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CAUL Meeting 2006/2
18-19 September, 2006
Curtin University, Council Chambers

AGENDA

738. Introduction & Welcome. Professor Greg Craven, Acting Vice-Chancellor of Curtin University will address members at 1.30pm on the 18th.

739. Attendance & Apologies. Expected to attend:

From CAUL: New members of CAUL: Philip Kent (Derek Whitehead), Keith Webster (Graham Black), Sandra Jeffries (Eve Woodberry); Stephen McVey (Imogen Garner); Jan Gordon (new in April, Andrew Wells);
Delegates for CAUL members: Carolyn Young, QUT; Con Graves, Griffith; Wendy Abbott, Bond; Wilna Macmillan, Monash; Jim Graham, ACU; Deidre Gillespie, RMIT; Alison Hunter, USQ;

From CONZUL: Gail Pattie, UCanterbury; Annette McNicol, UWaikato;

From NSLA: Anne-Marie Schwirtlich and Sue Hamilton, SLV; Alan Smith, SLSA; Margaret Allen, SLWA; Penny Carnaby, NLNZ; Warwick Cathro, NLA; Regina Sutton and Lucy Arundell, SLNSW; Lloyd Sokvitne, SLT; Jo McGill, NTL; Lea Giles-Peters, SLQ; Kate Irvine, NSLA;

Guests:  Professor Greg Craven, Acting Vice-Chancellor Curtin University; Ruth Pagell, University Librarian, Singapore Management University; Michele Sabto, Monash University; Barry Burton, University Librarian, Hong Kong Polytechnic University; Darren Holland, University of Ballarat;

Apologies: Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Monash; Gaynor Austen, QUT; Janice Rickards, Griffith; Gulcin Cribb, Bond; Felicity McGregor, UoW; Chris Sheargold, ACU; Bill Cations, Flinders; Anita Crotty, UCanberra; Craig Anderson, RMIT; Alan Smith, USQ;

740. 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.

741. Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting - 2006/1, April 6-7, Canberra. (Paper included)

742. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings - 2006/2, 2006/3, 2006/4. (Papers (3) included)

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

a) Endnote. La Trobe has trialled both RefWorks and EndNote, has done a comparative analysis, and will circulate the report as soon as it is finished. Earle Gow

b) E-Grad School (Australia). The LATN Information Literacy sub-committee will complete "InfoScholar: Information literacy for e-research", the information literacy online module by the end of December 2006. It will be one of the Modules that make up the online content of e-Grad School (Australia). The website is being developed at www.egradschool.edu.au Shibboleth will be used for students to access e-Grad School (Australia) with Identity Provider (IdP) being set up by the partners, however more work is required to allow for selective access. Imogen Garner

c) Digital Reference. The plan is to agree on a set of definitions (e.g. what is “referral”) and data collection forms and to make them available via the CAUL best practice site. Greg Anderson
STRATEGIC PLAN

744. Review of the Strategic Plan. The revised plan for 2007-2009 is included with the agenda. (Paper included) Eve Woodberry Hot Topic

745. CAUL Achievement Award 2005. The winner, Michelle Sabto, Monash University, will attend the meeting. Hot Topic

746. CAUL Elections. Eve Woodberry

Support for Research

747. Research Infrastructure. Warwick Cathro, John Shipp Hot Topic

748. Institutional Repositories. Penny Carnaby, Gail Pattie, Andrew Wells Hot Topic

749. Digitisation Summit. Anne-Marie Schwirtlich, SLV. Hot Topic

750. ARRIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). John Shipp, Derek Whitehead

FRODO Projects Hot Topic


b) ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World). http://arrow.edu.au/ Andrew Wells


MERRI Projects Hot Topic


e) RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively). http://www.rubric.edu.au/


g) DART (Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation E-Research Technologies). http://dart.edu.au/


New Projects: Hot Topic

i) Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER) [will build on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project]

j) Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities (RAMP) - Maxine Brodie

k) Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) - Stage 2. Andrew Wells

l) Legal Frameworks for e-Research [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project]

m) Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) - Stage 2. Vic Elliott

n) Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS) [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project]

751. Research Quality Framework. (Standing item) Andrew Wells Hot Topic

752. eResearch Coordinating Committee. Andrew Wells Hot Topic
753. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells (Paper included)

754. CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC). Heather Gordon (Paper included)

755. Collection Analysis. Wilna Macmillan, Monash, will report on a project aimed at assessing the university’s ability to support research. Hot Topic

Support for Learning & Teaching

756. Off-shore Services. Jeff Murray Hot Topic

757. Information Literacy Working Group. Ruth Quinn (Paper included)

Recommendations for CAUL
1) That the Information Literacy Working Group continue to exist in its current form for a further two years until the end of 2008.
2) That the terms of reference be changed to:
   a. Provide advice to CAUL on information literacy and related issues (no change);
   b. Provide ongoing support and resources to facilitate effective assessment of information literacy knowledge and skills and appropriate evaluation of information literacy courses and programs within university libraries (old (b) and (c) combined);
   c. Seek opportunities for CAUL to promote the inclusion of information literacy and related generic attributes in teaching and learning (no change); and
   d. Liaise on behalf of CAUL with other groups working in the area of information literacy (no change).
3) That nominations for the position of Convenor ILWG for 2007-2008 be called.
4) That the future directions of ILWG as outlined above be accepted.

758. University Library Australia. Shirley Oakley (Paper included)

759. Carrick Institute. John Shipp Hot Topic

a) Learning and Teaching Performance Fund. John Shipp
b) RIN. Derek Whitehead

Delivering Quality & Value

760. Workforce Planning. Margaret Allen, SLWA; Linda Luther Hot Topic

761. Off-site storage. Alan Smith, SASL Hot Topic

762. Best Practice Working Group. Jeff Murray (Paper included)

763. Statistics. Derek Whitehead (Papers (2) included)


Advocacy & Influence

766. Copyright. Eve Woodberry, Derek Whitehead (Paper included) Hot Topic

767. Relationships with other Organisations.

a) NSLA. Members of NSLA (formerly CASL) will join CAUL members for the Hot Topics sessions on September 18.

b) CONZUL. Gail Pattie Hot Topic

c) CAUDIT and ACODE.

d) National Library of Australia.
i) Libraries Australia (Kinetica). John Arfield, Linda Luther (Paper included)
ii) National Licensing Proposal. Heather Gordon
e) CAUL regional and sectoral groups.
i) QULOC. Jim Graham (Paper included)

768. Forthcoming Meetings
a) CAUL Meeting 2007/1. Melbourne, May 3-4 (in conjunction with EDUCAUSE 2007, April 29 – May 2)
b) CAUL Meeting 2007/2. Adelaide, September/October

CAUL Administration

769. CAUL Finances. Derek Whitehead (Paper included)
   a) CAUL Budget 2006. Derek Whitehead (Paper included)
   b) CAUL Budget 2007 – Draft. Derek Whitehead (Paper included)
      i) Membership Fees. It is recommended that the CAUL membership fee remain at $4,500.
      ii) CEIRC Levy. It is recommended that the CEIRC levy again be increased by 5% to account for salary increases – to $1,320 and $1,980 for “internal” and “external” participants. Internal participants include 39 CAUL institutions (ADFA is a campus of UNSW), 8 CONZUL institutions and the CSIRO.
      iii) CAUL Web Site Redesign. An estimate of $25,000 has been included in the budget - the lowest quote received by CAUDIT for a similar revamp of its site in 2005. Jeff Murray
      iv) CAUL Statistics Site Enhancements. The total price is $5643 if all are done, plus GST. Derek Whitehead

770. Executive Officer’s Report. Diane Costello (Paper included)

771. Other business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>LATN</td>
<td>Curtin University Building 105 - TL Robertson Library</td>
<td>Room 348 Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deirdre Gillespie, Fides Datu Lawton, Imogen Garner, Helen Livingston, Carolyn Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>Informal dinner @ Halo <a href="http://www.halocafe.com.au/">http://www.halocafe.com.au/</a></td>
<td>Barrack Street Jetty  Tel: (08) 9325-4575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Executive</strong></td>
<td>Room 348 Level 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eve Woodberry, Jeff Murray, Derek Whitehead, Andrew Wells, Diane Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td><strong>Innovative Research Universities Australia (IRU) Libraries</strong></td>
<td>Room 541 Level 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earle Gow, Helen Culshaw, Con Graves, Margaret Jones, Greg Anderson, Maxine Brodie, Ruth Pagell, Tony Shiel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30-11</td>
<td><strong>New Generation Universities Libraries Group</strong></td>
<td>Room 625 Level 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liz Curach, Leeanne Pitman, Jim Graham, Sandra Jeffries, Philip Kent, Graham Black, Des Stewart, Stephen McVey, Darren Holland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12.15</td>
<td><strong>Go8</strong></td>
<td>Room 429 Level 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Shipp, Andrew Wells (chair), Keith Webster, Vic Elliott, Wilna Macmillan, Linda O’Brien, John Arfield, Ray Choate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??11-12.15</td>
<td><strong>Best Practice Working Group</strong></td>
<td>Room 5103 Level 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday 18 September 2006**

**Venue:** Curtin University Council Chambers, Building 100 level 3

(Note: no food or drink permitted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.15-1.15</td>
<td>Lunch @ Building 104 “Curtin on the Park”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30pm</td>
<td>Professor Greg Craven, Acting Vice-Chancellor of Curtin University will address members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hot Topics - with NSLA members**

20m CAULdron: peak bodies and their relevance to institutional interests (Vic Elliott)

40m Institutional repositories (Penny Carnaby, NLNZ; Gail Pattie, UCanterbury; Andrew Wells)

30m Research infrastructure (Warwick Cathro, NLA; John Shipp)

20m Future Thinking & the Digitisation Summit (Anne-Marie Schwirtlich, NSLA Chair)

20m Workforce Planning (Margaret Allen, SLWA, Linda Luther)

20m Storage (Alan Smith, SLSA)

**Tea Break**

7 for 7.30 CAUL dinner @ Coco’s Riverside Bar & Restaurant [http://www.cocosperth.com/](http://www.cocosperth.com/) 85 The Esplanade SOUTH PERTH WA 6151 Ph: (08) 9474 3010 (with guests, including NSLA members)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9-1   | **Hot Topics**| 30m Michele Sabto, Monash University, winner of the CAUL 2005 Achievement Award  
CAUL Strategic Plan – Eve Woodberry  
Carrick Institute, Teaching and Learning Performance Fund – John Shipp  
RIN – Derek Whitehead |
| 20m   |               | Offshore Services – ECU Improvement Team - Jeff Murray  
CONZUL report – Gail Pattie |
| 10.30-11 | **Tea Break**| 11-1 **Hot Topics**  
20m Collection analysis – Wilna Macmillan, Monash  
RQF, e-Research - Andrew Wells  
FRODO, MERRI and New DEST Projects – Andrew Wells, Vic Elliott, Eve Woodberry, Jeff Murray,  
Copyright – Eve Woodberry, Derek Whitehead |
| 1-2   | **Lunch**     |                                                                 |
| 2-4   | **CAUL Business** –  
Libraries Australia  
University Library Australia  
CAUL Budget |  
4 | **Meeting close.** |  
| 4.45  | **Tour of ECU Library** |
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708. Introduction & Welcome. Eve Woodberry welcomed John Mullarvey, CEO of the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee who addressed delegates. The discussion is appended to these minutes.

Professor Ian Chubb, Vice-Chancellor of The Australian National University also addressed members at 10.30am on the 6th. The report of the discussion is appended to these minutes.

709. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry welcomed members, especially those attending their first meeting as CAUL members – Des Stewart was introduced by Gulcin Cribb and Anne Horn was introduced by Eve Woodberry. She noted that Keith Webster and Philip Kent had not yet taken up their positions at UQ and VU respectively, and that Heather Gordon would take up her position at JCU in May. She also acknowledged that Doreen Parker and Cliff Law had left their positions at VU and UNSW@ADFA since the last meeting and expressed thanks on behalf of members for their contribution to CAUL over many years. Members applauded warmly the contribution of Madeleine McPherson to CAUL, not only during her very active term as President, but also her valued participation over a long period of time. All wished her a long, healthy and happy retirement.

From CAUL:
Chris Sheargold, ACU
Vic Elliott, ANU
Gulcin Cribb, Bond U
Graham Black, CQU
Shirley Oakley, CSU
Imogen Garner, Curtin U
% Anne Horn, Deakin U
Jeff Murray, ECU
*Kaye Baudinette, Flinders U
Janice Rickards, Griffith U
Earle Gow, La Trobe U
Maxine Brodie, Macquarie U
Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Monash U
Margaret Jones, Murdoch U
Gaynor Austen, QUT
Craig Anderson, RMIT U
% Des Stewart, SCU
Derek Whitehead, Swinburne U
Ray Choate, U Adelaide
Leeanne Pitman, U Ballarat
Anita Crotty, U Canberra
*Angela Bridgland & Nicki McLaurin Smith, U
Melbourne
Eve Woodberry, UNE, President
Andrew Wells, UNSW, Deputy President
Jan Gordon, UNSW@ADFA
Greg Anderson, U Newcastle
#Mary Lyons, UQ

Helen Livingston, UniSA
* Madeleine McPherson, USQ
John Shipp, U Sydney
Linda Luther, U Tasmania
# Fides Datu Lawton, UTS
Heather Gordon, USC
*Ralph Kiel, UWA
Felicity McGregor, UoW
# Laura Maquignaz, VU

% first meeting as CAUL Member
# Acting Director
* Delegate of CAUL Member

In attendance:
Diane Costello, CAUL

From CONZUL:
Ainslie Dewe, AUT;
Sue Pharo (UOtago);

Guests: Professor Ian Chubb (Vice-Chancellor, ANU); John Mullarvey (AVCC CEO); Helen Fullgrabe (DEST); Clare McLaughlin (DEST)

Apologies: Alan Smith (USQ); Bill Cations (Flinders); Ruth Quinn, Anne Wilson (CDU); John Arfield (UWA); Katrina Valese (JCU); Linda O’Brien (UMelbourne); Liz Curach (UWS); Gail Pattie (UCanterbury); Stephen McVey (UNDA)
710. **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.

711. **Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting - 2005/2 September.** The draft minutes were not discussed, and therefore accepted without further amendment.

712. **Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings - 2005/6 November, 2006/1 February.** Minutes of previous meetings were included with the papers. There were no questions.

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

   a) **J STOR Print Storage.** This item was not discussed.

   b) **EndNote.** Felicity McGregor referred to a paper made available prior to the meeting. It covers actions since the last meeting and offered a couple of solutions. It appears too complicated to deal with via CAUL, but recommends sharing information among CAUL members as much as possible. The QULOC documents are freely available online. UNewcastle is developing an online module.

   QULOC decided to continue to support the EndNote person in 2006 budget. It was noted that more undergraduates are starting to use the tool, and face to face training is becoming unsustainable. QULOC would be prepared to consider a business proposal from CAUL.

   It was strongly recommended that the vendor be encouraged to improve its software to make easier to use, that it was a global issue and that CAUL funds not be used for this purpose. It was recommended that members write individually to Thomson Scientific expressing their concerns. *(Action: All)* Thomson is well aware of the effort being made by QULOC - training sessions, master classes, online modules - and applaud it.

   UniSA, UCanberra and UWS are using RefWorks. It was noted that staff time for support at UCanberra is 2½ hours per teaching week and costs only USD 9,000 per year. Academic staff are being trained to teach students as well as use for their own purposes. The skills are easily transferable.

   It was questioned why so many institutions are committed to a product that costs so much in time and money. La Trobe has trialled both, has done a comparative analysis, and will circulate the report as soon as it is finished. *(Action: EG)* The library decided to use only EndNote.

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

714. **Review of the Strategic Plan.** The plan, including its mission, objectives, environment and actions will be reviewed thoroughly at this meeting. Eight documents, strategic plans of ARL, CARL, CONZUL, CNI and SCONUL, were included with the agenda papers.

   Eve Woodberry described the history of CAUL's strategic plan up to the last full review in 2003. The environment has changed significantly since then, as has the membership. Her plan of the session is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20061strategicplan.ppt

   **Notes of the general discussion and the four discussion groups from Thursday are appended to these minutes.**

715. **CAUL Achievement Award 2005.** The winner is Michelle Sabto, Monash University, who was unable to attend this meeting but will be present at the next.

716. **CAUL Elections.** Elections were not required for any CAUL committee in 2005 as the number of committee vacancies exceeded or equalled the number of nominations. Members are asked to consider the advantages of committee membership and to consider options for a more formalised committee search procedure. Eve Woodberry stressed the professional rewards of being part of a CAUL committee are compensation for the extra time contributed and urged members to nominate next time elections were called. Members could build on the work of previous committees which had given CAUL such tools as an ROI model for electronic resources and CEIRC.
Support for Research


The process began in May 2004, building on international trends. The final report was released by the Minister on March 28. *Research Quality Framework: Assessing the quality and impact of research in Australia – Final Advice on the Preferred RQF Model.*

http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/policies_issues_reviews/key_issues/research_quality_framework/final_advice_on_preferred_rqf_model.htm A Development Advisory Group has been established, with a timeline yet to be confirmed, but likely to be 2007/8. Work on the data management side will required engagement with ResearchMaster, ARROW, etc.

There has been no system-wide method of measuring quality and impact. The aim was to develop a transparent and robust framework on quality and impact. The latter includes economic, social and environmental and has been the cause of much controversy. The UK's RAE (Research Assessment Exercise) is about to begin its 6th cycle, in parallel with a metrics project to see if they mirror each other. The RAE has been successful in increasing the number of highly cited publications, and in improving collaboration and cohesion within departmental teams. The RQF will review research outputs in groupings nominated by individual universities, and will assign a quality score and an impact score. In the future this may also apply to publicly funded research organisations. The ATN and IRUA groups of universities are already trialling the RQF, and are expected to be helpful in establishing guidelines and technical working groups. The groups will be assessed, rather than individuals, based on a portfolio of evidence. Within each group, the four best outputs of eligible researchers will be assessed. It is not yet clear whether impact will be applied to the groups or the individuals. Twelve assessment panels may add experts or sub-groups, and will be subject to a moderation process which will validate the scores. Quality will be assessed on a five-point scale and impact on a three-point scale. The distribution of funding has not been finalised, though all funds from the Institutional Grants Scheme will be diverted to the RQF, as will half the Research Training Scheme funds. The Research Infrastructure Block Grants will be left as is.

International assessment exercises have allowed the identification of strengths and weaknesses in research effort, and may point to areas where extra funding is required e.g. the enabling sciences. Many examples of small pockets of excellence have been uncovered by earlier exercises. It is recognised that such a system creates opportunities for manipulation of the system e.g. by poaching high impact researchers or teams, though it is hope that the behaviour changes will be positive.

In response to questions, Helen Fullgrabe added that end-user feedback will form part of the impact assessment, as is currently the case with CRCs.

CAUL is planning a workshop on research quality indicators (formerly referred to as the bibliometrics workshop), at UNSW on May 1st. Linda Butler will design the program according to CAUL needs, and will address not just citation indicators but also indicators that have emerged from other workshops. The workshop is intended to be very practical, to inform university librarians or staff leading this process within the library, especially those on their university's RQF committee. Humanities indicators will be covered, included in the 53 indicators which have been used. Some work has been done on quality, impact and discipline relationships. CAUL members indicated that they are currently engaged in citation analysis and expressed interest in the workshop. They were invited to send questions for addressing at the workshop. (Action: All) It was noted that the approach is quite different from the forthcoming CAVAL workshops, with Linda Butler and Colin Steele, and that the overlap between the two workshops is limited.

**718. *e-Research Coordinating Committee. Hot Topic.*** The presentation by Cathrine Harboe-Ree is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20061ercc.ppt](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20061ercc.ppt) She outlined the forthcoming report of the ERCC, noting that its findings parallel NCRIS (National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy) in support of infrastructure requirements. It recognises the need to find a champion, to play a role similar to that of Professor Tony Hey in the UK's e-science initiative. It provides a platform for a leadership role for CAUL members within their
own institutions. Projects such as the FRODO and MERRI projects, high performance computing and middleware projects, have not had a deployment strategy – a path into production will be needed.

