

C·A·U·L

COUNCIL OF

AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS

CAUL Meeting Papers (2005/1)
Joint Meeting with CONZUL

3-4 April, 2005
Auckland, NZ

Group Meetings 9.30 – 5.00 3 April
Informal Dinner 7.00pm 3 April
Business Meeting 9.00 – 5.00 4 April
CAUL Dinner 7.00pm 4 April

Venues:

University of Auckland, Kate Edger Information Commons
SKYCITY Auckland Convention Centre
CAUL Dinner @ Pontoon
Informal Dinner @ Mikano

This page is intentionally blank.



**CAUL Meeting 2005/1
Joint Meeting with CONZUL**

**4 April, 2005
from 9am to 5pm**

SKYCITY Auckland Convention Centre, NZ

Agenda

645. Introduction & Welcome. Housekeeping. Gail Pattie.

646. Attendance & Apologies. Expected to attend:

From CAUL: *Mary Lyons (UQ); Greg Anderson (UNewcastle); #Helen Livingston (UniSA); Delegates for CAUL members: Alison Hunter (USQ); Alan Brady (UBallarat); *Jan Gordon (UNSW@ADFA); *Nicki McLaurin Smith (UMelbourne); *Anne Wilson (CDU);

Guests: Judith Peacock (Information Literacy Coordinator, QUT);

*Attending first CAUL meeting. #Attending first meeting as CAUL member.

Apologies: Alan Smith (USQ); Leeanne Pitman (UBallarat); Cliff Law (UNSW@ADFA); Linda O'Brien (UMelbourne); Stephen McVey (UNDA); Chris Sheargold (ACU); Ruth Quinn (CDU);

647. 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.

648. Minutes of Previous CONZUL Meeting, 18-19 November, 2004 (Paper appended)

a) **Business arising from previous meeting, not otherwise listed on the agenda.**

649. Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting, 13-14 September, 2004. (Paper appended)

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

650. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings. 2004/6 Brisbane, 6 December and 2005/1 Canberra, 15 February. **(Papers (2) appended)**

STRATEGIC PLAN

651. Review of the CAUL Strategic Plan. Eve Woodberry **(Paper appended)**

652. CAUL Achievement Award 2004. Judith Peacock, Queensland University of Technology.

Support for Research

653. ADT (Australian Digital Theses) Program. Proposed business plan. Andrew Wells, Alex Byrne **(Papers (3) appended)**

654. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). John Shipp, Derek Whitehead will provide an update on ARIIC, NCRIS, open access, etc.

a) **ADT Redevelopment.** Andrew Wells

b) **APSR (Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories).** Vic Elliott

c) **ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World).** Cathrine Harboe-Ree

d) **MAMS (MetaAccess Management Systems).** Eve Woodberry

655. CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC). Operational plan. Heather Gordon **(Papers (2) appended)**

656. TEC: National Consortium Licences Project 2006 onwards. Isobel Mosley **(Paper appended)**

657. Electronic Purchasing in Collaboration (EPIC) and Governance. Heather Jenks **(Paper appended)**

658. New Zealand Online – Proposal from the Library and Information Advisory Commission (LIAC).
Ainslie Dewe **(Paper appended)**

659. Shared Store. Helen Renwick.

Support for Teaching & Learning

660. Information Literacy Working Group. Graham Black **(Paper appended)**

661. BONUS (Books for NSW Universities). Greg Anderson **(Paper appended)**

Management for Best Practice

662. Best Practice Working Group. Felicity McGregor **(Paper appended)**

663. Statistics Focus Group. Derek Whitehead **(Paper appended)**

664. Practice-based Research. Imogen Garner **(Paper appended)**

665. Standards. (A standing item) Maxine Brodie, Derek Whitehead.

a) Standards Australia Committee IT/019. Maxine Brodie. **(Paper appended)**

Advocacy & Communication

666. Copyright. Eve Woodberry **(Papers (2) appended)**

667. Relationships with other Organisations.

a) **National Library of New Zealand.** Gail Pattie

b) **National Library of Australia.**

i) **Kinetica Advisory Committee.** John Arfield

c) **SCONUL.** A SCONUL tour of Australia will coincide with the CAUL meeting in Brisbane in September, 2005. Gaynor Austen.

d) **International Relations, Relations with Organisations in International Education, Study Tours.** A meeting is planned for Sunday 3 April to discuss options for international engagement by CAUL members and CAUL itself. Any resolutions will be brought to members. John Shipp.

e) **CAUDIT.**

i) CAUDIT PKI Project Steering Committee. Maxine Brodie **(Papers (2) appended)**

f) **QULOC.** Heather Gordon **(Paper appended)**

668. Forthcoming Meetings

a) **EDUCAUSE Australasia.** Auckland, 5-8 April 2005

b) **CONZUL.** Palmerston North, 21-22 July 2005

c) **IFLA.** Oslo, Norway, 14-19 August 2005

d) **CAUL Meeting 2005/2.** Griffith University, Brisbane, September 15-16. Janice Rickards

e) **ETD2005.** University of New South Wales, Sydney, September 27-30.

f) **CONZUL.** Wellington, 17-18 November 2005.

g) **CAUL Meeting 2006/1.** Canberra.

h) **CAUL Meeting 2006/2.** Perth, in conjunction with ALIA 2006. Imogen Garner

i) **Future joint CAUL/CONZUL meeting.**

Administration

669. CONZUL Administration Fund. Gail Pattie **(Paper appended)**

670. CAUL Finances. Derek Whitehead **(Paper appended)**

a) **CAUL Budget 2004.** **(Paper appended)**

b) **CAUL Budget 2005.** **(Paper appended)**

671. CAUL Executive Officer's Report. Diane Costello **(Paper appended)**

672. Other business.

	CONZUL/CAUL Meeting Schedule 2005/1	# pax
	Sunday 3 April at the University of Auckland, Kate Edger Information Commons, Level Four http://www.sges.auckland.ac.nz/public/maps/city.pdf meeting room, max 15 pax (1); seminar room, divides into two spaces (2) & (3)	
9-2.30 (1)	CAUL Executive	6
1-4.30 (AUT Room WA506)	LATN Members: Craig Anderson (convenor), Imogen Garner, Gaynor Austen, Alex Byrne, Helen Livingstone, Ainslie Dewe	6
1.30-3.30 (2)	Innovative Group of Universities Members: Bill Cations Flinders University Griffith University LaTrobe University Macquarie University Murdoch University University of Newcastle	?
1.30-2.30 (3)	New Generation Universities Libraries Group Members: Doreen Parker, Liz Curach, Anita Crotty, Chris Sheargold, Alan Brady, Alison Ransome, Graham Black. Heather Gordon, Jeff Murray	?
2.30-4.30	"CONZUL Strategic Planning Meeting" at the University of Auckland General Library, Level 3, Room 304 Gail Pattie, Keith Webster, Heather Jenks and Rachel O'Shaughnessy	4
2.30-3.30 (1) (requested change to 4- 5)	Best Practice Working Group Members: Ransome, Whitehead, McKinlay, Curach, Quinn, Cribb	?
2.30-3.30 (3)	Dual Sector Universities Group Members: Doreen Parker, Derek Whitehead, Ruth Quinn, Alan Brady, Craig Anderson	?
3.30-5.00 (1)	International Forum of members interested in discussing the level of CAUL involvement, their own participation in study tours, visiting or being host, relationships with other bodies such as the AVCC, DEST, IDP, etc. This will include discussion of the forthcoming SCONUL tour. John Shipp will chair. Attending: Alex Byrne, Anita Crotty, Bill Cations, Gaynor Austen, Graham Black, Gulcin Cribb, Linda Luther, Diane Costello	9+?
3.30-5 (3)	Group of Eight	
7pm	Informal dinner @ Mikano (mezzanine level) http://www.mikano.co.nz/ 1 Solent Street, Mechanics Bay, Auckland Waterfront (09) 309 9514	29

Monday 4 April @ SKYCITY Auckland Convention Centre 88 Federal Street, Room "Auckland 3 & 4"		
DRAFT timing only (to be confirmed on the day when starred items are confirmed)		
9-10.30	9.00 Welcome & housekeeping – Gail Pattie 9.10 Arrangement of the agenda; minutes of previous meetings 9.25 CAUL Achievement Award presentation to Judy Peacock 9.55 Review of CAUL Strategic Plan – Eve Woodberry	
10.30-11	Tea Break	
11-1	11.00 ADT 11.20 ARIIC Projects 11.50 CEIRC 12-1 TEC, EPIC, LIAC, NZ shared store	
1-2	Lunch	
2-3.30	2.00 Information Literacy 2.10 Best Practice 2.30 Statistics 2.40 CONZUL administration 3.00 CAUL finance 3.20 other items	
3.30-4	Tea Break	
4-5	4.00 Relationships – NLNZ 4.10 NLA – Kinetica 4.20 International relationships, study tours 4.30 SCONUL 4.40 Future CAUL / CONZUL meetings 4.50 other items	
7-11	CONZUL/CAUL dinner @ Pontoon, Pier 21, 11 Westhaven Drive, Auckland Telephone: 09 373 5776 Fax: 09 377 3074	47
Tuesday 5 April		
9-5	Metadata Seminar	
	ARL Seminar on LibQual+	



DRAFT MINUTES

COUNCIL OF NEW ZEALAND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS (CONZUL)

Minutes of a meeting held 18 and 19 November 2004, at Lincoln University, Christchurch.

PRESENT:

Sue Pharo	University of Waikato (Chair)
Tony Millett	University of Waikato
Ainslie Dewe	Auckland University of Technology
Lorraine Shepherd	Auckland University of Technology
Isobel Mosley	Lincoln University
Sue Colyer	Lincoln University
John Redmayne	Massey University
Linda Palmer	Massey University
Chris Wilson	University of Auckland
Helen Renwick	University of Auckland
Gail Pattie	University of Canterbury
Priscilla Read	University of Canterbury
Michael Wooliscroft	University of Otago
Rosemary Hudson	University of Otago
Keith Webster	Victoria University of Wellington
Zoltan Apáthy	Victoria University of Wellington

IN ATTENDANCE: Alex Byrne University of Technology Sydney
Rachel O'Shaughnessy NZVCC

THURSDAY 18 NOVEMBER

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Sue Pharo welcomed all present including CONZUL's newest member, Keith Webster, University Librarian at Victoria University of Wellington. Alex Byrne was also warmly welcomed in his capacity as both University Librarian at University of Technology Sydney and President-elect of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA).

Apologies were received from Janet Copsey and Sue Colyer, who would join the meeting in the afternoon.

2. HOUSEKEEPING

Sue Pharo advised that starred items were for information only and would not require discussion. Sue confirmed SPARC membership would be discussed under 5.7, a late paper on Consortia for Interloan and Reciprocal Borrowing under 10.1 and CONZULAC's YBP contracts under 15. Tony Millett also requested that item 20 under 13.4 and item 21 under 13.5 be unstarred.

3. MINUTES OF MEETING 22-23 JULY 2004

3.1 Corrections to July minutes

Starred item – no discussion.

3.2 Summary of actions from July minutes

Starred item – no discussion.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

9.1 Science Librarians Meeting - Isobel Mosley said that at the July 2004 meeting of Science Librarians, discussion had taken place on the issue of digitising classic New Zealand Science. Isobel wished CONZUL to note that the National Library is currently talking to the Royal Society regarding digitisation of its publications. Isobel confirmed she had spoken with Alison Elliott before the meeting and while Alison said there were no funds available at present, both groups may be working on this in the future.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy to seek more information on digitisation of Royal Society publications from Penny Carnaby.

11.10 ANZIIL – Ainslie Dewe said that the action associated with this item may not have been appropriate, and that CONZUL should have responded directly to Irene Dorskatsch. Alan Bundy had offered to add CONZUL to the list of groups that supported the Framework and that in light of this approach Ainslie stated that CONZUL should reconsider the Framework and convey stronger support.

Alex Byrne confirmed that the Spanish, Chinese and South Africans were interested in the Framework as it has a practical flavour. Most have taken the Framework as a reference point and made further developments, and in conclusion Alex suggested CONZUL consider "adopting" the Framework.

Chris Wilson said that the majority felt that it should not be adopted at the July 2004 meeting as not all points referred to university libraries. Michael Wooliscroft stated that Otago University had adopted the framework and found it to be a good foundation. CONZUL agreed they would convey support to Irene Dorskatsch and that Michael would update Richard Wartho, CONZUL's representative on the ANZIIL Executive, of this development. Going back to Alan's offer, Ainslie said there was no immediate need to address this, but that when the Framework was re-written CONZUL could put its name forward.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy to write to Irene Doskatsch, conveying CONZUL's congratulations regarding the Framework and stating it will be adopted as a foundation document. Michael Wooliscroft to advise Richard Wartho of CONZUL's decisions.

5. ADMINISTRATION

5.1 Confirmation of new Chairperson

Gail Pattie was confirmed and welcomed as the new CONZUL Chairperson from 1 January 2005.

5.2 Confirmation of new CEIRC representative

John Redmayne was confirmed as the new CEIRC representative from 1 January 2005. On behalf of CONZUL Sue Pharo warmly thanked Tony Millett for his outstanding work on this Committee.

5.3 Confirmation of new ADT Policy Reference Group representative

Gail Pattie was confirmed as the new ADT Policy Reference Group representative from 1 December 2004. On behalf of CONZUL Sue Pharo warmly thanked Michael Wooliscroft for his contribution to this Group.

5.4 CONZUL Administration Fund

Tony Millett confirmed the Fund would be transferred to the new Chair's home library prior to the end of the year. In terms of 2005 contributions, Tony stated it had previously been agreed that each library preferred to be invoiced an annual sum which, based on total costs including membership and general fees as invoiced through CONZUL, was recommended to be \$1500 per library. Isobel queried whether catering costs for CONZUL meetings were to be paid by the host institution, and CONZUL agreed that this was normal practice. Sue Pharo confirmed it was library group meetings, such as the Science Librarians meeting in July, where catering costs were paid for by CONZUL.

At this time Sue said it was appropriate to discuss *5.5 Production of CAUL Statistics* as this would also impact on contributions to the Fund. CAUL currently pays CAVAL for the production of statistics and after e-mail discussions with Diane Costello, Sue confirmed the amount CONZUL should be contributing to these statistics is AUS\$6,200. Tony stated that CAUL statistics could be paid for by the Fund or re-invoiced to each library. Ainslie Dewe suggested that the CAUL annual fee to CONZUL needed to be increased to include both general and statistics costs. John Redmayne supported Ainslie's recommendation and CONZUL agreed that Rachel O'Shaughnessy should talk to Diane about having one invoice issued to CONZUL annually that covered all costs.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy to discuss with Diane Costello the possibility of having one invoice issued to CONZUL, which itemises AUS\$9,000 as general costs and AUS\$6,200 as statistics costs.

Chris Wilson suggested that membership fees should be kept separate from general fees, but Tony reminded that, as it costs the Chair's University to run the Fund, the fewer invoices the better. CONZUL agreed that one fee to the Fund to cover all

costs was preferable and that Rachel O'Shaughnessy should do some further work on costs and recommend a figure for 2005 contributions.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy to recommend a figure for 2005 contributions to the Fund based on expected total fees to be invoiced through CONZUL and circulate this for approval.

5.5 Production costs of CAUL Statistics

Discussed under 5.4.

5.6 NZUL Statistics 2004 & e-metrics

Isobel Mosley spoke to her paper on e-metrics and recommended that from 2004, CONZUL continue to collect and report on the same e-metrics as detailed in the 2003 New Zealand University Library Statistics. Isobel also recommended that the meeting of Systems Librarians, to take place mid 2005, discuss mechanisms for collecting usage metrics and report back to CONZUL.

Chris Wilson stated Auckland did have some problems with e-metrics as not all vendors are COUNTER compliant. She said it was possible to do, but only COUNTER compliant databases should be counted so that apples are being compared with apples.

Tony Millett said that there was value for each library in comparing its own statistics over time, and there will always be some statistics that cannot be counted. He stated that the National Library will provide you with INNZ statistics if you ask for them, but not Te Puna statistics or End User Access statistics. Statistics were also not available from other New Zealand vendors such as Acumen and Brookers.

Chris said collection of statistics was very time consuming and the problems associated with the collection of e-metrics should be made clear. CONZUL agreed to continue the current situation while also understanding and recognising the issues being discussed.

Sue Pharo thanked Isobel for her work on statistics.

5.7 Renew COUNTER membership for 2005?

CONZUL agreed that both the COUNTER and SPARC 2005 memberships should be paid for from the Fund.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy to forward COUNTER and SPARC invoices to Canterbury University for payment.

5.8 Submissions process

Sue Pharo spoke to the submission guidelines that had been drafted, and conveyed the need for buy-in and process. CONZUL suggested alterations to wording, and Helen Renwick offered to assist Rachel O'Shaughnessy re-draft the guidelines before it was sent out to CONZUL for comment.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy and Helen Renwick to re-draft the submission guidelines and re-send to CONZUL for comment.

6. NATIONAL STORE

Helen Renwick took CONZUL through the National Store Working Group's latest progress report. She confirmed that the contract for development of a modelling tool had been given to RDT Pacific, a company with asset and project management experience, including development of high density storage facilities. CAVAL still remains interested in working with New Zealand libraries and MetroNet is also keen to be involved.

The modelling tool is an Excel spreadsheet and of the three scenarios the Working Group was investigating - a single national store, three regional stores (north, central and south) and out-sourcing to a commercial operator – it recommended that the single national store was recommended as the best option. Helen stated that interested libraries now needed to take a step forward and the four recommendations made in the paper were intended to progress the concept.

Michael Wooliscroft said he was pleased and excited to have the paper and confirmed Otago would be keen to be involved in developing a strategy for a store. He asked whether the Group had considered giving the model to MetroNet and Helen responded that it needed to first go to NLNZ and CONZUL since they had funded the development of the model. She did not see problems with MetroNet being involved but was keen to ensure proper process was followed.

Tony Millett clarified that responding to recommendation two, which asked libraries to commit to developing the concept of a shared store, did not yet mean a financial commitment at this stage. He also said ownership issues would need to be discussed further and sought more information about what "developing the concept" actually meant. Helen stated that a mini-group needed to undertake some further work, but the Working Group did have draft papers on ownership and governance.

John Redmayne asked whether financial commitment should come first, and Helen stated that more development of the concept was required initially. For the record, Sue Pharo also confirmed that Waikato was interesting in participating.

Gail Pattie stated that Canterbury was also interested in participating and would rather work together with other libraries than independently. Isobel Mosley said she supported the issue in principle, but couldn't see that Lincoln would need any storage in the next 10-15 years.

Helen told CONZUL she envisaged the first meeting to be a thrashing out of issues. The National Library is also a full partner and as they have a Memorandum of Understanding with public libraries, they are likely to be very keen to have MetroNet involved.

Rosemary Hudson then suggested that a small fund could be started to cover initial costs and when questioned, stated that around \$10K had been contributed by each party when CONZULSys began. Helen stated that it had been the Working Group's thoughts that the cost of initial meetings would be born by all committed parties until a more formal body was established and felt this was implied in recommendation two.

Ainslie Dewe stated that AUT would want to contribute from the point of view that a store would benefit them as material from their Library could be disposed of, if a last copy was held in the store. The CAVAL model shares costs across all libraries as all

benefit from a store. Helen responded by saying that discussion had moved on from this idea and the Group considered that those that had a specific storage need were in the best position to take action. Others were asked to speak up if the Group's assumption was incorrect but no further discussion took place.

Zoltan Apathy suggested that scalability of membership could be explored, such as the LCoNZ shareholders and customers model.

Michael then asked how the figure of 1.5 million volumes had been arrived at, in relation to the scenarios mapped out and Helen confirmed it was a theoretical model. Keith also stated that there were a number of applicable models once the issue of asset transfer was worked through. They included document delivery models and scanned contents pages like Amazon to aid users.

Sue Pharo then sought CONZUL's agreement on the paper's four recommendations. Recommendation one was agreed and it was noted that the libraries who had commissioned the modelling tool included both CONZUL and the National Library. Recommendations two and three were agreed, and recommendation four agreed with a slight change "**That it is recommended** that those libraries **decide whether to** invite MetroNet to participate in the development of a shared store, and **whether** this report be made available to them."

7. UPDATES

7.1 IFLA and the World Summit on the Information Society

Alex Byrne confirmed his term at IFLA was two years as President-Elect and two years as President. He stated it was an amazing honour to see libraries all around the world and provide leadership. IFLA is changing dramatically, beginning with alterations to statutes. In terms of voting rights this means votes can now be posted instead of members having to attend meetings in person. Alex said IFLA is now globally represented, as while previous presidents came from Europe and the US presenting a very Euro-centric view, different world views are now emerging.

Last year the first ever strategic planning exercise was undertaken. In terms of a Strategic Plan members want IFLA to achieve what can't be achieved at a national level. IFLA have also reviewed their fee structure for national associations and it was confirmed that annual conferences will continue to take place. The 2005 IFLA conference is to be held in Oslo, Norway, 14-18 August. IFLA also wished to participate at other conferences, as reflected in the recent Interloan Conference in Canberra and LIANZA's annual conference in Auckland.

The World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) is a significant event being held in two phases. The first phase was in Geneva 2003 and the second will be in Tunis next year. WSIS was also the first summit to recognise the role of non-government participants in the development of an information society. Alex highlighted that our issues – ICT, intellectual property and sustainability – were now on the government's agenda and recognised in an international declaration and action plan (<http://www.ifla.org/III/wsisis060604.html>). Not to take advantage of this moment was to lose an opportunity.

7.2 CAUL

Alex stated that CAUL members value their relationship with CONZUL as it strengthens both groups.

Of interest to CONZUL will be the In-Reach Pilot Project, which includes four participating universities – UTS, Newcastle, NSW and Charles Sturt. Two sites are using Innovative's In-Reach product and the remaining two sites, ExLibris. The pilot allows clients to use items across campuses with unmediated requesting. A competitive rate for delivery between campuses has been negotiated with AusPost who guarantee one day delivery in the city and two days within States.

The ADT Expansion and Redevelopment Project is also underway. The current ADT database has 2,600 full text theses online with the ideal being a one stop shop of 120-130K records if full Australian coverage is reached. Alex stated that there were challenges with Kinetica and the issue of Masters theses, but these will be discussed at next year's meeting. Discussion on the expansion of ADT to universities in the Pacific region also needs to be held.

Alex also advised that UTS will have its regular library open day after the ALIA Information Online Conference on Friday 4 February 2005. The UNSW will be hosting the Digital Theses Conference in September 2005 and the Turk-ANZAC Conference scheduled for April 2006 is proceeding.

Alex commented that the new Australian government will drive the privatisation of universities, which will have major implications for libraries. UTS is surrounded by 73 private training organisations who have now been locked out of using UTS library services. These organisations may be able to call themselves universities in the future, so it was a pity that higher education was not more of an issue at the recent election. Alex stated that over the last 6-7 years government funding has dropped from 90% to 31%, resulting in moves to full fee paying courses and growth in international students. Keith Webster also commented the UK has faced similar experiences and has been forced into commercial situations.

7.3 Council of Higher Education Librarians of South Africa (CHELSA)

Alex said he had been invited to give a keynote at the South African Library Association's 7th annual conference. Democracy was the theme of the conference that included 700 multi-racial attendees.

Attending the third meeting of the newly formed body, CHELSA, was also a highlight. Made up of a mixture of polytechnic and university librarians, it is anticipated that new universities will be created from the merging of polytechnics and universities. One of the major challenges faced by the CHELSA is the differences between rich and poor universities and now polytechnics are also coming into the picture. CHELSA is looking at shared systems, professional development, co-operation across inequalities, information literacy and the ANZIIL Framework. Alex noted there was pressure to support research, and tension was evident at a digital theses workshop, where institutional and national developments were debated. Libraries decided that the ADT type route should be followed but Alex stated that the group needed to look at the bigger picture. With South Africa the richest of the African countries it needed to look to its neighbours and provide assistance. Alex concluded by stating that CONZUL and CAUL may be able to help in terms of document sharing and advice.

On behalf of CONZUL Sue Pharo thanked Alex for his extensive and valuable input to the meeting.

8. JOINT MEETING WITH E-LEARNING DIRECTORS AND SCIT

See Appendix A.

9. OPEN ACCESS – A CONZUL STATEMENT?

Ainslie Dewe and Alex Byrne stated open access was aimed at all people throughout the world. Alex said the IFLA statement recognises many dimensions such as the moral rights of authors, quality, censorship and supporting the public domain. While IFLA supports open access movements it can't see a move away from total user pays to full open access, and a hybrid model is more feasible. It was noted that the IFLA open access paper was taken to CAUL and the CAUL Statement on Open Access was drafted and adopted.

Ainslie commented that there were a number of things going on in New Zealand, but CONZUL has no umbrella covering these initiatives. The National Digital Strategy looks at content so this document is relevant. NZ Online which may be funded from the Growth and Innovation Fund (GIF) takes the NZ On Air model and will look to fund born digital items or the digitising of items. David Cunliffe is interested in the Library and Information Advisory Commission (LIAC) giving more advice to government on this issue.

SPARC also has a view about open access and the Scottish libraries have also made a very practical declaration. In conclusion Ainslie recommended that CONZUL create a statement on open access.

Isobel Mosley questioned what universities do with these documents once they are completed and Michael Wooliscroft stated that at Otago it would go through the Library Services Committee, the Standing Committee and then be approved by Senate. He also stated that a summary article is sometimes produced for the library newsletter. Sue Pharo also said documents such as these follow an internal process and are sent to relevant committees.

Keith Webster stated that making the next move is difficult and implementation needs to be influenced by input from libraries. Sue stated that a CONZUL statement on open access could be taken to the NZVCC but it was agreed that the NZVCC may be unsure what to do with it, and it was noted that the statement will have more application at the grassroots level. Alex stated that the SPARC website had guidelines under 'Create Change' that would be of assistance and perhaps a statement needed to be drafted now that the National Digital Strategy presented an opportunity. CONZUL therefore agreed to draft a statement on open access and Ainslie and Isobel volunteered to make a start and come back to the group.

ACTION: Ainslie Dewe and Isobel Mosley to draft a statement on open access and present it to CONZUL.

10. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

10.1 Reciprocal borrowing policy

John Redmayne presented Draft 5 of the Reciprocal Borrowing Policy. It was noted that the list of general exclusions in Appendix A was good to have. Chris Wilson

stated that Auckland had an expectation that the service would be charged for and this was not listed. John stated that if Auckland did not want to be part of the scheme for the initial pilot year then this would be possible. He confirmed all exclusions would be listed in Appendix A, and those that had not yet sent exclusions through should do so promptly.

John confirmed he would circulate Draft 6 by Friday 26 November and CONZUL would have 5 working days to comment meaning all feedback was to be received no later than Friday 3 December. All further comments would then be worked into a final policy and all libraries should confirm participation to Rachel O'Shaughnessy. It was agreed that the scheme will begin in January 2005 and that the policy would be added to the CONZUL website.

A communication statement was discussed as well as an opportunity for the Vice-Chancellors' to launch.

ACTION: John Redmayne to circulate Draft 6 by Friday 26 November with CONZUL providing feedback by Friday 3 December. Rachel O'Shaughnessy to add the final policy to the CONZUL website.

Gail Pattie then discussed her late paper on *Consortia for Interloan and Reciprocal Borrowing*. She stated the paper detailed a consortia deal for purchase of a Dynix product, URSA, which Canterbury would be happy to demonstrate in 2005. URSA would have initial set up costs and \$10,000 maintenance costs per year, and while initially limited to eight participants it could be extended further. It was suggested that this be put on the agenda in 2005 for discussion.

Tony Millett queried what was in the deal for LCoNZ libraries, and Gail stated it would need to be investigated but it was standards based, while Voyager products may not be. Ainslie Dewe confirmed LCoNZ should look at this option, if only from an informational point of view.

