relating to hot topics discussed, projects, management and careers.

Approximate 9:30 starting time suggested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Presented By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 mins Australian Research Repositories Online for the World (ARROW) Project Update | Andrew Wells  
University Librarian  
University of NSW |
| 15 mins Internationalisation                         | Alex Byrne  
University Librarian  
University of Technology, Sydney |
| 15 mins Copyright Issues and the Free Trade Agreement | Eve Woodberry  
University Librarian  
University of New England |
| 15 mins Teaching and Learning Reforms                | Lynne Benton  
University Librarian  
University of Newcastle |
| Break                                                |                                                   |
| 1 hour University Librarian Open Panel               | Andrew Wells  
Alex Byrne  
Eve Woodberry  
Lynne Benton +  
Others as nominated |
# CAUL Strategic Plan

**Report to CAUL from UniLibrariesSA**

**Author:** Ray Choate  
**September 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Relationships with other Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Report on Activities of UniLibrariesSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Convenor of UniLibrariesSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Activity since last report**  | 1. The three libraries have purchased the RLG ILL Manager which has been installed at all 3 universities and testing continues.  

   2. The regional reciprocal borrowing agreement was renewed allowing borrowing from all three university library systems by all staff and students of the three universities.  

   3. Staff Development. A series of six seminars for members of the three university libraries have been organized.  

   4. Regional Collections Management. Discussions are being held on the concept of “last copy” in relation to collection management and storage.  

   5. Universities Research Repository South Australia -- URRSA. Stage three of the Store has been completed, and material is being transferred to the new extension from the three library systems. The extension cost $1.8m and allows for storage for 500,000 items, bring capacity to 1.5m vols. A trial using Ariel for delivery from the Store has been undertaken.  

   6. Document Delivery. Regional interlending protocols are being reviewed including lending from the Store.  

   7. Information literacy. A successful one-day seminar/workshop on information literacy at the three libraries was held on the 12th of May. Plans were made for another seminar in 2005.  

   8. Technical Services. A working group is benchmarking local practices and exploring cooperative ventures.  


| Achievements since last report  | See Above                               |
| Plan for forthcoming activity  | The Annual Reports for 2003 is being completed. |
| Recommendations to CAUL         |                                        |
This page is intentionally blank.
### CAUL Strategic Plan
#### Report to CAUL

**Author:** ______John Arfield__________  
**Date:** ______2 September 2004________  
**Period covered:** __Sept. 2003-Sept. 2004____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1. Information resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Represent CAUL on the Kinetica Advisory Committee (KAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>John Arfield and Linda Luther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity since last report</strong></td>
<td>There have been two meetings of the Kinetica Advisory Committee, in person, one in March 2004 and the other in August 2004. There was also a meeting by teleconference in November 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievements since last report</strong></td>
<td>Predominant topic throughout the year was the redevelopment of Kinetica. The KAC gave advice among other things on the requirements of the new system, on the various solutions proposed, and on the communications strategy, and monitored progress. Considerable progress was made during the year with all targets being met to achieve an anticipated launch of the Search and Products sub-system in January 2005. Preliminary demonstrations of the new system at the Kinetica Users Group meeting in August 2004 were very favourably received. Other topics covered during the year included document delivery, the quality of the NBD database, authority control, catalogue records for electronic sets, and end-user access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</strong></td>
<td>Minutes and papers of Kinetica Advisory group meetings are available at <a href="http://www.nla.gov.au/kinetica/kacpapers.html">http://www.nla.gov.au/kinetica/kacpapers.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan for forthcoming activity</strong></td>
<td>The KAC will continue to play a particularly important role during the implementation phases of the redevelopment project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAUL budget implications</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations to CAUL</strong></td>
<td>That CAUL continue to take advantage of the opportunity to contribute towards the development and operation of Kinetica.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft Proposal for Türk-ANZAC Research Libraries Conference

Johnies and Mehmets side by side: Collaborative application of technology in research and academic libraries

18th March University
Çanakkale, Turkey

24-30 April 2006

Where: Gallipoli and 18th March University, Çanakkale
Who: Australian, New Zealand and Turkish librarians
Theme: Johnies and Mehmets side by side: collaborative application of technology in research and academic libraries

The theme has been inspired by a statement by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk about the ANZACs which was given on his behalf by Şükrü Kaya, Minister of the Interior, at the Quins Post Cemetery in 1934 and inscribed on the Gallipoli Fountains of Honour, Brisbane:

“Those heroes that shed their blood and lost their lives ... You are now lying in the soil of a friendly country; therefore rest in peace. There is no difference between the Johnies and the Mehmets to us where they lie side by side here, in this country of ours ... You, the mothers who sent their sons from far away countries; wipe away your tears. Your sons are now lying in our bosom and are in peace. After having lost their lives on this land, they have become our sons as well.”