Skills acquisition for ICT and information professionals is needed quickly, but there is unlikely to be additional funding to support it. Skills transfer will be supported through the establishment of an e-research centre, with 7 nodes, for research and development, support, outreach and deployment. The report picks up authentication issues in support of access and middleware rather than bandwidth or computer power.

A new committee will focus on data management, including a national digitisation strategy, advocacy for the digitisation of Australian resources.

A number of scholarships sponsored by the e-research centres will be established – for ICT and IM professionals to undertake research into a variety of disciplines, and discipline professionals to undertake research into informatics.

The CAUL e-research working group has met twice, and recommends to CAUL some priorities for action:

1. improve collaboration with CAUDIT, as e-research sits between libraries and IT;
2. CAUL to seek representation on all e-research committees established as part of this process, by writing to the secretariat when the report is released; (Action: EW)
3. include e-research as a theme in EDUCAUSE 2007 – it was noted that it is already included;
4. develop data management plan guidelines, with a perspective wider than libraries;
5. lobby for access to national data, particularly government data;
6. support the training of CAUL and CAUDIT staff through “e-research 101” – to include the meaning of e-research, related issues and first steps.
7. enable collaboration through the continuation of the CAUL working group and the inclusion in CAUL's strategic plan; (Action: Executive)
8. convene an e-research forum along the lines of CAUL’s forum on institutional repositories - to map the territory, provide an overview of e-research, look at examples of how information management professionals are approaching this task, explore the first steps in data planning. Other university personnel should be involved. CAUL members strongly supported this proposal. (Action: Executive)

The report of its first meeting was circulated to members in November and is available at http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/eResearch2005.doc


719. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). A report on ARIIC by Derek Whitehead has been circulated to members.

a) **APSR (Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories).** This item was not discussed.

b) **ARROW.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that road shows were planned for March April but have deferred until the new version of the software is released. A number of new institutions have joined – membership will be 10 by mid-year. Training is being organised. An ARROW community is being established to share experience and
knowledge, using wikis and a number of groups – a Google group, RQF group, content group, technical group and some face-to-face meetings. Monash will use the repository to support its RQF. This information will be shared with others. Evidence of all content types will be deposited in the repository e.g. music composition, digitised artworks, etc ResearchMaster will be used, and workflows to bypass ResearchMaster will be built for those who don’t use it i.e. plug into another IM tool. Monash is leaning heavily on the RAE (Research Assessment Exercise) to second-guess what DEST wants. It is collecting the published item, the only thing of interest to the reviewers, and providing a link back to the published source (with permission from Elsevier).

c) **MAMS Project.** A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

d) **MAPS Project.** Jeff Murray reported that the MAPS steering committee met once last year. The project has funding of $582k to build a roadmap for middleware. It should result in a directory structure which will help members deploy Shibboleth. Patricia McMillan from Macquarie has been appointed project manager. [http://www.middleware.edu.au/](http://www.middleware.edu.au/)

e) **RUBRIC Project.** A report from Madeleine McPherson was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

f) **OAK-Law.** A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

g) **DART.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that UQ, JCU and Monash are the key players in this data management project; it will involve researchers: JCU will focus on the data collection stage; UQ on the annotation stage; Monash on identifying researchers needs and data management. Functionality is being built into repository space.


This DEST funded project will:

- Provide a model for collaboration linking e-research and e-learning
- Bring together online resources for postgraduate research students developed across the ATN universities and adapt them to the requirements of sector-wide delivery and access
- Extend participation in resource development to other research training providers
- Build the collaboration into a corporate structure so that partnerships can be formalised within the business plan for operating the company.

The project is an ATN initiative, with roles for DDOGS (modules related to research projects) and LATN (information literacy). A business plan is due in May and the 10 modules are to be completed in 2006.

The information literacy module will be modelled on AIRS, the QUT-developed online project. The QUT-specific information and interactivity are being removed so the final product will be less sophisticated. Interactivity and other features may be added later. All participants will have an online postgraduate information literacy module, INFO-scholar.

A MAMS mini-grant will support the development of an access management solution for e-Grad School. The potential for applying Shibboleth is being discussed.

**720. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.** A report from Andrew Wells was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

**721. CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC).** A report from Heather Gordon was circulated with the papers. This item was not discussed though the National Licensing Proposal was discussed under item 714, Strategic Plan.

**722. *Portico & Archiving of Digital Content. Hot Topic.** The presentation by Andrew Wells is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/caul20061portico.ppt](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/caul20061portico.ppt) He recommended that CEIRC includes a clause in all its licences to demand online deposit of content in a third party store. (Action: CEIRC) He highlighted the CLIR (Council on Library and Information
Resources) program on the preservation of digital resources and the article by Anne Kenney, *Surveying the E-Journal Preservation Landscape* at [http://www.clir.org/pubs/archives/ejournal.htm](http://www.clir.org/pubs/archives/ejournal.htm). He noted that Australia’s preservation project, Pandora, is highly selective about which peer-reviewed journals it preserves. Portico [http://www.portico.org/](http://www.portico.org/) provides a method for input and preservation. It will be a dark archive for subscribers. The trigger for access is when the content is no longer from the publisher. Foundation subscribers in 2006/7 will gain a 25% discount on the archive capital fee, which in turn is based on collections expenditure. It is risk management only, and a very small part of the library’s budget.

Institutions such as the KB (Koninklijke Bibliotheek) maintain authorised dark archives, while others such as OhioLINK and the University of Toronto locally load their own content and maintain their own archives. Questions included: would Portico’s archive ever be needed – why wouldn’t the publisher just sell to another? why isn’t content put into escrow in case of a catastrophic event? In discussion of an Australian JSTOR, the following comments were made: AustLit has identified a range of literary sources that would be digitised if funds were available; in the context of a national digitisation strategy, if JSTOR can be funded from SII (Systemic Infrastructure Initiative) funds, why cannot Australian journals; QULOC identified 23 Queensland print publishers and is encouraging a number of aggregators and publishers to assist in digitising and preserving their content.

**Support for Teaching & Learning**

723. *Information Literacy Working Group.* A paper from Ruth Quinn was included with the agenda. The position of the working group was discussed as part of item 714, strategic planning discussions.

724. *University Library Australia.* A report from Shirley Oakley was circulated with the agenda.

Recommendation to CAUL:

That all students of a particular university be treated equally, regardless of campus of enrolment, with respect to their eligibility for ULA membership and that this be based on the fundamental principle that the scheme is a cooperative scheme designed to facilitate support for teaching and learning.

UTS has declared its intent to charge differently for different categories of students as a result of concerns expressed by library staff. UTS’s central location was available to any member of the community, but has security gate with simple registration process for use.

UTS is fully supportive of the ULA in principle but is concerned about numbers. Feedback from UTS students who cannot find books indicates that it does not have adequate resources to satisfy the needs of own students. It is possible to set local charges if special conditions exist. Other universities were asked to look at their own library setup, and make a commitment that the libraries are the primary source of support for their own students. Fides Datu Lawton asked for a review of the ULA protocols.

Graham Black reported that CQU libraries are staffed with professional staff with access to all CQU databases and collections of required reading. Agreements have been made with other universities at the Gold Coast, Sydney and Melbourne, by which CQU pays according to the number of registrations. Students have access to ULA, and may use it if they wish. He does not support differential fees.

Shirley Oakley added that there shouldn’t be any distinction based on location of university unless there isn’t a library service provided. There is a requirement that library services are provided, even if not from the campus.

UBallarat has campuses in Sydney, Adelaide and Melbourne with libraries. Fully enrolled UB students are sometimes taught by partner-employed staff and sometimes by UB staff. In Melbourne, the library has reasonable multiple copies and growing print resources. All have UBallarat electronic resources. They ask for the same level of access to ULA as any other UBallarat student. The level of charges being proposed for Sydney students to use the library at UTS will make it difficult. UTS treats students from the Sydney campus as associate
borrowers while those based at other campuses are classified as ULA borrowers. Students are encouraged to use UBallarat as their primary source.

QUT treats a university differently if it has a campus or study centre in Brisbane. If this is the case, all students pay the fee, no matter which campus they are enrolled at.

Curtin set up a campus in Sydney in 2006 and contacted UTS to provide a library service, but ultimately signed with UNSW. The arrangements are meant to avoid these problems but won't necessarily control what students or academics do.

UoW has a site in Sydney. It recognised that its students make use of library staff as well as books. The challenge is for the university librarian make university understand what the implications are, that services needed are not just e-resources and recommended reading – there is not the equivalent level of resources as the students on the home campuses.

RMIT business library wants turnstiles to keep other students. The users number 600 out of 15,000 so it is not clear how the impact can be so significant? They are holding discussions with the university concerned. It is assumed that the students don't understand that their library has an arrangement with another in Melbourne.

UniSA staff report greater defaulting by ULA borrowers than by other types of external borrowers and want to introduce a charge.

Macquarie is opening a campus in Sydney city in partnership with a private provider. Since ULA was implemented, the sector has changed and is complicated by courses being given in collaboration with private education providers. A review is in order. The problem should be defined more closely, and data made available in order to make an informed response.

(Action: SO)

Professor Chubb said earlier that no university can support itself. This collaborative venture fits well with that. The program was set up extremely well in the first place, based on clear principles, and the goal should be to keep that.

CAUL cannot compel any of its members to follow ULA, especially if in conflict with the university’s requirements. ULA should endeavour to keep the cooperation and mutual understanding but recognise that some negotiation may be required.

QULOC reviewed reciprocal borrowing, and showed that the percentage of loans and use is very low. A snapshot will appear in the QULOC annual report due at the end of the month.

Management for Best Practice

725. *Digital Reference KPIs.* A report from Greg Anderson was circulated with the agenda.

It recommends that:

**Implementation of the Performance Indicators:** some or all of the Performance Indicators identified through this project are implemented for digital reference service evaluation in UNISON Libraries during 2006.

**Benchmarking:** Unison Libraries review the Performance Indicators and, in order to enable effective benchmarking, develop an agreed standardized model of data collection including:

- Definitions of reference categories
- Data interpretation methodology
- Data collection forms.

**CAUL:** The report be sent to CAUL with the suggestion that the Performance Indicators be implemented for digital reference services evaluation in CAUL Libraries.

Greg Anderson reported on the UNISON project, which started with an extensive literature review. They reviewed definitions very carefully but decided to keep them. A survey of UNISON libraries found that digital reference activity is still quite low, only 5%. The plan is to agree on a set of definitions (e.g. what is “referral”) and data collection forms and to make them available via the CAUL best practice site. **(Action: UNISON)**

Members endorsed the proposal to implement the performance indicators in CAUL libraries.
726. **Rodski Client Survey.** Felicity McGregor asked for feedback on the changed list of questions which are already being implemented by Rodski. In response to a question about mapping the changed questions to earlier surveys, it was noted that the number of categories is still the same, facilitating benchmarking and the use of time series data. The revision has reduced the number of references to library staff – it should have referred to the library – but has nevertheless retained substantial continuity.

727. **Best Practice Working Group.** A report from Felicity McGregor was circulated with the agenda.

Recommendations to CAUL:

*Rodski:* CAUL members using Rodski implement the revised version of the survey.

*Performance Indicators for Digital Reference (Information and Research) Services*: CAUL endorses the relevant recommendations of the Project Group and encourages its members to use them.

728. **LATN’s Benchmarking and Quality Assurance Across Libraries Project.** Hot Topic.


This project grew out of information sharing at LATN. Its aim was to provide a snapshot of quality assurance activity across institutions, to identify gaps and best practice and to learn from each other. The budget of $9,000 was supported by the five LATN institutions and AUT. The project was undertaken by Leanne Levinge (QUT) and Karen Tang (Curtin) who conducted site visits and interviews. The literature review drew on the previous work of Pitman/Wilson and McKinnon/Walker. The report identified a number of issues, including:

- need better facilities for the ongoing management of statistics;
- need to be better at measuring impacts and outcomes.

A project website will be developed URL?, to help in identifying possible collaborations, and establish a methodology for future projects. The project has helped to improve relationships across the LATN libraries, and provided a good skill development opportunity for staff.

Gaynor Austen encouraged members to present more “hot topics” to CAUL meetings.

LATN members benchmark against each other using LibQUAL+, and against other IATUL members in the US, Canada and the UK.

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

730. **Standards.** Derek Whitehead reported on the Metadata Reference Group. AICTEC has set up a group to provide input to Standards Australia’s education metadata code of practice; and early draft by Jon Mason and Debbie Campbell is the basis for discussions, and a workshop will be held at USQ on 20-21 April to advance this. Derek represents higher education on the reference group. RFID standards working group – Craig Anderson is a member, though not representing CAUL – there was strong support for this to be a hot topic at the next CAUL meeting. (Action: DC)

731. **Staff Development.** AVCC Library Staff Development Conference. Jeff Murray reported that the meeting will be held in Adelaide 22-23 June, and recommended that members send their deputies and high achievers – to focus on the RQF, national research agenda, changing role of libraries and librarians. There will be ample time for sharing and group work, and to compare notes on current projects. Very good feedback was received from the last conference. UTS feedback was that it was pitched too low. Members asked if there was value in repeat attendance.

**Advocacy & Communication**

732. **Copyright.** A report from Eve Woodberry was circulated with the agenda, together with a letter from the ALCC outlining their workplan. This item was not discussed.
733. Relationships with other Organisations.

a) *CONZUL.* Sue Pharo passed on Gail Pattie’s apologies and best wishes. She reported that New Zealand now has a new minister for education who will negotiate a funding model with each university and will separate further education more clearly; several changes in CONZUL membership, now that there are not as many deputy librarians; the national storage project didn’t get government funding but is moving ahead with a business plan; have decided on a location and that it would be a last copy store; ownership and governance are under discussion; many multi-sectoral projects; Ainslie Dewe reported that CONZUL has appointed Craigie Sinclair as their new executive assistant; working on institutional repositories projects; ALCONZ is looking at opportunities for multi-institutional repositories; ADT has nominated representatives on policy and technical committees; products in latest EPIC round include Grove, ProQuest Science, OED, Britannica; ULANZ is operating very well in its first year; only one university won’t lend to others; there is no library representation on the e-learning reference group, content overlooked in e-learning models; national content strategy is being worked on by the National Library; asking for funding along the lines of the UK’s people’s network; encouraging the uncoupling of telecoms infrastructure and service; WSIS outcomes reflected library issues because of Winston Tabb’s contribution; the next CONZUL meeting is at AUT on April 27-28.

b) *Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee.* John Mullarvey, Chief Executive Officer, addressed members. The discussion is appended to these minutes.

c) Australian Digital Alliance / Australian Libraries Copyright Committee.

d) CAUDIT.

i) *EDUCAUSE 2007.* April 29 to May 1. Melbourne. Derek Whitehead reported that the program committee is aiming to have a draft program by August and call for papers – send suggestions to Angela Bridgland or Anne Horn.

e) ACODE.

f) National Library of Australia.

i) *Libraries Australia (Kinetica).* A report from Linda Luther was included with the papers.

ii) *Libraries Australia (Kinetica).* Andrew Wells outlined the Executive’s discussion with the National Library on the allocation of the set amount they expect to recover from university libraries. The total amount is based on the amount currently being spent by the sector, and the NLA suggested that CAUL decide on the cost allocation. They proposed a breakdown based on total library budget. Several allocation models were drawn up, based on tiers of EFTSU and library materials budgets, and tabled for discussion. It was noted that whichever model was used, there were big winners and big losers, even if it is phased in over time. Comments included:

(1) what are we paying for – a bibliographic utility; a document delivery service; a reference and finding tool; it was noted that being able to trace and deliver a book from a second-hand bookshop is a great service;

(2) how are we using it; it was noted that the free interface doesn't have much functionality, but libraries may ask for the fully-featured interface which can be tailored for each university and allow students to have their own accounts; the bibliographic utility is being used less over time as records are obtained from SerialsSolutions and other vendors; some larger users have reduced their costs significantly over the past few years as a result of changing practices; changes for universities are likely to be more significant than those for CASL; there are other competitors for document delivery services;

(3) recognise the national bibliographic database as a national asset which is important to retain; there is a level of commitment as the alternatives are expensive; important
to have an efficient document delivery system; it is a major contribution to the public good;

(4) the database hasn’t been updated since October and usage reports are lacking; it was noted that there is no service level agreement in the institutional contracts;

(5) there is no business plan, no cost analysis or indication of what other sectors are paying; how has the NLA arrived at total cost for the sector; it was noted that the bulk of LA costs are paid by its institutional users; it is not clear whether the NLA considers universities as customers or partners – there was no recognition of the financial or content contribution by universities to LA either at the launch or in any of the following press;

(6) a ten year plan might be considered optimistic as the environment may have changed significantly by then;

(7) the current model is based on a flat fee with a discount for contributing records; it is moving to a subscription model, away from a transaction-based model; any usage-based model is a disincentive to use, so support a model based on usage surrogate, such as EFTSU; it was suggested using a combination of EFTSU and materials budget in the model; (Action: DC) any formula needs to minimise changes; incorporate a factor for capacity to pay; AARNet uses a model based on usage + capacity to pay (university revenue) + size (EFTSU) + proportion of nation’s research funding;

(8) LA operates on a financial year subscription cycle (which does not suit most universities); it is not necessary to make a decision for the 2006/7 year, but if there is going to be a significant change for 2007/8 then it will need to be in the 2007 budget process, which may start as early as July; the default is the current model;

(9) in previous correspondence, the NLA committed to decreased costs when moving from transaction-based costs to a site licence; this appears to have lasted for only one year; increases should be no more than CPI;

(10) each institution has a contract with the NLA, pays in quarterly instalments plus document delivery charges; there is concern about being charged as a sector – there may be more value in negotiating individually; it is appreciated that the NLA brought this to CAUL but the proposal is inflexible;

(11) CEIRC models are based on a negotiated price and cost per institution, then each institution chooses to opt in; it doesn’t need to be handled by CEIRC even if working with CEIRC-type models; the NLA has not suggested a single invoice for CAUL; the NLA assumes that all members would continue to subscribe; an option is to switch to OCLC;

(12) a way forward – negotiate a term of agreement; negotiate a price; identify cost allocation model; share the cost fairly;

(13) a way forward – communicate the issues to the NLA; confirm the nature of the relationship with the NLA; confirm whether the payment is for infrastructure or service; obtain more information about services and costs, including fixed and variable costs, and the costing strategy vs the pricing strategy; no commitment to charging as a sector. (Action: Executive)

Linda Luther asked members to direct more feedback via their representatives on the Kinetica Advisory Committee, especially when papers were circulated; it was noted that many of the papers were confidential to the KAC and therefore not available to CAUL members.

g) QULOC. A report from Heather Gordon was included in the papers. This item was not discussed.

734. Forthcoming Meetings

a) CAUL Meeting 2006/2. Perth, in conjunction with ALIA 2006. This item was not discussed

b) *CAUL Meeting 2007/1. It was noted that CAUL meetings generally held early April and September or early October, but holding it in conjunction with the EDUCAUSE meeting, April 29 to May 1, would result in a later meeting. CAUL, CAUDIT and ACODE
are sponsors of the conference and may also participate as speakers and session chairs. Enough members indicated that they would attend EDUCAUSE so it was decided to hold the CAUL meeting immediately following EDUCAUSE in Melbourne. It was suggested including some ACODE agenda in the CAUL agenda, perhaps a hot topic on learning and teaching.

c) **CAUL Meeting 2007/2.** It was proposed that the meeting be held in Adelaide. Helen Livingston offered to host at the University of South Australia in October, 2007. *(Action: DC)*

**CAUL Administration**

735. **CAUL Finances.** A report from Diane Costello was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

a) **CAUL Budget 2005.** The expenditure report for 2005 end-of-year was tabled at the meeting, to supplement the September report included in the papers. This item was not discussed.

b) **CAUL Budget 2006.** The expenditure report for 2006 to date was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

i) **CAUL Research Fund.** The fund was accumulated through a levy in 2004. The only proposal received to date was both beyond the means of the fund, and required further definition. Derek Whitehead outlined a proposal to draw on data currently being collected to describe better changing usage and user behaviours. The presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/stats/caul20061dw.ppt](http://www.caul.edu.au/stats/caul20061dw.ppt)

He noted that most current understanding is based on folklore, and asked members to advise him of the data they are collecting which may be able to be used more broadly. *(Action: All)* Examples included: loans, which can be mined to show the rates of lending across borrower categories, which service points, active users (high proportions of TAFE students are inactive users); EZProxy can capture what is being used by whom – more useful than COUNTER data which doesn’t match users with use; can compare usage of individual databases against others; can compare sign-on data to library computers with occupied seats; TrafficProX counts users at a range of entrances, service points, and areas within libraries, and can be monitored centrally.