Chris Wilson also stated Auckland were implementing VDX and were a LIDDAS site. It was recognised that there were multiple products on the market and these all needed to be able to talk to each other.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy to put the *Consortia for Interloan and Reciprocal Borrowing* paper on the next meeting's agenda.

10.2 Digital theses - ADT/ProQuest's Bepress

Michael Wooliscroft thanked Gail Pattie for Canterbury's recent paper regarding digital theses software. Chris Wilson said she could not really give any further update regarding ProQuest's Bepress product, and confirmed it was not a priority for Auckland this year. The group was advised that Bepress allows you to out-source management and storage of digital theses and information is held on a server in the US. Alex Byrne confirmed that ProQuest is represented on the ADT board, and that people will have a variety of options available to them. The ADT Expansion and Redevelopment Project will use MetaSuite software for management, harvesting and discovery, although a decision will still need to be made regarding storage.

10.3 Collection security

Gail Pattie confirmed that her paper regarding Operation Pukapuka was for informational purposes, but that she had had media ask what university libraries were

doing about the problem. Gail confirmed she was highlighting the issue as universities may be embarrassed if it happens again.

Alex Byrne stated that UTS had had similar problems with thefts and installed security cameras, employed security guards and had plain clothed police on the premises. At the time Police stated more had to be done to control access, but it was not until the Sydney Olympics that Federal Police insisted on tighter controls. Swipe card-controlled entry gates was therefore implemented with no complaints and users felt safer. Keith Webster stated that this is now standard practice for libraries and university buildings in the UK, following pressure from both insurance companies and Police. Keith said that at his last post the Student Association had requested closed swipe card access and insurance had paid for its implementation.

Michael Wooliscroft also conveyed his thanks to Gail on keeping libraries updated on this issue.

10.4 NZ Research Information Working Group (NZRIWG)

Sue Pharo stated that there were no further updates to report at present. At the last teleconference in September, the Group had suggested Penny Carnaby approach MoRST and TEC to see if they wished to be part of this Group and the outcome of those talks has not yet been reported.

Ainslie Dewe stated that the final Terms of Reference still included items 3 and 4 which CONZUL had rejected at the last meeting. Isobel Mosley said compromise was required and the alternative suggested by Tony Millett that the wording "stage" or "phase" to distinguish between points 1 and 2, and 3 and 4 respectively was used by the NZRIWG.

Sue confirmed that the project had not had any buy-in from the Research Committee when it met on 10 September, so it was very difficult to move forward on this basis. It was noted that this Group had been working together since February 2004 with little progress having been achieved due to differing views over scope. Alex Byrne suggested that CONZUL's position be reviewed in relation to open access. Priscilla Read said there was a difference between availability and accessibility, and gaps still needed to be highlighted. Ainslie stated that universities could still achieve the desired result through open access.

Tony Millett said the group's Terms of Reference proposal did not have the support required from within universities so it was time to withdraw and set up a smaller working group within CONZUL to focus on identifying gaps. Chris Wilson stated this could be revisited through the second paragraph of the Research Committee's resolution that a plausible problem definition be established in conjunction with purposes and benefits.

John Redmayne said that open access was a good argument especially as each university is setting up their own research databases.

CONZUL then voted to withdraw from the Research Information Working Group, with all agreeing except Lincoln University who were against withdrawing.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy to advise the Research Information Working Group that CONZUL wishes to withdraw from the Group, to focus energies on open access and repositories.

10.5 National Consortium Licences Project

Isobel Mosley said an e-mail had recently been sent to all members from Rachel O'Shaughnessy, regarding next steps with this project. It was hoped that all universities would continue to participate in the consortium.

Tony Millett also took the opportunity to remind CONZUL about the recent Knowledge Basket and Acumen deals he had circulated asking that all libraries respond by the deadline given.

10.6 Tertiary and Research Library Managers' Forum

Sue Pharo said working with tertiary and research libraries had been challenging, although good support had been received from Amanda Cooper, Co-convenor of TELSIG. CONZUL agreed that each year the tasks of administration, organisation and hosting of a forum and following-up on forum actions needed to be rotated so all could work as full partners. CONZUL stated that clipping onto the LIANZA Conference had worked well this year, although next year there may be a clash with CAUL's Brisbane meeting.

ACTION: Sue Pharo to report CONZUL's recommendation to the research and tertiary group's next teleconference.

FRIDAY 19 NOVEMBER

11. STRATEGIC PLAN 2004-2006

Sue Pharo stated that CONZUL needed to spend time looking at where it was going and suggested a review of the Strategic Plan in 2005. The associated paper and updates for each action were discussed.

Goal 1 – Leadership and Advocacy

Action 1 – CONZUL stated they had agreed to withdraw from this Group yesterday.

Action 2 – CONZUL agreed submissions work is ongoing.

Action 3 – Tony Millett noted that all universities are represented on the NZVCC's Copyright Committee. In terms of an update Tony said the licence agreement with PMCA for multiple copying from New Zealand newspapers was still dragging on with no news on pricing. It was noted that a retrospective payment could be expected if negotiations carry onto in 2005/2006. CONZUL then discussed possible amendments to the Copyright Bill in 2005 and the Public Records Bill.

Action 4 – Ainslie Dewe said she had visited the Open University in the UK to discuss knowledge management and had had a paper accepted for EDUCAUSE 2005.

Goal 2 – Innovative access to resources for research, teaching and learning

Action 1 – CONZUL confirmed this needed to be two statements and should be reviewed next year.

Action 2 – CONZUL stated the ANZIIL Framework action had been updated yesterday. In terms of the second part of the action associated with Catts, Michael Wooliscroft said Otago had received a research grant and he would make the results available to CONZUL.

Action 3 – Ainslie stated that this action had not been completed as ECDF funding had not been approved, but that as a result of the joint meeting with E-Learning and SCIT some further action may be taken.

Action 4 – CONZUL agreed this action was in progress.

Action 5 – CONZUL agreed this should be changed to Massey and that John Redmayne should take on New Zealand negotiations for databases such as those from Knowledge Basket and Acumen.

Goal 3 – Capacity Building

Action 1 – CONZUL agreed the National Store was making good progress.

Action 2 – CONZUL agreed that the Reciprocal Borrowing Policy was almost complete.

Action 3 – CONZUL agreed to sit on this policy.

Action 4 – It was noted there had been some discussions regarding Rodski and LibQUAL at the most recent CAUL meeting. Some Australia libraries may pull out of Rodski which will influence benchmarking. LATN libraries may also move to LibQUAL as it was good for benchmarking with other institutions. CONZUL stated this would be an important area to focus on in 2005. Alex Byrne had written a paper on LibQUAL and John Redmayne agreed to circulate some articles comparing LibQUAL and Rodski.

ACTION: John Redmayne agreed to circulate articles comparing LibQUAL and Rodski.

Action 5 – CONZUL agreed the action had been partially completed.

Action 6 – CONZUL agreed the action had been completed.

Goal 4 – Partnerships

Action 1 – CONZUL agreed the action had been completed.

Action 2 – CONZUL agreed the action had been completed.

Action 3 – CONZUL agreed the action had been completed.

Action 4 – Sue Pharo stressed the great benefit CONZUL receives from its relationship with CAUL and John noted that the University Library Australia (ULA) Working Group was missing from the list.

12. LIBRARY MEETINGS

Sue Pharo noted that the year ahead was very busy with a joint CONZUL/CAUL meeting in April and three CONZUL meetings. Gail Pattie stated that a meeting in late February was required if items were to go on the CAUL agenda. CONZUL agreed that the following locations would host meetings, with dates to be circulated shortly – Feb/March, Dunedin; July, Palmerston North and November, Wellington.

Sue then moved on to discuss meetings of librarians. Priscilla Read confirmed that Canterbury were still happy to host in 2005. Auckland's proposal for an information literacy meeting was discussed and John Redmayne stated he was unsure if there was a need and recommended that Māori services librarians be supported. Michael Wooliscroft supported John's recommendation and confirmed ANZIIL were already planning a 2005 meeting for information literacy librarians. Chris Wilson stated that Janet supported Li Wang's paper and was not convinced there was a need for a Systems Librarians meeting. Chris said she was not convinced there was a need for Māori services librarians as they always seemed to be attending a large number of meetings.

Priscilla said that Canterbury's Systems Librarians felt they never met and work had been undertaken to tighten the agenda and would include digital theses and the question posed regarding University Library Statistics. Sue Colyer stated that Reference Librarians had also wanted a meeting and this had come through to Auckland from Victoria. Gail Pattie said CONZUL had committed to having a meeting of Systems Librarians but questioned whether events had overtaken this, especially with EDUCAUSE being hosted next year.

CONZUL agreed to go ahead with the Systems Librarians meeting next year, which would be hosted at Canterbury. Sue noted there were three other proposals on the table – Information Literacy, Māori and Reference. CONZUL agreed there were a number of meetings that Information Literacy Librarians could attend, and more seemed to support a meeting of Māori than Reference. John agreed to host a meeting of Māori services librarians at Massey and work on an agenda which would be brought back to CONZUL's next meeting. Keith Webster agreed to talk to Victoria's Head of Research and Reference and establish whether there was a genuine need for a meeting. CONZUL also commented that a definition of reference would be of assistance, and confirmed that the number of library group meetings per year should stay at two.

ACTION: John Redmayne to work on an agenda for Māori services librarians and bring this to CONZUL's next meeting.

13. RELATIONSHIPS

13.1 National Library of New Zealand (NLNZ)

Sue Pharo stated that Penny Carnaby's update had been received from the National Library and asked for comments from the group. Questions were asked regarding the Documentary Heritage Policy Framework and Michael provided some brief background. Ainslie Dewe also commented that Penny had provided LIAC with an update on this policy.

It was noted that a review of the Alexander Turnbull Library (ATL) had been completed, and while unsure whether it was internal only CONZUL highlighted their frustration at not being approached to provide feedback. CONZUL asked Rachel O'Shaughnessy to request further information on the review and also update Penny on the fact that CONZUL would be withdrawing from the Research Information Working Group.

ACTION: Rachel O'Shaughnessy to request further information on the ATL review and advise that CONZUL would be withdrawing from the Research Information Working Group.

Gail Pattie commented that the National Digital Forum (NDF) had been very good and Ainslie stated that once CONZUL had an open access statement they could make a real contribution to the NDF. Michael Wooliscroft stated that nominations for the NDF organising committee were being sought, and recommended that CONZUL be represented. Keith Webster volunteered and Michael confirmed he would send Rachel O'Shaughnessy the appropriate contact so CONZUL's representative could be forwarded.

ACTION: Michael Wooliscroft to send Rachel O'Shaughnessy the appropriate NDF contact so Keith Webster's contact details can be forwarded.

13.2 Te Puna Strategic Advisory Committee (TPSAC) – 5 October

Sue Pharo asked for comments regarding the TPSAC Minutes and Terms of Reference and said she had received a letter from Kim Gutchlag calling for three university representatives on TPSAC to be forwarded by the end of November.

As an update to the Minutes Isobel Mosley said the Working Group who had looked at removal of charges included herself and Barbara Garriock. This work had now been completed as the National Library would now take up the case. It was noted that charging for 2005 would remain the same as for 2004 and Tony Millett stated this was disappointing for Waikato, whose usage had dropped significantly. The National Library had confirmed their hands were tied as they were bound to revenue targets set by government so no reductions were possible. Tony stated access to statistical data was very important and this needed to be addressed. While INNZ statistics can be retrieved if asked for, it was not possible to acquire Te Puna and/or End User Access statistics. Chris Wilson confirmed that Janet Copsey was on the Bibliographic Records Working Group whose first meeting would take place on 30 November.

In terms of university representation on TPSAC, John Redmayne confirmed he wished to stand down. Sue Pharo thanked John for the hard work he had done on this Committee on behalf of CONZUL. Three representatives were required and John recommended Chris Wilson for her vast experience. Isobel suggested Janet

and Chris confirmed she would discuss this with Janet. Keith Webster volunteered and Sue Colyer was also recommended. CONZUL agreed that all names should be confirmed to Rachel by 26 November, and Rachel would advise Sheryl Calvert as the appropriate contact listed in Kim's letter.

ACTION: Representatives to be confirmed to Rachel O'Shaughnessy by 26 November, and Rachel to advise Sheryl Calvert.

13.3 Joint Standing Committee on Interloan (JSCI) – 5 November

Sue Colyer provided CONZUL with an additional paper on the IBS survey results and noted it was semi-confidential as it had not been reported to the National Library or LIANZA. The JSCI's next meeting on 10 December would make recommendations on the direction to be taken and Sue confirmed she would report back on this, as well as the outcome of research being conducted by the School of Information and Management Studies. Sue said the paper could be shared with interloan librarians as this material had not yet been sent out to them. Sue also noted that the LIANZA website will host statistical interloan data in the near future and members will be strongly encouraged to add statistics, although it will not be compulsory. More will be revealed after the 10 December meeting.

13.4 EPIC Governance Group (EGG) – Sept. & Oct. meetings

Tony Millett had asked that this item be unstarred as Heather Jenks had posed a question regarding science information. Tony stated that Knowledge Basket continues to add records to their *NZ Science* database, and as Isobel Mosley had pointed out earlier the Royal Society may be digitising its publications. Lorraine confirmed she would follow up with Heather about the question.

Isobel Mosley also said she had reported back from the Te Puna Strategic Advisory Committee (TPSAC) that NZJO was in the National Library's budget this year. It was noted that this may be a linking project as opposed to full-text. Isobel said that perhaps as part of open access discussions, publishers could be approached to digitise. Tony stated that RMIT are open to doing this and he had reported this back to the July 2004 meeting.

Tony also took the opportunity to remind libraries about the EGG survey seeking recommendations for databases appropriate to "all of country" licences, stating it was an opportunity to give feedback especially as significant savings had been made in the first round. Ainslie Dewe also pointed out it was worth thinking about what was good for alumni as well since they could also use this service. Tony said Gale Group do not object to alumni access, although further follow-up is required here, and neither do ProQuest. Ebsco won't allow alumni access which is ironic considering they are one of the vendors for EPIC.

13.5 LIANZA

Tony Millett has asked that this item be unstarred and wished to query a comment Steven Lulich had made regarding LIANZA Membership. Steven had stated that Auckland was paying personal membership fees of their staff and this may be a good example for other academic libraries to follow. Chris Wilson commented that this was currently the case, although staff members must be professionally qualified. It was noted that payment of fees was not automatic and that an approach must still be made by the individual staff member to management.

13.6 Library and Information Advisory Commission (LIAC)

Ainslie Dewe stated that the NZ Online idea, which may be funded from the Growth and Innovation Fund (GIF) would be followed up with Marion Hobbs and David Cunliffe. Chris Batt, Chief Executive of The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council in the UK was also able to attend the latest LIAC meeting as he had spoken at the National Digital Forum. A briefing from the Telecommunications Commissioner, and on Project Probe was also received.

LIAC has been asked to become a sponsor for public libraries looking at a Strategic Framework, but Ainslie noted LIAC must be careful when their core responsibility was to advise the Minister. A watching brief is also being kept on the Advanced Network as the regulatory environment is controlling development in this area. LIAC's newest member, Brian Pauling also has a broadcasting background which is of great assistance to LIAC.

13.7 MLIS Programme Advisory Committee – 3 November

John Redmayne discussed the MLIS Programme Advisory Committee's (PAC) latest meeting on 3 November. He confirmed that the Review Report would be presented to the Academic Board on 2 December. While PAC had not yet seen the Report, it may recommend stronger committee input and that a member external to the MLIS programme convene the committee.

John stated that Victoria will be audited in 2005 and reviews of programmes will be included. In regard to electives it was noted that 530 Māori Information Services was only offered every second year and that 526 Cataloguing had received good interest. Michael Wooliscroft expressed dismay that 530 was not offered annually. It was also noted that a senior tutor would now have a focus on distance students outside of Auckland and that a Practicum option was being worked on.

In conclusion John recommended that CONZUL invite a member of the School to discuss the Review Report and Practicum option once the Report is made public.

ACTION: CONZUL to invite a member of the School to discuss the Review Report and Practicum option once the Report is made public.

13.8 School of Information Management, VUW

Discussed in 13.7.

13.9 CEIRC Minutes – 7 October

Starred item – no discussion.

13.10 Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

Tony Millett presented a proposal put forward by the publishers of the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, noting that it had received some support from CAUL while also raising many questions. Tony stated he had been asked to bring this to CONZUL and it was likely the fee of US\$11,000 per year could be reduced to US\$8,000 per year. The fee would only be payable for three years on a "one-time cost" plan and CONZUL noted similar models may come forward if this model proves sustainable. In terms of supporting open access CONZUL was keen to participate and noted the product had appeal outside of philosophy. It was agreed that Tony

would negotiate reduction of the fee to US\$8,000 per year, and put a proposal forward to CONZUL in terms of apportioning costs by EFTS.

ACTION: Tony Millett to negotiate reduction of the fee to \$US8,000 per year, and put a proposal forward to CONZUL in terms of apportioning costs.

13.11 HUMANZ – Interim Council for the Humanities

CONZUL agreed they wished to be represented on HUMANZ's Interim Council for the Humanities (ICH). Rachel O'Shaughnessy confirmed meeting costs had to be met by the attendee and meetings may be in Wellington. Chris Wilson stated Helen Renwick could be interested, and Keith Webster confirmed he would be happy to attend. CONZUL agreed to approach Helen first and if she was unavailable, come back to Keith and accept his offer.

ACTION: Chris Wilson to approach Helen Renwick as CONZUL's representative on ICH and advise Rachel O'Shaughnessy of the outcome.

14. ROUND ROBIN

Librarians shared issues from their libraries.

15. OTHER BUSINESS

Sue Pharo stated that Stephen Pugh from YBP/Lindsay & Howes had recently visited Waikato University and during his talks noted the different timeframes for CONZULAC contracts. CONZUL briefly discussed the issues and Michael Wooliscroft confirmed he would write a brief report and circulate it to CONZULAC members.

Michael suggested a 1-2 hour meeting for CONZULAC members prior to the February/March 2005 CONZUL meeting. Michael also confirmed that Marilyn Fordyce would send out a performance review of the contracts to CONZULAC members shortly.

ACTION: Michael Wooliscroft to write a brief report and circulate it to CONZULAC members.

16. OTHER MEETINGS/CONFERENCES

The following meetings and conferences were noted for information purposes:

- ALIA Information Online – 1-3 February 2005, Sydney
- CONZUL/CAUL Joint Meeting – 4 April 2005, Auckland
- EDUCAUSE Australasia – 5-8 April 2005, Auckland
- LIANZA Conference – 12-14 September 2005, Christchurch
- CAUL – 15-16 September 2005, Brisbane

John Remyne also noted that in 2006 the ALIA Conference and CAUL meeting would be aligned in Perth.

Appendix A

JOINT MEETING

COUNCIL OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIANS (CONZUL), E-LEARNING DIRECTORS AND THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SCIT)

THURSDAY 18 NOVEMBER

1. WELCOME

Sue Pharo, CONZUL Chair, Wayne MacKintosh, E-learning Co-ordinator and Gerrit Bahlman, SCIT Chair welcomed all three groups to the meeting.

2. PRESENTATIONS and REVIEWING 2004, LOOKING TO 2005

E-Learning

The E-Learning Group began with a presentation from Lincoln about Moodle (<http://moodle.com>), which is a virtual learning environment software solution and a spin-off of eCDF funding. Moodle is being piloted to replace Lincoln's current in-house system "Learn@Lincoln" and full implementation is envisaged by 2006. In terms of usage Moodle will be used at Lincoln by 3550 EFTS and 230 staff, while also managing 550 papers. The product has over 2,000 registered sites in approximately 96 countries and 56 languages including Māori. In contrast to WebCT and Blackboard, Moodle is preferred in terms of ease of use and administration. Moodle was designed in 1999 and is both a technological and pedagogical system. A Moodle conference will be held at Waiariki Institute of Technology 3-4 February 2005.

CONZUL

Sue Pharo moved back to the agenda to begin reviewing 2004. Speaking to a CONZUL paper, Sue stated that CONZUL had been through a busy year with key projects being the National Consortium Licences Project and the National Store Project. Work had also been undertaken to complete a new Strategic Plan, update CONZUL Terms of Reference, complete a Reciprocal Borrowing Policy, implement a Professional Development Visits programme and comment on various submissions. A number of joint meetings and workshops had also been held throughout the year.

Sue stated that from 2005 CONZUL would have a new Chair, Gail Pattie from the University of Canterbury, and CONZUL looked forward to further progress in 2005 especially in the area of storage.

As one of the CONZUL presentations, Gail Pattie gave a short update on Canterbury's experience with digital theses. It was noted that CONZUL had hosted an Australian Digital Theses (ADT) (<http://adt.caul.edu.au/>) workshop in March and that the wider picture was one of digital repositories. Canterbury had analysed ADT, D-Space and Greenstone software for digital theses and selected ADT with implementation likely in 2005. Canterbury will aim to commit 200-300 theses per year to the ADT Program.

Rosemary Hudson gave the second CONZUL presentation on ENCompass. Libraries have been working with databases over the last few decades although the problem of access has grown with the wide variety of interfaces. In trying to manage this, four Library Consortium of New Zealand (LCoNZ) libraries purchased ENCompass, which includes ENCompass for Resource Access (ERA),

LinkFinderPlus (LFP) and ENCompass for Digital Collections (EDC). LCoNZ are working with the first two products which allow for federated searching across one unified database. Databases can also be organised in different ways, for example Otago have arranged by subject collections with a focus on first and second year students. Otago are keen to have this introduced next year but LCoNZ is currently looking at capacity load.

LFP is also being implemented and this can be used with ERA as it provides links to full text. Rosemary also said that Otago will be looking at more datasets and working with e-learning and IT more. Otago are also looking to complete the Cavisham Project in EDC where access will be provided to print and digital images. The National Library has also completed Matapihi (<http://www.matapihi.govt.nz>) in EDC, which acts as a repository for metadata for remote collections based at Alexander Turnbull Library, Auckland Art Gallery, Auckland City Libraries, Christchurch City Libraries and Otago Museum.

E-Learning

Wayne MacKintosh stated that E-Learning Directors were a new group still finding their feet. The Group is looking at concepts of new pedagogy and investigating the landscape, as well as sharing documentation and environments within each individual institution. Wayne stated the Group is not formalized as an NZVCC Standing Committee and they would be exploring this option in the future and felt the NZVCC would be agreeable to this. Wayne also recognised formal status would allow the Group to take advantage of administrative and secretarial support the office could offer.

SCIT

Gerrit Bahlman stated that SCIT met 2-3 times per year. Links with CAUDIT lead to a high level of information exchange. SCIT are involved with EDUCAUSE 2005, benchmarking performance across universities, and IT security, access and reliability. As a group SCIT needs to build a policy framework and develop a case to support an administrator, which will ideally be achieved in the next 12 months.

Gerrit noted that areas of collaboration may fall from the Advanced Research Network (ARN) and called on Neil James to speak on behalf of SCIT on this issue.

Neil James stated that MoRST picked up on the need for an ARN after work was begun by NGI-NZ. Now a member of the MoRST Steering Group Neil stated that an IDF grant of \$8.2 million had been made and around \$40 million had been allocated from this year's budget. A full-time Implementation Manager is working on the project and RFPs are likely to be sent out in the New Year. Contracts may be let by May 2005 and NGI-NZ is likely to be contracted to run a Capability Build programme and assist with communications.

Ainslie Dewe commented that Neil's quote about New Zealand being unique in the world as it does not have an ARN, had been quoted to the Library and Information Advisory Commission (LIAC). Neil stated Greece is aiming to have all citizens accessing an ARN.

While it was noted that the cost of moving information around the world is dropping all the time the real costs for universities of the ARN are still unknown.

3. UPDATES

3.1 Ministry of Education's Tertiary e-Learning Research Fund

Wayne MacKintosh confirmed that e-learning directors were not putting any applications forward due to the restricted nature of research topics and the small size of the fund.

3.2 Ministry of Education's Interim Tertiary e-Learning Framework

Ainslie Dewe stated the Framework was disappointing and had a real lack of vision especially in respect to the scenarios in the document. The fundamental building blocks were not addressed and Ainslie said she was unsure how these issues would be addressed. It was noted that the Framework was based on early childhood right through to higher education which is problematic.

Andrew Higgins proposed that a joint working group be established to work on a second eCDF project together and Gerrit asked what the topic or issue would be. He confirmed Andrew should work through this and come back to the group as a whole. Each group could then independently assess and decide whether to work on this proposal.

ACTION: Andrew Higgins to suggest a topic or issue for an eCDF application that can be jointly worked on and send it to each group for independent consideration.

Isobel Mosley confirmed she was interested in more general communication with TEC not just an eCDF proposal where processes were fixed. Gerrit suggested that this be taken to Auckland for a special interest group meeting, and Stephen Whiteside as Convenor of EDUCAUSE was asked to organize this.

ACTION: Stephen Whiteside to organize a special interest group meeting at EDUCAUSE, April 2005 to include TEC, MoE, CONZUL, SCIT, E-learning Directors and ITPs.

3.3 PBRF

Isobel Mosley confirmed that CONZUL had made a PBRF submission on 30 September 2004. The group was advised that if they wished to stay in touch with TEC regularly they should subscribe to TEC NoW at <http://www.tec.govt.nz/updates/update.php> to receive automatic e-mail updates.

It was suggested that each group representative talk to Lindsay Taiaroa, Executive Director of the NZVCC to discuss the communication strategy the office has with TEC, as direct communications from Standing Committees may undermine communications from the NZVCC office.

ACTION: Sue Pharo, Wayne MacKintosh, Gerrit Bahlman to talk further about how communication with the TEC can be improved.

4. ACTIONS

The groups agreed to discuss individually how they wished to work together in the future and report back.

ACTION: Each group to report back how they wish to work in the future.



CAUL Meeting 2004/2
13-14 September, 2004
Hadley's Hotel, Hobart
DRAFT Minutes (updated 16/2/05)

615. Introduction & Welcome. Madeleine McPherson welcomed members to the meeting, with a special welcome to Jenny Rayner of the State Library of Tasmania, and Kay Raseroka, President of IFLA. She welcomed those attending for the first time, Stuart Whelan, Ralph Kiel, and Con Graves, and the return of Helen Livingston. Ray Choate advised members that Ira Raymond, formerly librarian of the University of Adelaide, died the previous weekend.

Professor Daryl Le Grew, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Tasmania, welcomed members to Tasmania. He touched on the advantages of an island community, the role of the university in targeting unique local products, the role of commercialisation of intellectual property in the future of Australian universities, and the role of universities in promoting discourse in the post-digital age.