Purpose: A meeting of minds, sharing of experience and expertise and exchange of knowledge in the use of technology to advance academic and research libraries.

Conference themes:

Digital content: digitisation, epublishing and erepositories
Digital access: digital objects, metadata and resource discovery
Digital service: ‘invisible’ clients, multiskilled staff and integration
Format:

Monday 24 April: Opening, conference sessions and commencement dinner

Tuesday 25 April: ANZAC Dawn Service and visit to the Gallipoli battlefield, launch of Türk-ANZAC Commemorative Digitisation Project.

Wednesday 26 April: Workshop

Thursday 27 April: Conference Sessions and closing dinner.

Friday 28 – Sunday 30 April: Study tour to Troy, Library at Ephesus, Universities in Izmir and ??

Conference workshop suggestions:

Digitization
Establishing e-archives and epublishing
Benchmarking
Interactive e-learning software and its applications

Social program

See above

Trade Exhibit

Depends on Turks as they would have to organise it

Tours

See above plus optional tours before or after to Istanbul and beyond – suggest these be provided by a tour company.

Organising Committees:

Because of the tri-national nature of this conference it is proposed to have an organisational structure consisting of three committees:

- a committee of Turkish university and research libraries
- a joint Australian & New Zealand committee led by CAUL & CONZUL but with representatives of other relevant organisations such as the Australian War Memorial
- a Türk-ANZAC coordinating committee consisting of representatives of the other two committees.

Sponsors: ALIA, IFLA, NLA, Australian War Memorial, ScreenSound Australia, Australian Department of Veterans’ Affairs ?? and Turkish sponsors and commercial sponsors.

Alex Byrne
Gulcin Cribb
August 2004
### Budget 2004

The budget spreadsheet is up-to-date as at 27 August, 2004. The following line items expected to be underspent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President representation</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other representation</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA meetings</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Award</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy Project</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Indicator Web Site</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT Program</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC meetings</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC research</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOLC meetings</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Line items expected to be overspent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Representation</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Assistant</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Income** 435,940.00  
**Budgeted Expenditure** 393,077.00  
**Balance Underspent** 52,700  
**Expected 2004 operational surplus** 95,563.00  
**Expected retained earnings** 299,080.45

---

1. Overpayment from 2003 refunded in 2004  
2. Carryover from 2003 still unspent  
3. Carryover from 2003 still unspent  
4. Membership levy not expended in 2004  
5. ADT expenditure again lower then membership fees  
6. Audit costs for two years plus higher than expected book-keeping costs, also associated with the audits.  
7. Increase in salary due to natural increment plus increase in salary management costs

CAUL 2004/2 – Finance Report
The following are proposed variations from the 2004 budget.

Income:
- Interest income has been adjusted based on income actually received for the most recent 12 month period available.
- Research levy - reduced to zero on the basis that expenditure to date in 2004 has been zero.
- ADT levy - expenditure currently includes 55,000 for central management by UNSW, with UNSW is paying ETD travel costs. An ADT levy of $1,425, reduced from $1,800, would cover these costs.
- CEIRC levy income is higher - 3 new external participants

Expenditure:
- Office staffing costs will be higher due to natural increments and management costs. $65,000 (for CEIRC + General Office Administration) includes salary (at HEW 4), on-costs and salary management through Library Locums. The latter is currently under review now that the administrative assistant is full-time.
- Audit and accounting is higher at 7,300, including 3,300 for the 2004 audit.
- Equipment expenditure is reduced to zero - no upgrades are required in 2005.
- Copyright travel has been increased to 2,500 (at Qantas rates - may be less when Rex competition kicks in)
- The proposal to develop software for the collection and use of CAUL statistics involves these additional costs -
  Development cost (ex-GST) $37,583 One-off
  Increase in annual cost (ex-GST) $8,610 Annual
- CEIRC meeting costs have been reduced to 15,000 based on the last twelve month's costs.

The operational deficit is expected to be $32,995.