Members reported a range of data collection processes: Swinburne no longer collects data at information desks on an ongoing basis – data is collected in much greater detail for one week in each semester and extrapolated against traffic counts over the semester; QUT is trying to develop KPIs for the degree of “embeddedness” of information literacy – aiming for fewer people in classes, preferring to embed the training in the curriculum; aiming for greater automation of data collection rather than staff counts; Macquarie is examining intensity of use – loans/collection, and different ways of using the data we already have – the information will be shared with members *(Action: MB)*; Monash has developed a procedure to handle vendor reports of suspected over-use (abuse) of licensed databases – the information will be shared with members *(Action: CH-R)*; UTS is scoping a data mining project, examining what can be extracted from systems – the information will be shared with members *(Action: FDL)*. Derek Whitehead will draft a specification for the project. *(Action: DW)*

736. **Executive Officer’s Report.** A report from Diane Costello was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

737. **Other business.**

The meeting closed at 2.35pm
CAUL Strategic Planning - Canberra - 6 April, 2006 - General Discussion

Topics addressed include:

a. the Research Quality Framework (RQF);
b. internationalisation;
c. the changing nature of students and their requirements – how students work internationally; how they seek and use information; how to create spaces for learning; workforce and succession planning;
d. continuing financial stringency – how the modern university is managed, the comparison with the commercial sector, financial models and organisation, the value proposition of the university library, the library's accountability to the university of the 5% of its budget;
e. does the library have to be in the library?;
f. what are students doing when they are in the library? - using computers, consequences for books and print, consequences for staffing; the changing nature of the use of space;
g. the changing nature of the role of the library staff in providing support for changing behaviours;
h. the concept of library as contributor to learning and research outcomes, rather than the library as space;
i. the need for hard data to prove that the library is performing well, to demonstrate its value;
j. the move from resources and technology into behaviour – the complete change of focus, new ways of using information, how resources are used, how the library is facilitating use;
k. providing leadership in the information strategy of the university;
l. focus on what 40 libraries can do together rather than those that cannot be productively done;
m. review external perceptions – where goals are unrealistic, focus on those that can be done productively or work in smaller groups, CAUL may be seen as peripheral because work within QULOC and LATN may be more relevant, where can CAUL add value;
n. the current themes in the strategic plan don’t address these sectoral groups - should they be amended or added to;
o. focus on the relationship with the AVCC and other groups within the environment – university groupings such as the ATN, international organisations;
p. CEIRC is currently working very well but may need a sunset clause;
q. CAUL should continue to speak as one voice on issues such as copyright and public policy where there is less influence in state and sectoral groups;
r. with the great emphasis on quality, it is important to keep benchmarking;
s. Professor Chubb’s emphasis on partnerships and collaboration was noted;
t. continuing value in sharing information – historically, CAUL has made a point of this, better knowledge of the wider sector among libraries than other areas of universities, important to filter and feed information out to the universities;
u. the British Library commissioned a study on the value of the British Library to the economy - CAUL should do the same;
v. quality should be embedded in all activities;
w. need to “tangibilise” what CAUL does – relate better what CAUL does, make the contribution clearer, highlight achievements eg ULA;
x. CAUL surveys are very beneficial;
y. are new measures or new methodologies need for measuring value to the university;
z. other institutions ask to join CAUL – there is benefit in being closely defined;
aa. CAUL has “brand recognition” and is approached by other organisations for contribution, input, views, representation.
CAUL Strategic Planning - Canberra - 6 April, 2006 - Group Notes

I. Best Practice Group - Vic Elliott reported.


Strengths:
- CEIRC
- ULA
- Information sharing
- Copyright
- Contribution to public policy
- Quality / Statistics / Benchmarking

Home for everyone – it was noted that not all universities belong to a group such as LATN.

Issues
- Plan itself to serve as an advocacy tool / presentation
- Address public / institutional policy issues – proactive as well as reactive
- Accept diversity of interest and institutional nature
- Enable professional workforce skills development across HE sector (belongs in best practice category) (*gap in current plan)

Best Practice
- Category in itself or essential layer with other categories (e.g. teaching and learning, research) – recommend keeping it as a separate category
- Best practice is not the best name/term (quality management?)
- Should include administrative/management practices

Goal
- OK but “world class” is the wrong term
- Emphasis on need to perform (and measure performance) in line with international standards

Rationale
- Add international context (in terms of competitiveness)
- Demonstration of ability to add value

[£363 million a year knowledge dividend to UK economy - UK national library reveals results of ground-breaking research 10 December 2003 :: Posted by British Library Press & Public Relations (UK)]

Operating within tight fiscal and administrative constraints

Objectives
- Statistics
- Benchmarking (omit “facilitate”, this is just sharing information)
- Sharing of management and planning information – often within or out of sectoral / regional groups.

NEW Objective:
- Professional skills (workforce) development essential in rapidly changing information infrastructure environment
- Shift of emphasis from inputs to outcome measurement (building of value frameworks) – show the value of doing x, y, z
- CAUL to contribute to national / international development of relevant quality measures

Actions (Ongoing):
- Statistics Collection
- Conduct of surveys
- Development, etc, of performance indicators (use “agreed measures” instead of “indicators”)
- Annual review of CAUL performance belongs somewhere else.
- OMIT –
  - technical / topic framework – done
  - Review CAUL statistical measures – should be an ongoing action
  - review customer satisfaction survey – done
develop LI RS quality measure *(being done by UNISON, accepted by CAUL later in the meeting)*
review document delivery indicators (to be done, but not exclusively by CAUL)
**NEW:**
Establish workgroup to investigate and contribute to workforce planning
Develop outcome / impact measures (as distinct from input measures)
(only 2 new actions, given the number of ongoing/continuing actions)

should embed best practice rather separate? differing opinions
risk if embedding then would need to repeat,
some overarching concern e.g. workforce planning is a weakness, so better to keep separate
AUQA talks more about quality assurance
which international standards are we talking about
embedding is the ultimate goal, but until it is, need to keep it in front
need performance indicators in the whole plan otherwise how do we know when we get there
for all sections of the plan, how do we know when we have completed the actions
restructure under advocacy, communication and management as a single category rather than two?
not a single international standard, but should be measured in the international context?

II.  **Communication** - Jeff Murray reported.

Group members:  Jeff Murray, John Shipp, Ray Choate, Maxine Brodie, Helen Livingston, Ainslie Dewe, Laura Maquignaz, Madeleine McPherson, Anne Horn

**Recommendation - to rename as advocacy, communication and management**

should reflect CAUL being proactive rather than reactive
need to keep best practice as a topic because this is also a government priority
the relationship with CAUDIT is very important
learn from CAUDIT and workforce issues and recruiting

**This goal could be called something else**

- We felt the title is appropriate - re-sorted the order

**Tangibilise**

- What is our value and how do we demonstrate it

**Constantly scan the environment**

- Filter

**CAUL is a good brand and should continue to promote this**

**DEST and others should be encouraged to ring CAUL**

- The splintering of the AVCC has not been good for anyone.

**CAUL should make comment on**

- Copyright
- Scholarly communication things
- Information infrastructure
  - Content, connection and capability
  - Research capacity
- Guidelines for the support of offshore students
- Information literacy
- Graduate qualities
- High level international issues
- Business continuity and risk management
- What life would be like without Libraries
CAUL communication will be proactive
- However CAUL should remember its station and be sensitive to diplomatic relations with other groups i.e. Vice Chancellors
- Take people offline pay them to do a study

CAUL should communicate sensitively to new members
- Continue the welcome "package"
- Continue to introduce new members to the group

The communication roles within CAUL require definition and succession planning
- i.e. copyright

CAUL should work with other groups and not repeat efforts that are consistent with our objects
- SCONUL
- CAUDIT
- CARL
- CONZUL

Mechanisms
- Interactive communication may be useful depending on the workload of members
  - Wikis, Blogs
  - Web site - losing material over time, however is a good store for information

Audiences
- Each other
- Government bodies
- University groups
- External groups

Language
- Mandarin for librarians?

Comments on the plan
- Achieve balance of the higher order moving forward and what we are going to deliver

Other matters
Should CAUL’s strategic plan include a strategy that we will be somehow involved in Asia?
- Study tours are successful
  - India
  - Thailand
  - International exchange should be explored
  - Although there is a growing questions mark about the viability of twinning arrangements

CAUL is facing a change in the profession and will welcome people from a variety of backgrounds into the group
- Our processes need to accommodate this

CAUL will need to be actively involved in succession planning and getting the right people into the profession

Internationalisation of the workforce is an issue requiring some strategies
- Brain drain

111. Teaching and Learning - Derek Whitehead reported.
Group members: Derek Whitehead, Angela Bridgland, Ralph Kiel, Earle Gow, Fides Datu Lawton, Gaynor Austen, Heather Gordon, Anita Crotty, Shirley Oakley, Sue Pharo.
Very little CAUL work really fits into the learning and teaching space but we need to keep it in the plan - most things are done locally and don't really involve CAUL more widely. However, the group did consider aspects of the goal, as follows

**Heading:** Change to Learning and Teaching  
**Goal:** Words were discussed, but not a coherent answer. "Promote and facilitate the role of the library in achieving effective learning" perhaps.  
**Rationale:** not discussed  
**Objectives:** Not discussed  
**Actions** (wording is mine, content is from the group)

1. Continue to refine and clarify protocols for the streamlined operation of University Library Australia – the national borrowing scheme – and other forms of reciprocal use (ULA Working Group). The core goal is to agree upon and implement a common program.

2. Work with ANZIIL to promote information literacy amongst CAUL members and more widely. The group was sceptical about whether we need both the CAUL group, and ANZIIL in information literacy - leadership has been assumed by ANZIIL. The role of CAUL needs to be discussed further. There was a later discussion which also noted that the members of ANZIIL and the CAUL working party overlap considerably; the idea was put though not discussed that we not refer to the CAUL standards, since they also operate in TAFE. There is only one thing left on the agenda of the CAUL information literacy group, which is to finalise the instrument. However, information literacy is a big part of what we all do - the working group may need redefining.

3. Continue development of guidelines, standards and model conditions for the operation of service delivery in partnership with other agencies and institutions, both offshore and within Australia. The group agreed that the guidelines are useful, need further development, and are relevant to onshore partnerships was well as offshore - the same quality principles apply to library services provided by partner institutions or commercial entities.

4. Work with ACODE in our shared spaces including content management and related standards and protocols. The group agreed generally that there were shared spaces, and that we needed to work together.

5. Foster and encourage research into library involvement in teaching & learning. CAUL needs to collaborate with library schools and other research entity to get relevant research done.

6. The library as space – as important as ever – CAUL has a role is sharing information, which is a significant one. However much of the work in this area will inevitably be local.

7. Course materials support by libraries is essential - the group was not clear as to the role for CAUL except in the areas of best practice, standards, common approaches e.g. policies on providing textbooks, on online reserve etc - issues for exploration.

8. Graduate attributes are important - we need to have library input though we are not the main players

The group also agreed that the best practice layer, whether treated as a different goal or not, is very important to learning and teaching. Perhaps most of the work CAUL does in relation to learning and teaching relates to best practice tools, guidelines, and shared knowledge. Key topics within the best practice area - such as statistics, Rodski, reciprocal access - are about learning and teaching and their support. These are all areas in which we do well - including fairly extensive benchmarking amongst CAUL members.
IV. Research - Craig Anderson reported.
Group members: Andrew Wells, Mary Lyons, Janice Rickards, Margaret Jones, Craig Anderson, Des Stewart, Chris Sheargold, Jan Gordon, Felicity McGregor

Goal
- Use research life cycle as the key concept
- Needs to be broader than access to research resources – cover dissemination, curation etc

Suggest Several Goals
- Promoting research through institutional repositories
- Data management with research life cycle.
- Leadership in information management strategy.

Concepts/Actions
- RQF – how little academics know about research agenda.
- E-Research Co-ordinating Committee.
- Relationship with CAUDIT.
- Consciousness and awareness raising.
- Data management plan – with the E-Research Centre.

“E-Research 101”
- Our skills are around organisation of data management.
- Digitisation:
  - Strategy at national level.
  - Presentation issues.
  - Sustainability of hybrid library.
- CEIRC
- ADT – next thing e.g. IRN? [Institutional Repository Network]
- Research training:
  - Exchange of best practice?
  - Support e.g. Endnote?
- Relationship with DDOGS, CAPA, DRES?
- Open access (part of ADT metamorphosis).

Teaching and Learning

Goal
- Looks like old-fashioned view of libraries as supporting.
- More active statement needed.
- More “partnership” than “contribution”.

Actions
- Benchmarking space for learning environment.
- How to package Teaching and Learning support for a mobile/remote population e.g. everything that requires face-to-face - how do we do for remote users? E.g. a lot of work in information packaging and information presentation.
- Review of offshore guidelines.
- Standards/guidelines for Teaching and Learning support in twinning arrangements, particularly where services are outsourced (Margaret Jones’ idea).
- Relationship with ACODE – skills acquisition/capabilities in learning environment, IMS for Academics. Can they use the tools?
Best Practice

- Will there be a group?
- Current plan has no performance indicators in BP.
- Rodski is fragmenting.
- Have not got far in benchmarking PIs.
- This area more important than ever.
- ROI
- Statistics are critical.
- BP WG adds value by looking at the whole.
- Look at a different approach?
- Commission work only if we are serious and we are going to use workplace planning.
- Need to have staff development in plan – WAGUL/ LATN work.
- Look at CAUDIT work in recruitment

now has more of an explicit focus, especially with the RQF, learning and teaching performance fund put in place
research life cycle is important, other matters hang off it
data management - we need to be an information strategy and management leader
promotion of research – is this the library's job
promoting general directions of research
promoting our universities' research to the world
digitisation - national strategy would be useful
practical - e.g. EndNote proposal
relationships - DDOGS, CAPA, CAUDIT and ACODE
continuation and importance of CEIRC
an extension of ADT- carry the philosophy re institutional repositories and datasets
current objectives are very applicable, and same with objectives, change projects under it
existing goal is about maximising access to data, need to broaden, depends on relationships with other organisation e.g. CAUDIT and ERCC and NCRIS
kinds of skills needed to do this work need to be clarified
need sunset clause for ADT
Monash completing research support plan – very well received is much higher level of engagement in information literacy for research students – need to be expressed more explicitly in research not just teaching and learning. research has shown that it helps students complete their research more quickly.

Mission
more about outreach, especially for CAUL, not just provision of resources
CAUL Strategic Planning - Canberra - 7 April, 2006 - General Discussion

Members were asked to focus on strategic themes, mission, actions.

CAUL participation in the National Licensing Proposal.

Heather Gordon drew attention to the CEIRC report to review and determine the level of interest in the national licensing proposal in preparation for the forum in July. In September CAUL agreed to stay in the reference group - to commit to the process but with no commitment to participation. It was reaffirmed that CAUL members should only participate in any product offer if they considered it of value to their institution. It was suggested that alumni access could be a sufficient reason for participating. It was suggested that an example of a product that members might purchase would be APAIS (by shifting funds currently spent on it), but if the public libraries bought in, why would the universities need to?

The governance model was circulated and John Shipp and QULOC provided comments. There is concern about using CAUL's resources, an operational more than a financial issue - CAUL will readily share its expertise and assist in setting it up. If CAUL does not wish to commit additional resources then it should decide this before the forum. It should also decide whether to include it in the strategic plan.

The senate committee recommended identifying resources, but the process has gone a lot further. It was noted that New Zealand relies on the universities for EPIC to succeed. CONZUL maintains its in-principle support. Australia's federal structure makes the process even more difficult, but CAUL should not anticipate failure by withdrawing the current level of support.

It was agreed not to include it in the strategic plan but to stay involved in the establishment process as agreed at the last meeting. CAUL will decide whether to commit any resources to participate in the governance group. (Action: HG, DC)

CAUL strategic themes.

It was noted that ARL includes research with learning and teaching because the former often flows into the latter - there is often not much included on the agenda for learning and teaching. It was decided to keep separate, even though not clearly separate, because the universities do - research training may fit into the other, but mostly separate. Learning and teaching may receive less attention if combined with research.
APPENDIX I

John Mullarvey, Chief Executive Officer, Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee

Priorities of the AVCC - most important is the relationship with the government, the new minister, trying to consolidate the relationship and the cabinet. Further priority is the research quality framework; quality is key for the Australian and overseas governments. The government wants to know how to guarantee the quality - cost is less an issue.

Need to be able to show the economic benefit of higher education to the nation. Some papers in government indicate that the benefit is in reducing government contributions and moving to private e.g. HECS contributions; that universities don't make any contribution as a result of government contributions but rather because of private contributions. What should the AVCC do in a policy statement for the next federal election.

The government claims that the economy has been booming as student contributions have increased - so why should they spend more money. All Australia’s major competitors are spending and increasing contribution, but it is an argument that is not persuasive to this government.

Impact of workplace relationships reform - what do universities have to do to get the 7½% increase available from the government. What additional changes in workplace relations or governance for universities to get access to the full amount of money. There is a rumour that the government may be looking for quotas of AWA’s.

Universities need to spend more time ensuring that data collection is more rigorous, especially for the teaching and learning performance fund, to ensure that it is equitable across the sector.

The new protocols will come into place in January 2007, and some universities may find it difficult if the government doesn’t provide funded places or more research money, so the RQF will simply redistribute money.

Review of support mechanisms for students. The AVCC will repeat the survey this year and attempt a complete rethink rather than tinkering with the current models. It will need good data to do this properly.

A shift from State to Federal responsibility for higher education is high on the agenda of the new minister. It has already thrown been out by MCEETYA. The AVCC prefers the dual approach, no matter who is in power. There has been a substantial increase in regulation since the Crossroads review with an increasing amount and frequency of changes in the reporting. The AVCC will argue for administrative changes and will handle the policy changes later.

In a new paper on the Bologna process, 45 European countries will move to 3 year undergraduate degrees, 2 year masters, proper quality control, etc the Australian system has some variations e.g. honours degrees, some 4 year undergraduate degrees. The question is - should the Australian system move closer? A big issue is wider recognition of Australian qualifications, especially in this region. If the Bologna process helps this, then it could be an advantage.

A communiqué was issued from the AEI forum held in Brisbane this year, from 21 ministers and vice ministers of education from the Pacific region, with a desire for more transparent student mobility – a big issue for library services. The minister is keen to press ahead with international engagement, but appears more interested in enhancing what is already in place, than opening new universities overseas.

The Attorney-General's review accepted most of the AVCC's arguments on fair dealing, including those on education licences. The major issue in the current schools case is the CAL view that schools should not have access to data. If students are given instructions to view a website - CAL argues that this is remunerable. The current AVCC access agreement runs to 2007 currently costing the sector $20m. $100m is rumoured to be CAL's starting point, and the AVCC would recommend returning to record-keeping.

The ScreenRights agreement is running smoothly. Five universities are not participating.

Technological Protection Measures Report - the AVCC will meet the Attorney-General soon and press for the government to implement its recommendations.
Research Quality Framework. It is not clear whether there will be one. More money is needed for the implementation and for the base infrastructure. The Development Advisory Group does not include any employee of any university. Ian Davie is the AVCC's nominee.

Productivity Commission Review of Public Support for Science and Innovation. A Treasury paper says there is no economic benefit to Australia in adding more to research & development. The AVCC needs to produce the evidence that the sector is of benefit to Australia, not just the universities.

The minister has moved away from external interference in ARC grant approvals and back to peer review. The bill before parliament will remove the ARC board and leave the decisions in the hands of the CEO who is appointed by government. The college of experts is of concern, regarding government interference.

There are claims that graduates are useless in industry – mostly from small business who don’t wish to train employee. It is difficult to get any business support in arguments to government.