616. Attendance & Apologies.

From CAUL:

*Stuart Whelan, ACU
Vic Elliott, ANU
Gulcin Cribb, Bond U
Graham Black, CQU
Shirley Oakley, CSU
Imogen Garner, Curtin U
#Helen Livingston, Deakin U
Jeff Murray, ECU
Bill Cations, Flinders U
*Con Graves, Griffith U
John McKinlay, JCU
Earle Gow, La Trobe U
Maxine Brodie, Macquarie U
Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Monash U
Margaret Jones, Murdoch U
Ruth Quinn, CDU
Gaynor Austen, QUT
Craig Anderson, RMIT U
Alison Ransome, SCU
Derek Whitehead, Swinburne U
Ray Choate, 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
Dr Alan Bundy, UniSA
Madeleine McPherson, USQ, President
John Shipp, U Sydney
Linda Luther, U Tasmania
Dr Alex Byrne, UTS

Heather Gordon, USC
*Ralph Kiel, UWA
Liz Curach, UWS
Felicity McGregor, UoW
Doreen Parker, VU

#Acting Director
*Delegate of CAUL Member

In attendance:
Diane Costello, CAUL

From CONZUL:
Ainslie Dewe, AUT
John Redmayne, Massey U
Michael Wooliscroft, U Otago

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

Apologies:
Chris Sheargold, ACU
Janice Rickards, Griffith U
Jeff Ovens, UNDA
John Arfield, UWA
Janet Copsey, U Auckland
Sue Pharo, U Waikato
Professor Denise Kirkpatrick, Monash U
Dr Evan Arthur, DEST

- 617. Arrangement of the agenda.** Items were starred for discussion. For those items not starred, all items for noting were considered noted, and all recommendations were considered approved.
- 618. *Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting, 1-2 April, 2004.** Item 1199. AARLIN. Earle Gow advised members that arrangements had been made with Ex Libris for 21 licences (the current 13 participants and any others who join, up to the 21) and 104,000 EFTSU. Ongoing costs will depend on EFTSU, with maintenance and administration charges added to the cost of the perpetual licence.
- 619. *Minutes of Executive Meetings, 6-7 June and 12 August, 2004.** Copies of the minutes were included in the agenda papers. There were no additional comments.
- 620. Business arising from previous meetings, not otherwise listed on the agenda.**
- 621. *CAUL Membership & Representation.**
- a) **CAUL Elections 2004.** Eve Woodberry reported that elections for three members of the Executive had been finalised. Madeleine McPherson has been elected for a further two year term, as have Derek Whitehead and Andrew Wells.
- b) **Membership of CAUL Working Groups & Ad Hoc Committees.** The Executive drafted a set of guidelines for establishment and membership. Madeleine McPherson, circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed, so the recommendation is accepted.
- Recommendation to CAUL: *That CAUL members accept the guidelines.*

STRATEGIC PLAN

- 622. Review of the Strategic Plan.** Madeleine McPherson noted that progress is reported in the minutes of each Executive meeting.

Support for Research

- 623. *ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee).** John Shipp reported on the meeting held the previous week. ARIIC now has a web site. The invoice for JSTOR has been received, providing access to the end of 2006 for all universities. Some additional funds retained from the favourable exchange rate may be used for training, a roadshow, promotional materials eg information that can be added to the web site, or for interactive training. Vic Elliott expressed concern about allocating much to training when the product should be intuitive. There has been no formal announcement from the government. John Shipp will check with DEST about the timing of a press release. **(Action: JS)** Discussions are being held about whether results of research under ARC funding should be directed to institutional repositories.
- a) **ADT. Hot Topic.** Andrew Wells reported that the ADT-ARIIC project is an expansion of the ADT metadata repository to become a one-stop shop database for theses with the addition of records for theses yet to be digitised. The harvesting software is being upgraded to OAI-PMH-compliant to cope with the variety of institutional repository software, support Z39.50, etc. Peter Green, Curtin University, is working with UNSW personnel on the project.
- Data is being extracted from the NBD, approximately 130,000 records, and will need to be manually cleaned in the final stage, expected to be early 2005. Links will be added to local document delivery systems for those theses that have not been digitised. The project will look at options for retrospective digitisation and alternative submission systems, such as BEPress which is being marketed by project partner, ProQuest.
- The future of the program is that of the management a metadata repository, extracted from various forms of institutional repository software where universities are managing their own digital content. The ADT business plan will be revised to take this into account. **(Action: AW)**

- b) **APSR. Hot Topic.** Vic Elliott reviewed progress in the Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories. <http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20042apsr.ppt> He compared APSR and ARROW, both major projects looking at repository systems, highlighting the importance of testing different philosophies and technologies. APSR has moved into its operational phase, and ANU's role is to test the IR software and embed it into the academic community, including assisting academics to become self-sufficient in archiving. The University of Sydney is testing digital objects, under the sub-project SORRTS. The University of Queensland is viewing multiple repositories, branded as e-scholarship@UQ. ANU's dSpace will be made available to other universities at the end of 2005. International linkages are being made: with Thomson Scientific's Web Citation Project, with the dSpace/Google/OCLC project to limit searches to a specific institution.
- c) **ARROW. Hot Topic.** Geoff Payne presented "ARROW progress report to CAUL" <http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20042arrow.ppt> He reported that ARROW will attempt to put a repository system in place early in the project even though the software is quite immature. He offered to provide references to the evaluations of various repository softwares conducted in early 2004. ARROW is now a member of the FEDORA consortium which provides the opportunity to influence developments. The National Library is producing the resource discovery system, harvesting using OAI-PMH to its TeraText database, using the PictureAustralia model and technology. UTS is sharing its experience with open access journal publishing using OJS (Open Journal System) from Public Knowledge Report. They are working with Google to determine how best to expose the content. It will be possible to use different models of metadata for different types of objects, and OCLC's CORC to allow translation between metadata sets.

The aim is to develop a generalised institutional repository system. Incentives will be needed to attract content eg if DEST were to recognise institutional deposit for additional credit, to add administrative efficiency to DEST reporting. It is being developed as Open Source software, a condition of the DEST agreement.

ARROW has paid VTLS a large deposit to lock in preferential pricing for all universities who wish to licence the software.

It was suggested that providing a central repository was less difficult technically than politically. Some institutional material may not be able to be exposed outside the university. It was noted that FEDORA does not yet handle authentication.

It was noted that the ADT program is essentially metadata harvesting, with a central index pointing to local repositories. It is expected that most ADT participants will migrate to another form of repository system.

- d) ***MAMS Project. Hot Topic.** James Dalziel presented "MAMS Requirements Gathering" [http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting\\$/MAMSrequirementsDalziel.ppt](http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting$/MAMSrequirementsDalziel.ppt) beginning with an overview of content management systems technologies [http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting\\$/ContentManagementDalziel.ppt](http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting$/ContentManagementDalziel.ppt) He noted significant similarities and overlaps between content systems developed by various elements of the sector eg web management systems, document management systems, etc. which may have different interfaces but the same underlying structure. Within the university, different sections manage different repositories eg the PR section may own the website. There may be a problem with cultural interoperability across IT services, grid computing, library services, e-learning, etc. Both the new technologies and DEST are now pushing to discuss the common meaning.

Some of the COLIS work is common to some of the newer areas eg e-reserve is similar to learning objects, then fold in digital rights management, identity and access management. The project focussed on 4 communities and their major high-level functionality, in a preliminary attempt to map functions between the four systems. They then looked at the commonality across the systems, at which fundamental technologies would work across all systems, with different workflows and different interfaces to meet all needs. There is approximately 20% unique functionality across all areas. This suggests that it is better to look at the data end rather than the services end.

James Dalziel asked for a straw vote to prioritise system requirements, then requested that members each complete the requirements spreadsheet formally. The straw poll identified the following: single sign-on; digital rights management; repositories; attribute management; user preferences; federation policy.

624. ADT (Australian Digital Theses) Program. A report was circulated with the minutes. The program was discussed under item 623(a) above.

625. *CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC). A report from Heather Gordon and the minutes of the most recent meeting were included with the agenda. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that Group of Eight has entered into negotiations with Elsevier for ScienceDirect and all other current Elsevier products, followed by a separate discussion on Scopus. They are expecting an offer within the next week. If an agreement is made, then others may be able to join the agreement under the same or better conditions. Elsevier has also met with the AVCC.

a) CEIRC Strategic Directions. Heather Gordon thanked the other members of the working party, Gulcin Cribb and Jocelyn Priddey for their contribution to the draft strategic directions document, which was circulated with the agenda. She proposed that the recommendations be accepted, that CEIRC develop an operational plan, develop a budget, and that appropriate staffing be resourced to carry out the operational plan.

The CEIRC budget has always been simple, to support the committee's work and allow for some research and analysis. The latter has been rarely used because it is difficult to find appropriate personnel. Little analysis of CEIRC's work and achievements has been done, and little analysis of the issues being faced. For twelve months, the CEIRC budget has been self-supporting, including an appropriate allocation of the time of the Executive Officer. Members accept that the CEIRC budget may be reallocated internally, but should extra funds be required they must be included in later budget proposals. Members were reluctant to endorse the document without knowing the budget implications.

The document suggests a range of activities to put the CEIRC program on a business footing eg development of an operational plan, analysis of return on investment. Section 4.2 outlines some actions that CEIRC could undertake in 2005 and in 2006.

John Shipp agreed that more management information is required. Members accepted the recommendations pending further work on the detailed operational plan and related costing. **(Action: HG)** Madeleine McPherson thanked the committee for producing the document.

626. *AARLIN (Australian Academic Research Libraries Information Network). Earle Gow advised members that the AARLIN project was funded by DEST 2003-2004. Twelve institutions have committed to continue in the program. Six are live, and others are ready to implement. A thorough evaluation will be conducted in 2005. The agreement will cover the next 3 years, and new members may join at any time under the current licence. The ultimate objective is a national system, and libraries outside the sector have expressed interest. Earle Gow expressed thanks to CAUL for supporting the project. The ARC is said to be delighted in the outcome. The final report to DEST will be circulated to members. **(Action: EG)** Madeleine McPherson congratulated Earle Gow on the completion of the project noting that it would no longer appear on the agenda as a standing item.

627. *Scholarly Communication Working Group. Andrew Wells has undertaken to organise an e-science event to engage the research sector to gain a better understanding of the issues. He noted that articles on this area by Tony Hey are worth reading. It was suggested that the group facilitate sharing information in this area, especially from those who have created materials for use within their own institution. Dan Atkins at JISC-CNI was very good, as was a recent dLib article on *Rethinking Scholarly Communication: Building the System that Scholars Deserve*. <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september04/vandesompel/09vandesompel.html>

628. *Open Access. Hot Topic. Madeleine McPherson presented "Open access: a progress report." <http://www.caul.edu.au/scholcomm/caul20042open-access.ppt> She discussed definitions of open access, recent decisions by some commercial publishers to offer some open

access options, and some business models. She suggested that publishers seemed to be more threatened by discipline-based repositories than by institutional repositories. She concluded that open access is unlikely to affect library costs, and is not yet affecting the price of journals.

The newly-formed Australian Scholarly Electronic Publishing Group is preparing a paper on open access, a scholar-friendly statement addressing copyright and the retention of authors' rights. It is proving to be an excellent forum in which to discuss related issues. DEST is interested in the opportunities for dissemination of research information provided by open access. It was suggested that more data is needed on institutional relationships with publishing eg whether authors are charged for e-prints. Such information could feed into negotiations with publishers.

- 629. *CAUL Statement on Open Access.** Madeleine McPherson referred to the discussion at last CAUL meeting on the IFLA statement, noting the value of positioning open access in the DEST agenda. A draft statement on open access was circulated with the agenda.

John Shipp reported on the discussion at the last ARIIC meeting, which accepted a very similar statement in principle. ARIIC will issue its statement shortly, and it was agreed that CAUL should issue its statement without delay. **(Action: DC)** The ARC has indicated that it won't provide funding for "author pays" publications, and is not likely to mandate research output into institution repositories.

Members discussed the intention of the document, to open access to information, to oppose IT-generated lockdown, whether it should be assumed as a core value, whether the definition of "access" would serve only to deflect the point of the document, whether the document is to serve as a guide for CAUL action and/or to position CAUL in the DEST agenda, . It was agreed to use the very brief definition from the presentation in the first paragraph.

It was suggested that a companion document could address other related issues and that CAUL should discuss secure systems and access to information with IT directors, rather than include in this document. IFLA tried to broaden the concept because the narrow definition was technologically based and ignored other parts of the world.

It was agreed to add "or otherwise available without economic restriction" to the fourth action and to substitute "collaborate with other researchers, research libraries and publishers to raise awareness" for the second.

It was stressed that the intent is not to limit access to scholarly communication to that in the public domain, meaning crown copyright and out-of-copyright materials. Public domain could mean everything under fair dealing, not only copyright-free material, and can be extended through licences eg creative commons, etc. Lawyers tend to use the narrower definition.

It was agreed not to define open access too precisely in order to keep the document flexible. It is important to highlight the role of an institutional repository in self-archiving rather than appearing to focus on open access publishing. The document was accepted as amended.

(Action: DC) When the values section of the strategic plan is revised, include the concern with increasing restriction to resources, both economic and technological/security based.

(Action: CAUL Executive)

Imogen Garner undertook to refer the issue to ALIA regarding its freedom of information and freedom to read documents. **(Action: IG)**

Support for Teaching & Learning

- 630. *Information Literacy Working Group.** Ruth Quinn reported on the ISS instrument and progress on the technical manual, to include a project plan for the remainder of the year, with monthly updates, ready for testing by the end of September and due to finish by the end of the year. A report was circulated with the agenda and its recommendations were accepted.

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. (Action: DC)*

2. *That the Information Literacy Working Group continue in its current form for a further 12 month period.*
3. *That Karen Visser from ANU replace Margaret Henty (ANU) on the working group.*

a) **Best Practice Characteristics for Developing Information Literacy in Australian Universities.** Guidelines have been developed by the ILWG, and were circulated with the agenda for approval by CAUL.

631. *Services to Offshore Students. Alex Byrne spoke to the paper circulated to members before the meeting. He noted some concern with the definition of offshore system, which meant resulted in a lower response rate than expected – it will be revised. **(Action: AB)** Members had varying levels of involvement in accreditation. Some have very few students but some up to 7500. Support is mostly electronic; information literacy and collections are overwhelmingly electronic. Teaching languages other than English doesn't appear to be a big issue. Support for staff varies, depending on whether they are employed by the institution or partner institutions. Licences are generally no problem, provided that definition of students is clear. Definition of staff is harder. Funding is variable, but library services are mostly not fully funded.

The survey provides base-line information, and will be run again in 2006 to review differences. **(Action: AB)** It was agreed that the raw data should remain within CAUL, but may be useful to forward to Vice-Chancellors and IDP to highlight the issues, noting that it may be an issue for AUQA. Should underline the importance. A summary will be prepared for wider circulation. It was suggested that it be linked with the best practice guidelines and that institutions not be identified. **(Action: AB)**

Madeleine McPherson reported that she and Diane Costello had visited AEI, DEST's international education branch, and the AVCC. AEI is concerned with quality of offshore programmes and don't need persuading that quality of library services is important. \$10.5m is available over 4 years for quality assurance programmes. They have provided names of people in China for the information of those on the forthcoming study tour. AusTrade is very keen to sell Australia as a destination first, then choose an institution, but universities generally prefer to represent themselves individually. IDP's research indicates that the quality of services is a factor in determining choice. One agent advised that the good provision of library services was a selling point. If library services were not a differentiator, it would be easier to collaborate.

The AVCC, through the Deputy Vice-Chancellors International, is revisiting its code of conduct for international students, and broadening it to include offshore programs. If AVCC code of conduct set a floor, then some of the destructive outcomes of competition may be tempered.

632. University Library Australia. Alison Ransome. This item was not discussed.

Management for Best Practice

633. Dealing with Legal Authorities on Campus. Hot Topic. Alex Byrne presented "Academic libraries and access to objectionable material" <http://www.caul.edu.au/aul-doc/aul20042legal.ppt> He offered some examples of legal authorities attending campus and demanding access to library records. He referred to the need for education of, and discussion with, library staff regarding their responsibilities. He discussed UTS policies and codes of conduct, state and federal legislation, and ALIA guidelines. He reported that some public libraries have refused to deliver information to the authorities because it was collected for a different purpose. He provided references to UTS guidelines and policies.

634. Deep-linking on Web Sites. Hot Topic. Derek Whitehead presented "Eight questions about deep linking" <http://www.caul.edu.au/aul-doc/aul20042deep-linking.ppt> He explained that shallow-linking is linking only to a home-page. Deep-linking is assumed to be allowable because of the nature of the web, although frames make this a little more complicated. The German High Court decided that deep linking violated neither copyright nor competition law. It is only legally dubious if the linking appears to pass off other work as one's own, if it is a breach of licence, if it is deceptive or misleading. He listed some "rules of good house-

keeping" for inserting and maintaining links. Monash University now has a policy on deep linking, which covers issues such as deep-linking to confidential or commercial sites.

635. Client Surveys. Comparison of Rodski and LibQUAL+. A report from Beth Marnane, UTS, was circulated prior to the meeting. This item wasn't specifically discussed, although referred to under the next item.

636. *Best Practice Working Group. Felicity McGregor spoke to the report included in the papers. A meeting of the BPWG was held prior to the CAUL meeting. Two recommendations on the Rodski client survey and on reference indicators, were presented to members.

It was recommended committing to Rodski for a further two years. It was noted that it is the only national benchmarking tool used by CAUL, is very useful to present to AUQA and other bodies, and is very valuable to compare results. The company is most willing to make improvements, and the BPWG to take any CAUL recommendation to them.

Alex Byrne advised that UTS will proceed with LibQUAL+, and other LATN members will decide in February whether LATN as a whole will move to LibQUAL+. RMIT has just run Rodski and will be running LibQUAL in the near future.

It was agreed to continue with Rodski, but look actively at LibQUAL and review in September 2005. **(Action: BPWG)** Members will again be invited to nominate their survey plans for 2005. **(Action: DC)** Stan Rodski is willing to attend a CAUL meeting to discuss previous and future surveys with members. The QULOC quality working group may convene a workshop with speakers from both companies and the institutions using both Rodski and LibQUAL.

Comments from members included:

- no clear evidence that LibQUAL+ is better
- any move to another survey would lose trend data
- the fewer doing it, the less valuable
- concern about creating a league table based on perceptions, which are based on expectations
- important to do benchmarks against like institutions; cannot see the value of comparing against different types of institutions
- NGU group wishes to benchmark against the whole group, not just their small group
- concern that joint sector institutions be available for benchmarking
- UQ has been using Rodski for six years, primarily to measure self against self, able to change the questions locally, and address the issues which are important locally
- LibQUAL+ requires a considerable amount of work internally to manipulate the data, so Rodski was cheaper overall because of the reduced administration costs
- the number of respondents varies depending on what else is going on in the university at the time, and not related to whether the response is electronically or not
- neither survey covers distance education students
- very hard to get a group this size to collaborate, and recommend thinking seriously about withdrawing in a clump
- benchmarking is intended to collect useful ideas for improvement
- if making changes for specific sectors, what sort of input to make strategic changes to survey

Some members expressed interest in collaborating on a staff perception survey such as the Rodski employee survey, benchmarked against other organisations but not universities, currently used by Victoria University.

A CAUL list has been established for discussion of client surveys.

UNISON is funding a the development of indicators for information and research services, building on the work done by CRIG (CAVAL Reference Interest Group). A survey has been completed, and a further report will be made to the April meeting. Members supported the continuation of the project through UNISON. **(Action: UNISON)**

It was noted that the BPWG had completed its actions listed in the CAUL strategic plan. Information on planning documents is being added to the CAUL web site. The AUQA good

practice database is also useful. Southern Cross University is the first library to be included in the database, and will be linked to the CAUL site. **(Action: DC)**

637. *Statistics Focus Group. Two papers were circulated with the agenda. Derek Whitehead reported on the culmination of 2004 action items relating to the CAUL statistics. Some additional measures were selected and trialled, showing a clear deficit in the area of usage of online resources, and that data cannot be collected usefully at this stage. COUNTER is developing measures which should be mature in two years; only expenditure on e-resources is currently measurable, and this will be collected in 2004. In 2004, a comprehensive survey on the presentation and collection of CAUL statistics culminated in the proposal for an online statistics site. New Zealand libraries will be kept separate from the CAUL rankings from 2004, to make the presentation of data simpler for political purposes.

a) CAUL Statistics Web Site Proposal. Derek Whitehead reported that the committee had reviewed a number of options, including one based on ARL's software. The SAS software which supports the ARL version is too expensive, but the preferred option copies its functionality. The development costs will be \$37,000, based on no new data items, and 10 years back-files, and can be paid from the 2004 CAUL operational surplus. The annual additional \$8,000, an increase over and above the current expenditure of \$19,000, can be funded out of existing resources without fee increases. CONZUL has offered to contribute proportionately to the cost. It was recommended that the development by CAVAL go ahead with a view to beginning data collection in 2005. The recommendation was accepted. Craig Anderson abstained, as he is a Board member of CAVAL. **(Action: DC)**

638. Standards. This item was not discussed, although a Maxine Brodie addressed standards as part of the forum on teaching & learning.

Advocacy & Communication

639. Copyright. A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda papers. This item was not discussed.

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 asked members to consider the proposed guidelines.

It was noted that the financial contribution is generally a determining factor, and consideration should be guided by the flow-on effect on CAUL membership fees. It was recommended that any commitment include a period of review, rather than being open-ended. Any member may suggest at any meeting that CAUL joins a given organisation, but commitments will only be made in light of the budget. The recommendation (Madeleine McPherson / Alex Byrne) was carried, with the addition of a reference to a timeline. **(Action: DC)**

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.
UNISON and UniLibraries SA contributed reports. These were not discussed.

- b) CONZUL.** A joint meeting with CONZUL will be held in Auckland, 4 April, 2005. Ainslie Dewe reported on LIAC, the Library and Information Advisory Commission. John Redmayne reported on CONZUL. It was noted that Sue Pharo, Chair of CONZUL, will be stepping down at the end of 2004. An invitation from Sue Pharo for any CAUL members in New Zealand in November to attend the final CONZUL meeting of the year at Lincoln University, Nov 18-19, 2004.

Tony Millett, CONZUL's first and only representative on CEIRC, will be stepping down from that role at the end of the year. Tony has made an excellent contribution on CEIRC. CONZUL has discussed the replacement informally, and have concluded that it is important to keep the close connection with CONZUL. The new representative will come from amongst the University Librarians and Deputy University Librarians on CONZUL.

Face-to-face reciprocal borrowing. The scheme, the draft of which is almost complete, is to be called ULANZ (University Library Aotearoa New Zealand). CONZUL is very grateful for the excellent University Library Australia model and for Alison Ransome's work in particular.

National Store. Octa Associates have been engaged to scope such a project between the university libraries, the National Library of New Zealand, and possibility some big Metronet (urban public) libraries.

The Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) has provided funding for two years for the universities, CRIs (Crown Research Institutes-the NZ version of the CSIRO) and two polytechnics for the Web of Science and the ScienceDirect freedom collection. The good exchange rate has meant that the surplus funding has been targeted at some additional ScienceDirect subject collections.

A second annual Forum was held on 9th September of the Managers of Tertiary and Research Libraries (University, Polytechnic, College of Education, Wananga, and CRIs). The first meeting in 2003 was under the aegis of the TEC. The idea of an Office of Library Cooperation has been dropped, but the group will work on sector-based statistics, regional reciprocal borrowing, NZ e-resources outside the CEIRC arena, and strengthening Maori staffing in tertiary libraries.

Te Puna (NZ version of Kinetica). This is also under redevelopment with the theme "Te Puna Futures". There are some tensions and differences of opinion in regard to the possibility of outsourcing bibliographic records and the national union catalogue. One of the factors in terms of the economics of the present arrangements is a 16% decline in transactions over the past 5 years (maybe relating to the use of overseas document delivery services for interloan and the wide availability of full text electronic databases such as ScienceDirect). As 6 of the 8 New Zealand universities are now Voyager sites (only Massey and Canterbury are not) and the six will implement intralending through the Universal borrowing module in the future, this is likely to reduce interloan traffic through Te Puna even further.

- c) CAUDIT & ACODE.** EDUCAUSE 2005 will be held in Auckland, 5-8 April. Madeleine McPherson serves on the steering committee, chaired by Stephen Whiteside. She reported an overwhelming response from sponsors. The program committee is focussing on e-learning, e-research and e-management. The next ACODE/CAUDIT/CAUL joint executive meeting will be held December 6.
- d) National Library of Australia. Kinetica.** A report from John Arfield was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.
- e) JULAC.** John Shipp encouraged members to join the tour of China in October. Madeleine McPherson advised members that DEST AEI had offered to provide contacts from their offices in China.
- f) CASL.** Jenny Rayner from the State Library of Tasmania joined the meeting for the first session.

- g) IFLA.** Kay Raseroka, President of IFLA, addressed the meeting. She thanked Alex Byrne and UTS for supporting her visit, and expressed deep appreciation for the support of “southerners” in her election to IFLA presidency, noting the previous Euro-centricity of the organisation. She paid tribute to the intellectual leadership of Warren Horton.

IFLA is the global voice of librarians throughout the world: the advocate for libraries, librarians and their users. It participates in the World Summit for the Information Society, which is essentially a government affair, but recognises the need for private partners in the information society. IFLA must play a larger role in influencing governments about the role of libraries in the information societies – this is reflected in the outcomes, and its references to libraries and museums. Libraries must be in the centre of discussion at WSIS next meeting next year, and not allow the agenda to be usurped by technology and finance.

Kay reported that IFLA has only a staff of seven yet is expected to take on even more advocacy. IFLA members are encouraged to contribute to the development of their own region. She asked CAUL members to support Alex Byrne in his role as president from 2005.

IFLA would like to include groups such as CAUL because of their unique perspective, to help IFLA be truly global. Kay stressed the role of librarians in lifelong learning, information literacy and other literacies, and noted the focus that CAUL has placed on information literacy. WIPO issues will be another focus of IFLA's advocacy – Eve Woodberry is a member of CLM, the copyright and legal matters committee. IFLA established a working group to look at free trade issues, and has been invited to contribute to the WIPO review, looking at WTO and other UN agencies. CAUL could influence that and contribute to the local perspective.

Alex Byrne added that IFLA is reviewing membership fees and recommended that CAUL consider becoming a member. The new fee structure is based on expenditure, with a minimum, based on the cost of servicing a member, and a maximum. Advocacy is strengthened if small associations can be included, so a category has been introduced for those who cannot afford the minimum fee. A new category for regional groups has been introduced. The annual fee for CAUL would be EUR 1000 if its expenditure is below EUR 250,000. It was moved (Alex Byrne/Alan Bundy) that CAUL takes up membership of IFLA. The recommendation was carried. **(Action: DC)**

- h) Türk-ANZAC Research Libraries Conference.** Gulcin Cribb and Alex Byrne reported that the proposal stems from a discussion at IATUL in Turkey, where they were approached by Turkish librarians to work together, to support a joint research libraries conference and to begin a joint digitisation project. There has been strong support from New Zealand and Turkish colleagues. They asked CAUL to endorse it rather than contribute financially, and encouraged members to attend. It offers opportunities for benchmarking with different parts of the world, advocacy, a way of profiling our work, and leadership, particularly in the electronic area. It was suggested that CASL members may be interested, having excellent materials for digitisation such as diaries and papers. It was agreed that CAUL's name be included as a supporter of the conference. **(Action: AB, GC)**
- i) SCONUL.** Gaynor Austen was approached by Suzanne Enright, chair of SCONUL regarding a SCONUL tour of Australia, to coincide with the CAUL meeting in Brisbane in September, 2005. A formal proposal will be put to SCONUL. CAUL members were invited to suggest particular areas worth showcasing to SCONUL and to advise Gaynor Austen. **(Action: ALL)**

641. CAUL Meetings

- a) CAUL Meeting 2005/1.** Auckland, New Zealand, 4 April, prior to the EDUCAUSE Workshops and Conference 5-8 April. **(Action: Janet Copsey, Ainslie Dewe, DC)**
- b) CAUL Meeting 2005/2.** Griffith University, Brisbane, 15-16 September, with satellite meetings on the 14th. **(Action: Janice Rickards, DC)**

- c) **CAUL Meeting 2006/2.** It was proposed (Imogen Garner / John Shipp) that the meeting be held in Perth, in conjunction with ALIA 2006. Imogen Garner advised members that ALIA conference is being held 19-22 September, and offered to hold the CAUL meeting at Curtin. The proposal was accepted. **(Action: Imogen Garner, DC)**

It was suggested that the first meeting of the year be held in Canberra, to provide an opportunity to develop relationships with national institutions. The suggestion was supported. **(Action: DC)**

CAUL Administration

- 642. CAUL Finances.** A report outlining the draft 2005 budget and the expected over- and under-expenditure against the 2004 budget was circulated with the papers.