Diane Costello
Executive Officer, CAUL
3 September, 2004
## CAUL Budget 2004 (updated 3/9/04)

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure (to 27/8/04)</td>
<td>27,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Sub-Total</td>
<td>19,146.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Sub-Total</td>
<td>11,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>8,116.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Officer (and others)</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure (to 27/8/04)</td>
<td>27,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Sub-Total</td>
<td>19,146.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Sub-Total</td>
<td>11,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>8,116.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19,146.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,116.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Surplus / (Deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,116.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expected variation from budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52,700.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revised surplus / (deficit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59,816.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Assets and Liabilities

### Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture cost</td>
<td>9,148.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment cost</td>
<td>10,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Creditors</td>
<td>160,858.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentication Project</td>
<td>55,786.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment depr.</td>
<td>-7,008.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment depr.</td>
<td>-9,147.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture cost</td>
<td>11,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Sub-Total</td>
<td>19,146.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Sub-Total</td>
<td>11,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance (2004)</td>
<td>209,840.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-payments for 2004 fees</td>
<td>386,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Creditors</td>
<td>160,858.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentication Project</td>
<td>55,786.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment cost</td>
<td>11,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment depr.</td>
<td>-9,147.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment depr.</td>
<td>-20,732.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture cost</td>
<td>11,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Sub-Total</td>
<td>19,146.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Sub-Total</td>
<td>11,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance (2004)</td>
<td>209,840.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Non-Cash</td>
<td>229,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td>28,697.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Program</td>
<td>57,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCOME / EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>435,940.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Foreign Currency Account (AUD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>504,760.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Communication</td>
<td>455,321.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>308,551.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Program</td>
<td>67,346.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (AUD)</td>
<td>1,397,352.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>4,244,789.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Communication</td>
<td>455,321.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Program</td>
<td>1,259,535.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (USD)</td>
<td>5,976,626.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ceirc Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>27,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>20,090.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Officer (and others)</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Assistant</td>
<td>20,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOLC Meetings</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL-Industry ThinkTank</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CEIRC</td>
<td>110,600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING</td>
<td>229,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPYRIGHT</td>
<td>28,697.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH &amp; DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Program</td>
<td>57,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCOME / EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>435,940.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revised actual Expenditure 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>340,377.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Draft Agenda Item 642(a)

- Membership
- Operating Non-Cash
- Copyright
- Research & Development
- Scholarly Communication
- ADT
- Ceirc Program
- TOTAL INCOME / EXPENDITURE
- Expected variation from budget
- Revised surplus / (deficit)
- Revised actual Expenditure 2004
40 CAUL members @ $4,500

EO full costs = salary, on-costs, salary admin, travel not related to specific program - divided 65/35 between CAUL and CEIRC

from 1995 & 2003

Printer to replace 1995 Canon LBP

Includes audit for 2003 + 2003

Includes refund of rental overpayment in 2003

Includes $3,000 for meeting guest speakers

To be repaid to DEST

$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting

40 CAUL members

Commitment reinstated by Exec

Zwolle conference in 2004 budget

Assets minus liabilities minus rest-of-year expenditure (actual expected)

Library Consortium £335 ($500)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>Unspent allocation from 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepaid in 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>Approved CAUL Exec 13/1/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>Unspent allocation from 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>40 X $500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>from 2002, w/o by APA, possibly owing to CSA and EBSCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>from 2002, w/o by APA, to be refunded to subscribers + o/s invoice to OUP which it claims has been paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>USD5,000 (est.AUD 8,500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>Sponsored by individual CAUL members USD5,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>40 CAUL members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>UNSW bearing expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>39 CAUL members, CSIRO &amp; CONZUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>20 external participants @1,800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>usd2844.70 minus usd537.34 for bank fees to 19/7/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>1 meeting only in 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
<th>Expected actual expenditure (at 27/8/04)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page is intentionally blank.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Income $</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Expenditure $</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Balance $</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure</th>
<th>Assets and Liabilities</th>
<th>Balance @ 31/12/03</th>
<th>Balance 2004 @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>32,486.40</td>
<td>32,486.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>7,300.00</td>
<td>7,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,692.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Meetings</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation of CAUL</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications / Web Site</td>
<td>950.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEST PRACTICE</strong></td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,033,322.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Publication</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27,610.00</td>
<td>27,610.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Meetings</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTERS Membership</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILWG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of statistics software</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37,583.00</td>
<td>37,583.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INCOME / EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>415,000.00</td>
<td>268,569.40</td>
<td>268,569.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>228,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 40 CAUL members @ $4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 1. EO full costs = salary, on-costs, salary admin, travel not related to specific program - divided 65/35 between CAUL and CEIRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: from 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 19,000 in 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: from 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J9</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: Includes audit for 2003 + 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 1220 to 27/5/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 315+GST per fortnight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J10</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: Refund of rental overpayment in 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: Includes $3,000 for meeting guest speakers, $4,000 for SkyCity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L15</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: To be repaid to DEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: $100 for domain name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L17</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: InfoLitProject &amp;PI web site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: $5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: 40 CAUL members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cell: E20
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
1xALCC,CLRCSydney,LobbyingCanberra,?Zwolle,?IFLA?