ESOS standards will become public for a three week period in May, for publication in June, so there will not be much time for review. The document goes into great detail, including examples of evidence e.g. all students to receive an offer in writing, and have to have a copy on file, providing lounges for students. All sectors have different arrangements which haven’t been taken into account.

Transnational quality framework. There will be more data collection and a question re library services provided to overseas students. The government is looking at a quality framework different from AUQA.

Skilled migration. Amid concern that overseas students can get a degree without being able to speak or communicate effectively in English, it is proposed that all students should take an English language test before they graduate, including local students.

Response to Questions

There are likely to be AUQA changes as a result of the current review. MCEETYA is reviewing AUQA later this year. There is a view that AUQA should disappear but would be replaced by something else. It should look more closely at overseas services. A quality statement will be published by the AVCC in May. If an off-shore university results in an Australian qualification then it should be subject to AUQA. The AVCC does not support whole-of-country audit for each sector, because others shouldn’t be tarnished just because one member is not performing. The process should not be separate from AUQA just because it is overseas.

What evidence is there that Australian quality is less than it should be? AVCC has been concerned about student staff ratios, students who are unable to speak English fluently when they return home, the perception that a reduction of government results in reduced quality. AUQA reports have been generally very positive, but are a result of large amounts of work done by universities in preparation for the review. League tables are generally less relevant in shaping opinion. Encouraging students to stay here as skilled migrants is not regarded well in some countries.

There has been a dip in preliminary numbers this year, as always happens when the economy is booming. The government claims it is because of the inflexibility of universities. Overall there has been a reasonably steady growth. AVCC does argue for diversity, but the government argues for the same through regulation – universities cannot change their course load easily because of regulation. It is a matter for individual universities.

The first round of the RQF would not lead to a significant redistribution of resources – quality research and impact (which hasn’t been done anywhere in the world so weight given initially will be small, and this is the one that will cause most redistribution of resources). If the model is wrong, it could be significantly negative for the sector, particularly for the excellent research in the smaller universities.
APPENDIX II.

Professor Ian Chubb, Vice-Chancellor of the Australian National University

Professor Chubb is one of the three longest serving vice-chancellors in Australia. He highlighted changes over the last twenty years:

- Student contribution to their education, from $25,000 to $200,000 at the end of their degrees;
- Student expectations have changed widely;
- In spite of comments the quality of students is much better than they used to be;
- A degree no longer guarantees a job;
- The government no longer provides adequate maximal support for teaching and research in our universities;
- No longer can any university in Australia do everything that needs to be done, or can be done, on its own; students and community need things that neither can do as well on their own – ANU and USyd collaborating e.g. number of small enrolment courses in languages; split PhD programs; arrangements with overseas universities;
- Less joining larger groups of universities; being more selective; more bilateral agreements; suggests this also applies to libraries;
- The unpredictability of funding is the most difficult to manage; no safety net adjustment for 6 or 7 years; how long before efficiency and effectiveness is threatened; will only give universities more money if they consider it is earned but don’t know how that is; we can respond better if we are better organised;

Responses to Questions:

- Sharing joint storage doesn’t impact on competition; not material to getting the best students as long as they get access to what they need;
- Cooperation is difficult to achieve without some autonomy at the university level and the library level; much autonomy has been given up over time; would be happy to hand over autonomy to a well-organised, well-structured group to manage a central infrastructure; proper decision making with formal protocols which were unambiguously followed; if set properly should work; don’t need a representative from every institution; couldn’t be too collegial or wouldn’t work.
- How many students do we need? Is it sensible that the cost of each science student should be the same no matter which university they go to or what infrastructure is provided or the density of the student population, etc. these questions aren’t being asked, and we need to in order to convince the government that the sector is of value.
- Too many issues are being handled piecemeal rather than strategically; what are the consequences of not making the tough decisions; what are the consequences of the sector’s not being represented as a whole overseas;
- Go8 welcomed the RQF initiative, but it needs to be a real measure of real quality, not to introduce more surrogate measures; to fund quality wherever it is found and in whatever quantity; Go8 has most to lose and less to gain; do you fund retrospective or potential, not those who had done good research but who could? The ARC funds potential; funds are allocated to the present and recent past; impact on the academic community is quality; impact is important even if you can’t measure it? Is it worth to put 20% into impact? The RQF issues paper is a camel, which won’t lead to constructive outcomes; only looks at four published papers over six years; need sensibly defensible international benchmarks.
1383. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells, Derek Whitehead, Jeff Murray, Cathrine Harboe-Ree (Deputy President). In attendance: Diane Costello

1384. Minutes of the previous Executive Meeting, 2006/1, 6 February 2006. Approved.
   a) JISC issues call to preserve online journals & ARL Endorses Call for Action to Preserve E-journals. ICOLC has committed to discuss potential strategies and actions at its next meeting in 2006. Diane Costello will report back. (Action: DC) See also Item on Portico. Cathrine Harboe-Ree suggested that we should try to get funding for a joint JSTOR storage plan. Andrew Wells will include this in the discussion for Research for the strategic plan. (Action: AW)
   b) CAUL Research Levy. Derek Whitehead will scope a project for the use of data already collected in libraries. He will raise for discussion at the CAUL meeting. (Action: DW)
   c) Center for Research Libraries. Anne Horn met with a CRL representative at IFLA, and made a report available to the Go8. Andrew Wells will follow up. (Action: AW) Monash is reporting to Go8. USD 13,000 per year provides voting rights on which content will be digitised in coming years. Monash will try to negotiate on price. (Action: CH-R)

1385. CAUL Membership
   a) USQ. Alan Smith has taken on the title of Executive Director, Division of Academic Information Services, and USQ is not planning to reinstate the University Librarian's position.
   b) Applications for CAUL membership. CAUL's membership is currently very well defined and external bodies know what CAUL is and what it stands for. CAUL has links with DEST and the AVCC and there is value in that brand recognition. CAUL should consider whether an expanded membership would strengthen it and add value. Is there a role for associate membership? Applicants for CAUL membership are usually seeking information and professional colleagues. The current membership definition could become difficult if the definition of university became blurred. CONZUL's financial contribution to CAUL is not attached to any kind of membership.
      The CEIRC program is already available to external institutions. Diane Costello maintains an email list for information from and about CAUL.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1386. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). Members discussed how the planning sessions should run:
   Are the four areas currently defined the best to continue with? What areas are not covered because of the age of the current plan? International relationships? The impact of overseas campuses?
   When members break into the four groups, work on the strategies and actions, then address any of the other three areas. The other organisations' strategic plans may provide some guidance. Don't concentrate on word-smithing. Work at a very practical level for the next few
years. Focus on what CAUL should be doing as opposed to the individual institutions. Focus on goals because the old ones tend to be narrow.

The aim of the session is to arrive at a goal, some strategies and some actions. Nominate a rapporteur for each group. Encourage members to clarify what they want CAUL should be doing and can do, rather than what needs to be done.

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1387. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). Derek Whitehead circulated a report for the CAUL meeting.

1388. FRODO Projects.
   a) ARROW. Cathrine Harboe-Ree.
   b) MAMS. Eve Woodberry reported that the project was beginning to connect to other ARIIC projects.

1389. MERRI Projects.
   a) MAPS Project. Jeff Murray will report on MAPS at the CAUL meeting.
   b) RUBRIC Project. Eve Woodberry.

1390. E-Research Coordinating Committee. Cathrine Harboe-Ree has prepared a presentation for the CAUL meeting. ERCC is a joint ministerial committee. NCRIS is a single ministerial committee. The 16th area is a collaboration platform, to be headed by Rhys Francis from CSIRO. It is not clear whether funding will be available.

ARIIC may be wound up in 2006. The proposed eResearch centre (with 7 nodes) may have some focus on data management issues. There may be some funding for skills development, eResearch scholarships, perhaps in eResearch methods, and for personnel moving between a single discipline and informatics.

1391. Bibliometrics Workshop. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that the workshop will go forward as library staff are being drawn into bibliometrics but do not have the necessary skills and tools. CAVAL is also running workshops and there may be some overlap, but the CAUL workshop will focus more on CAUL’s requirements. CAUL could co-fund the venue and expenses with DEST. It will be aimed at the university librarian or the person in the library who needs to engage in the citation analysis. CAUL members may bring relevant personnel from their own institution. (Action: AW) It was noted that the institutional analysis and reporting office at UNSW is being given the same weight as the research office.

1392. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). Diane Costello reported that Thomson Scientific would like CAUL’s view on which ANZ journals should be included in Web of Science. It was suggested that Linda Butler should know which would best advantage Australian researchers, and how to capture information about the most highly valued journals? (Action: DC) It was agreed that it is desirable for academics to be the major determinants. The procedures used by Thomson Scientific to determine which journals to include will be clarified. (Action: DC) Other sources of ANZ refereed journals may be DEST and Ulrich’s.

   a) National Licensing Working Group. It was noted that CAUL’s commitment has been significant, in CAUL staff time and travel costs for Heather Gordon.
   b) Portico. The mission of Portico <http://www.portico.org/> is to preserve scholarly literature published in electronic form and to ensure that these materials remain accessible to future scholars, researchers, and students. Initial support for Portico is provided by The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, Ithaka, The Library of Congress, and JSTOR. Andrew Wells reported that UNSW will join as an insurance policy.

1393. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells reported Tom Ruthven will start as ADT manager in the near future.
CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING
MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

1394. AVCC Library Staff Development Program. 22-23 June, 2006 in Adelaide. Jeff Murray will report to the CAUL meeting, and encourage members to send senior staff. It was agreed that Diane Costello should attend.  (Action: JM, DC)

1395. Statistics. CAVAL’s and CAUL’s statistics email lists have been combined to simplify communication with the universities’ contacts, and enabling CAUL’s email archive to be used.

1396. Library MIS Workshop. Jeff Murray, Derek Whitehead and Diane Costello.  (Action: DC)

COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY

1397. Communication. (Standing item)
   a) President’s Report. Eve Woodberry attended ALIA’s CIP meeting, and visited the AVCC and Sue Hutley, ALIA’s new Executive Director. Sue is focussing on education and marketing, under the presidency of Dagmar Schmidmaier.
   b) Public Relations/ Media Reports.
   c) CAUL Report.
   d) Executive Officer’s Report. The report is included in the CAUL meeting agenda papers.

1398. Copyright. Eve Woodberry reported that John Mullarvey had asked universities to be careful not to include non-remunerable copying in the surveys. He suggests that if a satisfactory agreement is not reached with CAL, he may recommend that universities go back to record-keeping. It is possible that CAL will use the open access debate to open up a new avenue for licences. The copyright agenda will be busy in the next year.

Monash is planning to capture local publications for their institutional repository, though not for publicly exposure. They will later seek concurrence from Elsevier and other publishers. Monash aims for a complete repository which can turn on content as soon as approval is received, which may be immediate or may be two years.

   a) ADA AGM 9 March 2005. Derek Whitehead

1399. Submissions to Public Inquiries.
   a) Productivity Commission. Science and Innovation Study. Andrew Wells will draft a submission. He will contact the commission to discuss its relationship to the work we are doing. It is not clear whether they will take NCRIS and other such programs into account.  (Action: AW)
   b) AVCC-NHMRC code. A CAUL response has been submitted. It supports communication of research to the wider public. It recommends that the status of publication should be clearly identified e.g. working paper, preliminary results – rather than wait until it has been published or approved by the institution.  it was noted that many of CAUL’s comments on the first draft had been included.
   c) NCRIS. National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy.
      • A single national proposal (in each of the priority capability areas) will be developed through a designated facilitator or coordinating bodies as outlined in the NCRIS Roadmap. More information on the facilitators for the individual capabilities and the details of the proposal development process will be made available shortly.
      • March 2006: The Investment Framework is anticipated to be released. It will explain in detail how the NCRIS programme will be implemented.
      • March – September 2006: Preparation of funding proposals
      • Late 2006: Proposals assessed, funding agreements and business plans negotiated and funding approved
1400. Sponsorship & Trade Shows. A recent invitation from the New Librarians Symposium organisers highlighted the fact that CAUL doesn't have a position on sponsorship or presence at trade shows. Members discussed possible reasons for hosting a trade booth e.g. to attract staff into CAUL libraries. Students seem to think that it is too difficult to find employment in academic libraries, even for base grade librarians. Many may employ non-librarians because they cannot find enough librarians. Is it to do with the perception of university librarians and what they do. It was noted that corporate libraries pay quite well, and public libraries are better known.

A trade stand may appear as though CAUL has something to sell. Should CAUL members aim to be included the conference program. It would be a better way to show the benefits and challenges of their work. Andrew will approach the committee to be included in the program.

(Action: AW)

1401. Relationships with other organisations.

a) CAUDIT & ACODE. CAUL will nominate items for the agenda: eResearch, the combining of libraries with teaching and learning in more universities. Jeff Murray is attending the CAUDIT meeting in Cairns in May.

b) National Library of Australia.

i) Libraries Australia (Kinetics) Cost Allocation Model. A draft based on FTEs has been circulated. Comments from Monash are appended to this agenda.

It was suggested that there was no urgency to change the model just yet. The status quo looks less painful in the short term LA has not provided any accounting for its expenditure and other income. Are CAUL subscribers being given appropriate feedback and service. At the CAUL meeting, Linda Luther will lead the discussion with Andrew Wells. Select a few of the spreadsheets to show – alternatives based on bands under EFTSU and library collections budget - all illustrate the problem of using a formula to allocate costs. The NLA's proposed model was based on total budgets.

NLA is presenting Libraries Australia as a free service. It had given a clear commitment that the price would go down, but the price dropped for only one year. Subscribers are subsidising the public good. The total costs should be questioned.

More universities are buying records commercially. LA is of declining relative importance to the information world – basically a national union catalogue of print materials. There has been no clear re-thinking of what is the NBD. What is the value of LA as a cataloguing utility, particularly to CAUL members?

ii) Peak Bodies Forum. The next meeting is scheduled for December - Eve Woodberry expects to be able to attend.

c) CASL.

d) CONZUL meeting, 27-28 April, 2006, Auckland. Eve Woodberry cannot attend the meeting in late April and asked if anyone else was able to.

1402. CAUL Meetings.

a) CAUL Meeting 2006/1. Canberra, 6-7 April 2006 with committee meetings on the 5th.

i) Review of CAUL Strategic Plan.

b) CAUL Meeting 2006/2. 18-19 September, 2006 in Perth (in association with the ALIA biennial conference). ALIA is 19-22 September 2006. Joint meeting with CASL.

i) Library Collection Evaluation. Evaluation of collections to support research; fitness of the university to move to a different level of research. Cathrine Harboe-Ree is pleased with the work being done on the project, making comparisons with Go8 and other overseas universities.

c) CAUL Meeting 2007/1. Earle Gow has advised that a new international group, INU will be meeting in Melbourne in April alongside EDUCAUSE April 29 to May 1. He has
suggested that the library members be invited to observe at the CAUL meeting if the timing is suitable.

1403. Forthcoming Executive Meetings. Andrew Wells and Derek Whitehead away mid-May to mid-June, Diane Costello away in May; Eve will be at IFLA August 20-24; Cathrine Harboe-Ree in Europe sometime in September; Jeff Murray available during WA school terms: 1/2-13/4, 1/5-7/7, 24/7-29/9, 16/10-7/12; not during CAUDIT meetings.

a) 2006 July 7, Brisbane (in conjunction with CCA, July 6 morning)
b) 2006 September 18, am, Perth (in conjunction with the CAUL meeting)
c) 2006 November 7, pm and November 8, am, Melbourne (in conjunction with CCA, the afternoon of the 8th, and the CEIRC committee on the 9th)

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1404. CAUL Finances.

a) CAUL Budget 2005.
b) CAUL Budget 2006.

1405. Risk assessment for CAUL

1406. Other business.

The meeting concluded at 1.00pm
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CAUL Executive Meeting 2006/3

5 July from 2pm and 6 July from 2pm, 2006
(in conjunction with a meeting of the Joint Executives of CAUL, CAUDIT and ACODE)
Customs House, 399 Queen Street, Brisbane

Minutes

1407. Attendance: Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells, Jeff Murray, Cathrine Harboe-Ree (Deputy President). In attendance: Diane Costello.

1408. Minutes of CAUL 2006/1, Canberra, 6-7 April 2006. These will be posted to the web site and CAUL members advised. (Action: DC)

1409. Minutes of CAUL Executive 2006/2, Canberra, 5 April 2006. The draft was noted. (Action: DC)

1410. Minutes of the previous Executive Meeting, 2006/2, 5 April, 2006

a) CAUL Research Levy. Derek Whitehead will scope a project for the use of data already collected in libraries. (Action: DW)

b) Center for Research Libraries. Anne Horn met with a CRL representative at IFLA, and made a report available to the Go8. Andrew Wells will follow up. (Action: AW) This will be removed from the agenda. (Action: DC)

1411. CAUL Elections. Positions for election this year - Andrew Wells, Derek Whitehead, Heather Gordon, Martin Borchert (Action: DC)

STRATEGIC PLAN

1412. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). This is the key item for today’s agenda. Diane Costello will pull together the changes as discussed and circulate to the Executive. (Action: DC)

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1413. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). Andrew Wells will follow up the presentation of the feedback on the JSTOR and Web of Science. (Action: AW)

1414. FRODO Projects. Some of the following reports were made during the meeting of the Joint Executives of CAUL, CAUDIT and ACODE.

a) ARROW. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that 15 institutions are now involved. Overseas organisations which have applied the software include Oxford University, National University of Singapore and the National Library of Wales. A community of users has been established to share information, not only about the software but also about workflows, etc. Monash is conducting a mock RQF this year and using the repository to manage the information.

The Minister is to announce the second round of funding under the SII, focussing on creative development with repositories. USQ and Monash will be investigating persistent identifiers as part of stage II, with a view to establishing a preferred way forward nationally, similar to ISBNS or ISSNS.
b) **MAMS.** At the joint Executives meeting, Geoff Dengate reported that Ken Klingenstein, head of middleware for Internet II had reviewed MAMS, particularly noting the good work in the tools area. The NSF has recently released software which includes MAMS-developed tools. MAMS is now regarded as a leader in this field. The tools can help implement Shibboleth very quickly. Many library databases have now been “shibbolised”. The work on certificates is coming together. Mini-projects will provide some services to test the tools further. The virtual federation must consider ways to continue the work when the funds run out.

c) **APSR.** There was no report.

**1415. MERRI Projects.**

a) **MAPS Project.** Jeff Murray reported. A meeting of the steering committee was held June 29. The project completion has now been delayed to 2007 though it is now working on a more practical level since Patty McMillan commenced as Project Officer. The outcome will be a five-year work plan for interoperability.

At the joint Executives meeting, Nick Tate reported on the project, [http://middleware.edu.au/](http://middleware.edu.au/). The steering committee met recently and again tomorrow, about the access grid. The focus is on services, not overlapping with NCRIS but aligning better with it. There is a gap in the definition of sustainable services to support middleware. Implementation has been sporadic because there is no commitment to funding the range of projects in these areas. The next middleware forum is being held August 21 followed by the technical “camp” August 22-23. Members were encouraged to send a senior person to the first day.

b) **RUBRIC Project.** At the joint Executives meeting, Alan Smith reported that USQ, UNE, USC, the University of Newcastle and Massey are involved. The newsletter at available at [http://rubric.edu.au/](http://rubric.edu.au/) The project is monitoring ARROW’s work, and undertaking extension and pilot activities with other FRODO and MERRI projects such as APSR and MAMS. There is potential for widening the project to other regional universities.

Additional funding has been allocated to the eFramework which addresses an integrated courseware environment and distributed learning network. The project has been commissioned to re-do the eframework website [http://www.e-framework.org/](http://www.e-framework.org/) eFramework now has its own resources. USQ has taken over the remaining DEST funding for hosting the IMS network (formerly Macquarie).

c) **DART Project.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that UQ, JCU and Monash are investigating the information flows in the life cycle of research, including creating databases, sharing them between institutions, analysing data, getting them into repositories. The project includes 7 key investigators and a project manager. Two exemplars will be presented to DEST - marine science and crystallography – with two more being prepared in the humanities, one in aboriginal culture. DART II will develop the tools for deployment.

d) **OAK-Law.** Eve Woodberry reported. OAK stands for open access to knowledge. It focuses on IP management of repositories e.g. Creative Commons. ROMEO is a JISC funded project to identify publisher permissions for depositing content in institutional repositories.