- a) **CAUL Budget 2004.** Derek Whitehead reported on the projections for 2004 expenditure, noting that the research funds would be carried over to 2004. He added that the budget surplus reflects the 2003 decision that CEIRC would be self-sustaining and not cross-subsidised by CAUL. It was noted that the costs outlined in an expression of interest received in response to a research proposal were well beyond the funds available, so the Executive is redefining the proposal. **(Action: CAUL Executive)**
- b) **CAUL Budget 2005.** Derek Whitehead advised members that the budget is based on the assumption that the statistics development would proceed, and is otherwise a steady state budget. Costs to members will be reduced by the suspension of research levy, and the reduction in the ADT levy to \$1,425 to accord with expected expenditure. It was proposed (Earle Gow / Derek Whitehead) that the budget, with an increase to account for new IFLA membership, be approved. The proposal was accepted. **(Action: DC)**

- 643. Executive Officer's Report.** A report was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

- 644. Other business.** Sue McKnight has taken up a position at Nottingham Trent University. Madeleine McPherson advised that she has written a farewell letter on behalf of members.

- a) **Internet access by the general public.** Janine Schmidt reviewed practices in universities in the light of the AVCC guidelines, and discussed the approach taken at the University of Queensland. <http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20042internet-access.ppt> http://www.avcc.edu.au/policies_activities/teaching_learning/guidelines_codes/Code_of_Conduct_for_Universities.pdf She reported that libraries want to continue to provide service access to the public. For varying reasons, access by those under 18, security, IT services lean towards closing off access. A range of measures has been adopted at the University of Queensland: a trusted zone of selected internet sites, licensed materials and catalogues; all adjunct staff listed in a staff database; some supervised use on public terminals; email accounts for visiting conference delegates.

Alex Byrne reported that the UTS CBD library receives very heavy use by ULA, private colleges, TAFE and InSearch users. Community access is managed, but UTS tries to distinguish between the general public and users from for-profit colleges. They acknowledge that privacy does not have to mean anonymity, but do not retain records that identify content used.

The meeting concluded at 4.35pm Tuesday.

CAUL 2004/2 Action List

DC	[Obtain UQ detailed response to AVCC internet paper]
DC	[Obtain Monash policy document on linking and deep-linking]
AW	Review ADT business plan to take into account the general move to IR software away from EDT software – by CAUL 2005/1 – and to address CONZUL participation
ALL	Complete spreadsheet of development requirements and return to James Dalziel by 27/9/04
DC	[Obtain UTS policies and codes of conduct on handling illegal patron activity]
DC	Open Access presentation includes various links to OA statements – add to CAUL web site
DC	[Obtain discussion paper on OA being prepared by Australian Scholarly electronic Publishing Group]
DC	[Make links to sub-projects of APSR]
DC	[Check AUQA recommendation on ECU offshore standards]
DC	[AUQA appear to accept anecdotes without verification – several institutions mentioned this]
GC	Make available list of AUQA reports related to library and IT
DC	[Link to Scott Bennett, CLIR report, on library refurbishments in last 10 years]
DC	[Obtain URL from Maxine Brodie re slides on education.au site]
JS	Check with DEST re a press release for JSTOR
HG	Develop CEIRC operational plan and review budget for 2005 and 2006
DC	Take AARLIN off CAUL agenda as standing item
DC	Amend draft statement on OA as per meeting comments and issue asap
DW	Draft a definition of “public domain” for the CAUL OA statement
EXEC	When revising the strategic plan, address under values the increasing restrictions to resources both economic and technological / security based
AB	Review definition of off-shore in the CAUL statement, and prepare a summary [?of the survey results] for wider circulation, especially AVCC and IDP.
DC	Survey CAUL re plans for Rodski for 2005
UNISON	Continue work on information and research services measures
DC	Make a link to the AUQA good practice web site
DC	Revise guidelines for CAUL's membership of other organisations, to include a timeline for review and the requirement to bring to CAUL as part of the budget process
ALL	Suggest to Gaynor Austen which areas and institutions should be showcased on the 2005 SCONUL tour
DC,AD,JC	Organise CAUL 2005/1 in Auckland
DC,JR	Organise CAUL 2005/2 in Brisbane
DC	Organise CAUL 2006/1 in Canberra
DC,IG	Organise CAUL 2006/2 in Perth
EXEC	Redefine research proposal on user behaviour
DC	Organise CAUL membership of IFLA for 2005



CAUL Executive Meeting 2004/6

(in conjunction with the ACODE / CAUDIT / CAUL Joint Executive Meeting)
Customs House, Brisbane
Monday, 6 December, 2004
from 1.30pm

Minutes

(updated 25/1/05)

1229. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry (Deputy President), Andrew Wells, Derek Whitehead, Cathrine Harboe-Ree. In attendance: Diane Costello.

Apology: Madeleine McPherson (President)

1230. Minutes of the previous Executive Meeting, 2004/5, 12 September 2004. The previously circulated minutes were accepted without further correction.

1231. CAUL Membership & Elections. With the resignation of Madeleine McPherson, members discussed the ongoing membership of the Executive Committee. Eve Woodberry has signalled her intention to withdraw from the CEIRC committee while she undertakes the office of President, and a representative of the Executive committee is required to replace her. Cathrine Harboe-Ree was nominated as Deputy, Andrew Wells as CEIRC representative, Derek Whitehead as the ARIIC representative.

It was agreed that Eve Woodberry would invite Jeff Murray to join the executive until the next elections; with some suggested back-ups should Jeff not be available. **(Action: EW)** If Madeleine McPherson is still not available at the next elections, the position of president and deputy president will be deemed vacant, the first to be filled for the regular two-year term, and the second for an initial one-year term. Cathrine's term also finishes. DC will draft a memo to CAUL following the acceptance of the new executive. **(Action: DC)**

Nominations for members of the CEIRC committee were called following the Executive's nomination of its representative. Heather Gordon was elected unopposed. The Executive formally confirmed Heather Gordon to continue as chair of CEIRC for 2005. **(Action: DC)**

STRATEGIC PLAN

1232. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). Each member of the Executive will review one section the plan and make recommendations for changes. Derek Whitehead will review the section on best practice, Cathrine Harboe-Ree will review research, Andrew Wells will review teaching & learning, and Eve Woodberry will review advocacy. A statement on restriction of access to information due to security/technology and economic reasons will be added into the strategic plan values statement. **(Action: DC)**

1233. CAUL Achievement Award. The committee strongly supported the nomination of Judith Peacock, Information Literacy Coordinator from Queensland University of Technology. Diane Costello will announce the winner and prepare a press release. **(Action: DC)** Judy Peacock will be invited to the April meeting to give a presentation, pending confirmation of the program with CONZUL. **(Action: DC)**

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1234. ARIIC. The next meeting is December 17, to be attended by Derek Whitehead, and chaired by Rory Hume. **(Action: DW)** Research funding directions are now set and unlikely to be changed for quite some time. Each of the projects must prepare a progress report and outline

plans for 2005. In a discussion of further funding for content, it was noted that the AVCC has proposed asking DEST for \$3.5 million for additional *Web of Science* back-sets which are still a priority for some, but not all, institutions. CEIRC suggests the Nature archive and PCI full-text would be higher priority. It was recommended that CAUL approach ARIIC with preferred datasets. **(Action: EW)**

1235. NCRIS. An advisory committee chaired by Rory Hume has been appointed to develop Australia's vital National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy. They are scheduling sessions for individual universities and the public in each capital city. CAUL will prepare a response to the framework document, due by 26 February. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will circulate a draft for comment. **(Action: CHR)** When the accessibility framework is released, CAUL will also prepare a response. [Published 21 December, 2004
<http://www.dest.gov.au/resqual/default.htm>]

1236. Australian Digital Theses Program (ADT)

- a) **ADT-ARIIC Project.** It was noted that escrow conditions are written into the project contract. Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress) software will be tested as part of the project, and UniSA has expressed interest. ARROW software will be available by mid-2005. Both bepress and BioMed central offer outsourced bureau-type services for repositories. ProQuest may be prepared to offer bepress locally. DEST is interested in a centralised/distributed repository network similar to APAC. Retrospective conversion is expensive so few theses will be able to be converted within the project. Between bepress, ARROW and DSpace, there are many options for theses and other repository objects.
- b) **Business Plan.** A rewrite of the business plan is mooted. **(Action: AW)** Janine Schmidt questioned the cost of administration of the central ADT services, particularly in relation to the ADT-ARIIC funding. Andrew Wells tabled the 2004 expenditure for the program, and noted that the maintenance of the central data repository and the support provided to members in the establishment of their own repositories is still required while the redevelopment is undertaken. UNSW staff spend a great deal of time assisting personnel at the local sites with their ETD software, and with enabling their records to be harvested. Of the \$60,832 cost, \$55,000 is charged to CAUL. It is possible to put this out for tender if CAUL wishes.
- c) **ETD2005.** Andrew Wells provided an update on conference planning. Andrew Wells, Helen Mandl and Robyn Benjamin form the conference committee. Cancellation insurance has been taken out, and a very conservative budget developed. CAUL is listed as a sponsor with Adobe, Ex Libris and ProQuest as confirmed paying sponsors. UNESCO is being approached to support delegates from developing countries. 250 delegates are expected for the two and half days. The web site is
<http://adt.caul.edu.au/etd2005/etd2005.html>

1237. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).

- a) **Operational Plan & Budget 2005.** Eve Woodberry reported that a committee meeting had been held a week ago, with a large changeover of the committee membership. John Redmayne replaced Tony Millett as the CONZUL representative, while Martin Borchert (Griffith) replaced Sue Dowling (Murdoch) as the Datasets Coordinators' representative. Jocelyn Priddey had been coopted for a third year and now retires.

The committee is working on the draft operational plan. The CEIRC budget currently highlights three amounts of \$5,000 out of current funds. It was agreed that already-budgeted funds could be used for these projects.

CEIRC currently has 95 agreements, with the equivalent of \$A11m handled through the CAUL office and an even larger amount handled through local agents and offices.

- b) **Group of Eight.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported on Elsevier proposals to the Group of Eight. The back-files and DiscoveryGate offers were initiated by the Go8 and have been

coordinated through CEIRC. Diane Costello outlined the Elsevier journal purchasing model adopted by the combined University of California campuses.

Andrew Wells has approached Andrew Wong of OCLC regarding WorldCat access for the Go8.

- c) **Stanford Encyclopedia Of Philosophy.** Diane Costello outlined correspondence with Andrew Brennan from the Australasian Association of Philosophy regarding the endowment fund mooted to sustain the SEP. Dr Brennan had written individually to all CAUL members asking them to contribute. Diane Costello will coordinate the sign-up of institutions and the collection of funds on behalf of CAUL. **(Action: DC)** It was noted that the SEP is part of an experimental stage in the open access movement. Should the SEP cease to exist, the endowment funds will be returned to the contributors. It is not clear what would happen to the content.
- d) **International Coalition of Library Consortia.** The next ICOLC meeting is in Boston in April, 2005. Diane Costello will represent CEIRC.

CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING

1238. Australian and New Zealand Institute of Information Literacy. A question was raised about the relative roles of ANZIIL and the CAUL Information Literacy Working Group. CAUL is not a member of ANZIIL but its members may be individual members of ANZIIL. The ILWG was established to provide CAUL with advice on information literacy.

MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

1239. Standards. This is a standing item. There was nothing to report.

1240. Statistics. The online site is under development. CONZUL is contributing proportionately to the \$37,000 development cost.

1241. Rodski. Several institutions are still to notify the office of their plans for 2005 surveys. The LATN members are undertaking LibQUAL+ surveys in 2005.

COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY

1242. Copyright. Members were asked to consider the strategy for 2005, particularly with respect to the implementation of the US-AUS Free Trade Agreement. Eve Woodberry will attend the meeting in Brisbane 18 February: Copyright: New Futures, New Agendas, and the Creative Commons conference in Brisbane in January.

- a) **Increase in digital copying in universities.** John Mullarvey advised that data would be available at the end of November. It was suggested that any increase coming off a nil base may not be meaningful. It was noted that the universities have paid approximately \$20 million to CAL for the rights to copy. IPRIA (the University of Melbourne's Intellectual Property Research Institute of Australia) is currently undertaking some interesting research. Linda O'Brien suggested they might investigate the value of the universities' contribution to CAL and they are now scoping the study. They may organise a Victorian seminar to focus on operational matters. File-sharing is the most important copyright-related issue at the moment.
- b) **Geneva Declaration on the Future of the World Intellectual Property Organisation.** <http://www.cptech.org/ip/wipo/genevadeclaration.html> & <http://www.futureofwipo.org/> Eve Woodberry reported that the library community considers that WIPO should be looking at a more balanced copyright regime. IFLA issued a statement <http://www.ifla.org/III/clm/CLM-GenevaDeclaration2004.html> which expressed concern about some issues not addressed in the declaration. She suggested that CAUL sign it as a measure of support, and advise CAUL members that it has been done. **(Action: EW)**

1243. Communication. (Standing item)

- a) **President's Report.** In the absence of Madeleine McPherson, Diane Costello reported that the President had participated in the CAUL tour of China in late October, and

commented on the hosts' recognition of her presidential status. A follow-up visit was made to Fiona Buffinton at DEST AEI, accompanied by John Shipp and Diane Costello. Madeleine McPherson was in Canberra to attend the National Library's web archiving conference.

- b) **Public Relations/Media Reports.** It was noted that the ADT upgrade generated very good press.

Formulating 130, 000 theses for your perusal. Louise Perry 2004/09/22 The Australian Higher Education Supplement
<http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/printpage/0,5942,10837338,00.html>

Thesis database to bloom. Bill Pheasant 2004/09/13 Australian Financial Review
<http://www.afr.com/premium/articles/2004/09/12/1094927428392.html>

InCite.

Campus Review.

There have been two recent articles on electronic presses, including HES 1.12.04 and one in October.

- c) **CAUL Report.** A draft of the 2003 report is in progress but due to the lateness of completion, it was agreed that a combined 2003/4 report would be produced early in 2005. **(Action: DC)** It was noted that the first publication was deliberately entitled "CAUL Report" but the following year was called "Annual report" leading to an expectation that a report would be published every year.
- d) **Executive Officer's Report.** A report was included with the agenda and is appended to the minutes. Diane Costello reported briefly on her attendance at e-ICOLC while on holidays in Europe. The agenda for the meeting reconfirmed the decision taken by CEIRC not to fund attendance at the European meetings, although there were a number of delegates who were specifically interested in CAUL activities such as best practice and information literacy. It was noted that CEIRC activities consumed 85% of CAUL office administrative support in the second half of the year. Records will continue to be kept for a full year to determine the overall balance of time spent on CEIRC and other CAUL activities, to feed into the budget process. **(Action: DC)**

1244. Relationships with other organisations.

- a) **CAUDIT & ACODE.** Members expressed a preference for the next CCA meeting to be held in June. Andrew Wells will organise the proposed e-research seminar with John Shipp, and Derek Whitehead will send a report on the ARIIC meeting to the three groups. **(Action: DW, AW)**
- i) **EDUCAUSE 2005. Sky City, Auckland, 5-8 April, 2005.**
- (1) **Metadata Workshop.** Derek Whitehead reported briefly on the good progress on the workshop program.
- ii) **Joint CCA Executive Committee.** Brisbane, 6 December, 2004.
- iii) **CAUDIT PKI Project Steering Committee.** Maxine Brodie will represent CAUL on the steering committee.
- b) **CONZUL.**
- c) **JULAC.** Report of CAUL study tour October 2004. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that Chinese universities are more interested in targeting students in the USA (80%) and Europe, especially France. Alex Byrne had separately visited the Shanghai public library the previous week. Andrew Wells is attending a conference in Shanghai in mid-December. Australian universities have a presence on the ground, and Chinese universities are very well aware of which Australian universities with whom they have relationships.

China is in a stage of extraordinary growth and has much to offer Australian universities. In some areas they are ahead in digital library developments, but lag in graduate services.

The pedagogical style does not lend itself to good research skills, while the western style of developing research skills could be highlighted as a competitive advantage in the selling of Australian education.

Targeted staff exchange or visits can be very useful, but can be difficult bringing relevant people to Australia because the person selected by an organisation may not necessarily be the person who is invited.

CALIS (China Academic Library & Information System <http://www.calis.edu.cn/>) is driving digital library initiatives, inter-library loans and union catalogues. This will be added to the agenda for the CAUL "international" session on April 3, 2005. **(Action: DC)**

It was suggested that a tour of Scandinavia be arranged in conjunction with IFLA 2005 in Oslo. **(Action: CAUL Executive)**

- d) Relationships with organisations related to international education.** Over the past year, the CAUL President and executive officer have met with various personnel from IDP, DEST AEI and the AVCC and discussed their various roles in Australian universities involvement in higher education off-shore. Although the issue of services to offshore students has been on the CAUL agenda for some time, and CAUL has "sponsored" a number of international study tours, including the recent one to China, it was suggested that CAUL members be invited to a meeting to discuss the range of CAUL's involvement with, and any related financial commitment to, organisations in the international education market. **(Action: DC)**
- e) National Library of Australia.**
- i) Peak Bodies Forum, 10 December 2004.** Eve Woodberry will attend. CAUL has proposed that the management of copyright support and lobbying be on the agenda.
- ii) National Site Licence Forum, 8 December, 2004.** Eve Woodberry and Diane Costello will attend. This arose from the previous Peak Bodies Forum. Members questioned the expected outcome of the forum, and suggested that the open web would be the main competition to any national licence for remote access. It was questioned whether licensed remote access was a reasonable expectation in a commercial environment. Alumni access is provided free currently to ProQuest subscribers, but if usage increases significantly, charges may be instituted. The EPIC model is closest to a national site licence, but not all New Zealand libraries are participating.

1245. CAUL Meetings.

- a) 2005/1.** Auckland, 4 April, 2005, with committee meetings on the 3rd. At previous joint meetings, CAUL has chaired the meeting. CONZUL will be asked how they wish to run this meeting. **(Action: DC)** Recommend that the meeting be an extended business meeting, ADT, copyright, CONZUL, information literacy with Judy peacock, the FRODO projects, and list which will need extended time, a new group of universities which are dual sector. Is the EDUCAUSE conference website recommending accommodation options?
- b) 2005/2.** Brisbane, 15-16 September, 2005. Janice Rickards has confirmed the dates, and has several venues on hold. SCONUL is planning a study tour to Australia about this time, and will join part of the CAUL meeting.

1246. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.

- a) 2005/1 February 15** Canberra from 10.30am **(Action: DC)** Major items will be the agenda for April meeting, copyright, NCRIS, CAUL strategic plan.
- b) 2005/2 April 3** Auckland (in conjunction with the CAUL / CONZUL meeting)
- c) 2005/3 June** in conjunction with CCA. CAUDIT will confirm the date. **(Action: DC)**
- d) 2005 August** to plan for the September meeting.

- e) **2005 September 14**, Brisbane (in conjunction with the CAUL meeting)
- f) **2005 November/December** in conjunction with the CCA meeting. ACODE to confirm the date. **(Action: DC)**

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1247. CAUL Finances.

- a) **Audit of 2002 Accounts.** This audit is complete, and requires signatures of the Executive. **(Action: CAUL Executive)**
- b) **Audit of 2003 Accounts.** The audit began on March 8, is now complete, and requires signatures of the Executive. **(Action: CAUL Executive)**
- c) **CAUL Budget 2004.** Expenditure has been updated. Work on the CAUL Online Statistics Package has begun. Funds were budgeted to come from CAUL reserves, and initial payments have already been made. These will be accrued to show against the 2005 budget. **(Action: DC)**
- d) **CAUL Budget 2005.** \$1,700 has been added to expenditure for 2005 as the estimated cost of IFLA membership, and \$6,200 has been added to the income from the CONZUL contribution to the statistics web site. \$20,000 was carried over from 2004 research levy.

1248. Other business.

The meeting concluded at 5pm.



CAUL Executive Meeting 2005/1

J.B. Chifley Library, The Australian National University, Canberra

15 February, 2005
from 9am

DRAFT Minutes
(updated 28/2/05)

1246. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry (President), Jeff Murray, Andrew Wells, Derek Whitehead,. In attendance: Diane Costello. Apologies: Cathrine Harboe-Ree (Deputy President). Members welcomed Jeff Murray to his first Executive meeting.

1247. Minutes of the previous Executive Meeting, 2004/6, 6 December 2004. The previously circulated minutes were accepted.

1248. CAUL Membership & Elections. The President will write to Alan Bundy who is retiring in March and not attending another CAUL meeting. **(Action: EW)** Helen Livingstone will replace him at the University of South Australia. New acting CAUL members are Greg Anderson at Newcastle, Leeanne Pitman at Ballarat, Mary Lyons at UQ and Alan Smith at USQ. Introductory letters have been written to all.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1249. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). Executive members reviewed designated sections of the strategic plan to present to CAUL for ratification of proposed actions for 2005. It was agreed to review the whole plan fully at the first meeting of 2006. **(Action: DC)** It was noted that student numbers had dropped, and there is forthcoming change in research assessment and funding. The amendments will be prepared by 28 February for review by CAUL. **(Action: CAUL Executive)** It was agreed to review the objectives every two to three years.

a) Teaching & Learning.

2. ULA doesn't need reviewing.
3. Information literacy statistics are already being incorporated into the CAUL statistics, using the ARL definitions.
4. The ILWG is continuing with this item.
5. Most universities are establishing learning management systems, with more or less involvement by their libraries. DRM (digital rights management) and copyright management appear to be taking different development paths which need to be brought together. DRM tends to override a copyright regime, for example where an academic may be concerned with appropriate remuneration for their intellectual property. It was suggested that the MAMS project be strengthened to clarify the roles of DRM and copyright. The library is often responsible for copyright, particularly with e-reserve, but also with LMSs. It was noted that much content is not remunerable, but accessible under fair dealing or licence. Digital rights expression, where rights are defined, should be clearly differentiated from DRM where the content is potentially remunerable. It was agreed to explore this at the September meeting. **(Action: AW)**
6. The teaching & learning workshop was held September 2004.

Add a new item: the UNISON trial of BONUS (Books of NSW Universities), a project for user-initiated unmediated borrowing, using III INN-Reach product, and getting it to work with Ex Libris Aleph. **(Action: AW)**

Add a new item: Respond to proposed changes in the government's teaching & learning agenda, especially with regard to the Teaching and Learning Performance Fund. **(Action: CAUL Executive)**

b) Research.

6. AARLIN is now a consortium and no longer a CAUL project.

7. It was noticed that the new ADT software should be released in late March.

Add new items: Upgrade the ADT metadata repository. **(Action: ADT-ARIIC)**

Extend the scope of the ADT to New Zealand. **(Action: ADT Policy Group)**

UNSW will host the ETD conference in 2005. **(Action: AW)**

10. Copyright managements should be linked into digital repositories, and be a responsibility of the ARIIC projects. **(Action: AW)** It was suggested that institutional repositories are not naturally cooperative ventures but that common approaches should be developed.

11. The digitisation of newspapers is important for all levels of research. It arises in the NLA's submission to NCRIS. CAUL should continue to support the strategies of the NLA and other cultural institutions.

12. This project proved difficult to scope but it is important to know how resources are used. Library schools should be encouraged to engage in more user research. As usage data becomes "COUNTER-ised", such research should become easier. Andrew wells will discuss with Connie Wilson at UNSW **(Action: AW)** It was agreed to reword, to seek grant funding, not ARC funding necessarily.

Include an action to ensure that ARIIC survives under NCRIS. **(Action: DW)**

c) Best Practice.

17. The framework for sharing planning documents is established, so this becomes an ongoing action, with members being reminded annually to contribute content to the web site. **(Action: DC)**

18. The planning for the online statistics site has been done, and development is underway.

19. Review both LibQUAL+ and Rodski at the end of 2005.

20. The document delivery indicator was revised.

21. A UNISON group is now addressing this. They have produced a literature review and conducted a survey of CAUL members. Progress will be followed up. **(Action: DC)**

Item to be added: Many libraries are interested in reviewing their level of support for both offshore and onshore international students.

CAUL members should be encouraged to become AUQA assessors and to contribute to the AUQA good practice database. **(Action: DW)**

d) Communication.

u. The provision of national funding for infrastructure for learning and teaching – delete from the objectives. **(Action: DC)**

Retain all ongoing actions.

New items to be added:

Contribute, particularly through the ALCC, to the drafting of the copyright amendments, particularly with reference to fair dealing, coming out of the FTA.

Publish a CAUL report for 2003-4. **(Action: DC)**

Contribute to the development of NCRIS. **(Action: CAUL Executive)**

Emphasise international cooperation through the SCONUL study tour.

Take up IFLA membership for 2005 and review the benefits.

1250. CAUL Achievement Award. Judith Peacock has been advised of her award, and is available to speak at CAUL 2005/1 in Auckland. She will be presented with a certificate and cheque by the President. **(Action: DC)** The web page has been updated with details of previous winners.

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1251. ARIIC. Derek Whitehead has circulated a report of the meeting held December 17, 2004. The next meeting will be in Brisbane on February 17. The agenda includes institutional repositories with a paper presented by Ah Chung Tsoi, a paper by Cathrine Harboe-Ree on managing research output, Geoff Dengate on the draft middleware action plan, the NLA submission to NCRIS, open access. Neil McLean will discuss international cooperation on standards. The papers for this meeting will be circulated to the Executive. **(Action: DW)**

1252. Australian Digital Theses Program (ADT) It was noted that 3000 theses now online. It was suggested that the number of completions each year be included on the ADT site to show what proportion are being added. **(Action: AW)**

- a) **Business Plan.** A rewrite of the business plan is mooted for the first week in March, with a view to discussing in Auckland, but not necessarily finalising until September when the redevelopment of the site is complete. The local sites aren't yet as independent as they ought to be. The mandatory submission process is being targeted by a working group, with a view to sharing information about implementation, including the processes of achieving university approval.
- b) **ADT-ARIIC.** Andrew Wells reported on progress, particularly on the project with ProQuest using BEPress software, providing a bureau service, testing both submission and retrospective conversion. Maryanne Kennan will manage the project. Many universities have volunteered as test-beds. It is expected that pricing will be an issue.
- c) **ETD2005.** Andrew Wells provided an update on conference planning, noting that Stevan Harnad is confirmed as a keynote speaker.

1253. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).

- a) **Operational Plan & Budget 2005.** Andrew Wells reported that the operational plan was discussed thoroughly, with timelines and responsibilities clearly laid out. The committee is addressing a wish list for CEIRC agreements, licences with problems eg LEGENDcom, and potentials for ARIIC funding, notably the Nature back file and PCI full-text. Elsevier and Springer back-sets are not practical for national funding because there is little overlap of priorities. It was noted that the CASL Consortium had requested removal from the datasets list because the content was not relevant to CASL.

CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING

MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

1254. Action Research. Eve Woodberry reported that she had received an email from Imogen Garner regarding the deposit of research reports by CAUL members in the ALIA repository hosted by the University of Melbourne. She referred particularly to the grey research being carried out as part of the library's work. This is also relevant to the information linked from the CAUL best practice site. Imogen will be invited to prepare a brief paper for CAUL. **(Action: DC)**

1255. Statistics. A meeting of the CSFG (CAUL Statistics Focus Group) was held February 3 in Sydney. Progress reports on the development of the statistics web site have been received. Data collection will be undertaken at the end of March, using the new system for data capture, and incorporating ULA statistics. The data will be available online as soon as it is keyed in.

Derek Whitehead is drafting a definition for e-books so they can be counted separately. **(Action: DW)** It was noted that some categories of e-books receive very heavy usage. CSFG members will trial the definition in the first instance.

The committee is also reviewing offshore student data, which are complicated, if not impossible, to collect accurately. DEST data is a function of institution data, which is not necessarily accurate. Campus-based off-shore students and overseas distance education students are counted differently. It is important to know who is providing their library service.

The different nature of dual sector institutions is being addressed.