Cell: E30
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Library Consortium £335 ($500)

Cell: E31
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Approved CAUL Exec 13/1/04

Cell: A43
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005

Cell: E43
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Rollover from 2004

Cell: M43
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer: from 2002, w/o by APA, possibly owing to CSA and EBSCO

Cell: N43
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer: from 2002, w/o by APA, possibly owing to CSA and EBSCO

Cell: E46
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
USD5,000 (est.AUD 8,500)

Cell: C47
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Sponsored by individual CAUL members USD5,000

Cell: A49
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 CAUL members

Cell: E51
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
UNSW bearing expense

Cell: A55
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
39 CAUL members, CSIRO & CONZUL

Cell: J55
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
to 31/3/04

Cell: A56
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
23 external participants @1,800

Cell: J56
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Position vacant to 21/4/04

Cell: J57
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
$4,385.48 reimbursement from Blackwell expended in 2003

Cell: B58
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
USD5000 in 2003

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
1 meeting only in 2005?
Executive Officer’s Report to CAUL
24 March, 2004 to 3 September, 2004

This report includes extracts of reports to the Executive to August 12.

Office Staffing.

Rachelle Morgan commenced duty on April 21, as full time administrative assistant. Her responsibilities cover support for CEIRC activities, as well as CAUL as a whole. Training has been a significant office activity. Rachelle has begun keeping track of her time, between CEIRC and "other CAUL". Since she attended a MS Access training course, it will be a high priority to bring the CAUL/CEIRC database up-to-date. This database functions as a source of information and reporting on CEIRC subscriptions and CAUL institutions, and I have plans to enhance its use as such.

Brigid Whitbread continued part-time, assisting with the backlog of paperwork accumulated over the period of time that the office was understaffed. She has been cleaning up paper files, sorting, weeding, recording, discarding where appropriate. She finished work with CAUL on August 5.

I have taken 6 days recreation leave since March, and will be on leave for another 3 weeks from October 11.

Finance Activities.

Audit reports from both 2002 and 2003 were completed and the files “rolled over.” 2004 expenditure to date is included in the budget spreadsheet. Of note is the office rental, currently in credit due to ANU’s refund of overpayment in 2003 – overpayment caused by the establishment of fortnightly automatic deductions for monthly payments. Also of note is the audit expenditure, double the usual annual amount because both 2002 and 2003 audits have been completed this year. Two BAS reports were completed in-house.

CAUL Elections.

The election processes were completed for positions of President and two members of the Executive Committee.

Review of the Library Deposit Scheme.

Two meetings were held with the consultant employed by DoCITA. Responses have been received from a range of CAUL members.

ALIA Library Week Forum ‘Down and Loaded: the right information at the right time’ The brief - agreement on focus of discussions being issues around recommendation 7 of the Senate report; and related recommendations on digitisation, community networks and access to electronic information; any other matters for discussion.

CEIRC.

Offers and renewals from 70 vendors have been posted to members in the past five months. Several other offers are still under discussion either directly with the vendor, or with input from the CEIRC committee. Blackwell Publishing, Nature Publishing Group and Lexis Nexis are of most concern, because of continuing price increases, above current industry standards.

The offer from Taylor & Francis for its very large collection of journals is very attractive to many members, but is quite time-consuming because of the lack of initial detail, and the frequency of updates required to fill in the gaps. Renewals for membership of BioMed Central are also expected to take some time because current members’ fees must be quoted individually as a result of BMC’s inability to sustain its original pricing model.
New offers for Science Online and CRC Press CRCNetBase were concluded, with new subscribers to the former realising a discount of 18%, and more than 25% for the latter. The Thomson ISI offer for National Citation Reports failed to reach the minimum of 5 subscribers to obtain the 50% discount, and the offer has been extended for another month. I also discussed options with Virginia Walsh who has direct contact with the Go8’s Deputy Vice-Chancellors (Research).