**1416. E-Research Coordinating Committee.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that the final report of the eResearch Coordinating Committee hasn’t yet been presented to the Minister. It recommends that there should be a high priority for eResearch advancement, that there should be a champion and a committee, and an eResearch centre, with five nodes, with five people in each for five years. They would have a research focus but not be research centres ie they would support research not conduct it. There is a substantial request for funding for post-doctoral fellowships to support eResearch. These would be expected to be other disciplines moving into information science and vice versa. There is no funding for skills development, though the support centres could have a role in identifying such needs.
The role played by CAUL and CAUDIT is well articulated in the report and will be able to guide our strategic directions. It fits well with NCRIS and the new funding environment i.e. no earmarked funding which would allow CAUL and CAUDIT to bid for funds. If the Minister accepts the report, it is assumed there will be funds to cover it.

NCRIS comprises fifteen groups covering discipline areas, and a sixteenth, “platforms for collaboration,” which is meant to cover the SII capabilities, chaired by Rhys Francis and including Ah Chung Tsoi, James Dalziel, John Shipp, Nick Tate. They will try to influence the other fifteen in the support areas.

1417. **Research Indicators Workshop.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree. Diane Costello will add a short report, number of attendees, notes on the web sites, sponsored by DEST. The feedback was very positive. *(Action: DC)*

1418. **CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).** Andrew Wells reported on the proposal to revise the ProQuest renewal model. Wiley negotiations have proved advantageous for the institutions with the greatest expenditure, and improved for all the rest. CEIRC meetings are being officially shortened now that the planning processes are in place, and the group is working very efficiently.

a) **National Licensing Working Group.** A forum of all parties, and a vendor session, will be held at the National Library on July 3. Heather Gordon and Diane Costello will represent CAUL.

1419. **ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.** Andrew Wells reported that Tom Ruthven has been appointed as ADT manager. The changing environment, with migration away from Virginia Tech software, will mean a different approach to support from UNSW. Peter Green is a very active and engaged chair of the technical committee.

**CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING**

1420. **University Library Australia.** A meeting of the ULA working group was held in Sydney on May 2. Shirley Oakley then conducted a survey of CAUL members to determine the nature of the disparate campuses and library services currently managed by all universities. ULA statistics are being collected as part of the regular CAUL statistics collection.

**MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE**

1421. **Statistics.** CAUL statistics have been collected and the first draft released.

1422. **Library MIS Workshop.** Diane Costello will conduct a survey of members’ use of various information systems and services. *(Action: DC)*

1423. **AVCC Library Staff Development Conference.** Eve Woodberry reported that the conference appeared to attract the right level of attendees. An evaluation report will be prepared by the AVCC. Delegates reported huge benefits in meeting others and it was suggested that CAUDIT and ACODE be invited to future conferences. The venue and level of papers was good, with an appropriate balance between the environmental side and the practical. It was agreed to write to the AVCC to affirm the importance of staff development, and commending Susan Scott and Arminia Sorbara for the organisation. *(Action: DC)* It was suggested that presentations from the delegates be encouraged, for example a report on some activity that might be considered best practice. The delegates placed a heavy emphasis on staffing issues.

1424. **Workforce Planning.** Eve Woodberry

“At the last CAUL meeting there was a lot of discussion about workforce planning, but it was not actually on the agenda. We have just completed a workforce planning report here, and would be interested in sharing the experience with others at the Perth meeting. There may be one or two others who could make short presentations on the topic to generate a bit of discussion and appreciation of different approaches.” Linda Luther.

It was noted that workforce planning is now included in the strategic plan.

**COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY**
1425. Communication. (Standing item)

a) President’s Report. Eve Woodberry reported that she had written to the National Library regarding Libraries Australia. She attended the presentation of the ALIA fellowship to Tom Cochrane in Brisbane.

b) Public Relations/Media Reports.

c) CAUL Report. The report for 2003-2004 has been made available from the CAUL home page. Madeleine McPherson wrote the introduction, covering her tenure as CAUL President. A draft of the report for 2005-2006 has been circulated to the Executive for comment and additions. It was agreed that CAUL reports continue to reflect achievements rather than plans.

d) Executive Officer’s Report. The report is appended to this agenda.

1426. CAUL Web Site. Eve Woodberry reported:

“the issue which has been raised by members when talking to them is the website. You did ask for specifics and the main issues I noted are as follows:
- difficulty in searching and finding information;
- style/appearance is now inadequate for the organization;
- need for increased flexibility and functionality to reflect the changing nature of the web and the organization.

I note that CAUDIT has recently had their website redesigned and we do need to consider the way forward for the CAUL site.”

Cathrine Harboe-Ree asked one of her staff members to review the web site with a view to its accessibility. Jeff Murray suggested using a tabbed approach, a search at the top of each page, a standard shortlist of quick functions. Diane Costello will circulate the CAUDIT request for proposal for its web site redevelopment. This item will be discussed further at the next meeting. (Action: DC)

1427. Copyright. Eve Woodberry

a) Orphan Works Forum. Megan Deacon, Monash University, represented CAUL at the forum. Her report was circulated 30 June and will be made available to CAUL. Diane Costello will draft a letter of thanks to Megan Deacon. (Action: DC) CAUL members have been invited to contribute to the survey on the frequency and handling of orphan works.

b) ALCC/ADA. Eve Woodberry attended an ALCC meeting which discussed orphan works, fair dealing, the ADA forum on TPM which will be held prior to implementation on January 1. Andrew Harrison and Megan Deacon have written a paper for Monash’s mock RQF and are rewriting it for the repositories environment. DEST’s Margot Bell advised that the legislation will not allow capture of music even in closed repositories – a paper is being prepared for the Attorney-General.

c) IFLA/CLM. Eve Woodberry is attending as Australian representative on the copyright and legal matters committee, being funded by the ALCC. She is also presenting a paper on benchmarking in Australian libraries.

1428. Submissions to Public Inquiries.


b) NCRI S. National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy. John Shipp will attend the next meeting to be held July 17.

- A single national proposal (in each of the priority capability areas) will be developed through a designated facilitator or coordinating bodies as outlined in the NCRIS Roadmap.
March 2006: The Investment Framework is anticipated to be released. It will explain in detail how the NCRIS programme will be implemented.

March – September 2006: Preparation of funding proposals

Late 2006: Proposals assessed, funding agreements and business plans negotiated and funding approved

c) Review of Personal Property Securities. The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General has decided, at the suggestion of the Australian Attorney-General, the Hon Philip Ruddock MP, to review the law on personal property securities. 11 April 2006. The options paper invites comment by 2 June 2006. Eve Woodberry responded to Helen Daniels “that while some forms of intellectual property are dealt with, it is unlikely to affect copyright, which is the primary interest of libraries.”

1429. Relationships with other organisations.

a) CAUDIT & ACODE. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported on CAUL’s eResearch working group. Jeff Murray circulated his notes from the CAUDIT meeting, attended by a number of researchers discussing their support requirements.

i) EDUCAUSE 2007. Standing Item. Members will be encouraged to submit papers.

b) National Library of Australia.

i) Libraries Australia (Kinetica) Cost Allocation Model. A reply to the CAUL letter was received June 26. Eve Woodberry will invite Jan Fullerton to Melbourne on August 1, the next Executive meeting. Linda Luther has advised that she would like to be present. (Action: DC)

ii) Peak Bodies Forum. A December 2006 date was previously advised. The Forum has been postponed to accommodate changes in the Director-General’s schedule. The date for the next Peak Bodies Forum is now Monday 7 May, 2007.

iii) NLA information for CAUL. The National Library proposes to send regular information posts to CAUL members. The first covers the types of research projects in which the NLA will collaborate with other organisations or individuals. Diane Costello will circulate to CAUL with a note to say where it has come from. (Action: DC)

c) CASL. CAUL has been asked to comment on CASL’s “Draft positioning statement on libraries in the digital environment” by June 30. An extension has been granted so it may be discussed at this meeting, with a view to a formal CAUL response. Cathrine Harboe-Ree responded separately. The document is intended to be broader than CASL but does not cover higher education issues well. It is not clear who is the intended audience. It was agreed to ask for a copy of the latest draft. It was noted that digitisation needs to be selective not assumed to be comprehensive. (Action: DC)

d) CSIRO. Diane Costello met with Tricia Kelly, CSIRO’s new Executive Manager, Library Services, the first CSIRO position to hold line responsibility for all CSIRO libraries. She expressed great interest in working more closely with other library organisations, such as CAUL. It was agreed to invite her to the first meeting of 2007 to talk about CSIRO. (Action: DC)

e) AVCC. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will represent the Executive at the meeting of the Deputy Vice-Chancellors (Research) on July 28 in Wollongong. She will address eResearch and institutional repositories.

1430. CAUL Meetings.

a) CAUL Meeting 2006/2. 18-19 September, 2006 in Perth (in association with the ALIA biennial conference). ALIA is 19-22 September 2006. Joint meeting with CASL. It was noted that the ALIA reception on the Tuesday. Guests will include Ruth PAGELL from Singapore Management University. Diane Costello will finalise details with Imogen Garner, including an informal dinner on the Sunday. (Action: DC) Michele Sabto will be presented with her CAUL achievement award. Diane Costello will invite CASL to nominate
which topics they would like to speak to. (Action: DC) Topics suggested include: workforce planning; AVCC library staff development conference. Eve Woodberry will call for hot topics from CAUL members. (Action: EW)

i) Library Collection Evaluation. Evaluation of collections to support research; fitness of the university to move to a different level of research. Cathrine Harboe-Ree Held over to the 2006/2 meeting. Cathrine Harboe-Ree may not be able to attend, and would send Wilna Macmillan.

ii) RFID Standards. Craig Anderson (from CAUL 2006/1)

b) CAUL Meeting 2007/1. Melbourne, May 2-4. EDUCAUSE April 29 to May 1.

c) CAUL Meeting 2007/2. Adelaide, October 2007. Helen Livingston is checking venues with a view to setting the date, possibly 3-5 October. It was agreed to stay with the usual mid-September timing because of school holidays. (Action: DC)

1431. Forthcoming Executive Meetings. Eve will be at IFLA August 17-30; Cathrine Harboe-Ree in Europe most of October; Jeff Murray available during WA school terms: 1/2-13/4, 1/5-7/7, 24/7-29/9, 16/10-7/12.

a) 2006 August 1, 12 noon to 5pm in Melbourne. To be confirmed. [Note, later changed to August 15.]

b) 2006 September 18, am, Perth (in conjunction with the CAUL meeting)

c) 2006 November 7, pm and November 8, am, Melbourne (in conjunction with CCA, the afternoon of the 8th, and the CEIRC committee on the 9th)

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1432. CAUL Finances. Diane Costello

a) CAUL Budget 2005. The audit has been largely completed but not finalised.

b) CAUL Budget 2006. Diane Costello will work with David Knox to set up the budget spreadsheets.

i) Unbudgeted expenses.

(1) Domain Name Registration, caul.edu.au, expires 31-08-2006 Invoice: S8416, Renew from 31-08-2006 to 31-8-2008 for $110.00 (GST inclusive).

(2) National Site Licence Reference Group. Direct costs for Heather Gordon to attend meetings in Canberra have been $1665 this year to date.

1433. Risk assessment for CAUL. Members agreed that a light touch is appropriate for CAUL, an assessment of the top half-dozen risks e.g. succession planning; contingency planning; loss of commitment by members / fragmentation of CAUL; CEIRC is covered by its own plan; public liability – is this covered by the venue; Andrew Wells will review, using the CEIRC framework. (Action: AW)

1434. Other business.

The meeting concluded at 5.00pm
Meeting between CAUL and CAUDIT Executives on eResearch, 6 July 2006, Brisbane

**eResearch.** CAUL and CAUDIT will work together to improve capability in supporting eResearch. The headings of the ERCC report all involve CAUL and CAUDIT:

- strategic framework
- leadership
- deployment of research and development – less interest than there should be in deployment
- skills transfer – role of research centre
- implementing better access
- eResearch fabric
- managing data – towards Australian data research strategy
- resources

Monash has held a “sector intersections” meeting – representatives from computer science, IT, CAUL, Ah Chung Tsoi and Andrew Treloar – looking at what can be done in this space – relevant to where CAUL and CAUDIT can cooperate. Its conclusions included the urgent need to collaborate, high priority for data management, which tools will need to be developed, communication. The DART project is building a base for a data management regime. Monash needs an institutional data management group, under the eResearch Centre Advisory Committee, to develop data management guidelines, access guidelines, priority areas identified, analysis of skills requirements, audit of training and skills opportunities, best ways to support collaborative and systemic infrastructure activity. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will make notes available. *(Action: CH-R)*

CAUL has begun work on its own activities. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will convene a meeting of CAUL’s eResearch working group as soon as the ERCC report is released. It has agreed that the following were priority areas:

- development policy and advocacy skills
- data management
- training and skill development
- collaboration nationally and international
- need to incorporate in strategic plan.

**CAUDIT priority areas** are:

- framework of frameworks
- computer grid

**CAUDIT and CAUL priorities** - complementary but different perspectives from CAUL and CAUDIT members.

1. An eResearch seminar for CAUL and CAUDIT, plus researchers and research managers, staff from research offices – eResearch 101 for librarians and others, using DART personnel.

2. The greatest overlap is in data management. There is increasing demand from researchers for management of vast amounts of data they are collecting. It is an issue of research practice, but not driven from CAUL or CAUDIT. DART can inform the practice and policy development for data management. It should generate some model data management plans that could be disseminated.
   a. opportunity to develop guidelines for data management for receipt of research grants
   b. could be an data management workshop at EDUCAUSE as a sub-theme of eResearch.

3. US is further ahead, possibly because of some mandated requirements - at least in data management planning. There was interest in a study tour, a smaller group, with CAUDIT participation, to see what they are doing in the US, the UK, Canada, Europe. EDUCAUSE 2006 October 9–12 Dallas, Texas EDUCAUSE 2006 [http://www.educause.edu/conference/annual/](http://www.educause.edu/conference/annual/)

4. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will, with CAUL’s eResearch working group, draft a program for comment to the CAUDIT Executive. It was suggested that DEST may support this financially. Diane Costello will organise the function. *(Action: CH-R, DC)*

5. An audit of formal courses currently available, which ones would be useful. A group should scope the project, including how to identify courses. It was suggested reviewing JISC work in this area.
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1435. Attendance.  Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells, Jeff Murray, Cathrine Harboe-Ree (Deputy President), Derek Whitehead. In attendance: Diane Costello.  

1436. Minutes of CAUL Executive 2006/ 2, Canberra, 5 April 2006; 2006/ 3 Brisbane 5-6 July. There were no amendments.  


1438. Business Arising.  

a) CAUL Research Levy. Derek Whitehead will scope a project for the use of data already collected in libraries.  (Action: DW)  

1439. CAUL Membership.  

a) An application for membership of CAUL has been received from the Box Hill Institute. The CAUL constitution reads re membership:  

Membership is open to the University Librarian or equivalent of institutions which have representation on the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee, and the Chief Librarians of other nationally significant libraries in higher education institutions which are not represented on the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee. There shall be one member from each institution.  

Admission to CAUL of institutions which are not members of the Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee shall be determined by CAUL after receiving a recommendation from its Executive Committee.  

The Box Hill Institute is not a member of the AVCC, nor yet a nationally significant library in a higher education institution. Offering degrees is not a sufficient condition for entry to CAUL. CAUL is not yet prepared to open a pathway for TAFE institutions to join CAUL but increased degree offerings in TAFE and other institutions will be monitored.  (Action: DC) Both the CAUL web site and the CEIRC program are accessible to non-university libraries.  

b) Attendance at CAUL meetings by additional representatives from a university. It was agreed that, in general, guests may attend non-business sections of the CAUL meeting, subject to approval of the CAUL Executive.  (Action: DC)  

STRATEGIC PLAN  

1440. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). This is the key item on the agenda. The draft of August 11 follows the planning sessions at CAUL 2006/1 and the July meeting of the CAUL Executive. This plan will cover 2007-9 and reviewed again in 2009.  (Action: DC)  

Mission. The mission should be revised to take into account other changes in the environment – it should reflect information management, student experience and relationships with the community, how members demonstrate responsiveness, contributions to member universities, assisting universities to achieve the above.  (Action: CH-R)
Values. The same access should be available to DE students, international students, offshore students, TAFE students etc. Commitment to access without censorship - respect for intellectual property and fair use, respect for the intellectual and creative endeavours of others. Innovation in the application of new technologies and service models, responsiveness and customer focus, excellence in operational and service delivery.

Learning and Teaching. This should cover the convergence of services, such as learning commons, learning support and academic skills support.

Information Literacy. This should be about sharing information within CAUL. All are very preoccupied with information literacy and integration with learning management systems, but it is not emerging in CAUL meetings. Some members’ staff won Carrick awards for their work. There should be more sharing of best practice in this area, taking stock and learning from others about how to approach it. Benchmark, self-assess, report results. The x-generation doesn’t need spoon-feeding – the important aspect is knowing that good quality information exists, knowing how to find it, how to filter it and how to use it; push it out to them as they study. Libraries are making radical choices about what resources to devote to this area. A summit on the changing role of the professional librarian could be useful. This discussion will be provided as background information to the ILWG. (Action: DC)

The relevant action item should read: Seek global best practice in information literacy, and make it available to CAUL members. (Action: ILWG)

International guidelines. It was suggested that a minimum requirement include an internet connection with a minimum connection level. CAUDIT input is also needed for authentication. Call for expressions of interest in working group to review guidelines. (Action: DC)

Collaboration with ACODE and CAUDIT. Specify areas in which this collaboration is important, e.g. ICT support for learning commons, service-oriented architecture for information services, learning management systems, learning materials management systems, integration of resources into LMSs, planning of EDUCAUSE 2007 with CAUDIT and ACODE. From the student/researcher point of view, it is all one service so the emphasis should be student-centred services.

eResearch. Use the headings from CAUL’s eResearch Working Group recommendations in the research segment, and the actions in the terms of reference for the ERWG. Another meeting of the ERWG will be held following the release of the ERCC report. E-metrics should be included because researchers see this as a library responsibility.

RQF, Bibliometrics and Research Information. All should be included as research performance, not just the RQF.

Delivering Quality and Value. Values should include international engagement, a new measure to incorporate the changed environment. Most of CAUL’s international recognition is around innovation rather than continuous improvement. The rationale should refer to the action to demonstrate the value proposition of an academic library along the lines of the British Library values document. Include a comment on national agendas, competitiveness, the push to perform better with less government income, the push for greater diversity. Rewrite to reflect “being the best we can”. (Action: AW)

1441. Best Practice Working Group. Felicity McGregor has advised of her wish to stand down as chair of the BPWG. It was agreed to call for expressions of interest in chairing the working group. (Action: DC) Note that there is work for this group under the new strategic plan. Note that membership is self-selecting.

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1442. ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee). Derek Whitehead reported that there are no plans for the next ARIIC meeting. Feedback relating to the JSTOR and ISI products has been circulated to the committee. It was agreed to make RQF a standing item on both CAUL and the Executive agendas until further notice. (Action: DC)
Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported on the RQF IT Working Group - its goal is reliable, stable software to manage the RQF documentation, to be delivered by the end of 2007. The software is not yet specified because the RQF model has not been finalised. A huge amount of work is now being done within the four RQF working groups.

1443. FRODO Projects.
   a) **ARROW (Australian Research Repositories Online to the World)**. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that there will be an ARROW day on September 8.
   b) **MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project)**. Eve Woodberry attended a meeting of the Steering Committee on August 9. The aim is to implement MAMS as an identity/access management system. ARROW is likely to build it in. The web site contains a great deal of information. An easy start-up CD shows how you can apply Shibboleth to a new product.

1444. MERRI Projects.
   a) **OAK-Law (Open Access to Knowledge (OAK) Legal Protocols for Copyright Management)**. Eve Woodberry reported that the Steering Committee had heard nothing recently. The *Unlocking IP* conference was attended by OAK Law personnel. The project is working with Sherpa. Their approach is more legal than practical.