1256. Standards. This is a standing item. There was no discussion.

COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY

1257. Communication. (Standing item)

- a) **President's Report.** Eve Woodberry reported on her attendance at the Peak Bodies Forum and National Site Licensing Forum in Canberra in December. Many of the issues relating to the site licensing meeting are not relevant to CAUL. The forum failed to identify the audience and the targeted content or to define a site licence. In particular, public libraries haven't defined what they want to provide to whom.

Derek Whitehead reported that 80 people will be attending a Gulliver forum in Victoria. It will be a mini-consultation with suppliers. In the Gulliver model, the costs are essentially based on usage, which, if it becomes too high, most libraries would be unable to afford to participate.

An outcome of the Peak Bodies Forum is to draft a letter for libraries to send to government representatives about the access to, and sustainability of, government publications in the electronic environment. ALIA will be holding a forum on government publications. It was agreed to amend the letter slightly to put it in the context of tertiary education and research, and to circulate to CAUL for their use. **(Action: CH-R, DC)**

Eve Woodberry attended an ALIA/IFLA meeting for national organisations in Canberra, focussing on the structure and direction of IFLA.

She has been teleconferencing into the EDUCAUSE steering committee

She is replacing Madeleine McPherson on the MAMS steering committee, the next meeting of which will be at the end of April.

- b) **Public Relations/Media Reports.** A report in *The Australian HES* about the impact of foreign currency exchange rates on library purchasing on December 22 included quotes from John Shipp, Janine Schmidt, John Arfield and Diane Costello.
- c) **CAUL Report 2003-2004.** The first draft is due at the end of February. **(Action: DC)**
- d) **Executive Officer's Report.** The report is appended to the agenda. Diane Costello highlighted the high proportion of time devoted to CEIRC activities, including the invoicing, by the administrative assistant, currently 88%, and that some rebalancing of the program expenditure will be incorporated into the 2006 budget. **(Action: DC)**

1258. Copyright.

- a) **AVCC Information Policy Strategy Forum, 16 March, 2005.** The AVCC is seeking advice on directions to take, particularly in relation to the next iteration of the AVCC/CAL agreement. Derek Whitehead and Eve Woodberry are on the Steering Committee. Eve Woodberry will be conducting a survey as a CAUL questionnaire to find out what is happening in the universities regarding the use of the part VB licence. **(Action: EW,**

DW) It was recommended that Rachel Vance from ANU and Graham Greenleaf from AustLII be invited. **(Action: AW, EW)**

b) Increase in Digital Copying in Universities. This will be addressed at the IP Strategy forum. It was noted that licensed content is complicated to identify. The increase in digital copying in universities is expected to be high as it is coming off a zero base. Kim Weatherall of IPRIA will be investigating whether the CAL agreement is a good deal for universities, from the legal and economic perspectives.

c) Joint Library PR on WIPO Declaration.
<http://www.cptech.org/ip/wipo/genevadeclaration.html>. Eve Woodberry will sign it as a measure of support, and advise CAUL members that it has been done. **(Action: EW)**.

1259. Government Publications. At the December meeting of the Peak Bodies Forum the National Library agreed to develop a letter which libraries could send to members of Parliament, after adaptation for local needs, including local examples of the difficulties of accessing government publications for their readers. In 2004, CAUL members were invited to comment on the distribution of government publications for contribution to a DoCITA consultancy. Many included comments on long-term access.
<http://www.caul.edu.au/surveys/LibraryDepositScheme.doc> The state governments have the same issues. It was noted that ALIA has long chaired the government publications committee. It was decided that this is more a public library letter than a CAUL issue, but that the letter should be circulated to CAUL members to use as they wish. Recommend that all responses be copied to ALIA, particularly with the examples, so they can analyse the responses. **(Action: DC)**

1260. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

a) NCRIS (National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy). Cathrine Harboe-Ree will draft a response from CAUL. Submissions are due February 26. The National library has provided a copy of their draft submission.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree is working on the draft response on NCRIS and will circulate to the Executive urgently as it is due on February 26. **(Action: CH-R)** Derek Whitehead will report fully from the ARIIC meeting so it can be fed into the CAUL submission to NCRIS. **(Action: DW)** It was agreed to use the NCRIS document structure for the outline.

The response should reinforce the importance of information infrastructure (which is not expected to be contentious) and content. The government is keen to avoid all funds going to mega-projects. It should be stressed that digitisation is not just about licensing and digitising but also about partnerships between libraries and researchers to create the content eg Australian Dictionary of Biography and Dictionary of Australian Artists Online. It creates not only content but a place where scholarly discourse occurs. It was agreed that the major focus for the NLA should be digitisation, preservation, metadata and discovery. An important example is the NLA's national metadata harvester.

The response should stress the importance of ARIIC. ARIIC supports the creative commons approach, and its open access statement could be seen a surrogate DEST statement. Nothing has yet been done on the research access agenda, part of DEST's research quality agenda.

b) Research Quality Framework. There is no basis for a submission at this stage, but consultations are being held at institutional level.

c) Review of the Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice (1997). Cathrine Harboe-Ree has offered to draft a response, covering information literacy, plagiarism, open access. Submissions are due April 1. **(Action: CH-R)**

1261. Relationships with other organisations.

a) CAUDIT & ACODE.

- i) **EDUCAUSE 2005. Sky City, Auckland, 5-8 April, 2005.** Eve Woodberry is "attending" the meetings of the steering committee. The organisation appears to be going well. By 4 February there were 256 early bird registrations.
 - (1) **Metadata Workshop.** Derek Whitehead reported that the speakers are all interested and will be confirmed soon. **(Action: DW)**
- ii) **e-Research Forum.** Andrew wells is meeting with John Shipp re what can be achieved from the day, and what the structure could be. **(Action: AW)**
- iii) **Joint CCA Executive Committee.** Schedule for 2005. The first meeting will be held June 6 in Brisbane. Derek Whitehead is not available. ACODE will finalise the date for the second meeting.
- b) **CONZUL.** The joint meeting in April will be chaired jointly by Gail Pattie and Eve Woodberry. CONZUL will fund a share of the meeting expenses and will organise the official dinner on Monday April 4. Chloe Steer from the University of Auckland has made all the meeting arrangements, in consultation with Rachel O'Shaughnessy (NZVCC) and Diane Costello.
- c) **Relationships with organisations related to international education – IDP, AEI, AVCC, etc** A meeting is planned to discuss CAUL's role in facilitating international activity, including study tours in and out of Australia, negotiation with Australian organisations with a role in international education, etc. John Shipp has offered to chair the meeting. The meeting will most likely be held on April 3 from 3.30 to 5.00. Diane Costello will arrange the agenda in consultation with John Shipp. **(Action: DC)**
- d) **ARL (The Association of Research Libraries, US).** Duane Webster, Fred Heath and Colleen Cook will be visiting Australia and New Zealand in March/April and will meet with CAUL and CONZUL representatives in Auckland on April 3. They have asked to visit a number of Australian university libraries, with a particular view to discussing quality and benchmarking activities. Leadership and management training programs offered by ARL would be highly relevant to Australian libraries.
- e) **ALIA. Education Reference Group - Review of Education Policy Statements.** There was an alert to this in late October, but the actual documents requesting comment were not received. Now that they have been received, it was agreed to circulate them to CAUL asking for expressions of interest in responding and in attending the April meeting. **(Action: DC)**
- f) **National Library of Australia.** The Director-General and senior staff will be invited to the next meeting of the CAUL Executive held in Canberra.
 - i) **Peak Bodies Forum, 10 December 2004.** Eve Woodberry has circulated a report of the meeting to CAUL.
 - ii) **National Site Licence Forum, 8 December, 2004.** Eve Woodberry and Diane Costello attended the meeting, and the draft minutes have been circulated.

1262. CAUL Meetings.

- a) **CAUL Meeting 2005/1.** Auckland, 4 April, 2005, with committee meetings on the 3rd. Eve Woodberry and Gail Pattie will co-chair. The dinner will be on the Monday evening, organised by Rachel O'Shaughnessy (NZVCC).

Agenda items will include:

ARIIC project reports

ADT business plan

Judith Peacock's presentation – CAUL Achievement Award

NZ Library Advisory Committee & national digital strategy

EPIC (the NZ "national site licence")

plus recommendations from both CAUL and CONZUL, with suggested priority and timing for each item. A rough agenda of CONZUL items has been received, for integration with the CAUL items. Written reports will be requested, including for the ARIIC projects, and

only star them if questions are to be asked. John Shipp will be invited to provide a report to include NCRIS, open access, etc. Regional group chairs will be invited to send in reports. A report on the BONUS project will be appended to the ULA section. **(Action: DC)** CONZUL will be asked to approve the redraft of the agenda, and CAUL & CONZUL members asked for further items. **(Action: DC)**

- b) **CAUL Meeting 2005/2.** Brisbane, September, 2005. SCONUL is planning a study tour to Australia in the first half of September and has included the CAUL meeting in their agenda. There are 15 acceptances so far.
- c) **CAUL Meeting 2006/1.** Canberra. John Mullarvey has expressed interest in attending another CAUL meeting. It was suggested that he be invited to CAUL 2006/1 in Canberra. **(Action: DC)**
- d) **CAUL Meeting 2006/2.** Perth, in association with ALIA 2006.

1263. Forthcoming Executive Meetings. Diane is away in May, Eve away most of May, Derek away June and the week either side, Andrew in June first week, Cathrine the first two weeks in July.

- a) **2005/2 April 3 Auckland** (in conjunction with the CAUL / CONZUL meeting)
- b) **2005/3 June 6 Brisbane** (in conjunction with CCA). CAUDIT is convening the meeting.
- c) **2005/4 August 12 Sydney.** The agenda for the September meeting will be confirmed. The committee will meet for dinner on the 11th.
- d) **2005/5 September 14 Brisbane** (in conjunction with the CAUL meeting)
- e) **2005/6 November 16 Melbourne** (in conjunction with the CCA meeting). ACODE is convening the meeting.

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1264. CAUL Finances.

- a) **Audit of 2002 Accounts.** This audit is complete, and has been signed off.
- b) **Audit of 2003 Accounts.** The audit is complete, and has been signed off.
- c) **Audit of 2004 Accounts.** The audit documents are in preparation, and the audit will start at the end of February.
- d) **CAUL Budget 2004.** A draft final report for 2004 was circulated prior to the meeting.
- e) **CAUL Budget 2005.** A progress report will be prepared at the end of February. **(Action: DC)**

1265. Other business.

- a) **EdNA review.** Derek Whitehead will draft a response with Gary Hardy. **(Action: DW)**
- b) **CAVAL Steering Group on Information Literacy.** The ILWG has recommended that CAUL not fund the travel of the workshop speakers.
- c) **Early English Books Online.** Ross Coleman inquired whether a JISC-type national approach to the purchase of EEBO would be possible in Australia. Diane Costello suggested to him that it was highly likely that the main interest would be from the Go8 libraries, and that JISC funding was quite different from CAUL's, however CAUL could assist with publicising any projects and calling for expressions of interest.
- d) **IFLA membership.** A response re membership fees was received 15 February, and it was estimated that CAUL's membership fee for 2005 would be EUR 1,000. **(Action: DC)**

The meeting concluded at 2pm.

This page is intentionally blank.



ACTION PLAN
DRAFT for 2005

III. MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

Action – Ongoing

16. Manage a framework for sharing management and planning information such as reports, instruments, RFIs, position descriptions, buildings, workforce, strategic plans, software specifications, etc (Action: CAUL Executive Officer)

Action – 2005

17. Develop an interactive site for the collection, analysis and presentation of CAUL statistics. (Action: Statistics Focus Group)
18. Review and compare the Rodski and LibQUAL+ customer satisfaction surveys. (Action: Best Practice Working Group, LATN)
19. Review and develop measures of the quality of library information and research services and develop measures to support them. (Action: UNISON Reference Group)
20. Develop and evaluate measures of the quality of library services provided offshore and within Australia to support teaching and learning. (Action: Alex Byrne)

IV. COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY

Action – 2005

21. Contribute to the drafting of amendments to the Copyright Act prompted by the AUS/US Free Trade Agreement. (Action: EW, ALCC)
22. Publish a report on CAUL activities in 2003-4. (Action: CAUL Executive Officer)
23. Contribute to the development of the National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy. (Action: CAUL Executive)
24. Host a study tour by member of SCONUL (Society of College, National and University Libraries (UK)) (Action: ALL)
25. Take up membership of IFLA in 2005 and review its benefit to CAUL. (Action: CAUL Executive)

CAUL Executive Committee for 2005

PRESIDENT

Ms Evelyn Woodberry
University Librarian
University of New England
Tel: 02 6773 2165
Email: eve.woodberry@une.edu.au

VICE-PRESIDENT

Ms Cathrine Harboe-Ree
University Librarian
Monash University
Tel: 03 9905 2665
Email: cathrine.harboe-ree@lib.monash.edu.au

MEMBERS

Mr Jeff Murray
Director Knowledge and IT Service Centre
Edith Cowan University
Tel: 08 9273 8823
Email: jeff.murray@ecu.edu.au

Mr Andrew Wells
University Librarian
University of New South Wales
Tel: 02 9385 2662
Email: a.wells@unsw.edu.au

Mr Derek Whitehead
Director, Information Resources
Swinburne University
Tel: 03 9214 8333
Email: dwhitehead@swin.edu.au

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Diane Costello
Email: diane.costello@caul.edu.au

CAUL OFFICE:

LPO Box 8169, ANU
Canberra ACT 2601
Tel: + 61 2 6125 2990
Fax: +61 2 6248 8571
<http://www.caul.edu.au/>

Mission

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.

The Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) comprises the university librarians or library directors of the universities eligible to be members of the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee.

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.

(Revision date 15 February2005)

I. CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING

Goal: To Optimise Learning Outcomes and Maximise 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.

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)

Action – 2005

3. Respond to proposed changes in the government's teaching & learning agenda, especially with regard to the Teaching and Learning Performance Fund. (Action: CAUL Executive)

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
 (Action: Information Literacy Working Group)
5. Support research investigating the effects of digital rights management systems on access to information resources used in learning and teaching, including economic impacts and the educational statutory licence. (Action: CAUL Executive)
6. Review the outcomes of the BONUS trial being conducted by UNISON and consider any implications for developing user initiated unmediated borrowing services. (Action: ULA Working Group, UNISON BONUS working group)

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 stated objectives will also contribute significantly to teaching & learning. Promoting Australian research to the world is considered along with the universities' access to global research.

Action – Ongoing

7. Continue the development of the Australian Digital Theses Program. (Action: ADT Steering Group)
8. Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchase and licensing of electronic information resources. (Action: CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee))

Action – 2005

9. Upgrade the ADT metadata repository to improve its functionality, make it OAI-compliant and to expand its content to include metadata for non-digital theses. (Action: ADT-ARIIC Project Team)
10. Expand the ADT program to include members from New Zealand. (Action: ADT Policy Reference Group)
11. Host the ETD2005 conference. (Action: UNSW Library)
12. Contribute to the development and promotion of institutional digital assets repositories initiatives. (Action: SCWG, ALL members)
13. Contribute to the development of a national strategy for digitisation of Australian research resources across the wider cultural sector. (Action: ALL Members)
14. Seek funding to conduct research into information-seeking behaviours and their impact on service models (building on Houghton / Steele research). (Action: CAUL Executive)
15. Contribute to the Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee, particularly in light of its role within the National Cooperative Research Infrastructure Strategy. (Action: DW)

**CAUL Strategic Plan
Report to CAUL**

Author: Andrew Wells

Date: 20 March 2005

Date of previous report: 2 September 2004

Section	1. Contribution to Research
Action	8. Continue the development of the Australian Digital Theses Program)
Responsibility	ADT Policy Reference Group
Time-line	Ongoing
Activity since last report	<p>ADT-ARIIC: Expansion and Redevelopment Report</p> <p>DSTC selected as software supplier for redeveloped metadata repository. Procurement followed UNSW procedures. DSTC's MetaSuite v 5 was selected on condition that DSTC could demonstrate scalability requirements. Successful testing completed by August 2004.</p> <p>Contract negotiations commenced September 2004 and completed February 2005.</p> <p>Data extraction from National Bibliographic Database required extensive testing. Project has negotiated an agreement between CAUL and the National Library of Australia for initial data extraction and updated data. ADT will continue to work with NLA on improving data quality</p> <p>Project plan established with ProQuest to test its retrospective conversion services and submission system. Ten CAUL members are participating [Deakin, Griffith, QUT, Swinburne, Adelaide, Melbourne, UNSW, UQ, USA, UWS]. Mary Anne Kennan appointed Project Manager for this task.</p> <p>Ongoing work with ARROW Project on data modelling for theses</p> <p>ETD2005</p> <p>Appointed ICE as conference organiser.</p> <p>Web-site finalised, and call for papers issued. See: http://adt.caul.edu.au/etd2005/etd2005.html</p> <p>Keynote speakers include Stevan Harnad, Alex Byrne, Hai Jin and Zhang Xiaolin. Program will also include a number of national and international guest speakers</p> <p>ADT Program</p> <p>Meeting held February 3 during Online Conference.</p> <p>Sub-group on mandatory submission formed. This group will develop materials to assist members implement mandatory submission, including advocacy and best practice.</p>

<p>Achievements since last report</p>	<p>ADT Program Status</p> <p>35 CAUL members signed with program</p> <p>2 CONZUL members signed (Canterbury and Otago)</p> <p>27 active members</p> <p>3,300 ETDs available (2554 on 2 September 2004)</p>
<p>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</p>	<p>Press reports in AFR Higher Education Section, Campus Review and Australian Higher Education in September 2004 regarding selection of DSTC and the goals of the expansion program</p>
<p>Plan for forthcoming activity</p>	<p>ETD2005</p> <p>Completion of Redevelopment and Expansion Report (planned for June 30)</p> <p>Revised business plan to CAUL and CONZUL in third quarter 2005 proposing an Australasian Digital Theses Program</p>
<p>CAUL budget implications</p>	<p>To be reviewed as part of business plan</p>
<p>Recommendations to CAUL</p>	<p>Note the report</p> <p>Active support of and promotion for ETD2005</p>

To: CAUL
CONZUL
ADT Policy Committee

From: Andrew Wells

Subject: ADT Business Plan revision

Date: 21 March 2005

A draft revision of the ADT business plan is attached. This document will be revised in the next few months. I intend bringing a final version to the September meeting of CAUL for its approval. Approvals from CONZUL and the ADT Policy Committee will also be sought.

I would like to draw your attention to key matters raised in this document:

1. CAUL and CONZUL joining forces to create an Australasian Digital Theses Program
2. The development of institutional repository systems providing feasible alternatives to the ADT software: this changes the character of the Program
3. The nature of the Program following the completion of the ADT Redevelopment and Expansion funded by ARIIC
4. Participation in NDLTD (Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations): costs and benefits need to be articulated
5. Continuation of current governance arrangements: these have proved successful
6. UNSW Library continuing to operate the central activities of the Program: members may wish to consider going to tender or inviting expressions of interest from other CAUL and CONZUL members

Financial projections have not been calculated: these will be easier to estimate once the Expansion and Redevelopment Project is completed.

Version	Date	Author
1	22 March 2005	Andrew Wells, Alex Byrne, Tony Cargnelutti

AUSTRALASIAN DIGITAL THESES PROGRAM

BUSINESS PLAN 2006-2009

1. SUMMARY

This plan sets out the next stages for the development of digital theses programs in Australia and New Zealand universities. The successful financial, administrative and governance arrangements used in the Australian Digital Theses Program are carried through to the Australasian Digital Theses Program.

2. PROGRAM STATUS

2.1 BACKGROUND

The Australian Digital Theses Program was established in 2002 following a successful Australian Research Council funded project which ran from 1998 to 2001. The model of a central metadata repository providing discovery of and access to digital versions of theses residing on distributed servers is proven.

In 2002, the Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) accepted a business plan which had the following key features:

- All CAUL members were automatically members of the ADT Program
- Each CAUL member would pay an annual levy to fund operations for members including maintaining the central metadata repository, assistance with set up, advocacy and communication
- A Policy Group overseeing the development of the Program and the work of a Technical Committee
- The appointment of the University of New South Wales Library to act as CAUL's agent in maintaining and development the Program

2.2 PROGRAM GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

The number of active participants and theses available online has exceeded targets in the 2002-2006 business plan. At the end of 2004, there were 25 active participants, and 2 New Zealand universities announced their intention to join the Program. The growth in theses available online over time is shown in the following table:

Date	Active members	Number of theses
July 2002	12	560
March 2003	16	897
August 2003	22	1458
March 2004	22	2030

September 2004	25	2554
March 2005	27	3,300

At the end of 2004, 10 Australian universities announced policies requiring mandatory submission of digital versions of theses, with an additional 3 planning to introduce in 2005. This will ensure increasing rates of growth.

The ADT Program has undergone significant development in 2004 with support from the Systemic Infrastructure Initiative, part of Backing Australia's Ability. The ADT Program responded to a call for proposals from the Department of Science, Education and Training for projects that demonstrated improvements or research in information infrastructure. The key activity has been the expansion of the coverage ADT's central metadata repository to include as many records for all PhD and Masters (Research) theses as possible. The functionality of the metadata repository was developed to support the OAI Metadata Harvesting Protocol, information retrieval protocols (Z39.50) and improved data quality maintenance. DSTC has been contracted to provide software for the metadata repository.

The ADT Program is a member of the international Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations, with representation on the Board of Directors and several committees. ADT has been represented at every Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETD) Conference. The achievement of ADT has been internationally recognised and is being seen as a useful model for other countries. In September 2005, CAUL and UNSW Library will host the eighth ETD Conference.

3. OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

Environment

The policy environment for the ADT Program is positive. Government and industry interest in making fundamental research available is frequently expressed. The ADT Program has won key sectoral support from academics and postgraduate students.

The key environmental factor influencing the future development and form of the ADT Program is the development of institutional repositories (IRs). When ADT began, the only software available was the original Virginia Tech software (a prototype of the later version ETD-db) specifically designed for digital theses. In the last four years, there has been considerable growth in software development for IRs: much of this software can or is being developed to manage digital theses. The ETD-db software is lagging in development and better choices are available to members. The Systemic Infrastructure Initiative has funded ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World) and APSR (Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories). These two projects are deploying DSpace and FEDORA to manage digital theses, in addition to other data types. These and other e-publishing ventures are promoting rapid innovation in repository software.

ProQuest is developing an alternative to locally deployed software to manage digital theses by offering a bureau-type service with its Information Commons service. Testing of this software and associated workflows is a pilot project within the Systemic Infrastructure Initiative funded ADT project.

The success of search engines requires that ADT makes its metadata and content (subject to local restrictions) available. Ignoring the power and user take-up of services such as Google undermines awareness and visibility of the Program.

Trends and implications

Policies mandating deposit of digital versions of theses will promote growth although libraries will need to find efficient workflows to deal with increased throughput. In Australasia, there are some 6,000 higher degree completions each year. There will be many challenges in meeting the processing requirements and efficient workflow.

This development suggests the following parameters for the ADT Program:

- Digital theses will be managed locally within institutional repository systems or remotely through bureau services.
- Adherence to the OAI Metadata Harvesting Protocol will be essential for the efficient development and maintenance of ADT's central metadata repository
- Data exchange and harvesting protocols will be a major technical focus, particularly exchange with national discovery and national bibliographic database services
- The central metadata repository must feature currency, wide coverage, reliability and high quality data
- Mandatory submission of digital theses will require sharing of expertise in workflow and policy development
- Ensuring that metadata is available for discovery by search engines. Even better, content should be made available
- Making the ADT web site a source of information to a wide audience
- Maintaining international linkages and recognition
- Continuing to build on existing partnerships including the sharing of knowledge, experience and expertise

4. OPERATION

This plan recommends no major changes to the way the ADT Program operates. The technical model is successful. The governance model has worked for both the ongoing program and the redevelopment project. Time is needed to understand how the recent expansion and technical redevelopment of the program will affect its operation and use. The mandatory submission movement is growing. Many CAUL and CONZUL members are still not active in the Program. The main area of change is the number of options now available to university libraries to manage digital theses.

The following is proposed for 2006-2009:

Membership

When members become 'active' they will fill out the Membership Form in Appendix 1

The ADT Program will formally join the NTLTD Program for an annual fee of \$US... The benefits of this membership are:

[To come – requires further discussion]

Access

Access to the ADT metadata repository will be free for any individual or organisation. Access to full text of theses is strongly encouraged. Metadata licensing and re-use policies are set out in Appendix 2.

Administration and Reporting

CAUL will be the organisation which administers the ADT Program for CAUL and CONZUL and will be advised by the ADT Policy Reference Group (with expanded membership from New Zealand). The University of New South Wales Library will continue to manage the program on behalf of CAUL and CONZUL. UNSW Library will report program status and issues to CAUL and CONZUL through the ADT Policy Reference Group.

Service Levels

UNSW Library agrees to provide service levels to members as set out in Appendix 3.

Meetings

The ADT Policy Reference Group will meet no less than 2 times per year.

The ADT Technical Committee will meet no less than 2 times per year.

Governance

A two-tiered structure will apply

ADT Policy Reference Group

2 CAUL members (1 as Chair)

1 CONZUL member

1 representative of the Deans and Directors of Graduate Schools

1 representative of the Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations

1 representative of the New Zealand academic or postgraduate community

1 representative of the National Library of Australia

1 representative of the National Library of New Zealand

ADT Program Manager (UNSW)

UNSW University Librarian will attend meetings but have no voting rights.

The Committee may invite expert advisors to participate in meetings but without voting rights.

CAUL Executive Officer will provide support.

ADT Technical Committee

ADT Program Manager (Chair)

ADT Technical Support representative (UNSW)

4 CAUL representatives

2 CONZUL representatives

Financial Operation

- Cost of operation

The University of New South Wales Library estimates the following annual costs:

Staff – Program Management	
Staff – Technical Management for Metadata Repository	
Staff – Web Site Administration	
NLTLD membership	
Hardware – life cycle costs annualised over 4 years of business plan	
ETD representation	
Software maintenance	
Data services [Kinetica and Te Puna]	

- Revenues

To be calculated over CAUL and CONZUL members.

- Financial Reporting

UNSW Library will provide reports on costs and revenues to CAUL and CONZUL through the ADT Policy Reference Group

5. PROGRAM EVALUATION

Measure	Indicator
Program Growth	
Number of active CAUL Libraries	80% by end 2006 [67% at March 2005]
Number of active CONZUL libraries	50% by end 2006 [25% at March 2005]
Number of online theses available	5000 by end 2006
Number of retrospectively converted theses available	[Baseline and estimate to be determined]
Stakeholder relationships	
Strength of relationship with scholarly community	Assessment of relationship 50% of CAUL members have mandatory submission of digital theses by end 2006 [25% at March 2005] 25% of CONZUL members have mandatory submission of digital theses by end 2006 [??% at March 2005]
Search statistics for metadata repository	[To be determined]
Governance and management	
Costs meet budget for centralised operation	Variation no greater than 5%
CAUL and CONZUL satisfied with program management	CAUL and CONZUL responses to ADT reports, proposals and communication

Appendix 1

Membership form

To be revised in line with change in operation of program

Appendix 2

Metadata and Copyright

Current policy: to be reviewed

ADT COPYRIGHT AND METADATA POLICIES

1. Contribution of metadata

ADT members extend to CAUL a non-exclusive, royalty-free licence to:

- a) Access metadata on ADT members' computer systems
- b) Harvest, copy, host and store all or part of the ADT members' metadata in the ADT metadata repository
- c) Convert harvested metadata whenever necessary to meet data format and data content standards used in the ADT metadata repository
- d) Allow free access to the metadata by any users of the World Wide Web for their personal educational and research use

2. Re-use of Metadata

- a) ADT members may use ADT metadata for educational and research purposes the inclusion of metadata in subject listings, catalogues or other discovery tools is in keeping with the purposes of ADT
- b) Commercial re-use of metadata must be approved by CAUL and CONZUL. The ADT web-site will contain information about commercial re-use of metadata

3. Copyright

- a) CAUL and CONZUL will jointly own copyright in the ADT web site

Appendix 3

Service Level Agreement between CAUL and CONZUL members and UNSW

To be revised in line with change of operation of program

This page is intentionally blank.