**CEIRC Operational Overview.**

The preparation of the overview required collating a great deal of detail about CEIRC’s operations. Although there is much information held in office files, collation and analysis can be labour-intensive.

**Meetings held with:**

March 25, 5 April, 15 April Auditor re audit of CAUL’s 2003 accounts
March 26. Interviews for CAUL administrative assistant (with Margaret Henty, ANU)
March 30. Lindy Hyam and Denis Meares, at IDP with Madeleine McPherson
May 19. Dave Lambart, consultant for AGIMO, re Library Deposit Scheme, with Margaret Henty, ANU
June 4. With Madeleine McPherson, met with Simon Kent, Higher Education Adviser to Jenny Macklin, Opposition Spokesperson on Education, Canberra
June 23. Linda Butler, ANU re Journal Citation Reports and the humanities, Canberra
July 23. Sarah Waladan, ADA and ALCC.
July 30. Greg Tanenbaum, BEPress, teleconference
August 11. Alex Byrne, UTS re LATN and IPD.
August 25. Roxanne Missingham, NLA.

**CEIRC-related meetings held with:**

March 31. Isobe Koichi of Nikkei, in Sydney
April 27. Cormac Hanrahan from Ovum, Canberra
April 29. Brad Rosairo from CSA, Canberra
May 3. Jeroen Prinsen from ISI, Canberra
June 2. Philip Thomson, Eurofield Information Systems re Macquarie Dictionary WordGenius, Canberra
June 8. Heather Gordon, CEIRC chair, re CEIRC strategic directions and operational plan, Brisbane
June 24. Dr Antoine Bocquet, Nature Publishing Group, Canberra
June 25. Karen Vitullo, ABS Library, Canberra
July 2. Dr Anne Bittner, Blackwell Publishing, Canberra
July 9. Rae Smyth, Nielsen BookData, teleconference
July 20. Scott Schuetze, SerialsSolutions, teleconference
July 21. Richard Griffiths, Capital Monitor, Canberra
August 9. Heather Gordon, CEIRC chair, Canberra
August 20. Marianne Josserand, BioMed Central, teleconference.
September 1. Benny Kesuma, Bureau van Dijk Electronic Publishing
September 2. Alastair Story, Health Communication Network

**Events / Meetings attended.**

March 26. Warren Horton commemoration at the National Library
April 29. AVCC Library Staff Development Conference program committee teleconference
May 24. ALIA Forum
May 31. Presentation on leadership in universities by Sir Gareth Roberts
June 1. NSCF Forum “Changing Research Practices”
June 2. Roundtable with Charles Oppenheim on Open Access and Institutional Repositories (organised by Vic Elliott)
June 2. ALIA URLS presentation by Anita Crotty on the new guard at the University of Canberra
June 7. CCA Joint Executive Meeting, Brisbane
June 24. Consultative Workshops – e-Research Support - Professor Ah Chung Tsoi, ARC, Canberra
July 12. Elsevier Science Library Connect Seminar, Sydney
July 20. ALIA URLs Forum – Cliff Law, UNSW@ADFA, Canberra
July 30. ADA AGM, Canberra.
August 9-10. AVCC Library Staff Development Conference, Canberra

September 1. Launch of the University of Canberra's ADT Program, Canberra.

and as organiser and secretary:

March 29 ADT/ARIIC meeting at UNSW
March 31 CAUL Executive meeting at UTS
April 1-2 CAUL meeting at UNSW
April 22 CEIRC meeting at UTS
June 6-7. CAUL Executive Meeting, Brisbane
July 1. CEIRC Meeting, Sydney
July 5. ADT-ARIIC Technical Committee Meeting, Sydney
July 12. ADT Policy Reference Group Meeting, Sydney
August 6. CAUL Statistics Focus Group, Melbourne.
August 12. CAUL Executive Meeting, at UNSW.

and planning:

President's meetings in Canberra 8-9 September
CAUL 2004/2 – Hobart, with Linda Luther
CAUL Executive 2004/5 – Melbourne, December 6-7
CCA Joint Executive – Melbourne, December 6
CAUL 2005/1 – Auckland – 4 April 2005

Diane Costello
3 September, 2004