1445. DEST Projects - 3rd round. The Minister for Education, Science and Training, the Hon Julie Bishop MP, announced six new initiatives that will support greater collaboration between researchers, both domestically and internationally. 31 July 2006 It was agreed to seek reports on these projects for the CAUL meeting. (Action: DC)
   a) **Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER)** [will build on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project]
   b) **Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities (RAMP)**
   c) Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) – Stage 2
   d) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project]
   e) Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) - Stage 2
   f) **Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS)** [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project]

1446. E-Research Coordinating Committee. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that the ERWG will set priorities from the list of CAUL action items. Many are dependent on resources and the time to organise. Some work needs to be done irrespective of the ERCC report. The ERWG will be convened later, perhaps in Melbourne around November 9 when CEIRC meets. (Action: CH-R)

1447. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). Andrew Wells
   a) **National Licensing Working Group**. Members discussed the Heads of Agreement document prepared by the National Library to be signed by each organisation participating in a national licence. It is unclear how/if CAUL can participate at this level. It was referred to CEIRC. (Action: DC)

1448. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells reported that the ADT Policy Reference Group will meet in late October. A broad transition strategy is under development. The operational review will be added to the CAUL 2007/1 agenda. (Action: DC)

**CONTRIBUTION TO TEACHING & LEARNING**

1449. University Library Australia. Diane Costello reported that the Working Group, in response to the discussion at CAUL 2006/1, is reviewing protocols along the lines of the guidelines for off-shore campuses. It has conducted a survey of CAUL to see how many have opened...
campsuses in capital city CBDs and what services are being offered. A follow up has been sent to those who have opened campuses, to determine how services are provided and what their dependence is on ULA.

MANAGEMENT FOR BEST PRACTICE

1450. Statistics. Derek Whitehead reported that DEST has not yet released 2005 statistics, delaying the completion of the CAUL statistics for 2005.

1451. Library MIS Workshop. Diane Costello will conduct a CAUL survey to determine how members are currently using which software and systems, and what gaps there are. (Action: DC)

1452. Workforce Planning. Diane Costello will ask Linda Luther, who has expressed interest in this area, to present a hot topic for CAUL 2006/2. (Action: DC)

COMMUNICATION & ADVOCACY

1453. Communication. (Standing item)

a) President’s Report. Eve Woodberry. Letters have been sent this year to the following:
- Des Stewart, Keith Webster and Philip Kent, to welcome them to CAUL
- Tom Cochrane and Imogen Garner, in recognition of their ALIA Fellowships
- Cliff Law, on his retirement from CAUL
- Tricia Kelly, the new Director of Library Services at the CSIRO
- Eve Woodberry attended the Australian Book Industry Association awards in Sydney. It was hosted by the Minister for the Arts.

b) Public Relations/Media Reports. November’s ALIA inCite will cover business practice (contract and licence management, purchasing, project management). Heather Gordon will be invited to contribute, or Jeff Murray if Heather is not available. The CAUL affiliation should be included in these reports. (Action: DC)

c) CAUL Report 2005-6. Eve Woodberry will send suggestions. (Action: EW) It was suggested including an obituary for Marian Bate. (Action: AW) An ADT award is being established from Marian’s estate.

d) Executive Officer’s Report. The report is appended to this agenda.

1454. CAUL Web Site. The RFT for the redevelopment of the CAUDIT web site has been circulated to the Executive. Diane Costello has discussed the development, the costs and the processes with Richard Northam, supervisor of the CAUDIT project.

It was proposed that the site be brought up to current web standards, and continue to be supported within the CAUL office.

Principles: must be kept simple; maintainable readily without external support; as compliant with standards as it needs to be; within desirable budget; a brief to identify what is to be achieved; attachment to brief from Monash; don’t outsource or put on external site; not a marketing tool; straightforward, usable, easy to navigate.

The de facto standard for web site design includes a navigation bar, breadcrumbs, search engine and a site map. RSS feed may be desirable. Include a PowerPoint template design as part of the design specification.

CAUDIT has multiple security access levels – CAUL has two at the moment, open to the public, and accessible to CAUL/CEIRC institutions. It was agreed to retain only two. CAUDIT has specified a content management system for its second phase. Content management and content presentation are separate.

All current pages should be upgraded, which may require a different consultant. This should therefore be costed separately.

It was recommended that a small working group, convened by Diane Costello, including Jeff Murray, and Jenny Dewar from Monash start with the CAUDIT document, draw up a
specification of user requirements, and invite a limited number of people to respond to the specification with a view to starting in early 2007. \textbf{(Action: DC)} It was agreed that members provide names of personnel that have the capacity to do the work, along with examples of their earlier work. \textbf{(Action: Executive)}

Retained funds could be used to develop the site. It was agreed to add $25,000 to the CAUL budget proposal for 2007, the lowest quote received by CAUDIT to revise their site. \textbf{(Action: DC)}

1455. Copyright. Eve Woodberry

a) \textbf{IFLA/CLM.} Eve Woodberry will attend the next meeting of IFLA’s Copyright and other Legal Matters Committee in Seoul.

b) \textbf{ADA / ALCC Copyright Advisor.} The CAUL Executive responded to a proposed increase in salary for Sarah Waladan.

“CAUL supports the salary proposal for Sarah on the basis that she is doing an excellent job at a critical time in the copyright environment. The Executive requested that the ALCC notes that the $20,000 per annum provided by CAUL is reviewed on an annual basis as part of the budget process and based on current commitments the amount will remain the same in the foreseeable future. Should the salary increase impact on the funding required from the sector no guarantee can be provided at this time that increased funds would be available. The Executive did note that the ALCC has accrued considerable reserves which it is anticipated will cover any additional costs.”

It was noted that Sarah has built up a good network in both the government and academia.

1456. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

a) \textbf{Productivity Commission. Science and Innovation Study.} Andrew Wells \textbf{(Action: AW)}

b) \textbf{NCRIS. National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy.}

- March 2006: The Investment Framework is anticipated to be released. It will explain in detail how the NCRIS programme will be implemented.
- March – September 2006: Preparation of funding proposals
- Late 2006: Proposals assessed, funding agreements and business plans negotiated and funding approved

1457. Relationships with Other Organisations.

a) \textbf{CAUDIT & ACODE.} Eve Woodberry has received an invitation from ACODE to attend a RIN (Resource Identification Network \url{http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/go/pid/104}) seminar in Melbourne on September 1. Invitations have also been sent to Maxine Brodie, Cathrine Harboe-Ree (not available), Andrew Wells. The RIN has a notional budget of $7m. \textbf{(Action: EW)}

CAUL may identify the best model from its perspective, following a meeting with Linda Luther and John Arfield after the CAUL business meeting. \textbf{(Action: DC)} There is a risk that members will withdraw unless an appropriate solution is found.

1458. EDUCAUSE 2007. Standing Item. It was noted that Jan Wilkinson (British Library) and Susan Gibbons (Assistant Dean, University of Rochester, Public Services And Collection Development) are on the program.

a) \textbf{National Library of Australia.}

i) \textbf{Libraries Australia (Kinetica) Cost Allocation Model.} Jan Fullerton and her senior staff were unavailable for a meeting with the CAUL Executive on August 15, but suggested meeting in Perth when Tony Boston and Warwick Cathro will be available. It was decided not to meet in Perth. \textbf{(Action: EW)} CAUL may identify the best model from its perspective, following a meeting with Linda Luther and John Arfield after the CAUL business meeting. \textbf{(Action: DC)} There is a risk that members will withdraw unless an appropriate solution is found.
ii) **Peak Bodies Forum.** The next Peak Bodies Forum will be held Monday 7 May, 2007.

b) **NSLA.** CASL has been renamed National and State Libraries Australasia, NSLA.

c) **AVCC.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree represented the Executive at the meeting of the Deputy Vice-Chancellors (Research) on July 28 in Wollongong. As it was the last item on the agenda, not all members were present for this session. All questions were about the RQF and were very informed and pertinent questions were received regarding copyright in institutional repositories. The PowerPoint can be made available. *(Action: DC)*

The PhillipsKPA review of the AVCC 2006 was noted. It was agreed that it was too early for CAUL to respond but the Executive would monitor developments and comment if required.

d) **ALIA.** It has been proposed that the Aurora program include a strand for middle managers. It was suggested meeting with Dagmar Schmidmaier at the November meeting in Melbourne. *(Action: AW)*

**1459. CAUL Meetings.**

a) **CAUL Meeting 2006/2.** 18-19 September, 2006 in Perth (in association with the ALIA biennial conference). ALIA is 19-22 September 2006. Joint meeting with NSLA. Curtin’s Vice-Chancellor will address members. Eve Woodberry will write to CAUL to invite members to nominate additional topics, call for groups that wish to meet Monday morning, provide information about dinners, accommodation and agenda information. *(Action: DC)*

i) Michele Sabto will be presented with the 2005 CAUL Achievement Award and will make a presentation. She will talk about the wider involvement in publishing.

ii) **NSLA.** have advised hot topics to be led by their members.

    Institutional repositories (Penny Carnaby, NZ) - CAUL requested that this be something new, to stimulate discussion, as members already are heavily involved.
    
    Workforce Planning (Margaret Allen, WA) - Ask Linda Luther to work with this. *(Action: DC)*

    Research infrastructure (Warwick Cathro, NLA) - CAUL requested that this be something new, to stimulate discussion, as members already are heavily involved.
    
    Storage (Alan Smith, SA) - CAUL requested that this address where cooperative storage has progressed since the CAUL-organised forum in 1999.
    
    Future Thinking & the Digitisation Summit (Anne-Marie Schwirtlich, NSLA Chair)

iii) **Library Collection Evaluation.** Evaluation of collections to support research; fitness of the university to move to a different level of research. Wilna Macmillan will be representing Monash at the meeting, and will present this topic.

iv) **RFID Standards.** Craig Anderson (from CAUL 2006/1)

v) **Copyright.** Derek Whitehead will provide a copyright update, to include tpm's and fair dealing. *(Action: DW)*

b) **CAUL Meeting 2007/1.** Melbourne, May 3-4. EDUCAUSE April 29 to May 1. Diane Costello will call for expressions of interest in hosting the meeting. *(Action: DC)*

c) **CAUL Meeting 2007/2.** Adelaide, October 2007. Helen Livingston is checking venues with a view to setting the date, possibly 3-5 October. It was agreed to stay with mid-September because of school holidays. *(Action: DC)*

**1436. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.** Eve will be at IFLA August 17-30; Cathrine Harboe-Ree in Europe most of October; Jeff Murray available during WA school terms: 1/2-13/4, 1/5-7/7, 24/7-29/9, 16/10-7/12.

a) **2006 September 18, morning, Perth** (in conjunction with the CAUL meeting)
b) **2006 November 7, pm and November 8, am, Melbourne** (in conjunction with CCA, the afternoon of the 8th, and the CEIRC committee on the 9th)

**CAUL ADMINISTRATION**

1437. **CAUL Finances.** Diane Costello

a) **CAUL Budget 2005.** The audit has been completed, and the data files rolled over to the new financial year. Members should refer questions to Diane Costello. *(Action: Executive)*

b) **CAUL Budget 2006.** Diane Costello asked for comments on the revised format. *(Action: Executive)*

c) **CAUL Budget 2007.** Diane Costello

i) **CAUL membership fees.**

   (1) **Salary Increases.** These will be taken into account in expenditure estimates. CAUL rates have been based on ANU’s.

   ii) **ALCC Levy.** Eve Woodberry advised Tom Cochrane, ALCC chair, that while CAUL supported a salary increase for Sarah Waladan, CAUL would not be increasing its contribution. It is recommended that the 2007 CAUL budget contribution remain the same at $20,000 plus GST.

1438. **Risk assessment for CAUL.** Andrew Wells will prepare for the November meeting. *(Action: AW)*

1439. **Other business.**

The meeting concluded at 4.45pm
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CAUL Mission

The Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) mission is to support its members in the achievement of their objectives, especially the provision of access to, and training in the use of, scholarly information, leadership in the management of information and contribution to the university experience.

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

Membership

CAUL is comprised of the university librarians or library directors of all Australian universities.

Environment

The environment in which CAUL operates is characterised by:

- An increasingly diverse and technically literate student population;
- Changes in learning and teaching practices facilitated by technology;
- Changes in research practices;
- The emergence of alternative approaches to discovery, dissemination and access to scholarly information;
- A developing policy environment that puts research activity in a global context;
- Government policy to create greater differentiation between institutions in the higher education sector;
- Increased accountability whilst operating in a fiscally challenged environment;
- Increasing requirements to demonstrate quality processes and outcomes;
- The broader application and importance of information management skills; and,
- The enduring importance of the librarian’s role and values in an increasingly complex environment.
Values

- Collaboration within and across sectors
- Commitment to resource sharing;
- Commitment to access to information, ideas, and creative works without censorship;
- Respect for the intellectual and creative endeavours of others;
- Equitable access to services and resources independent of the nature of participation e.g. distance education, off-shore campuses, international students, TAFE students. [Does this fit in values?]
- Innovation in the application of new technologies and service models
- Excellence in operational and service delivery;
- Openness, responsiveness and customer focus;

Goals

The Strategic Plan charts how CAUL will meet its objectives. It outlines the following goals:

- optimising and maximising student learning outcomes and graduate attributes;
- optimising and maximising services and resources available to researchers;
- supporting universities’ wider scholarly communication and information management roles;
- promoting continuous improvement in university libraries, and,
- influencing the development of an appropriate legal, regulatory and funding environment
I. CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING AND TEACHING

Goal
CAUL will facilitate the member’s role of optimising and maximising student learning outcomes including the contribution that libraries make to graduate attributes.

Rationale
Libraries are essential to learning activities in higher education, and provide facilities, services and resources, both physical and virtual, to support these activities.

CAUL librarians play a significant role in guiding students through an increasingly complex information environment by providing the skills to become effective independent learners.

CAUL members provide comprehensive, cost-effective collections and to share and maximise resources. All are active participants in the CEIRC consortial purchasing program, gaining significant benefits in content, licensing and value for money. Libraries are integrating their collections to reflect the continuum between undergraduate and research requirements.

Libraries’ physical facilities are being reconceptualised in response to changes in pedagogy and technology. Physical facilities are being reconfigured in response, and virtual services are emerging as a significant alternative and complementary method of service provision.

The library has a major role in resource discovery and access to resources in collaboration with other student service providers, IT services are increasingly being integrated through “learning commons” developments.

CAUL members have increased responsibility for the provision of comparable library services to offshore and international students.

Actions

University Library Australia
1. Continue to refine and clarify protocols for the streamlined operation of University Library Australia – the national borrowing scheme – and other forms of reciprocal use. (ULA Working Group)

Information Literacy
2. Review global best practice in information literacy and make it available to CAUL members. (ILWG)

Offshore service delivery
3. Review the CAUL guidelines, standards and model conditions, for the operation of service delivery in partnership with other agencies and institutions offshore. (Working Group)
II. CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

Goal
To maximise the information resources available to researchers and the facilitation of their access, and to support libraries’ wider scholarly communication and information management roles.

Rationale
The challenge of adequately supporting research activity through provision of access to scholarly information remains a key concern for CAUL members and e-research is emerging as an area of great interest to libraries. The research aspirations of CAUL members’ institutions are being brought into sharper focus through the imminent introduction of the Research Quality Framework and the recent appearance of international ranking tables.

Libraries are partners in helping their institutions to achieve their research objectives through the traditional means of providing research collections, bibliometrics, research skills training and document delivery, and through more recent innovations such as establishing institutional repositories and publishing channels, providing intellectual property and copyright advice and leading various information management activities.

It is recognised that the stated objectives will also contribute significantly to teaching and learning.

Actions
4. Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchase and licensing of electronic information resources. (CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee))
5. Continue the development of the Australasian Digital Theses Program. (ADT Policy Reference Group)
6. Review the operational requirements for central administration of the ADT vis a vis the take-up of independent institutional repository solutions by members, and reduced dependence on VT software. (ADT Policy Reference Group)
7. Contribute to the development and promotion of institutional digital assets repositories initiatives, particularly through DEST’s SII-funded FRODO, MERRI and 2006 projects. (ALL members)
8. Contribute to relevant groups & activities regarding information infrastructure eg National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy, Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee. (CAUL Executive)
9. Draft a framework under which digitisation projects can be identified and supported vis a vis JISC’s Digitisation in the UK: The case for a UK framework. (CAUL Executive)

eResearch
10. Contribute to relevant national and international groups and activities regarding eResearch e.g. e-Research Coordinating Committee (CAUL Executive)
11. Development of policy and advocacy skills (eResearch Working Group)
12. Data management (eResearch Working Group)
13. Training: a) improve the level of data management knowledge, engagement and capability nationally; and b) ensure that a critical mass of librarians advance to a level of expertise where than can provide training to researchers. (eResearch Working Group)
14. Enabling collaboration (eResearch Working Group)
III. DELIVERING QUALITY AND VALUE

Goals

The pursuit of internationally recognized high quality library services and operations through application of the principles of continuous improvement and best practice. Defining the value proposition of university libraries in a changing and diverse environment.

Rationale

CAUL will develop strategies for enhancing the quality of university library services and operations. Through continuous improvement of operations, CAUL libraries will strive for the highest standards of service delivery and administration.

Changes in information and higher education are leading to transformations in the ways university libraries operate and deliver services. Traditional performance measures do not capture new and emerging services. Many of these measures indicate declining usage and relevance of particular services. This affects perceptions about the value of academic libraries. A major challenge is to develop a new language to demonstrate value and identify new performance measures that enable meaningful and relevant benchmarking.

Actions (ongoing)

15. Benchmark performance measures with comparable international organisations and contribute to the development of international performance measures
16. Continue to develop, extend, scope and cost a range of agreed performance measures
17. Facilitate the enhancement of knowledge and skills of members and their staff in delivering high quality outcomes through seminars, workshops etc e.g. RQF forum, institutional repositories forum, AVCC library staff development conferences.
18. Investigate workforce requirements and skills development to ensure maintenance of quality services in a rapidly changing information environment
19. Collect and publish statistics on Australian university library outputs and activities
20. Facilitate sharing of management and planning information among CAUL members e.g. through one-off seminars, hot topics at CAUL meetings, etc
21. Conduct and publish the results of surveys and questionnaires which enable members to share collective knowledge and experience

Actions (2007)

22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative (Ad Hoc Working Group)
23. Extend UNISON work on performance measurement for reference (UNISON Working Group)
24. Workforce planning – explore options for CAUL’s contribution following the work of LATN and WAGUL. (BPWG)
25. Review CAUL’s document delivery performance indicator as a measuring tool following the resource-sharing forum. (BPWG)
IV. COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

Goal
To identify, prioritise and exploit opportunities for CAUL to influence the information management and higher education environment and communicate its activities.

Rationale
University libraries are well recognised for the value they add to their institutions’ mission, improved levels of service and efficient use of resources. Their continued visibility, relevance and importance to the community-at-large, stakeholders and the Government are vital to CAUL’s ability to support the learning, teaching and research activities of their institutions. This will be done by improving services and resources, to avoid threats to the affordable flow of information and to help protect Australia's intellectual capital.

CAUL is aware of the tensions that operate within the sector from constrained funding and competing needs.

CAUL will project a coherent perspective on key issues of national information policy and resources where appropriate.

CAUL will communicate the benefits of collaborative and cooperative action undertaken by CAUL and its members.

Actions

Collaboration & International Engagement

26. Work with partners in the information services sector, especially ACODE and CAUDIT, on areas of common concern, including ICT support for learning commons, learning management systems and the integration of resources within LMSs, content management systems, service-oriented architecture and related standards and protocols.

27. EDUCAUSE 2007

28. Draw together the diverse positions of all members of the sector ensuring the efforts of related and similar groups are not duplicated in our activities e.g. CAUDIT, ACODE, CONZUL, NSLA, CARL, SCONUL, ARL and relevant others.

29. Publicise the role of CAUL in fostering international collaboration

30. Research, develop and promote an active strategy to foster closer ties between higher education libraries in relevant countries. This may include further study tours and international exchange opportunities. (CAUL Executive)

Policy in Higher Education and Information Infrastructure.