CAUL Strategic Plan Report to CAUL

Author: **Heather Gordon**

Date: March 4, 2005; Date of previous report: September 1, 2004

Section	Information Resources
Action	Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchase and licensing of electronic information resources through the CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee)
Responsibility	CEIRC Convenor
Time-line	Ongoing
Activity since last report	<p>Meetings held on October 7, 2004, December 2, 2004, and January 31, 2005 in Sydney. Approved minutes are available at http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/ and draft minutes are available at http://www.caul.edu.au/dataset\$/ceirc-meetings.html</p> <p>CEIRC strategic planning The Committee has prepared the 2005 operational plan. The CAUL Executive approved an expenditure of up to \$15,000 to fund specific activities outlined in the plan. A copy of the plan is attached to this report.</p> <p>Product negotiations The Datasets Coordinators have identified 23 products for CEIRC to consider, most of which have no current CEIRC offer. The Committee will consider the list during the next several meetings.</p> <p>Discussions are currently underway with: Gale have reported that they will not allow for region-specific, locally designed licences but will implement a global academic licence. Sage Publications have reported that they will consider consortial purchasing agreements. RMIT Publishing reports that they have not revised the user license for the Plus Text products as it is a joint RMIT Publishing/CAL license and they have yet to come to an agreement with CAL. Oxford University Press outstanding items include the costs of adding and deleting titles. Cambridge University Press 2005 pricing is outstanding. Diane Costello has written to the Director of Journals, Dr Conrad Guettler, expressing concern at the lack of response. Taylor and Francis 2006 pricing model still to be decided. Several CEIRC members attended a luncheon at Online 2005 to discuss issues with the company. The company has sent an ebooks licence for CEIRC to review. For more information see http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/offers.htm</p> <p>Product service issues Factiva will be distributed by ProQuest. DSCs will compile a list of technical issues for CEIRC to communicate to ProQuest. The DSCs report that LexisNexis AU now requires the user to acknowledge a click-through licence on the web page, and agree that their name details will be sent to the US. CEIRC will look into the privacy compliance issues.</p>

	<p>CEIRC membership The CAUL Executive approved membership for 3 new organisations since October 2004, Forest Research (a New Zealand Crown Research Institute), the Australian Wine Research Institute and Avondale College.</p> <p>CEIRC Committee membership The membership of CEIRC for 2005 is as follows:</p> <p>Heather Gordon (Chair, CAUL nominee) Gulcin Cribb (CAUL nominee) Andrew Wells (CAUL Executive nominee) David Groenewegen (Datasets Coordinator representative) Martin Borchert (Datasets Coordinator representative) John Redmayne (CONZUL representative)</p> <p>to be announced (CSIRO representative) Sally-Anne Leigh has resigned due to her appointment at the University of Melbourne.</p> <p>Diane Costello (Secretary & Executive Officer, CAUL)</p>
<p>Achievements since last report</p>	<p>ABS have responded to the CEIRC letter outlining concerns. They have been invited to attend the April CEIRC meeting for further discussion.</p> <p>CISTI has offered a 20% discount on all Direct Service and Urgent Service copies from April 1, 2005 through March 31, 2006.</p> <p>Wiley InterScience has waived the 2005 enhanced access fee as the CEIRC participation rate is 98%. Participating members can receive a refund or credit note to be applied to the 2006 EAL journals' invoice.</p>
<p>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</p>	<p>Diane Costello has prepared a policy and procedure for payment of CEIRC invoices. The information is available online, linked from the CEIRC Committee page at http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc.htm</p> <p>Diane Costello emailed Datasets Coordinators on February 25 to invite them to continue to report problem clauses in licences, and to provide copies of clauses successfully negotiated locally for local conditions. The process for updating licences on the web-site was also described.</p> <p>Diane Costello will attend the Springer Asia/Pacific Library Advisory Board meeting in Singapore in early March.</p> <p>CEIRC meeting summary reports were emailed to CAUL members by the convenor on Feb 8, 2005 for the Jan 2005 meeting, December 7, 2004 for the December 2004 meeting and October 15, 2004 for the October 2004 meeting.</p> <p>Draft minutes of the DSC meeting held on January 31, 2005 are available online at http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc.htm</p>
<p>Plan for forthcoming activity</p>	<p>Next meetings are scheduled for April 20 and June 16.</p>
<p>Recommendations to CAUL</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That CAUL members note the 2005 Operational Plan. 2) That CAUL approach ARIIC to request funding to evaluate the effectiveness of the JSTOR national site license including: usage rates, how it has been used, how it has contributed to research at universities. 3) That CAUL approach ARIIC to request funding for products such as Nature Archive and PCI Full-Text (the AVCC has approached DEST to fund ISI Thomson backfiles under the SII).

2005 CEIRC Operational Plan

Strategic Goal	Task	Timeframes (start – end)	Responsibility	KPI	Resources Required	Budget	Actions Taken
1.2 Develop ROI reporting tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate available tools Analyse CEIRC survey results Determine which tools to adopt/best means to communicate Implement tools 	August- Oct	Gulcin Cribb <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heather Gordon 	ROI communicates value to CEIRC participants.			
1.3 Survey CEIRC participants to identify elements that will add value to any deal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a survey tool/questions Pre-test survey Distribute survey via web Collate & analyse results Communicate & operational results 	May– July	Andrew Wells <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sally-Anne Leigh David Groenewegen John Redmayne 	Survey results are included in CEIRC checklist, sample clauses for reference when negotiating contracts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Web assistance to design survey and post on web Research analysis assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$5,000 \$5,000 	
2.1 Develop a risk management system for CEIRC operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a risk management framework Test framework with information from SWOT & operational review 	July- Sept	Heather Gordon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gulcin Cribb 	System ensures compliance, and is applied at the strategic, operational and project level. Risks are identified and level of risk is			

2005 CEIRC Operational Plan

Strategic Goal	Task	Timeframes (start – end)	Responsibility	KPI	Resources Required	Budget	Actions Taken
				managed by priority and treatment strategies.			
2.3 Review and develop policies and procedures for CEIRC operational activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index existing p & p • Identify p & p to be developed • Prioritise list & set timeframes 	Jan - March	Diane Costello <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sally-Anne Leigh 	Annual financial and operational plans are completed and accepted by CAUL. Established turnaround times for operations are met.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EOs time 		
2.4 Review staffing requirements and draft recommendation to CAUL executive to ensure adequate and flexible staffing to meet workflows and workloads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft a 2005 operational plan • Identify resources and budget required to complete plan • EO to review plan • Present plan to CAUL Executive 	Jan - Feb	Heather Gordon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diane Costello • Eve Woodberry 	Staff are available when required.			<u>Completed</u> CAUL Executive reviewed and approved OP and budget on 6 December 2004.
2.5 Prepare induction kits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review available 	Dec - Feb	David Groenewegen	Induction kits are posted to the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EOs time • CAUL 		

2005 CEIRC Operational Plan

Strategic Goal	Task	Timeframes (start – end)	Responsibility	KPI	Resources Required	Budget	Actions Taken
for datasets coordinators and CEIRC members.	information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult with DSC, CEIRC current and past members Identify missing information Draft kits and post on website 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diane Costello John Redmayne 	CAUL website Feedback from CEIRC members and datasets coordinators is positive.	staff/contractor to post information on CAUL website		
3.4 . Survey datasets coordinators & external participants to identify and prioritise new products and services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop questions/survey tool Pre-test with past CEIRC DSCs Distribute before DSC Jan mtg Discuss at DSC Jan mtg Survey closes after Online conference Compile & analyse results Communicate & operational results 	Dec - Feb	David Groenewegen <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Martin Borchert Sally-Anne Leigh 	CEIRC negotiates agreements for identified products and services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Past CEIRC DSCs time 		The survey was conducted in late December, with 17 responses, which were discussed at the Datasets Coordinators meeting, where 23 products were identified for negotiation.
4.1 Identify and produce documentation that will promote and communicate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review survey results (1.3) Review ROI tools Review risk management 	Oct - Dec	Heather Gordon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Martin Borchert Andrew Wells 	Statement of benefits report is available and of use to stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Writer to produce reports CAUL staff/contractor to post information on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$5,000 	

2005 CEIRC Operational Plan

Strategic Goal	Task	Timeframes (start – end)	Responsibility	KPI	Resources Required	Budget	Actions Taken
CEIRC activities.	framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop strategic marketing plan • Draft documentation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diane Costello 		CAUL website		
4.3 Document and promote roles and responsibilities of datasets coordinators, CAUL officers, CEIRC chair and deputy chair positions, and members.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify & review existing documentation • Edit information • Determine location on website and post 	Feb - March	Gulcin Cribb <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diane Costello 	Role statements are on the CAUL website.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EOs time • CAUL staff/contractor to post information on CAUL website • 		First draft prepared. Document to be tabled at April CEIRC meeting.

2005 CEIRC Operational Plan

4.2 Strategic Directions

Key Result Area 1: Member Fragmentation	Timeframes	Key Performance Indicators
<p>Factors contributing to member fragmentation: costing models and conditions may not be competitive; products may not be relevant to members; other buying groups offer better price and conditions</p> <p>Goal: Members will participate in CEIRC for the cooperative purchasing of electronic resources.</p> <p>Actions</p> <p>1.1 Use different costing models to facilitate maximum participation of members.</p> <p>1.2 Develop return on investment (ROI) reporting tools.</p> <p>1.3 Survey CEIRC participants to identify elements that would add value to any deal.</p> <p>1.4 Analyse and address members' reasons for not participating in new offers and/or not renewing existing offers.</p> <p>1.5 Proactively work with the marketplace to ensure that relevant and competitively priced products are offered to members.</p>	<p>1.1 Ongoing</p> <p>1.2 Oct 2005</p> <p>1.3 July 2005</p> <p>1.4 Ongoing</p> <p>1.5 Ongoing</p>	<p>1.1.1 Number of products that members take up and renew as a percentage of offers.</p> <p>1.1.2 Number of members that take up each product.</p> <p>1.2 ROI communicates value to CEIRC participants.</p> <p>1.3. Survey results are included in CEIRC checklist, sample clauses for reference when negotiating contracts.</p> <p>1.4. Decrease in non-participation rate for new and renewed offers.</p> <p>1.5.1 Quality and number of new products offered each year.</p> <p>1.5.2 Same as 1.1.1</p>

2005 CEIRC Operational Plan

Key Result Area 2: Business Continuity	Timeframes	Key Performance Indicators
<p>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.</p> <p>Goal: Ensure that CEIRC activities are managed efficiently and effectively and minimise risk to CAUL.</p> <p>Actions</p> <p>2.1 Develop a risk management system for CEIRC operations.</p> <p>2.2 Conduct a risk management audit.</p> <p>2.3 Review and develop policies and procedures for CEIRC operational activities.</p> <p>2.4 Review staffing requirements and draft recommendation to CAUL executive to ensure adequate and flexible staffing to meet workflows and workloads.</p> <p>2.5 Prepare induction kits for datasets coordinators and CEIRC members.</p>	<p>2.1 Sept 2005</p> <p>2.2 March 2006</p> <p>2.3 March 2005</p> <p>2.4 Jan 2005</p> <p>2.5 Feb 2005</p>	<p>2.1 System ensures compliance, and is applied at the strategic, operational and project level.</p> <p>2.2.1 Risks are identified and level of risk is managed by priority and treatment strategies.</p> <p>2.2.2 Business records are accessible, secured and backed up as appropriate.</p> <p>2.3.1 Annual financial and operational plans are completed and accepted by CAUL.</p> <p>2.3.2 Established turnaround times for operations are met.</p> <p>2.4 Staff are available when required.</p> <p>2.5.1 Induction kits are posted to the CAUL website.</p> <p>2.5.2 Feedback from CEIRC members and datasets coordinators is positive.</p>

2005 CEIRC Operational Plan

Key Result Area 3: Future growth and development	Timeframes	Key Performance Indicators
<p>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.</p> <p>Goal: Determine future directions and priorities for electronic information resources and services.</p> <p>Actions</p> <p>3.1 Identify projects and activities for short and long term objectives.</p> <p>3.2 Draft a budget to support R&D activities, data collection and analysis.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>3.4 Survey datasets coordinators & external participants to identify and prioritise new products and services.</p> <p>3.5 Monitor cost-benefit analysis of further expansion of external membership.</p>	<p>3.1 January & during year</p> <p>3.2 January</p> <p>3.3 As completed</p> <p>3.4 January 2005</p> <p>3.5 September & during year</p>	<p>3.1. Projects are completed on time and within budget and meet project goals.</p> <p>3.2. Budget is approved by CAUL and is expended according to established timeframes.</p> <p>3.3 AVCC receives information prior to any re-negotiation and acknowledges receipt.</p> <p>3.4 CEIRC negotiates agreements for identified products and services.</p> <p>3.5.1 CAUL executive approve external members nominated by CEIRC.</p> <p>3.5.2 Value of external membership is reported to CAUL via annual report.</p>

2005 CEIRC Operational Plan

Key Result Area 4: Communication and Marketing	Timeframes	Key Performance Indicators
<p>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.</p> <p>Goal: All stakeholders understand and acknowledge the role of CEIRC and the value of CEIRC activities.</p> <p>Actions</p> <p>4.1 Identify and produce documentation that will promote and communicate CEIRC activities.</p> <p>4.2 Publish a statement of benefits report annually on CAUL website and in CAUL annual report.</p> <p>4.3 Document and promote roles and responsibilities of datasets coordinators, CAUL officers, CEIRC chair and deputy chair positions, and members.</p> <p>4.4 Educate vendors and publishers about the Australasian higher education sector as it affects the provision of electronic information resources.</p>	<p>4.1 Oct 2005</p> <p>4.2 Sept 2006</p> <p>4.3 Feb 2005</p> <p>4.4 Ongoing</p>	<p>4.1.1. Relevant documentation is available on CAUL website.</p> <p>4.1.2 CEIRC strategic directions are relevant, current and support the CAUL strategic plan.</p> <p>4.1.3 CAUL receives timely advice on emerging issues and trends.</p> <p>4.2 Statement of benefits report is available and of use to stakeholders.</p> <p>4.3 Role statements are on the CAUL website.</p> <p>4.4.1 CEIRC is invited to participate on vendor and publisher advisory committees and focus groups.</p> <p>4.4.2 Vendors meet with CEIRC to resolve issues identified by dataset coordinators and CAUL.</p>

TEC: NATIONAL CONSORTIUM LICENCES PROJECT 2006 ONWARDS

BACKGROUND

This project had its genesis at LIANZA's Information Policy Summits in 1999/2000, when proposals were floated to seek government funding to support national site licences as part of strengthening the national information infrastructure. This was picked up by CONZUL and the Crown Research Institutes (CRIs) who jointly prepared a submission as part of the LIANZA Information Strategy. The announcement by the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) of special Innovation and Development Funds, available from 2004/5-2006/7, provided the opportunity for a joint application.

A joint CONZUL/CRI Working Party identified the priority e-resources to support research, negotiated with vendors and submitted a proposal to the TEC for funding of \$3.6 million over two years, which, when added to the existing level of funding from the institutions involved, would enable all the universities and CRIs to have current subscriptions and backfiles of *Science Direct* and *Web of Science*, which were not previously universally available. In addition three polytechnics opted to be included in the bid for subsets of *Science Direct*. One of the key arguments for universal availability was that government is encouraging cross-sector collaboration on research.

In December 2003 the TEC confirmed that the *National Consortium Licences Project* was one of nine successful bids (out of 159 applications) and by January 2004 the participants had access to the databases. The contracts took another eight months to sort out!

2006 FORWARD

One of the conditions attached to the funding was that participants would undertake best endeavours to fund ongoing subscriptions when the TEC funding ceases at the end of 2005. The Working Party considered alternative consortium management arrangements for 2006 forwards, including both CEIRC and EPIC. However, in view of the commitment to the TEC, it was decided to continue with the present arrangements, managed by the NZVCC Office with the Working Party to oversee the process, at least to get the ongoing contracts in place. That work is now well under way.

- All the participants agreed to the Working Party negotiating on their behalf. One polytechnic has withdrawn but a new one wants to join in.
- Elsevier and ISI have made proposals for 2006 forward, which have gone through various rounds of negotiation.
- The Working Party has developed pricing models for sharing the costs within the consortium. Many alternative cost-sharing models were considered, but no formula was found which could be applied uniformly across universities and CRIs to give an acceptable result, in terms of fairness and likely affordability. Therefore there is a certain amount of pragmatism in the options which have now been proposed for consideration, which takes into account the previous level of spending. Consortium members have now responded with their preferences and the Working Party believes that it will be possible to reach agreement on the cost-sharing. For *Science Direct* Model A (largely pragmatic) seems to

be the most acceptable. For *Web of Science* further information is needed from some participants before the preferred model can be confirmed.

- Actual pricing cannot be confirmed until all participants confirm that they have the funding to continue. In the case of *Web of Science* five CRIs require special budget approval and for *Science Direct* seven libraries (universities and CRIs) need budget increases. Participants will be asked to obtain budget confirmation by mid-May.
- If any libraries drop out of either deal, the Working Party will have to go back to the vendor(s) for a revised proposal, pricing models will have to be re-visited and participants will be consulted again.

Isobel Mosley
Working Party Chair
17 March 2005

EPIC: Electronic Purchasing in Collaboration – a shared initiative of New Zealand libraries



Electronic Purchasing in Collaboration – a shared initiative of New Zealand libraries

Introduction

EPIC is the national e-licensing initiative in New Zealand that makes available a package of electronic resources to all New Zealanders through the consortium member libraries. Through a National Library of New Zealand Te Puna Mātauranga o Aotearoa funded Proof of Concept project, using a competitive procurement process, it was possible to negotiate subscription rates that have allowed even very small libraries to subscribe.

One hundred and seventy six libraries have committed to EPIC to date, and the Ministry of Education has funded access for all New Zealand schools for the first year. As a result EPIC has provided unprecedented access to electronic resources for New Zealanders.

Background

In 2002, the National Library surveyed libraries to determine interest in forming a self-funded consortium for the purchase of e-content and to identify the type of content required. A positive response led to the establishment of two multi-sector working groups that developed and made recommendations about possible consortium structure, funding arrangements and content. They recommended that the following subjects were of widest appeal to New Zealand libraries:

- NZ newspapers
- General/ Business/ Health
- General Reference
- General Science

To take these recommendations forward the National Library agreed to fund a six-month proof of concept project to develop a cross-sector consortium to deliver at least two electronic publications for NZ libraries and their users. This was the PER:NA (Purchasing Electronic Resources: a National Approach) Proof of Concept Project which began in May 2003.

A Project Manager was seconded from another library and multi-sector Steering, Advisory, Technical, Requirements and Negotiations teams were set up. The initial focus was on the development and running of a Request for Proposal (RFP) process that sought to identify and select possible vendors and products.

Three possible outcomes that were identified and built into communications throughout the project:

- The project may demonstrate the viability of a self-sustaining model going on into the future.
- The project may deliver the some products but show that a self-sustaining model is not viable for a wider range of products.

EPIC: Electronic Purchasing in Collaboration – a shared initiative of New Zealand libraries

- The New Zealand library market cannot support a national approach to site licences. This is still a positive outcome, as the outcome will be supported by a transparent process and case study.

The following key principles were also emphasised:

- Collaboration - it is an opportunity to demonstrate that the New Zealand library sector can collaborate, in the national interest, through a licensing consortium;
- The model must have the potential to include any New Zealand library
- There should be expanded access to e-Resources for all users
- The consortium should be financially self-sustaining after the set-up phase
- A partnering approach with e-Resource providers

The RFP process was run from July-October and was a very intensive exercise. This was particularly so for the Negotiation Team, who committed many hours evaluating products and negotiating with short-listed suppliers.

The outcome of the RFP was the selection of a range of EBSCO and Thomson Gale resources. The PER:NA project team negotiated an 'all of country' deal, meaning every person in New Zealand could access the resources through a consortium member library – be it local library, education library, work library or the National Library of New Zealand.

The proposed deal was put to New Zealand libraries in early November 2003. Libraries were provided with a price range and it was explained that the final cost was dependant on the level of commitment. To commit, each library had to sign a letter of agreement with the National Library. On 19 December 2003 enough commitment was gained to announce that the consortium could be formed. Contracts were then signed between the National Library and EBSCO and Thomson Gale.

Partnering

EPIC has developed a partnering approach with EBSCO and Thomson Gale. Because EPIC is a new concept in NZ there was a need to work with the vendors to ensure flexibility in tackling any challenges or unexpected outcomes. The contracts with EBSCO and Thomson Gale include a schedule on an agreed way of working together that promotes prompt constructive communication and a problem solving approach. It still requires the delivery of agreed content, including increasing New Zealand content, and service levels. It also enables the setting of future goals and targets.

Governance & Staffing

PER:NA became EPIC in February 2004. The resources were rolled out to libraries in April, and the new governance structure was implemented in June 2004. The National Library is currently the lead agency, and hosts the EPIC office.

Strategic planning is the responsibility of the EPIC Governance Group (EGG) comprising 9 sector representatives. In addition to providing strategic direction, EGG guides the operation of the consortium and works to promote and stimulate expansion of the resources to as wide a NZ library market as possible. There is one full-time EPIC Manager role that is funded from the administration fund.

EPIC: Electronic Purchasing in Collaboration – a shared initiative of New Zealand libraries

Membership

Library Type	Percentage of Total in that Sector
Universities, Polytechnics, Wananga¹, Colleges of Education and other Tertiary	95%
Public Libraries	91%²
Special Libraries (includes Company, Charity, Government, Health and other types of libraries)	Approx 32%³
Schools - <i>The Ministry of Education has provided funding for all registered schools in New Zealand for the first year. Schools must register, and sign licences, before they can access through www.tki.org.nz/epic</i>	Approx 50%⁴ registered.

Resources

Over 16,000 full-text titles are available. Databases include EBSCO Australia/New Zealand Reference Centre, EBSCO MasterFILE Premier, Thomson Gale Infotrac Onefile and twelve other Thomson Gale collections including Biography Resource Centre and Health and Wellness Resource Centre.

The resources are only available as a package.

Access

Each member library manages its own access to the resources. This is so they can customise interfaces and access usage reports as they wish. A wide range of authentication options are supported including IP, Referring url, ID and Password, barcode pattern and the use of LibProxy and EZProxy is supported. Libraries are encouraged to set up remote access.

Promotion

Developing EPIC promotional material was challenging because there are so many different types of libraries with different client bases. Also some libraries did not want to provide access to the full range of databases so did not want to do a full 'EPIC' promotion.

To combat this we encouraged libraries to develop their own promotional strategies, to suit their own environments. We did this by providing them with customisable promotional materials, including EPIC posters with blank sections so libraries could paste in their details, generic press releases that libraries could personalise, desktop wallpaper and a PowerPoint template. To support this we also provided libraries with tips on ways to promote electronic resources.

¹ Public tertiary institutions that provide programmes with an emphasis on the application of knowledge regarding ahuatanga Maori (Maori tradition) according to tikanga Maori (Maori custom).

² Seven small public libraries have not joined largely due to technology and lack of technology support in their councils.

³ There is no definitive information about the actual number of Special Libraries in New Zealand so special libraries percentage may not be accurate.

⁴ Includes 91% of secondary schools

**EPIC: Electronic Purchasing in Collaboration – a shared initiative of New Zealand libraries
Cost Allocation**

EPIC is self-funded by its member libraries. A fair and affordable pricing model for all the libraries involved has been drawn up, based on 10 bands ranging from schools and charitable trust libraries at Band A (lowest) to large tertiary libraries on Band I and the National Library at Band J (highest).

Cost allocation depends on a number of factors: for example, population size for the public libraries and collection budget for the special libraries.

The pricing model includes a contribution towards administrative costs that covers the EPIC Manager's salary, and the costs of the Epic office.

The cost model will be reviewed prior to subscription renewal in March 2005.

Benefits

Some of the benefits of EPIC are:

- Nationwide access to electronic resources through all types of libraries
- Affordable subscription costs for most types of libraries
- Libraries that had already subscribed to the EPIC products could now do so for a lower price
- Existing consortia were not negatively affected
- Provision of technical support for libraries
- Increased awareness of the benefits of e-resources by smaller or less well funded libraries
- Higher profile for libraries in general, including at government level
- Greater awareness of the role of libraries and the information resources they make available

Current Focus and the Future...

EGG is currently focusing on consolidation and growth. In particular they have begun a training taskforce to develop a comprehensive training strategy. EGG is also concentrating on new content, funding structures, and strategic relationship building. It has been agreed that EGG will add to the current suite of products with in the next months. They are now consulting with members on preferred subject areas and investigating procurement processes.

More information on EPIC is available at: <http://www.epic.org.nz/>

Fiona Rigby
EPIC Manager
November 2004

With thanks to Catherine Nicholson, SCURL.



The Library and Information Commission Nga Kaiwhakamarama i nga Kohikohinga Korero (LIAC)

Report to CONZUL/CAUL joint meeting 4 April 2005

LIAC ended the 2004 year on a high note with a meeting with the Hon. Marian Hobbs and Hon. David Cunliffe on 14 December, to provide a briefing on its concept of **New Zealand Online**. This had been the topic of the LIAC presentation at the National Digital Forum on 2 November and was further developed at the LIAC meeting on 3 – 4 November.

New Zealand Online represents a natural progression from the LIAC vision of:
“Aotearoa – New Zealand: a leading information democracy”

LIAC had welcomed the timely release of the draft Digital Strategy which provided the policy framework it was seeking to underpin the achievement of its vision. The Strategy offers a framework for imagining the information society and LIAC believes that New Zealand libraries are ready and willing to play their part in turning the Strategy into reality for all New Zealanders.

LIAC’s response to the draft Digital Strategy was that it:

- Agreed with the Vision of the Digital Strategy
- Congratulated the Government for its ‘whole of government’ approach
- Recognised that the Strategy provided a unique opportunity to incorporate mātauranga Māori into the way New Zealand articulated its digital future.
- Recommended that public libraries be used as vehicles to achieve the vision
- Proposed the creation of a new entity, **NZ Online**, which would support ‘imagination points’ i.e. projects, which could provide the framework for a world-class, digital infrastructure.

NZ Online would act in effect as a rich and sophisticated information environment which connects individuals and communities. The concept of an **NZ Online** as the ‘knowledge bank of New Zealand’ has obvious links to the 3 ‘C’s’ of the draft Digital Strategy: Content, Confidence, and Capability.

Put simply, **NZ Online** would be an intranet for all New Zealanders providing access to a rich, online environment, full of content and experiences. **NZ Online** would stimulate content creation, provide information access, encourage the development of skills, and drive policy development (e.g. intellectual property rights, institutional arrangements, content strategy), and technical capability (the ‘nuts and bolts’ required for accessing online information). It would do this by engaging with the sophisticated library and information network already available, and extending that network to a far wider cross section of the community, business and public institutions. As a result **NZ Online** would ensure that New Zealand Aotearoa was a leader in the development of innovative and practical solutions, for the maintenance of the free circulation of information required to safeguard our democratic society.

The elements on **NZ Online** would be:

- A contestable funding strategy
- An online content and collaboration strategy
- An IP strategy – creative commons
- An authentication framework

This concept was offered to the two Ministers as a gift from LIAC. It was emphasised that the three Cs of content, confidence and capability were inextricably linked and must be kept together. Criteria would be required to judge any potential projects for **NZ Online** contestable funding.