31. Proactively influence the legal and regulatory environment which has an impact on libraries and higher education to ensure that CAUL is perceived as a significant contributor to national information resources and is consulted on matters affecting Information policy in higher education.

32. Ensure CAUL representation on groups seeking to influence regulatory reform, especially in relation to information policy such as: copyright, academic and other networks, higher education, eResearch, funding, etc. (CAUL Executive & All Members)

33. Respond to relevant federal and state government enquiries. (CAUL Executive & All Members)

34. Contribute to the ongoing operations of the Australian Libraries’ Copyright Committee to help shape the copyright policy environment. (All Members; $20,000 in 2007)

35. Promote the development of the national information infrastructure while highlighting the role of university libraries as partners in university learning, teaching, and research.

36. When appropriate, and with discretion, commission research into high priority matters affecting information policy in higher education, globally and nationally. (CAUL Executive)
37. Identify opportunities and assess collaborative proposals from members aimed at improving the quality of the national information infrastructure, especially in relation to information literacy, graduate qualities, business continuity and risk management. (CAUL Executive & All Members)

External Communication

38. Identify and cultivate influential contacts in the government, media and information industry accessing the professional networks of CAUL members. (All Members)

39. Promote and market the interests and achievements of CAUL to government, the universities, the AVCC, etc (CAUL Executive & All Members)

40. Develop and promote the CAUL web site as a source of information about higher education issues of relevance to university libraries. (Executive Officer & All Members)

41. In 2007, review and revise the presentation of the CAUL web site. (Executive Officer, CAUL Executive)

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

Internal Communication

43. Induct new members, continuing to send a ‘welcome package’ introducing them to the activities of CAUL and encouraging their participation. (CAUL Executive, Executive Office and All Members)

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

45. Inform members of the wide variety of communication channels now available to ensure members’ skills are contemporary and timely. (CAUL Executive & All Members)

Planning

46. Monitor and review the effectiveness of the CAUL communication strategy. (CAUL Executive and All Members)

47. Review the CAUL strategic plan in 2009. (CAUL Executive and All Members)
## CAUL Strategic Plan
### MAMS Report to CAUL

**Author:** Eve Woodberry  
**Date:** 4 September 2006  
**Date of previous report:** 23 March 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contribution to Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Represent CAUL on the MAMS Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>For the duration of the MAMS project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>Attended the MAMS Steering Committee meetings on the 3\textsuperscript{rd} May and the 9\textsuperscript{th} August in Sydney.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Achievements since last report | The MAMS project has been working with database providers to ‘shibbolize’ databases and requested CAUL provide its priorities to add to those from the UK and USA. This request was sent to CEIRC who are working on the project. ‘Shibbolising’ databases means that in the longer term it will not be necessary to use Ezproxy.  
The application of ‘shibboleth’ to the institutional repository projects is under negotiation with mixed responses from vendors. Work will continue in this area.  
The MAMS project is due for completion in 2006. In order to continue the development work and also the role out of the work to date, MAMS submitted a project plan to DEST recommending rolling in to the RAMP project. This will ensure the continuation of the work with the institutional repository projects, and the application within the e-research space.  
It was agreed that the MAMS Steering Committee would continue as the RAMP Steering Committee as the range of expertise required was similar enough to benefit from the knowledge developed by the Committee during the MAMS project. |
| Publicity, reports, publications since last report |  |
| Plan for forthcoming activity | Attend the MAMS Steering Committee meeting to be held in November in Sydney. |
| CAUL budget implications | None |
| Recommendations to CAUL | CAUL note the developments. |

Pro-forma updated 7 June, 2005
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## CAUL Strategic Plan
### Report to CAUL

**Author:** Maxine Brodie  
**Date:** 5 September 2005 (Final)  
**Date of previous report:** 15 March 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Advocacy and Communication: Relationships with Other Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Represent CAUL on the CAUDIT PKI Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Maxine Brodie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>January-June 2005 (Stage 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity since last report</strong></td>
<td>CAUDIT PKI Project Steering Committee Meeting met in Brisbane on 16 May (I was unable to attend because of the Management Frontiers US Trip)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievements since last report</strong></td>
<td>Substantial work was done for this meeting on the project plan for a pilot PKI implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Plan for forthcoming activity** | The CAUDIT PKI project has now been replaced by a newly funded ARIIC MERRI project:  
**E – Security Framework for Research**  
Lead Institution – University of Queensland  
Funding $649,000  
**Scope**  
Secure access and the authentication and authorisation of researchers, who access services and infrastructure across global networks, are fundamental building blocks for e-research. This project seeks to establish an E-Security framework which will integrate different two types of security systems, PKI and Shibboleth, to foster collaboration and enable the secure sharing of resources and research infrastructure within Australia and with international partners. The project will leverage off existing work in both areas, build on the advantages or these different systems and create a platform to enable the secure sharing of resources for and research infrastructure.  
**Partners:** Macquarie University, Council of Australian Directors of Information Technology (CAUDIT), Australian Partnership for Advanced Computing (APAC) and AARNet Pty Ltd |
| **CAUL budget implications** | Nil |
| **Recommendations to CAUL** | Pilot Project complete. CAUL Executive to confirm CAUL representative on this project Steering Committee if required by Lead Institution. |
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CAUL Strategic Plan  
Report to CAUL  

Author: Andrew Wells  
Date: 11 September 2006  
Date of previous report: April 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>II. Contribution to Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>5. Continue the development of the Australian Digital Theses Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>ADT Policy Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>ADT-ARIIC: Expansion and Redevelopment Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project is complete.

**OAI harvesting**

Theses from a number of members using the Digital Commons software are being added to the central database using OAI-PMH. Testing is underway with a number of other sites, including ones using DSpace.

**Research discovery services**

The ADT Program has been working with other theses services to exchange content. The following are either complete or under active negotiations:

- ARROW Research Discovery Service
- Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations
- Australian Council of Educational Research
- Libraries Australia
- PERX through their TechXtra service (http://www.techxtra.ac.uk/).

**Achievements since last report**  

**Membership**

There are 36 active members. Testing is underway with three new members: University of Auckland, Auckland University of Technology, and James Cook University of North Queensland.

**Theses**

There are 10,158 theses that link to a digital version of the thesis. 7,553 have been contributed directly by members and a further 2,605 have been loaded from the National Bibliographic Database. There are 135,990 records for theses on the database altogether representing those without links to digital theses.

**Publicity, reports, publications since last report**

**Plan for forthcoming**  

ADT Technical Committee
The Technical Committee met on Monday 4 September. Following a discussion on the implementation of institutional repositories to manage digital content including theses, the Committee has recommended to the ADT Policy Group that the program cease distribution of the ADT-customised VT-ETD software and that a date be set for cessation of support by the Program for that software. It also recommended that a review of the central ADT software be undertaken in 2007 though particularly taking into account the need to still gather records from members that use the VT-ETD software.

**NDLTD – Google Beta trial**

Six ADT members will take part in this trial to add theses records and content to Google Scholar via NDLTD. The trial is to test what workflows and data models will support efficient loading of theses into Google Scholar. The ADT Program is coordinating the trial for members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CAUL budget implications</strong></th>
<th>Ongoing levy to CAUL and CONZUL members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations to CAUL</strong></td>
<td>Note the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAUL Strategic Plan
Report to CAUL

Author: Heather Gordon
Date: September 7, 2006
Date of previous report: March 29, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Information Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchase and licensing of electronic information resources through the CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>CEIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Achievements since last report | **CEIRC 2006 Operational Plan**
1.3 Survey all CEIRC participants. Completed 
1.4 Analyse and address members’ reasons for non-participation. Ongoing 
2.1. Develop a risk management system for CEIRC operations. Ongoing 
2.2 Conduct risk management audit. Ongoing 
3.3 Communicate to CAUL ...negotiated AVCC/NCRIS products. Completed 
4.1 Identify and produce documentation to communicate and promote CEIRC activities. CEIRC is considering a Draft Strategic Marketing Plan 2007-2009. 
4.2 Publish a statement of benefits report. Ongoing 
4.4. Educate vendors and publishers... Ongoing 

**CEIRC Membership**
We have recommended to the CAUL Executive that the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research Ltd, a Crown Research Institute in New Zealand be approved for CEIRC membership.

The Department of Health has decided to withdraw from CEIRC membership.

**Product negotiations**
On June 13, all suppliers to CAUL were sent a request for 2007 pricing for both renewals and new subscribers. A preferred timeline was included in the request. Vendors were also referred to the CEIRC survey of 2005, noting its potential impact on preferred terms and conditions for CEIRC agreements.
ProQuest. The revised offer from ProQuest included three options: retain or join the current model; an FTE-based model; a pick-and-choose model. It is not necessary for all members to choose the same option.

Emerald. A 5 year renewal of the revised Emerald packages has been circulated. Initial responses have all been positive.

Wiley InterScience. Initial responses to the three-year renewal have been positive.

Blackwell Publishing. Initial responses to the new model are mixed, with some staying with the collection model.

Offers for new products have been received for:

- Research for Libraries.
- OCLC WorldCat Dissertations and Theses
- SIAM Journals Online and archive.
- Monash University e-press books and journals.
- Cambridge University Press's Cambridge Collections Online;
- Springer e-books, including Lecture Notes
- ASTM International Standards Collection Online
- LegalBIX (from LexisNexis)

For more information see http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/offers.htm

**Model Licence Clauses**

New clauses have been drafted to add to the webpage including: Visiting scholars, Adequate notice of withdrawal of content, Compensation for loss of content, description of content, and Ariel document delivery. The Model Clauses document is available at http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/CEIRC-licence-model-clauses.doc

**Other Issues**

Open URL Survey of compliant publishers is now completed and will go up on CEIRC web site. The focus is on Australian publishers

A discussion paper, Conditions for Adding New (Start-up) Titles, has been circulated to the DSCs for comments. The transfer of titles is a related issue. Springer is part of a vendor STM group called the “TRANSFER group” looking at a code of practice for what is essentially a “free trading zone” which should ease the transition of titles. Neil Renison will represent CEIRC as a member on the TRANSFER group.

CEIRC has recommended to the CAUL Executive that Diane Costello attend the next ICOLC meeting in Montreal in April 2007.

CEIRC discussed and endorsed the [ICOLC guidelines for statistical measures of usage of web-based information resources](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ICOLC-guidelines-for-statistical-measures-of-usage-of-web-based-information-resources). Statistics are to be kept for the number of sessions (logons), number of queries (searches) and number of full [text] content examined or downloaded.
**National Licensing Proposal**

Heather and Diane attended the 3rd National Licensing Forum on July 3rd. The Forum approved the vendor/library agreement pricing model, whereby eligible members may purchase products through a Head Deed agreement between the National Library of Australia and vendors.

Deeds may offer a range or products, pricing and availability to different Library sectors. The Consortium may include products that are not available to all Australian libraries and consortia.

NLP consortium members can purchase directly from the vendors that are parties to the Deed, at the price agreed for the Consortium.

A governance framework, defining the policies and conditions to administer the NLP as a non-profit consortium including authority, accountability, and participation is being drafted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CEIRC Vendor Checklist was updated on 22 June 2006 to include participation in archive services e.g. Portico, LOCKSS, etc. [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/checklist-vendor-negotiations.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/checklist-vendor-negotiations.doc).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for forthcoming activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next meeting is in Melbourne on 9 November. Continue to work on items in the 2006 operational plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUL budget implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget is on target. $5,000 set aside for research is unlikely to be used. ICOLC attendance came under budget with a saving of $800.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations to CAUL**
Pro-forma updated 7 June, 2005
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**CAUL Strategic Plan**  
**ILWG Report to CAUL**

**Author:** Ruth Quinn  
**Date:** 4 Sep 2006  
**Date of previous report:** 24 March 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contribution to Teaching and Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Action**           | Promote the development of standards, protocols and systems that will ensure a responsive and robust information environment to support flexible learning.  
                       | Undertake research and evaluation in information literacy as a graduate attribute. |
| **Responsibility**   | Information Literacy Working Group |
| **Time-line**        | Ongoing |
| **Activity since last report** | Several telephone calls between myself and Ralph Catts, now based in Scotland, regarding the Information Skills Survey. |
| **Achievements since last report** | 2nd edition of the ISS Administration manual now complete and available from the CAUL website.  
Easy Guide to ISS finalised.  
Reviewed ToR of ILWG as requested by Exec. |
| **Publicity, reports, publications since last report** | Documents that form the Information Skills Survey for Law/Education now complete with the Survey itself, the Admin manual, Technical manual, and Easy Guide all available from the CAUL homepage.  
Report on ToR of ILWG completed - see attached. |
| **Plan for forthcoming activity** | Dependant on outcome of attached report. |
| **CAUL budget implications** | None at this stage. |
| **Recommendations to CAUL** | That CAUL accept the ILWG report and consider the recommendations in the attached report. |
CAUL Information Literacy
Working Group

Review of ILWG Terms of Reference and Recommendation re continued existence

September 2006, prepared by Ruth Quinn, ILWG Convenor

The CAUL Information Literacy Working Group (ILWG) was established at the CAUL meeting held September 2003 for a period of two years and has the following terms of reference:

a) Provide advice to CAUL in information literacy and related issues;

b) Assist in the development of an assessment instrument for information literacy;

c) Develop appropriate measures for evaluating information literacy programs within university libraries;

d) Seek opportunities for CAUL to promote the inclusion of information literacy and related generic attributes in teaching and learning; and

e) Liaise on behalf of CAUL with other groups working in the area of information literacy.

The ILWG has been incorporated into the CAUL Strategic Plan under the area of Contribution to Teaching and Learning with the following specific actions for 2005-2006:

- Promote the development of standards, protocols, and systems that will ensure a responsive and robust information environment to support flexible learning;

- Undertake research and evaluation in information literacy as a graduate attribute through:
  o Development of an information literacy assessment instrument;
  o Development of evaluation measures which enable evaluation of library information literacy programs against university statements on graduate attributes;
  o Working with ANZIIL and university staff to design research projects that will contribute to the development of best practice guidelines;
  o Investigating the feasibility of deploying generic information literacy modules through collaborative effort.
Achievements

Since formed in 2003 the ILWG has achieved the following:

a) ILWG website established consisting of information about the group, links to publications available, links to IL websites in Australian universities, and a list of relevant literature on IL especially in Australian HE institutions.

b) Two e-lists established: caul-ilwg consisting of small working group, and caul-info-literacy consisting of an IL representative in each of the CAUL member institutions.


d) Finalisation of the Information Skills Survey, consisting of an instrument applicable to the Law and Education areas, an Administration manual, a Technical manual, and an Easy Guide, produced with the assistance of Dr Ralph Catts, formerly from CQU and UNE, and now based at University of Sterling, Scotland: http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/publications.html#iss


Success against ToRs

a) Provide advice to CAUL on information literacy and related issues.

Minimal success with ILWG not really proactive in this area as a group. The CAUL Exec Officer circulates relevant information such as the IFLA Statement, Carrick alerts, etc. Initially, the ILWG webpage was seen as a mechanism for achieving this, but updating this initially useful resource has proved challenging. Certainly it is expected that individual members raise issues within their own organisations.

b) Assist in the development of an assessment instrument for information literacy.

Reasonable success with the finalisation of the Information Skills Survey appropriate for use with students in the disciplines of Law and Education. It should be noted that the success of such ventures is dependent on the involvement of third parties, such as academics and university administrators.

c) Develop appropriate measures for evaluating information literacy programs within university libraries.

Reasonable success with members of ILWG involved in the redevelopment of the IL Standards into the IL Framework, published by ANZIIL, and the development of the Best Practice Guidelines, based on the ACRL equivalent document.

d) Seek opportunities for CAUL to promote the inclusion of information literacy and related generic attributes in teaching and learning.
Some success with the endorsement of the Prague Declaration: Towards an information literate society. There has also been some initial discussions with Ralph Catts regarding the possibility of a project to get information literacy included as part of the Course Experience Questionnaire.

e) Liaise on behalf of CAUL with other groups working in the area of information literacy.

Reasonable success with good links in existence with ANZIIL, ALIA Info Lit, Tafe Libraries Australia, and IFLA Information Literacy Section. Organisations such as ACRL, JISC, and Sheila Webber’s blog on IL are constantly monitored and occasionally contributed to, by individual group members.

Discussion

Based on feedback received from members of the smaller working group, the terms of reference for ILWG are appropriate and achievable by such a group, although it is recognised that such as group can only provide an oversight role to larger projects such as the Information Skills Survey. We recommend however that the Terms of Reference referring to assessment (b) and evaluation (c) be brought together into the one statement:

Provide ongoing support and resources to facilitate effective assessment of information literacy knowledge and skills, and appropriate evaluation of information literacy courses and programs within university libraries.

Working group members also felt that the current structure of ILWG which involves a small number of current IL practitioners and one university librarian was appropriate. There didn’t seem to be any advantage of moving to the traditional CAUL model of university librarians forming the core group. While face-to-face meetings would be an advantage, the teleconferences when we’ve had them have worked reasonably well.

We do note that discussion on the wider caul-info-literacy e-list has been very limited. People tend to use the ALIA Info-Lit e-list to discuss IL-related issues. The wider group has been a useful tool to communicate changes to the website etc, and more effort could be put into initiating and facilitating discussion. We recommend it be maintained for the time being.

I have been Convenor of the ILWG since 2003. I have agreed to do so until the end of 2006 after which I am more than happy to continue in this role, but I can see lots of advantages in having someone new in the position. I recommend we call for nominations to convene at the September 2006 meeting.
Future Directions

It is really in the area of proposed new work that would justify the continued existence of ILWG. There are a number of areas that have been proposed but there is a general consensus that the assessment area is the area to concentrate on. For the immediate future there are two practical projects that could be progressed:

1) Develop a straightforward instrument, perhaps in the form of a pre-test and post-test, that would be appropriate for measuring the impact of an IL program within an institution. There is concern within the group that the ISS has become unnecessarily complicated due to an emphasis on benchmarking. Is benchmarking across different institutions really necessary for IL, or is it better to have standard pre-tests and post-tests that could be used within an institution to ascertain if their IL program has been effective? ILWG could undertake a review of various assessment instruments that are now available, do an investigation of potential sources of funding to develop such an instrument, and then develop a Request for Information document that would test the market.

2) Develop an Australian version of the JISC i-skills document: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=pub_sissdocs. This targets the development of information skills in the electronic environment in both academic and general staff within HE/FE institutions within the UK, so gives a broader perspective than IL for students.

3) Promote the use of the current ISS for Law/Education by presenting at appropriate conferences, and perhaps holding a seminar in conjunction with ANZIIL. May be of interest to those organisations interested in benchmarking.

4) Update the CAUL ILWG website and reinvigorate the larger caul-info-literacy e-list.
Recommendations for CAUL

1) That the Information Literacy Working Group continue to exist in its current form for a further two years until the end of 2008.

2) That the terms of reference be changed to:
   a. Provide advice to CAUL on information literacy and related issues (no change);
   b. Provide ongoing support and resources to facilitate effective assessment of information literacy knowledge and skills and appropriate evaluation of information literacy courses and programs within university libraries (old (b) and (c) combined);
   c. Seek opportunities for CAUL to promote the inclusion of information literacy and related generic attributes in teaching and learning (no change); and
   d. Liaise on behalf of CAUL with other groups working in the area of information literacy (no change).

3) That nominations for the position of Convenor ILWG for 2007-2008 be called.

4) That the future directions of ILWG as outlined above be accepted.
## Section I. Contribution to Teaching & Learning

### Action
Continue to refine and clarify protocols for the streamlined operation of University Library Australia – the national borrowing scheme

### Responsibility
ULA Working Group

### Time-line
Ongoing

### Activity since last report
On issues reported to CAUL 2006/1:

1. **Website**: the Procedures and Protocols section was written in 2001 and requires update
   
   Text has been updated ready to load

2. **The PDF brochure requires update** – list of participating universities is not up to date
   
   Text has been updated. The brochure will be available only in electronic format and ULA member libraries can print copies locally if they require print versions. The CAUL office can advise on a suitable printer for those ULA members who wish to outsource the work.