The Commission was asked to develop the concept further at its meeting on 17 February 2005. LIAC was advised that the Ministry of Economic Development is considering governance issues relating to the Digital Strategy. The priority for LIAC, therefore, is to emphasise the infomediary role of libraries (e.g. through initiatives such as “AnyQuestions”) and the contribution that libraries could make in building the ICT capability (e.g. similar to the Peoples’ Network in the UK).

This was the main topic of business for the day and LIAC members articulated their personal visions for NZ Online. Put together, these ideas suggested a model for NZ Online (www.nzonline.co.nz) that would:

- become a virtual New Zealand for all New Zealanders
- link us with the rest of the world, and the world to New Zealand
- facilitate the creation of NZ content via a **content and collaboration strategy**
- fund the expansion of NZ content by establishing a **contestable fund** used to advance the content, confidence, connection goals of the Digital Strategy
- share and protect NZ content through an **intellectual property framework**
- share and protect Mātauranga Māori through an intellectual property framework which acknowledges cultural property
- provide citizen’s **authentication** via a NZ intranet with single sign-on
- ensure equity of access by using the public library network to complement direct access to digital information
- give access to NZ content to all New Zealanders via public libraries or directly from homes and businesses
- give access to world information for all New Zealanders via public libraries or directly from homes and businesses
- showcase New Zealand Aotearoa to the world and affirm cultural identity
- encourage New Zealanders to chat, share and create with each other and the world
- bring the NZ Digital Strategy to life

LIAC recommends that the next steps are to develop:

Content and collaboration strategy

This is required to map the information landscape, identify the gaps and promote digitisation of text, sound and visual content. Other elements include the availability of information literacy training and online librarians available to help with navigation, searching (e.g. “Any questions” initiative) and standards-based content creation

Contestable fund

The fund would be available for individuals, groups and businesses to apply for assistance with developing ideas, establishing new enterprises and creating new communities that advance the goals of NZ Online.

Intellectual property framework

Creative commons licences are required to encourage the sharing of intellectual property while retaining the creator's rights (<http://creativecommons.org/>). Issues relating to protection of Mātauranga Māori need to be considered.

Citizen's authentication

Different levels of access will be required for different purposes e.g. EPIC databases available only to New Zealanders, some Māori information may be restricted to the owners of that information, personal information would be available only to the owner of that information. Personal or group (e.g. iwi) profiles could be created to define access.

In summary LIAC suggests that the success of NZ Online is dependent on harnessing the skills, energy and vision that already exist within the New Zealand library network. These have been amply demonstrated through initiatives such as:

- EPIC database access provision for the whole nation
- "Any questions" for schools
- Matapihi as best practice for collaborative digitisation of New Zealand visual content
- Information literacy programmes widely available through all types of library

Under the umbrella of NZ Online, initiatives like these could be coordinated and extended to reach a far wider community and realise the vision of the Digital Strategy i.e. that

"New Zealand will be a world leader at using information and technology to realise our economic, social and cultural goals"

LIAC believes that the New Zealand library community is ready and willing to make this contribution.

Ainslie Dewe
Chair, LIAC
17 February 2005

This page is intentionally blank.

CAUL Strategic Plan Report to CAUL

Author: **Ruth Quinn**

Date: 21 March 2005

Date of previous report: 1 September 04

Section	Teaching and Learning
Action	Undertake research and evaluation in information literacy as a graduate attribute through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
Responsibility	Information Literacy Working group
Time-line	Ongoing
Activity since last report	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 Teleconference held last September 2. Information Literacy Assessment Project – Ralph Catts working on the final edit of the Technical Manual and the Assessment Manual.
Achievements since last report	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ILWG Website updated and expanded. 2. Separate email discussion list established for members of working group only.
Publicity, reports, publications since last report	Brochure entitled: <i>Best Practice Characteristics for Developing Information Literacy in Australian Universities: a guideline</i> is available from the CAUL ILWG website.
Plan for forthcoming activity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finalisation of the manuals for the IL Assessment Project 2. Next project to be agreed upon and mapped out. Currently discussion the following options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribution of Information Literacy to educational outcomes of interest. - Transition between University and work, or high school to University. - How does Info Lit in the workplace affect IL programs - Info on how our graduates access information – lifelong learning 3. Monitoring the activities of the Carrick Institute, particularly for the opportunity for any project funding.
CAUL budget implications	Cost of 2005 teleconferences have been incorporated into the budget.
Recommendations to CAUL	To note the report.

This page is intentionally blank.

CAUL Strategic Plan Report to CAUL

Author: Greg Anderson

Date: 11 March 2005

Section	Support for Teaching & Learning BONUS (Books of NSW Universities) – UNISON User Initiated Interlibrary Borrowing Research Study
Action	To determine the cost/benefit and level of client satisfaction for providing unmediated access to the combined monograph collections of UTS, UNSW, CSU and U. Newcastle.
Responsibility	UNISON
Time-line	April 2005 – March 2007
Activity since last report	1. Project officer sponsored by UNISON appointed in 2004. 2. Hardware and Software ready Dec. 2004. Records from UTS/Newcastle have been loaded into a central/union database. CSU and UNSW record load pending. 3. “Go live” date scheduled: 1 April 2005
Achievements since last report	The intended outcome of the research study is to evaluate the feasibility and useability of an unmediated monograph requesting service using the Innovative and Ex-Libris LMS. Patrons of the participating libraries will have unmediated access to the combined monograph resources of UTS, UNSW, CSU and U. Newcastle via a union database. The study was commissioned by UNISON which is also providing funding for the project officer. A Steering Committee and Site Coordinators group were established in 2004. During 2004, an MOU and Licence Agreement were signed by the participants. SUN Microsystems have partially sponsored the project with the provision of a server. UNILINC have also provided invaluable assistance with data load specifications as agent for CSU. Record loading commenced in December 2004 with the final load to be completed in March 2005.
Publicity, reports, publications since last report	A press release was authorised in August 2004. An update on the project is provided at UNISON meetings. A website is currently under construction.
Plan for forthcoming activity	An official launch is proposed for April 2005.
Recommendations to CAUL	That CAUL note progress with the project.

Pro-forma updated 19 July, 2004.

This page is intentionally blank.

**CAUL Strategic Plan
Report to CAUL**

Author: **Felicity McGregor**

(Date: 3.5.05; Date of previous report: 1.9.04)

Section	BEST PRACTICE
Action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and develop indicators of the quality of library information and research services and develop measures to support them. 2. Review the Rodski customer satisfaction surveys following the second cycle of use by members, in 2004.
Responsibility	Best Practice Working Group (Felicity McGregor)
Time-line	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trial and report by April 2005 2. The Executive is proposing that there be a review of both Rodski and LibQUAL+ at the end of 2005, as part of the reviewed/revised action plan.
Activity and Achievements since last report	<p><u>Performance Indicators for Digital Reference (Information and Research) Services</u></p> <p>The UNISON Reference and Information Services Interest Group have met on several occasions. A project plan has been drafted by Project Manager, Annette Dawes and a definition of digital reference agreed. Proformas to collect digital reference statistics and staff training information has been completed which will be trialed by UNISON libraries in May and June. Following data analysis and identification of KPIs a report will be prepared for UNISON by November 2005.</p> <p><u>Rodski</u></p> <p>The Chair of the BPWG met with Stan Rodski in October 2004. Agreement was reached on various changes to the Client Satisfaction Survey such as the addition of a Don't Know/N/A column, adding distance education students to the demographics etc. Stan Rodski has offered to report trends to CAUL and discuss changes. Revised offers to include employee surveys. This has been communicated to CAUL members (via Diane) with a request to notify her of proposed survey activity.</p> <p><u>Liaison</u></p> <p>Steve Hiller, Library Assessment Coordinator/Head Science Libraries University of Washington Libraries visited Wollongong in December and conducted an informal session for some UOW library staff. We exchanged information on assessment and best practice.</p>
Publicity, reports, publications since last report	Felicity McGregor has had an invited chapter: <i>Excellent libraries: a quality assurance perspective</i> published in <i>Advances in Librarianship</i> .
Plan for forthcoming activity	QULOC plans to hold a seminar on customer satisfaction surveys and employee surveys on the 1st July. More information from Gulcin.
Recommendations to CAUL	<p><u>Rodski:</u></p> <p>That CAUL members consider inviting Stan Rodski to the next meeting to consult and report on trends.</p> <p><u>Performance Indicators for Digital Reference (Information and Research) Services:</u></p> <p>That CAUL note progress with the project.</p>

This page is intentionally blank.

CAUL Strategic Plan Report to CAUL

Author: **Derek Whitehead**

(Date: April 2005; Date of previous report: Sept 2004)

“Cheap, useful, fairly valid.”

Section	3 – Management for Best Practice
Action	13 Collect and publish statistics on Australasian university library outputs and activities. 18 Review the current CAUL statistical measures – presentation format, usefulness, use and users and present a plan and proposal to CAUL.
Responsibility	Statistics Focus Group / Derek Whitehead
Time-line	Ongoing.
Activity since last report	Since the last meeting of CAUL (in Sept 2004) 1 The CAUL Statistics Focus Group met in Sydney on 3 February; Derek Whitehead, Jocelyn Priddey, Diane Costello, David Groenewegen, Cathie Jilovsky, Stephen Gillespie and Isobel Mosley attended; Janice Van de Velde from CASL an observer, and Gehan About an apology.. 2 The redevelopment of the statistics website and functionality should be completed by the time of the CAUL meeting in the first week of April. 3 Data collection for 2004 data will begin in early April 2005, using the new collection methodology. The 2004 data will include ULA statistics – i.e. reciprocal borrowing data at a national level (loans and registrations); it will also include expenditure on electronic resources. 4 The CSFG will pilot collection of data on e-books, using the COUNTER draft e-books specification. 5 A draft paper on comparison of data between dual sector universities and single-sector universities will be considered by the CSFG and the Dual Sector Universities Group after Easter. 6 The CSFG is monitoring the option of collecting new measures for database use - viz. number of logins, number of database searches, and number of full-text retrievals. CONZUL has reviewed (Nov 2004) their trial collection of this set of e-metrics data; the review recommends that they continue to collect this information. 7 The CASL statistics coordinator, Janice Van de Velde, has attended two meetings of the CSFG and is being copied into CSFG communications.
Achievements since last report	See above
Publicity, reports, publications	Minutes of the meeting on 3 February.
Plan for forthcoming activity	1 Offshore students: Determine whether we wish to include this in the 2005 data collection, and if so whether there are any issues. 2 Implement the new format and functionality and send out requests for statistics data in April 2005. 4 Consider an approach to dual sector university reporting – a TAFE deflator – which permits better comparisons between institutions.
Recommendation	That this report be accepted.

This page is intentionally blank.

664. CAUL HOT TOPIC

Access to practice-based research to inform provision of library and information services (LIS)

1. Australian university libraries have supported the Open Access Initiative (OAI) and the development of institutional repositories of research outputs in Australian universities.
2. Institutional repositories provide a stable and secure digital environment for research outputs, provide access to scholarly publications and increase visibility of research for the international research community.
3. Research output in institutional repositories is normally of published research such as journal articles and conference papers.
4. Librarians have been key drivers in the development of e-print but a brief survey of librarianship content in Australian University repositories found a limited number of items had been deposited. This might be because there is limited published research taking place.
5. There is also a great deal of unpublished research material such as un-reviewed preprints, research alerts, unpublished seminar and workshop presentations, working papers, discussion papers that may lack the polish of published works but still provide valuable information. Repositories could make this research material accessible to the wider research community.
6. There is a substantial amount of unpublished research literature being generated in our libraries. This material is potentially of great value to other libraries, educators and researchers but is not readily accessible.
7. Some of this unpublished practice-based research is available on library websites but more commonly it is locked away in personal files and on PCs, in email attachments and library storage systems. As a result we waste valuable resources re-inventing the wheel, contacting colleagues, checking websites, searching the published literature without success or 'googling'.
8. While most institutional repositories accept unpublished research in the form of 'working papers' there is a growing demand from researchers for more broadly defined non-peer reviewed materials to be captured and made available in some form of repository or archive.
9. Material that is not refereed would include much of the practice-based research carried out in our libraries. To address quality issues a repository may provide an abstract and some metadata indicating the existence of a paper instead of the full-text.
10. If we accept that much of the unpublished literature generated by practice-based research in our libraries is of value then the next stage is to consider possible ways to provide access to it.
11. Many of us have already developed repositories for our universities and have the technical expertise to do this. It could be that one of the university libraries provides an e-print repository for our practice-based research.
12. Alternatively CAUL could set up a repository.

13. ALIA already has an e-prints archive hosted by the University of Melbourne to facilitate access to scholarly communication. As stated on the website 'it has been set up specifically to enhance the visibility of research in library and information sciences'. An investigation of the website found that the site is hard to find on the ALIA website and has very few papers in it. However ALIA is leading the way with its e-prints initiative compared with other professional associations. There could be a role for CAUL to work with ALIA to populate and publicise this repository as the open archive for research on librarianship in Australia.
14. Another alternative could be an online archive of digitized research material including published and unpublished research, both text and non-text, supporting the advancement of library and information science in Australia.
15. There are sure to be other solutions but having a show-case repository or archive for the library profession would demonstrate Australian librarians' commitment to research in their own discipline, provide valuable access to practice-based research and increase visibility of LIS research based activities in Australia.

FOR DISCUSSION

Imogen Garner

CAUL Strategic Plan Report to CAUL

Author: Maxine Brodie

Date: 15 March 2005

Date of previous report: verbal Sept 04

Section	667 Management for Best Practice: Standards
Action	Report on activities of Standards Australia Committee IT/019
Responsibility	Maxine Brodie
Time-line	ongoing
Activity since last report	The Committee has met once in Sydney on 26 November 2004
Achievements since last report	<p><i>Project 2427: ISO 2146//A/NZ4779:2003 Registry Services for Libraries and Related Organisations</i> ISO/TC46 accepted a new date for the next draft by June 2005 and this new title for the standard – relevant to web-based directory services developments including ILL (Dr Judith Pearce).</p> <p><i>Z39.86 Digital Talking Book Standard</i> - Successful negotiations have been completed with NISO to clone this standard (Standards Australia/NZ)</p> <p><i>ISO 8459 Bibliographic Data Element Directory Parts 1-5</i> - consolidation has progressed, with the unique data elements added into a database - next draft of to be submitted by December 2005 (Janifer Gatenby).</p> <p><i>ISO 10161 Interlibrary Loan Application Protocol Specification Parts 1 & 2</i>- The US, Japan and Australia submitted a negative vote on the proposed revision to this standard because of its lack of backward compatibility with earlier versions. It is suggested instead that there is a need for a user-focused standard that integrates authentication and the e-commerce field as well. The Committee discussed the idea of a new work item, which would investigate a new service framework for resource delivery.</p>
Publicity, reports, publications since last report	<p>A seminar on standards development was held in Sydney on 25 November 2004 and was attended by a total of 44 external and 5 committee members. The seminar received very positive feedback. Speakers' presentations are available on the public area of the IT-19 committee website at: https://committees.standards.com.au/COMMITTEES/IT-019/S0003/IT-019-S0003.HTM</p>
Plan for forthcoming activity	<p>Presentation for and participation in Educause Metadata Workshop 5 April 2005</p> <p>Next meeting of the Committee in Canberra on 22 April 2005</p>
CAUL budget implications	Nil
Recommendations to CAUL	For information

Pro-forma updated 19 July, 2004.

This page is intentionally blank.

CAUL Strategic Plan Report to CAUL

Author: **Eve Woodberry**

Date: 18 March 2005

Date of previous report: 1 September 2004

Section	Advocacy, Marketing, Communication
Action	Present CAUL position to copyright meetings, references and inquires. 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	Open Content Licensing (OCL): Cultivating the Creative Commons, 18-19 January 2005 at QUT Copyright: new future, new agendas conference, 18 February 2005, Brisbane. AVCC Information Policy and Strategy Forum, 16 March 2005, Melbourne.
Achievements since last report	
Publicity, reports, publications since last report	
Plan for forthcoming activity	Correcting Course : Rebalancing Copyright for Libraries in the National and International Arenas. An Invitational Conference hosted by Columbia University on behalf of the ALA Office on Information Technology Policy. 5-7 May 2005 Columbia University IFLA Copyright and other Legal matters (CLM) meetings Oslo, August 2005. Organise seminar on "Libraries and Free Trade Agreements" for IFLA CLM, Oslo 2005.
CAUL budget implications	
Recommendations to CAUL	

Pro-forma updated 19 July, 2004.

This page is intentionally blank.

AVCC Information Policy and Strategy Forum

Melbourne, 16 March 2005

Educational Statutory Licences - Preparing for the future

Emphasis on “preparing for the future”

Taken in conjunction with the paper distributed – Educational Statutory Licences.

Objective – of this session and the breakout groups

- provide information to assist AVCC in the next round of negotiations with CAL (part VB)
- opportunity to provide input based on experiences since the start of the current agreement in 2002 with the application of technology and the legislation
- identify changes in the environment, both those which have occurred since the current agreement and those which we anticipate in the next few years and the impact on the negotiation of the agreement

Structure

- AVCC through Baker and McKenzie has provided some points which they consider CAL will use in the next round of negotiations – run through these first
- Concentrate on part VB and on the electronic.
- Intention is to raise issues to inform the discussion in breakout groups, not exhaustive and not provide answers

From AVCC/ Baker & McKenzie

1. We know that CAL's strategy in entering into the current Remuneration Agreement was to use this Agreement and the 5 years of monitoring of digital copying and communications to build its next case for the Copyright Tribunal, where the copying rates will be set.
2. CAL is not happy with the current level of remuneration and is most unlikely to negotiate a deal for the continuation of this rate plus CPI increases. CAL is beginning to prepare a Copyright Tribunal claim for a big increase in the amounts paid by universities under the Part VB statutory licence.
3. In any Copyright Tribunal case, the key questions will be "What has changed since the last determination of rate by the Copyright Tribunal?", "What has changed since the parties agreed to a level of remuneration under the current Remuneration Agreement?". We know from past cases that the Copyright Tribunal will want evidence of these changes. Reference to trends identified in

academic literature, anecdotal evidence, the position overseas, likely changes in the future, are all likely to be **given very little weight**.

Evidence digital copying

CAL's arguments for an increase will be based on the following

- at the time of the last Copyright Tribunal action, there was no evidence of digital copying before the Tribunal so that
- the rates that were fixed were based on print copying.
- There will have evidence of high levels of digital copying
- and of a move from hard copying to digital copying.
- There will also be evidence that CAL says argues for a higher value to be attributed to digital copies.
- The “**equitable remuneration**” specified in the current Agreement was based upon copying levels and types of copying that existed at the date it was entered into.

Differential pricing

- CAL will argue that the substitution of digital for print copies will demand a higher price. CAL will have evidence from the US monitoring system that supports their argument as to increases in levels of copying, especially digital copying.
- Precedent in the Tribunal for differential rates, including the course pack copying, and also coming from the Schools sector

Communication right

- at the time of the last Tribunal determination, there was no communication right. CAL will argue that an extra right requires extra payment and that the communication right has a particularly high value. They will have evidence as to the levels of use of this right and

will no doubt claim that each “making available” of a copy of a work on-line is a substitute for making of a number copies.

- They will say that the exercise of the communication right actually means that universities and their students are getting much more value from the digital copies that are made and that copyright owners should share in the benefits that have been realised.

Final argument – which is less tenable – that the Universities are making ‘savings’ as a result of the use of digital copying.

University ‘savings’

- As a result of digital copies and communications of content, universities have been able to effect cost savings in terms of the amount of space devoted to libraries, photocopying machines, etc. and that the savings in this area ought in part to be reflected in increased payments to copyright owners for use of their works digitally. (**shows a lack of understanding of the environment**)
- That universities had made savings in their book and journal acquisition costs as a result of being able to digitise material or access digitised material held by other universities or libraries by means of using the inter-library provisions of the Act. The greater ability to use these provisions should be reflected in higher payments to copyright owners. (**shows a lack of understanding – dangerous as it ties together library provisions in the Act with the educational provisions**)

While it is important that we can counter these possible arguments, that we also put our own arguments across. Counter these claims with evidence of our own which supports our position.

University Position

Environment

- CA (DA)Act passed December 2000 → effective March 2001
- Part VB Remuneration agreement (AVCC/CAL) signed in May 2002 – effective 1 Jan 2003 – 31 Dec 2007.

Technology for scanning capturing and indexing had been available for a number of years. With the legislation and the remuneration agreement in place as the last pieces of the puzzle, by 2003 universities had the legislative and legal framework necessary for e-reserve, course materials database and to use the technology to enhance teaching and research.

Sampling (began July 2002)

In the papers distributed for the meeting there is a statement which says the sampling reveals that 'electronic copying and communications are high'. Not surprising coming off a zero base and libraries had been waiting for the legislation so they could develop e-reserve. Makes sense that at the beginning of the agreement there would be a rapid uptake – libraries in a number of cases had been ready to go.

Return on Investment (ROI)

Another issue which needs to be taken into account and will impact on future developments is ROI.

While there has always been a sense of 'value for money' in what we pay for resources – this has become increasingly more formalised in the electronic environment because there are tools which allow measurement of use, and a greater range of options.

Consider what universities are paying under AVCC/CAL agreement. There is the desire to get value for money, in the electronic environment, more so than in the analogue environment – it is possible to calculate ROI.

- librarians have increased their interest in ROI with e-packages
- easier to measure (however inaccurately) usage either through 'hits' or 'downloads' consider against the cost of the package.

In addition **compliance costs** are high. We all have to build, operate and maintain an Electronic Use System (EUS).

If you put together the payment to CAL and the cost of developing and maintaining an EUS (staff, content management system, software) plus hardware, in an environment where there is an increasing amount of material available in electronic form under contract – you have to ask what the future might look like.

There will be a point when the ROI for the production and maintenance of an EUS has to be seriously considered against the cost and availability of material already available in electronic form.

CAUL Survey data

In order to gather some data for this Forum I carried out a CAUL survey – it wont be made available on the Website – general questions eg do you have an e-reserve or something similar, number of items, number of items copied under Part VB etc.

Snapshot of the current situation – see if it was possible to identify trends.

Summary:

23 respondents

22 some form of an electronic reserve.

Overall size of the database:

9 - Up to 5,000

5 – between 5 -10,000

4 – between 10- 15,000

4 – over 15,000

Majority have under 10,000 items in the database.
Majority of the material was copied under Part VB.
No consistency in growth rates on an annual basis – this depended on the age of the system – some institutions are still in establishment mode and others are well established.

Makes sense when you look at the time frame involved – we are only talking about a 2-3 year period.

Difficult to identify trends couple of points worth noting

- those institutions who have been operation for a few years show that the number of items added each year is fairly consistent.
- Issue of ‘taking down’ material needs a stronger emphasis.

Looking forward

The discussion paper distributed as part of the notes states “There is also the risk of electronic copying and communications levels ‘blowing out”

Consider the figures just discussed in conjunction with other developments.

Issues to consider

Issues here which require more discussion in the breakout groups.

- University Libraries have increased their investment in electronic resources since the DAA and agreement came into effect.
- If you look at the CAUL statistics – like any statistics these need to be read critically – and the figures I’m quoting are raw data then:
 - Column headed **Total Current Serial titles**
2001
934,917 titles held nationally (obviously considerable duplication)
703,785 in electronic form
Around 75%
 - 2003**
1,309,221 titles
1,122,467 were in electronic form
Around 86%

These titles are:

- covered by contract which allows for a variety of uses and specifies in some cases how they are to be used for reserve collections and inter-library loan purposes.
- They provide an increasingly large volume of material which can be linked to rather than scanned and stored.
- As the amount of material already available in electronic form increases there should be a reducing requirement to scan material.

There is also **an increase in sophistication** in access and use of electronic resources:

- **federated searching** (searching across multiple databases with one search) is increasing in availability and use,

- **links** through Learning Management Systems (WebCT, Blackboard).

E-books – following the downturn in early 2000 have returned with models which better suit the university market.

In addition there are instances of publishers aligning themselves with learning management systems to provide e-books as resources to be used with eg WebCT

These materials are covered by contract.

Additionally – mentioned at the end of the AVCC paper – other developments which impact on electronic copying. Uptake at present is extremely patchy.

- Open Access Initiative (OAI)
- Development of institutional repositories
- Pre/post print repositories (Los Alamos Physics)

Licensing

- ‘for educational purposes’ material
- Creative Commons licences (BBC using for its archive)

Consider the timeframe for the new Remuneration agreement is 2007+ these initiatives may have achieved some level of acceptance.

Environment at present

- analogue copying (photocopying) which is declining rapidly
- electronic copying which is increasingly covered by contract or one of the new developments

Is there an argument somewhere in the future to have more than one agreement?

Summary

- In the initial period of the current agreement universities, particularly libraries, had been waiting for the legislation and remuneration agreement to catch up with the technology, so there was a surge of action when all the pieces of the framework came together.
- Future – other developments in licensing and the Open Access Initiative, will impact on access and use of material in electronic form – particularly there will be improvements in the quality and depth of material already available in electronic form.

The next iteration of the AVCC/CAL agreement will take us through to 2012 when the environment may be substantially different. What do we want to build in to the Agreement which will reflect the changing environment.

Eve Woodberry
16 March 2005

CAUL Strategic Plan Report to CAUL

Author: Maxine Brodie

Date: 15 March 2005

Date of previous report: N/A

Section	Advocacy and Communication: Relationships with Other Organisations
Action	Represent CAUL on the CAUDIT PKI Project Steering Committee
Responsibility	Maxine Brodie
Time-line	January-June 2005 (Stage 1)
Activity since last report	Participation in first CAUDIT PKI Project Steering Committee Meeting, Brisbane, 17 January 2005
Achievements since last report	Inclusion of reference to ARIIC funded projects, particularly MAMS, in the project terms of reference (Terms of Reference attached)
Publicity, reports, publications since last report	N/A
Plan for forthcoming activity	Finalisation of project plan
CAUL budget implications	Nil
Recommendations to CAUL	For information

Pro-forma updated 19 July, 2004.

This page is intentionally blank.



PKI PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Terms of Reference

Background

CAUDIT has established the PKI Steering Committee to oversee the CAUDIT PKI Project, to develop policies and standards, to enable the collaborative use of Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) amongst and between its member institutions and to implement a prototype system.

It is intended that it should provide a basis for establishing a National Certificate Authority for international interoperation which is likely to be run by AusCERT under direction from CAUDIT and this committee.

This committee will be chaired by the Chair of CAUDIT and includes a wide range of interests across the higher education and research sector represented by both CAUDIT institutional nominees and representatives of Grangenet, AARNet, ARC, APAC, CAUL, DEST, DCITA and the AVCC. It is intended that there should be at least one member from New Zealand. The CAUDIT Executive is the approving body for members of the Steering Committee.

It is anticipated that this committee may have a longer life than this initial project and that it may over time address wider authentication and security issues across the sector. It is expected that the committee may undertake activities aimed at identifying this wider scope.

The committee will keep abreast of the guidelines, procedures and policies which have been developed for the Australian Government "Gateway" project.

The committee will keep abreast of developments of ARIIC funded projects, including the MAMS project and other similar projects.

Objective

The immediate project objective of the Steering Committee is to provide expert support and advice to CAUDIT to ensure that the policies and standards developed meet the needs of CAUDIT member institutions and the wider higher education and research sector.

The committee will also oversee the selection of pilot institutions that will implement a prototype PKI System using the common standards.

Once the prototype systems and standards are implemented, the project steering committee will facilitate the sharing of experience and information among the sector to enable rapid implementation.

Project Scope

The scope of the project includes the achievement of the following outcomes:

- Develop the definition of different levels of trust for CAUDIT member institutions and a trust framework between them
- Develop a set of common PKI policies for the sector
- Develop common standards for X509 certificates to support and underpin collaboration
- Identify options for a common sector wide approach to obtaining a "browser friendly" certificate which will include developing the requirements for a sector wide root certificate signed by AusCERT
- Establish an ongoing mechanism for sector wide PKI policy management
- Support the implementation of prototype PKI systems, using these common standards, among a small number of universities and research groups.
- Share the experience and information on the implementation of these prototype PKI systems within the sector to facilitate a faster uptake of the technology in the Australian university sector.
- Identify additional activities or future roles for the committee beyond the project scope.

Timeline

It is anticipated that the project, as defined in the scope will be completed by 30 June 2005.

Resources

The project has a cash budget of \$170,000 to achieve the outcomes as detailed in the scope. This project has been funded by the Australian Government via GrangeNet.

AusCERT will be contracted to undertake the analysis and development work.

CAUDIT will contribute time from the CAUDIT Senior Project Manager.

Meeting Frequency

It is anticipated that the PKI Steering Committee will physically meet on at least three occasions, with other discussions and comments to be undertaken via email and/or teleconferences as required.

CAUL Strategic Plan Report to CAUL

Author: **Heather Gordon**

Date: March 4, 2005

Date of previous report: 2003

Section	Relationships with Other Organisations
Action	QULOC Activities
Responsibility	Convenor, QULOC
Time-line	ongoing
Activity since last report	QULOC University Librarians met on November 26, 2004. Next meeting is scheduled for April 15, 2005. The approved minutes are available at http://www.quloc.org.au/ under QULOC Groups/University Librarians.
Achievements since last report	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Lending and Document Delivery Working Party completed a survey on Library Services to Off Campus Students. The survey will be completed every 2 years. 2. The Staffing Issues Working Party completed the Inter-Organisational Experience Program brochure and poster. They are available from the QULOC website under About QULOC. Two QULOC members participated in the program in 2004. 3. The following QULOC seminars were held in 2004: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Service Desk • EndNote Inservice • Emotional Intelligence • Project Management • EZProxy • Future Roles for Academic Librarians • Jay Jordan OCLC Public Lecture 4. The University Librarians Forum was held on Nov 25, 2004. Approximately 80 people attended the Forum. Five presentations are available from the QULOC website under QULOC Groups/University Librarians/ University Librarians Forum.
Publicity, reports, publications since last report	The QULOC News, Issue 3, 2004 is available online. The next issue will be published in May 2005.
Plan for forthcoming activity	QULOC is planning to offer a Digital Repository Seminar in late 2005. The Information Resources and Access Working Party is updating the listing

	<p>of Australian journals recommended for digitisation. Once complete the listing will be provided to CEIRC for information.</p> <p>The Quality Issues Working Party is planning a Rodski v. LIBQUAL seminar.</p>
--	---

Pro-forma updated 19 July, 2004.

CONZUL ADMINISTRATION FUNDS				
OPENING BALANCE				\$19,171.47
	RECEIVED			
	/PAID	DEBITS	CREDITS	
University of Auckland	21-Dec-04		\$2,500.00	\$21,671.47
Auckland University of Technology	21-Dec-04		\$2,500.00	\$24,171.47
University of Waikato	21-Dec-04		\$2,500.00	\$26,671.47
Massey University	21-Dec-04		\$2,500.00	\$29,171.47
Victoria University	21-Dec-04		\$2,500.00	\$31,671.47
Lincoln University	21-Dec-04		\$2,500.00	\$34,171.47
University of Otago	21-Dec-04		\$2,500.00	\$36,671.47
University of Canterbury	31-Dec-04		\$2,500.00	\$39,171.47
University of Auckland - reimburse for work on "National Store Project"	16-Dec-04	\$320.00		\$38,851.47
RDT Pacific Development of Modelling Tool for a Library Store	16-Dec-04	\$450.00		\$38,401.47
IFLA National Assn Membership	17-Dec-04	\$379.36		\$38,022.11
Library Consortium Membership for Project COUNTER	17-Dec-04	\$922.10		\$37,100.01
CAUL participation 2005	17-Dec-04	\$16,356.02		\$20,743.99
Rachel O'Shaughnessy, flowers for Janet Copsey	18-Feb-05	\$60.89		\$20,683.10
BALANCE AS AT 4 MARCH 2005				\$20,683.10

This page is intentionally blank.

CAUL 2005/1 Finance Report

Audit of 2004 CAUL Accounts.

We have just completed the reconciliations for 2004, the BAS for 2004Q4, and preparing documents for the audit of the 2004 accounts.

The actual (pre-audit) surplus is \$86,266.23, some \$9,000 less than the September estimate. The 2004 surplus will be used to defray the costs of the development of the online statistics system. The \$20,000 collected as a research levy will be retained for that purpose.

The audit is being conducted as usual by the firm of Walter Turnbull. In 2004, CAUL opened its third foreign currency account to handle invoices in £.

The ARC finally claimed the \$55,814 remaining from the 2002 Authentication Project, and USD 56,383 for 2002 subscriptions repudiated (claimed not owing) by the American Psychological Association was refunded to the respective universities. Oxford University Press also claims we don't owe it the USD 41,305 which we have collected from subscribers but not yet paid – we are endeavouring to have them recheck their books.

Account Management.

Procedures to help the universities understand how foreign currencies are transferred by various financial institutions were written to try to reduce the number of payments to CAUL which arrive short of the invoiced amount and require follow-up and reimbursement.

Electronic banking systems are being investigated to try to reduce the amount of time spent processing foreign currency payments and large payments in AUD, and to provide more timely statements and up-to-date account balances. Security is a major concern with electronic banking, and if not satisfactory, the back-up option will be for read-only access to the accounts.

CEIRC.

200 subscription invoices were raised in AUD, 850 in USD, 37 in EUR and 33 in £. Close to the same number of payments were received over the same time, and there is relatively little outstanding for 2005. We have paid just under USD 6 million, and just under AUD 1.2 million since November 1.

Two of our vendors have complicated matters by insisting on charging GST on USD invoices. Although CAUL has a private ruling that a supply from off-shore from a vendor to one of our institutions is not liable to pay GST, both Lexis Nexis and HCN, because they are invoicing from their Sydney offices, insist on charging GST. This involves our creating two invoices for each transaction, one for the USD supply and one for the AUD GST, and then reconciling the BAS when they arrive in different BAS quarters. Charging the whole amount in AUD is not an option because of the exchange rate risk for CAUL.

Diane Costello

22 March, 2005

	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1	CAUL Budget 2004 (updated 11/2/05)												
2													
3	Income	\$	Sub-Total	Expenditure	\$	Sub-Total	Balance	Actual	\$	Assets and Liabilities	Balance @	Balance 2004	
4								Expend- iture (to 31/12/04)		2003	31/12/03	@ 31/12/04	
5	OPERATING									NON-CASH			
6	Membership	180,000.00		Executive Officer (0.65)	65,000.00			66,691.95		Furniture cost	9,148.00	11,030.00	
7	Interest on Cash	19,298.02		Admin Assistant	23,000.00			31,551.50		Furniture depr.	-7,008.60	-9,147.60	
8	CONZUL contribution	9,000.00		Office Expenses	7,000.00			6,484.58		Equipment cost	20,249.06	24,024.75	
9	Publications	2,450.00		Audit & Accounting	4,000.00			12,507.00		Equipment depr.	-11,696.42	-20,732.42	
10				Office Rental	8,030.00			-2,824.08			10,692.04	5,174.73	
11				Equipment	2,000.00			2,288.95					
12				CAUL Meetings	15,000.00			12,029.62					
13				Executive Meetings	12,000.00			9,792.07		LIABILITIES			
14				President's Meetings	10,000.00			4,456.32		Pre-payments for 2004 fees	386,100.00	10,959.00	
15				Representation of CAUL	5,000.00			537.90		Trade Creditors	160,858.96	11,229.18	
16				Joint CCA Meetings	4,000.00			1,429.32		Authentication Project	55,786.00	0.00	
17				Publications / Web Site	850.00			0.00		GST Collected	69,293.58	87,357.01	
18				CAUL Achievement Award	6,000.00			5,000.00			672,038.54	109,545.19	
19								149,945.13					
20			210,748.02			161,880.00	48,868.02			ASSETS			
21			PROGRAMMES							Cheque Account	890,364.55	495,434.59	
22	COPYRIGHT									Petty Cash	100.00	100.00	
23	ALCC Levy	20,000.00		ALCC Membership	20,000.00			20,000.00		GST Paid	36,615.41	54,342.67	
24			20,000.00	ADA Membership	500.00			500.00		Trade Debtors	106,242.86	70,296.11	
25				Meetings	1,000.00			5,084.88					
26						21,500.00	-1,500.00	25,584.88			1,033,322.82	620,173.37	
27	BEST PRACTICE												
28			0.00	Statistics Publication	19,000.00			19,000.00					
29				Statistics Meetings	1,000.00			894.20					
30				COUNTER Membership	850.00			763.27		DATASETS ACCOUNT (AUD)			
31				Information Literacy Project	3,232.00			0.00		Datasets Income	579,364.97	791,072.28	
32				ILWG	2,700.00			1,137.30		Datasets Expenditure	420,114.05	828,138.66	
33				Performance Indicator Web Sit	1,915.00			0.00		GST refunded from ATO	308,551.56		
34													
35						28,697.00	-28,697.00	21,794.77					
36	ULA												
37			0.00	Meetings	0.00			0.00					
38						0.00	0.00	0.00					
39	Sub-Total (CAUL Programs)		230,748.02			212,077.00	18,671.02	197,324.78		FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (USD)			
40										Cheque Account @ 31/12	4,244,798.42	1,853,643.22	
41										Interest Received	4,815.45	7,012.00	
42	RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT									Liabilities	56,383.20	41,305.00	
43		20,000.00		Research & Development	20,000.00			20,000.00	0.00				
44			20,000.00										
45	SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION									Datasets income	5,927,881.24	7,275,109.87	
46		6,600.00		SPARC Membership	6,600.00			6,600.00		Datasets expenditure	4,235,266.06	8,600,956.48	
47			6,600.00										
48	ADT												
49	ADT Membership	72,000.00		Infrastructure (UNSW)	55,000.00			55,000.00		FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (EUR)			
50				Meetings	5,000.00			888.21					
51				NLTLD Meetings	0.00			0.00		Cheque Account @ 31/12	5,188.11	989,721.51	
52			72,000.00			60,000.00	12,000.00	55,888.21		Interest Received		2,281.96	
53										Liabilities			
54	CEIRC Program												
55	CEIRC Levy (CAUL)	57,600.00		Executive Officer (0.35)	35,000.00			35,911.05		Datasets income		2,680,552.92	
56	CEIRC Levy (external)	36,000.00		CEIRC Assistant	27,500.00			31,551.50		Datasets expenditure		2,690,065.35	
57				Meetings	20,000.00			19,104.62					
58	Interest from Foreign Currer	14,136.00		Research	5,000.00					FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (GBP)			
59			107,736.00	ICOLC Meetings	5,000.00			4,437.63					
60				CAUL-Industry ThinkTank	0.00					Cheque Account @ 31/12		68,237.06	
61						92,500.00	15,236.00	91,004.80		Interest Received		395.84	
62										Liabilities			
63	TOTAL INCOME / EXPENDITURE		437,084.02			391,177.00	45,907.02	350,817.79					
64	Actual surplus / (deficit)							86,266.23					211,548.20
65										Datasets income			172,129.20
										Datasets expenditure			

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 CAUL members @ \$4,500

Cell: E6

Comment: 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

Cell: L6

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
from 1995

Cell: B7

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
19000 budgetted

Cell: L8

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
from 1995

Cell: J9

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Includes audit for 2003 + 2003

Cell: J10

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Includes refund of rental overpayment in 2003

Cell: E11

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Printer to replace 1995 Canon LBP

Cell: E12

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Includes \$3,000 for meeting guest speakers

Cell: N14

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
incl. Devt of statistics site & new CEIRC members

Cell: N16

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Refunded to ARC 12/04

Cell: E18

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
\$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting

Cell: A23

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 CAUL members

Cell: E25

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Zwolle conference in 2004 budget

Cell: E30

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Library Consortium £335 (\$500)

Cell: J30

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Prepaid in 2004

Cell: E31

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Unspent allocation from 2002

Cell: E32

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Page 116 of 123
Approved CAUL Exec 13/1/04

Cell: E33

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Unspent allocation from 2002

Cell: A43

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 X \$500

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, to be refunded to subscribers (credited 11/04) + o/s invoice to OUP which it claims has been paid

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: A56

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
20 external participants @1,800

Cell: B58

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
USD 8454 -1442 + EUR 2386 - 104 + £ 461 - 66.78 =9260+3904+972=14136 (budgetted 12000)

Cell: F59

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
1 meeting only in 2004

CAUL Budget 2005 (updated 21/3/05)

Income	\$	Sub-Total	Expenditure	\$	Sub-Total	Balance	Actual Expenditure	\$	Assets and Liabilities 2003	Balance @ 31/12/04	Balance 2005 @ 2/3/05
OPERATING											
Membership	180,000.00		Executive Officer (0.65)	67,600.00			\$10,383.75		NON-CASH		11,030.00
Interest on Cash	19,000.00		Admin Assistant	33,306.00			3,764.71		Furniture cost		-9,147.60
CONZUL contribution	9,000.00		Office Expenses	7,000.00			1,214.06		Furniture depr.		24,024.75
			Audit & Accounting	7,300.00			600.00		Equipment cost		-20,732.42
Publications	200.00		Office Rental	8,190.00			1,235.40		Equipment depr.		5,174.73
		208,200.00	Equipment	0.00			0.00		LIABILITIES		
			CAUL Meetings	15,000.00			865.06		Research Levy 2004	20,000.00	20,000.00
			Executive Meetings	12,000.00			1,933.27		Pre-payments for 2005 fee:	10,959.00	0.00
			President's Meetings	10,000.00			711.07		Trade Debtors	1,847.22	68,021.91
			Representation of CAUL	5,000.00					GST Collected	87,357.01	7,919.70
			Joint CCA Meetings	4,000.00					Carryover from 2002	5,147.00	5,147.00
			Publications / Web Site	950.00						105,310.23	81,088.61
			CAUL Achievement Award	6,000.00							
			IFLA Membership 2005	1,700.00							
						176,346.00	31,854.00	20,707.32			
PROGRAMMES											
COPYRIGHT											
ALCC Levy	20,000.00		ALCC Membership	20,000.00			20,000.00		ASSETS		
		20,000.00	ADA Membership Meetings	500.00			500.00		Cheque Account	833,978.04	507,674.27
				2,500.00			698.44		Petty Cash	100.00	100.00
						23,000.00	-3,000.00	21,198.44	GST Paid	54,342.67	8,530.24
									Trade Creditors	5,146.99	951.02
BEST PRACTICE											
CONZUL contribution to sta	6,200.00	6,200.00	Statistics Publication	27,610.00						893,567.70	517,255.53
			Statistics Meetings	1,000.00			120.18		EXPECTED YEAR-END		
			COUNTER Membership	850.00					DATASETS ACCOUNT (AUD)		
			ILWG	3,000.00					Datasets Income	791,072.28	79,993.67
			Development of statistics softv	37,583.00			18,791.00		Datasets Expenditure	828,138.66	15,528.22
						70,043.00	-63,843.00	18,911.18			
ULA											
		0.00	Meetings	0.00			0.00	0.00	FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (USD)		
						0.00	0.00	60,816.94	Cheque Account @ 31/12	1,853,643.22	835,362.21
Sub-Total (CAUL Programs)		234,400.00				269,389.00	-35,189.00	60,816.94	Interest Received	7,012.00	2,362.23
									Liabilities	41,305.00	745,895.00
RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT											
	0.00		Research & Development	0.00			0.00	0.00	FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (EUR)		
		0.00							Cheque Account @ 31/12	989,721.51	1,388,890.23
SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION											
	8,500.00		SPARC Membership	8,500.00			8,500.00	0.00	Interest Received	2,281.96	3,311.35
		8,500.00							Liabilities		1,383,149.46
ADT											
ADT Membership	59,850.00		Infrastructure (UNSW)	55,000.00			0.00		Datasets income	7,275,109.87	124,773.87
		59,850.00	Meetings	2,000.00			0.00		Datasets expenditure	8,600,956.48	66,364.57
			NLTLD Meetings	0.00			0.00		FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (GBP)		
						57,000.00	2,850.00	0.00	Cheque Account @ 31/12	68,237.06	41,722.76
CEIRC Program											
CEIRC Levy (CAUL)	57,600.00		Executive Officer (0.35)	36,400.00			\$5,591.25		Interest Received	395.84	274.97
CEIRC Levy (external)	41,400.00		CEIRC Assistant	33,306.00			3,764.71		Liabilities		39,764.00
			Meetings	15,000.00			2,979.05		FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNT (GBP)		
Interest from Foreign Curren	7,500.00		Research	5,000.00					Cheque Account @ 31/12	68,237.06	41,722.76
		106,500.00	ICOLC Meetings	5,000.00			2,037.60		Interest Received	395.84	274.97
			CAUL-Industry ThinkTank	0.00					Liabilities		39,764.00
						94,706.00	11,794.00	14,372.61	Datasets income	211,548.20	2,348.00
TOTAL INCOME / EXPENDITURE		409,050.00				429,595.00	-20,545.00	75,189.55			

Cell: A6

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 CAUL members @ \$4,500

Cell: E6

Comment: 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

Cell: L6

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
from 1995

Cell: B7

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
19,000 in 2003; 5727 @2/3/05

Cell: E7

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Salary increase 5.5% 1/12/04

Cell: L8

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
from 1995

Cell: B10

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
1220 to 27/5/04

Cell: F10

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
315+GST per fortnight

Cell: E12

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Includes \$3,000 for meeting guest speakers, \$4,000 for SkyCity

Cell: M13

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
incl. Devt of statistics site & new CEIRC members

Cell: L16

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
InfoLitProject &PI web site

Cell: E18

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
\$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting

Cell: E19

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Approved CAUL2004/2

Cell: A24

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 CAUL members

Cell: E26

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
1xALCC,CLRCSydney,LobbyingCanberra,?Zwolle,?IFLA?

Cell: E31

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Library Consortium E335 (\$500)

Cell: E33

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Approved CAUL 2005/2

Cell: M43

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer: o/s invoice to OUP which it claims has been paid

Cell: N43

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer: o/s 41,305 invoice to OUP which it claims has been paid. +
88138 receivable
490728 payable + 302000 recd in advance from UQ

Cell: A44

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 X \$500 in 2004; no levy in 2005

Cell: E44

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Income from 2004 recorded in liabilities

Cell: E47

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
USD5,000 (est.AUD 8,500)

Cell: C48

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Sponsored by individual CAUL members USD5,000

Cell: A50

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 CAUL members + 2 CONZUL

Cell: E52

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
UNSW bearing expense

Cell: A56

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
39 CAUL members, CSIRO & CONZUL = 48*1200

Cell: A57

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
23 external participants @1,800

Cell: B59

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
USD5000 in 2003

Cell: F60

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
1 meeting only in 2005?

Cell: N62

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
39419 recd in advance for cup2005

This page is intentionally blank.

Report to CAUL 2005/1

This report combines 2 previous reports to the Executive Committee, supplemented by recent events. The finance section has been extracted to a separate report.

Report to CAUL 9 February to 22 March, 2005.
Activity report 16 November, 2004 to 9 February, 2005
Activity report 4 September to 16 November, 2004.

CAUL Strategic Plan.

The 2005 action plan was drafted following the February meeting of the CAUL Executive. An amended version will be presented to CAUL for discussion and confirmation at the CAUL meeting.

New email lists have been established for caul-info-literacy, anzac.conference and caul-client-surveys. All CAUL lists are accessible from the CAUL home page.

CAUL Elections.

Election processes were undertaken for the CEIRC committee in November. Heather Gordon was the only nominee for the CAUL position, and three nominations were received for the Datasets Coordinators representative. The CAUL members of the committee chose Martin Borchert, Griffith University. It might be interesting to note that the committee now includes 4 members from QULOC universities and one from Monash. The rest of the committee is CONZUL (John Redmayne), CSIRO (position currently vacant since Sally-Anne Leigh moved to the University of Melbourne) and CAUL (moi).

CAUL Office.

The CAUL Office will celebrate its 10th anniversary on May 1.

Office staff levels have grown from 1.0 in 1995 to 2.0 plus casual book-keeping (since September 2000.) In 1995, CEIRC was not born, and consortial purchasing was not included in the position description. 101 offers, including 41 renewals, were processed during 2004.

In June, 1998 Angela Wynants began work as half-time assistant, dealing mainly with CEIRC-related activities. She was succeeded in June 2000 by Margaret Richardson, and supplemented in August 2001 by Brigid Whitbread (also half-time) who left in September 2002 to have her third child. The position was left vacant because of extensive building renovations until temporarily filled in July-August 2003. When Margaret Richardson resigned at the end of 2003, the two positions were advertised as one and filled in April 2004 by Rachelle Morgan.

CAUL subscriptions were raised from \$2000 per year in 1995 to \$4000 in 1996, and \$4500 in 1998, at which time the CEIRC participation levy of \$1000 was introduced. This was increased to \$1200 in 2004. Transactions in 2004 amounted to USD 16m, EUR 3.4m, £ 300k and AUD 2.5m.

Annual leave from October 11 to October 29 inclusive. During this time, at my expense, I attended both e-ICOLC in Barcelona, and the co-located meeting of the Blackwell Publishing Library Advisory Board. It was a decision of the CEIRC committee, with which I concurred, that the e-ICOLC meeting agenda was not worth CEIRC's attendance. I still concur with this decision, unless the agenda format changes, but I found meeting a large number of European consortial operatives very interesting, and potentially very useful for CAUL. There was a great deal of interest in a range of our activities, already known to some of them, such as information literacy, benchmarking and quality processes.

Office Staffing.

Rachelle has been tracking her time since July, 2004 and reports that approximately 85-90% of her time is spent on CEIRC-related activities, the bulk of which is keeping track of responses to offers and renewals, building and maintaining the CEIRC database, and handling the invoicing and payment of CEIRC subscriptions.

We have cut back a little on the outsourced book-keeping, partly to keep better track of expenses by entering them as they occur rather than waiting for the monthly reconciliations, and partly because my preferred book-keeper is now more expensive than she used to be. However, her experience, her knowledge of our set-up and procedures, and her high level of competence are valuable. I shall, however, monitor the impact of taking back some of this work.

I should note that *ad hoc* new subscriptions are now making a noticeable inroad into the office operations. These are subscriptions that an institution may not be in a position to take up at the same time as everyone else, but starts mid-way through the subscription cycle. To date, I have supported and encouraged this flexibility, as some institutions find it difficult otherwise to manage their subscription cycles to ever fit into CAUL's cycle. It is clearly useful to members, as 45 have made use of it so far in 2004, 8 of them three times or more, however it is also worth monitoring.

CEIRC.

The offers page will show 24 new offers and 4 renewals in September/October, and then only four offers since November 16, primarily because the latter part of the year is devoted to invoicing for 2005 subscriptions, mainly for datasets, but also for CAUL memberships.

With the decline in the value of the US dollar, many British publishers who used to offer pricing in either £ or USD have now increased their USD prices to compensate. In the past it has been simpler for CAUL to handle all its foreign invoicing in USD, but with the determination of Kluwer to invoice in EUR, and the unpredictability of USD pricing for British publications, it is now better for CAUL to invoice in the native currency.

Meetings held with:

October 5. Karen Vitullo, Director, Library and Extension Services, ABS
November 15. Richard Northam, Senior Project Manager, CAUDIT
January 18. Gail Pattie, CONZUL, teleconference re CAUL/CONZUL meeting in April.
February 3. Steve O'Connor, CAVAL
March 1. Therese Cunningham, Commonwealth Bank re electronic banking options
March 2. Russell Livermore, Walter Turnbull re CAUL 2004 finance audit.
March 11. Jan Fullerton, Warwick Cathro, Roxanne Missingham re Kinetica, with Eve Woodberry, Andrew Wells & Vic Elliott.

and as organiser and secretary:

September 12. CAUL Executive, Hobart
September 13-14 CAUL Meeting, Hobart
October 6-7 CEIRC Committee, Sydney
December 1-2 CEIRC Committee, Sydney
December 6 CAUL Executive 2004/5 – Brisbane
December 6 CCA Joint Executive Meeting, Brisbane
January 31. CEIRC Committee, Sydney
February 3. CAUL Statistics Focus Group, Sydney
February 3. ADT User Group, Sydney
February 15. CAUL Executive, Canberra

and planning:

President's visit to Canberra, 8-9 September
President's visit to Canberra, 8-11 November
JSTOR Roadshow Australia & New Zealand – February, 2005
CAUL Executive Meeting, Auckland April 3.
CAUL/CONZUL 2005/1, Auckland, April 4.
CEIRC Meeting, Sydney, April 20.
CAUL 2005/2 – Brisbane – 14-16 September 2005
SCONUL tour of Australia September 2005

Events / Meetings attended.

September 9. AVCC. John Mullarvey & Paul Stubing, with Madeleine McPherson
September 9. DEST AEI. Fiona Buffinton et al, with Madeleine McPherson
September 12. ProQuest lunch & meeting, Hobart, with CEIRC & Executive Committees
October 27-29. e-ICOLC, Barcelona (own time & cost while on holidays)
November 8. Bennett's Lecture. David Seaman, Executive Director, Digital Library Federation.
November 9. DEST AEI. Fiona Buffinton, with Madeleine McPherson & John Shipp
January 31. Datasets Coordinators meeting, Sydney

February 10. Launch of Decipher Tourism Portal, Tourism CRC

CEIRC-related meetings.

September 16. Gary Gibson, representing Alexander Street Press

September 29. Michael Cairns, President RR Bowker, and Richard Siegersma, General Manager, Thorpe-Bowker CSA

September 29. Renny Guida - Director of Product Development, Thomson ISI, with Jeroen Prinsen and Mark Garlinghouse

September 30. David Tyler, Adam Matthew Publications

October 26-7. Blackwell Publishing Library Advisory Board, Barcelona

November 29. Emma Bowen, Lexis Nexis

January 7. Mark Phillips, Decipher Tourism Portal, Tourism CRC.

January 19. Chris Pierard, Serials Solutions, teleconference.

January 31. Robert Bovenschulte and Dean Smith, American Chemical Society
Michael Walsh, Chemical Abstracts Service

February 1. David Elek, Springer

Adrian Tang and Thomas Yi, Regional Director, Asia Pacific, Inspec

Peter Suomi, Business Development, Australia & New Zealand, Economist Intelligence Unit

Belinda Sharpe and Jay Chakrapani, VP Software Product Management, Ovid

Poonam Ramchand, Euromonitor

Richard Siegersma, Thorpe-Bowker

Jeroen Prinsen, Mark Garlinghouse, Keith McGregor – Thomson Scientific (ISI)

Eva-Maria Scheer, John Wiley

Susanna Lob, James Mercer, Oxford University Press

February 2. Elsevier Science SCOPUS event.

Natalie Blanchard, Swets

Steve Carey, Crown Content

Kari Paulsen, eBooks.com

Scott Lansdale, StatRef

Bruce Heterick, JSTOR

Christine Midwinter, CISTI

Lesley Maw, Royal Society of Chemistry

Phil Higginson, Standards Association of Australia

Andrew Pitts, American Chemical Society

February 3. Tamara Joyner, Palgrave Macmillan (Nature Publishing Group)

Pote Lee, Vicki O'Neill, iGroup

Bev Foster, Emerald

Jonathan Hixon, Keesings

Nancy Buckley, Blackwell Publishing

Pradeep Fernandes, ISI Emerging Markets

Jason Connelly, IHS (representing IEEE)

Keith Courtenay & Christoph Chesher, Taylor & Francis

February 7. Stephanie Krueger, JSTOR

February 24. Oliver Mann, CASL Consortium Convenor.

March 1. Casey Yew, Platts – teleconference

March 3-4. Springer Asia-Pacific Library Advisory Board, Singapore.

March 14. Emma Bowen, Lexis Nexis.

Diane Costello
22 March, 2005