3. **Metropolitan campuses of non-metropolitan universities**:
   
   Some ULA libraries perceived that ULA was being used for primary library services rather than supplementary services to extend the range of resources available. The ULA Working Party surveyed CAUL members. The survey results are available via the survey register 2006/11 [Library services for students at remote campuses & follow-up survey](#). The first survey revealed that the perception of “over reliance” by students at “shop front” campuses on ULA affects universities with inner city campuses. The follow up survey revealed the extent of use of “shop front” campuses. Statistics on ULA use as at 31/8/06 available at [ULA Statistics Reports (summaries)](#) and [ULA Reports - Full data from universities](#) lack the data which would allow in-depth analysis to confirm or eliminate the perception of over-reliance.

   Home institution libraries are involved to various degrees in the definition and quality assurance of library services to students and staff and “shop-front” campuses and where arrangements are made for full service provision by a third party library, there is no data to assess whether student use that service or prefer a ULA library which they perceive to be more convenient.

   It is also clear that there is a misconception by some CAUL members on what they can reasonably be expected to provide under ULA and where services that are requested are out of the scope of ULA.

### Achievements since last report
As above

### Publicity, reports, publications since
As above
last report

Plan for forthcoming activity

ULA Working Party will:

- Clarify the purpose and scope of the ULA service: what can be expected and what is out of scope
- Define and recommend standards for library services to “shop front” campuses located remotely to the home institution. There is significant overlap with the [CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students](#). 11 May 2004.
- Load updated content to the web site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUL budget implications</th>
<th>Nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAUL Strategic Plan  
Report to CAUL  

Author: **Felicity McGregor**  
(Date: 7.9.06; Date of previous report: 24.3.06)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>BEST PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Action** | 1. Review and develop indicators of the quality of library information and research services and develop measures to support them.  
            2. Other indicators  
            3. Rodski surveys |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Best Practice Working Group (Felicity McGregor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Time-line** | Rodski - Library Survey Communication Portal  
                 A list of proposed improvements to the Portal was circulated to CAUL members on 3/7/06 in the form of a CAUL Survey. Responses were collated and circulated on 17/8/06 to both CAUL and to Ivan Palos, Research Project Manager, Ambit Insights (now own Rodski).  
                 Responses to most of the suggestions were favourable.  
                 Ivan Palos has sent a letter to Felicity McGregor which outlines the actions already taken. Ivan asked for his thanks to be conveyed to those who provided feedback. He comments: “There were some great suggestions that we hadn’t thought of, which will help us provide you with a high class and useful portal”.  
                 The letter is attached. |

| Publicity, reports, publications since last report |  |
| Plan for forthcoming activity | Felicity McGregor has resigned as Chair of the Best Practice Working Group but advises that she is happy to participate in any future best practice related activity supported by CAUL. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations to CAUL</th>
<th>Rodski: CAUL notes the improvements to the Portal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### CAUL Strategic Plan

**Report to CAUL**

Author: **Derek Whitehead**

(Date: Sept 2006; Date of previous report: Apr 2006)

“Cheap, useful, fairly valid.”

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>3 – Management for Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>13 Collect and publish statistics on Australasian university library outputs and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Review the current CAUL statistical measures – presentation format, usefulness, use and users and present a plan and proposal to CAUL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Statistics Focus Group / Derek Whitehead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity since last report**

Since the last meeting of CAUL (in Apr 2006)

1. The Statistics Focus group has not met.
2. The new statistics website at [http://statistics.caul.edu.au](http://statistics.caul.edu.au) has been in operation since 2005, and Cathie Jilovsky has developed a work program incorporating suggested further minor changes to the site.
3. Collection of 2005 data has been completed (as at August 2006) and is currently being held up by the absence of 2005 DEST population data. When this is available, the statistics will be made available; publication of AARL has also, coincidently, been delayed.
4. In the meantime the 2005 CAUL Statistics have been made available through the CAUL Online Statistics site [http://statistics.caul.edu.au](http://statistics.caul.edu.au) without the DEST data. We have added notes to several pages on the website indicating this.

**Achievements since last report**

See above

**Publicity, reports, publications since last report**

The 2005 CAUL statistics were made available on the CAUL website in mid-August.

**Plan for forthcoming activity**

1. It is likely that the next meeting will be held in Sydney in conjunction with the Online Conference in February. No meeting is currently scheduled.
2. The deemed list is a significant element in the usefulness of the collection statistics. A statement will be drafted indicating how the deemed list is used in the statistics.
3. The CSFG has agreed that trend analysis of CAUL statistical data should be done, for, say, the past decade, as commissioned research. It agreed to further this proposal and to develop a specification for the work, and selectively seek proposals.
4. Additional measures. The CSFG monitors the need for additional measures and the relevance of existing measures. There was a report at the last meeting.
5. Training in the use of COUNTER standards has been proposed as an Australianised version of a UK training program. It will be discussed at the meeting in Sydney in February.

**Recommendation to CAUL**

That this report be accepted.

---

**Derek Whitehead**
CAUL Online Statistics - Enhancements

Note to the CAUL Executive
These enhancements have been proposed by CAVAL, which manages the CAUL statistics. I have discussed them online with members of the CAUL Statistics Focus Group (CSFG), who are supportive – comments from all of the members are attached, except for me, and I support the proposal too. As you can see, CAVAL have made a number of enhancements already. On the other hand, three tasks await further specification and quotation. The total price is $5643 if all are done, plus GST.
We recommend that these be funded.

Derek Whitehead
11 September, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement/Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority – Nov 2005</th>
<th>Status – August 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PDF copy of survey &amp; definitions</td>
<td>Add new feature to allow creation of PDF reports for survey (both with and without data) and definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented Mar 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CP/NA sum field fixes – Input Module</td>
<td>Update Input Module pages to incorporate new CP/NA sum/summed field logic for calculations</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Implemented Apr 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deemed List integration</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Detailed specification to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mount spreadsheet with AKA definitions</td>
<td>AKA definitions for stats/institutions to be mounted on site as excel file</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Implemented Apr 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Last modified/last accessed fields for library table</td>
<td>Add new fields to library table and modify input module pages to log last time a library account was accessed and last time library data was modified</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Implemented Mar 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Input Module DEST checkbox</td>
<td>Add checkbox to input module to handle DEST submission: if checked DEST fields are excluded from institution's submission i.e. institution can complete and sign-off submission (DEST fields are ignored on errors page); if not checked institution to fill out all fields as usual.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Implemented Mar 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CAUL Online Statistics - Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Instructions</th>
<th>Update based on evaluation feedback and experience</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Implemented Apr 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Front-end display modifications</td>
<td>Display comments/notes; display estimates; selective display of NU values; determine which pages on front-end to display above</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Quotation below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Online Help</td>
<td>Re-organise Online Help, Glossary and instructions to improve user-friendliness</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Implemented Apr 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Input module locked status</td>
<td>Add new locked status of ‘readonly’ to input module to allow users access to their data once submission is complete. When submission is signed-off, change status to readonly instead of locked, modify input module pages to only allow update/display save buttons if locked set to ‘no’. Modify input login page to allow readonly statut to login</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Implemented Mar 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Increase no of fields available for displays</td>
<td>Increase number of institutions to 15 when selecting fields for the Institutional data and graphs options</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotation below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Expand use of Region field</td>
<td>Incorporate the selection of regions into the Institutional data and Graphs options e.g. include option for CAUL (Australia) only</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotation below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Expand Graphs functionality</td>
<td>Add options to graph ratios</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop detailed specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Expand options for Summary statistics</td>
<td>Add new options to select by region or selected institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotation below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Collection Sizes</td>
<td>Add / subtract from last years values</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implemented Apr 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ranked Lists</td>
<td>Calculate “Standard set” i.e. as in print version</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotation below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Make input data available progressively rather than waiting for all data from all sites</td>
<td>17.1 Allow ‘readonly’ access to each institution’s data once input is complete. 17.2 make data available from Online site</td>
<td>17.1 Implemented Apr 2006 17.2 Develop detailed specification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTED as part of Annual maintenance** - Tasks 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 17.1

**Further scoping and development of detailed SPECIFICATION required** - Tasks 3, 13 and 17.2
CAUL Online Statistics - Enhancements

QUOTATION

Task 8   $2280
Task 11  $760
Task 12  $1140
Task 14  $1140
Task 16  $950

=====
TOTAL  $6270  (plus GST = $6897.00)

=====

If all 5 tasks implemented together 10% discount = $5643.00 (plus GST = $6207.00)
CAUL Online Statistics - Enhancements

CAUL Statistics Development Proposal – Comments from the CAUL Statistics Focus Group

Maxine Brodie

From: "Maxine Brodie" <mbrodie@mars.ocs.mq.edu.au>  
Wednesday - September 6, 2006 5:50 PM

To: "Derek Whitehead" <DWhitehead@groupwise.swin.edu.au> 

Subject: Re: [csfg] CAUL Statistics

Derek
I'm not sure I understand the implications of Task 8 but would be guided by the other CSFG members on this. I am happy to support all the other Tasks

Maxine

Chris Wilson

Hi Derek,

These look fine to me thanks. Is there a designated budget for the stats or will these proposals only go ahead if money is voted for the quoted enhancements?

Regards

Chris Wilson
Associate University Librarian, Access Services
University of Auckland Library |Te Tumu Herenga
Private Bag 92019 AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND
Phone 64 9 373 7599 ext 88052 Fax 64 9 373 7565
c.wilson@auckland.ac.nz

Gehan Aboud

Hi Derek,

Yes, all look good & the costs appear to be reasonable. I'm particularly interested to see further improvements to Deemed List integration.

Best Wishes

Ms. Gehan Aboud
Cataloguing Services Librarian
Victoria University
St Albans Campus Library
PO BOX 14428
MELBOURNE VIC 8001
Australia
CAUL Online Statistics - Enhancements

Jocelyn Priddey

Dear CSFG Folk,

The listed proposals and associated brief descriptions have my support.

Thanks

Jocelyn

Properties

Jocelyn Priddey
Senior Manager, Information Resources
IAS, Level 1, Duhig Bldg,
Library
University of Queensland
St Lucia 4072

Diane Costello

Dear Derek,

I consider most of the quoted items a high priority, so would support their being done (out of reserve funds, and all together.)

I would like 17 done sooner rather than later - waiting for a few institutions before being able to see the rest isn't making the best use of our system.

13 is a lower priority for me.
3 should be done.

cheers,
Diane

Diane Costello
Executive Officer, CAUL (Council of Australian University Librarians)
LPO Box 8169, ANU, Canberra ACT 2601 Australia
Tel: +61 2 6125 2990 Fax: +61 2 6248 8571
diane.costello@caul.edu.au http://www.caul.edu.au/
Hi Derek

the quoted proposals with brief descriptions have my support -

I would presume that item 12 would allow a CONZUL only option as well.

If implemented, I assume that for all the quoted items any support are covered under any annual maintenance that is currently paid.

If the detailed specifications were provided and CAVAL were able to quote then I guess approval for remaining items would have to go to next CAUL meeting

cheers
Stephen

Stephen Gillespie
Associate Director, Resources
RMIT University Library. Melbourne, VIC. Australia
mobile: 0425 780 884
ph: +61 3 9925 2573 fax: +61 3 9663 3047
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CAUL Strategic Plan
Report to CAUL

Author: Eve Woodberry
Date: 4 September 2006
Date of previous report: 23 March 2006

Section Advocacy, Marketing, Communication

Action

Present CAUL position to copyright meetings, references and inquiries.
Represent CAUL at meetings involving copyright issues in various forums

Responsibility

Represent CAUL and provide feedback to members on issues relating to copyright at a national and international level.
Represent CAUL on the ALCC.
Respond to copyright references and reports on behalf of CAUL.
Keep CAUL members advised of AVCC negotiations and developments regarding relationships with CAL, Screenrights and other copyright collecting agencies.
Circulate to CAUL matters of interest and developments in copyright legislation.

Time-line As required

Activity since last report

Represented CAUL at the ALCC meeting in Canberra on the 9th June.
Attended IFLA Copyright and other legal matters (CLM) meetings in Seoul, Korea 18-25th August, as the Australian representative.
Utilising the agreed methodology for the production of submissions to government inquiries CAUL agreed to support the ALCC/ADA submission to the Technological Protection measures (TPM) enquiry. The introduction of TPMs into Australian legislation was a requirement from the US/AUS FTA.
Megan Deacon from Monash University attended and reported on the ADAs forum on TPMs on 7th August for CAUL.

Achievements since last report

Publicity, reports, publications since last report

Plan for forthcoming activity

CAUL budget implications

Travel to Canberra for ALCC meeting
$20,000 contribution to the operation of the ALCC in 2007

Recommendations to CAUL

It is recommended that members agree to contribute $20,000 to the continued operation of the ALCC in 2007.
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### Advocacy and Communication

**Action**
- Relationships with other organisations – Libraries Australia Advisory Committee

**Responsibility**
- John Arfield and Linda Luther

**Time-line**
- Ongoing

**Activity since last report**
- The Libraries Australia Advisory Committee has held one meeting, by teleconference, since the previous report to CAUL.

**Achievements since last report**
- Discussion at the April CAUL meeting of the charging model and related issues was reported to LAAC. A status report on LA indicated that following the resolution of problems with the Record Import Service attention of NLA staff would turn to data quality. An expert advisory group had been established to review guidelines for cataloguing e-resources. There was discussion of the Post Implementation Review report and progress on the Customer and Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey was noted. Following a series of interviews and focus groups an online survey of all LA customers (both practitioners and CEOs) will be conducted.

**Publicity, reports, publications since last report**

**Plan for forthcoming activity**
- Further discussions are to be held between NLA and CAUL on the issues raised at the April CAUL meeting.

- A new business plan is being developed for Libraries Australia. Among the developments likely to be included are improving the quality of the database, the addition of more Z39.50 databases, more non-Roman script records, relevance ranking and the creation of logical views for specific library sectors.

- The 2006 Libraries Australia Forum will be held in Melbourne on 3 November. The previous day will mark the exact 25th anniversary of the AND; a celebration will be held to mark the event.

**CAUL budget implications**

**Recommendations to CAUL**

---

Pro-forma updated 7 June, 2005
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# CAUL Strategic Plan

## Report to CAUL

**Author:** Jim Graham  
**Date:** 28th August 2006  
**Date of previous report:** 29th March 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Relationships with Other Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>QULOC Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Convenor, QULOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Achievements since last report** | Jim Graham from Australian Catholic University took over from Heather Gordon as QULOC Convener on 3rd July. Jim's 2 year term will finish in mid 2008.  
Since the last CAUL meeting QULOC has organised the following seminars;  
- Write that report/ QULOC Staffing Issues Working Party. 12/5/06.  
- Selling the Library message / QULOC Lending & Doc Del WP. 22/6/06.  
- [The Successful Repository](#)/ An APSR event held in collaboration with QULOC and RUBRIC. 29/6/06  
- Communication with clients using New technologies / QULOC Information & Communication Technology WP. 28/8/06. |
| **Publicity, reports, publications since last report** | QULOC’s 2005 Annual Report and Issue 6 of *QULOC news* have both been published and are available on the QULOC website.  
An Information Kit for Working Party Representatives and Convenors has been published and is available on the website. |
| **Plan for forthcoming activity** | Forthcoming QULOC events include:  
- Working Effectively Across Collaborative Teams / Staffing Issues WP. 8/9/06.  
- Masterclass for EndNote Trainers / Information Skills & Services WP. 27/10/06  
- University Librarian’s Forum . 23/11/06  
QULOC University Librarians will have a business meeting on 24th November and review the QULOC Strategic Plan on 23rd November 2006.  
A revision of the QULOC Research Grant Guidelines will be available on the website before the end of September. |
| **CAUL budget implications** | None. |
| **Recommendations to CAUL** | None. |
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Format of this Report
The main budget worksheet is CAUL’s Profit & Loss (P&L) for the year to date, showing:

In AUD:
- Budgeted income
- Budgeted expenditure
- Expected expenditure to date (based on the budgeted amount and the expected expenditure flow, which may be seasonal)
- Actual expenditure to date (from the MYOB AUD P&L report)

The sub-total (CAUL + CEIRC operations) reports CAUL’s operational budget. Following this sub-total are items for which CAUL collects funds to pay subscriptions of various kinds, effectively cost-neutral: datasets subscriptions, Rodski subscriptions, SPARC membership.

In USD, GBP and EUR:
The income and expenditure of the foreign currency accounts are presented below the AUD report - these items, datasets income and expenditure, also are effectively cost-neutral with the exception of interest.

The worksheets which follow the main report are the Balance Sheets and the P&L reports for each of the four currencies.

CAUL Income
The budget for CAUL income is presented once only, not month by month. The only variable items are interest earned and the sale of publications - currently the information literacy user guide, and the CAUL performance indicators which are sold through CAVAL. All other income is collected at the beginning of the year, due by January 31. Presenting a month-by-month report would be highly repetitive.

CAUL Expenditure
The expenditure to date is taken from the MYOB report AUD P&L, shown on a separate worksheet. The budget item may be a single MYOB item, or may be a sum of more than one item eg office expenses are the sum of accounts for fax, telephone, consumables, training, bank fees, etc; executive officer expenses are the sum of salary, on-costs, salary administration, etc.

Datasets Subscriptions “Budget”
As there is no budget for this item, income and expenditure patterns of the previous year have been used. The bulk of the income and expenditure happens during renewals time of November-January.
CAUL Budget Report - 2006 Budget year to date report
13 September, 2006

Over-expenditure cf budgeted expenditure to 13/9/06:
The total salaries for general administration and CEIRC administration add correctly, but are showing over and under respectively because the hourly rates are different.

Under-expenditure cf budgeted expenditure to 13/9/06:
The 2007 budget for the President's meetings has been reduced because this item is consistently under-spent - in the main because the President extends travel for other purposes, and makes only a few trips specifically in the role of CAUL president.
Similarly, the 2007 budget for representation/seminars has been reduced. This item will be monitored.
Only one ADT meeting will be held in 2006, in October. The costs are likely to be less than budgeted.
CEIRC has not commissioned any external work, with the committee undertaking all identified work. The research budget is likely to be unspent.
Audit of 2005 CAUL accounts
The audit of the 2005 accounts confirmed a "profit" of $36,635, of which $24,306 was a surplus to the budgetted amount, and the remainder effective "income" from interest earned and "gain/loss on foreign exchange" on the foreign currency accounts. Retained earnings amount to $427,929 across all accounts. Cash held at the end of the 2005 financial year was AUD 739,619.

Salary Expenditure for 2007
The Executive Officer total is based on the 2007 salary of $89,039 plus on-costs and salary administration (ANU) of 39%

The Finance and Administration Officer is based on the 2007 salary of $44,203 plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7%

The Administration Officer (0.15 FTE) is based on the 2007 casual rates of $30.02 plus plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7%

CEIRC Income & Expenditure for 2007
CEIRC Income is based on a 5% increase over last year's fees, for both the 49 internal (CAUL, CONZUL and CSIRO) members at $1,320 and the 26 external participants at $1,980.

CEIRC Expenditure varies with the cost of travel of the committee, and increases annually because of salary costs, currently calculated at 35% of the Executive Officer and 85% of the Finance and Administration Officer

Interest earned on the foreign currency accounts in notionally available to the CEIRC program, though the funds are not actually transferred into the AUD account, and do not therefore show as income earned, except on paper. The funds are retained in the foreign currency accounts as a float.

Publications / Web Site for 2007
It is proposed that the web site design be updated. CAUDIT is in the middle of a similar exercise, and was given quotes of $21k, $35k and $99k for the first stage. Given that the CAUL requirements are simpler, specifically with respect to the number of levels of authentication, it is proposed that $25,000 be allocated from reserve funds.

Travel Costs for 2007
CAUL committee meetings are held in the most efficient and cost-effective venues, which generally means the least onerous travel conditions for the members (eg preferably be able to fly direct) while taking best advantage of the cheaper fare options available. Costs depend mostly on the home base of the committee members - more expensive where there is less competition between airlines. The average cost of fares hasn't changed much over the last few years, so the location of the committee members is generally the largest variable factor.

ADT Budget 2007 - Andrew Wells.

We set out cost of operation in business plan 2006-2009, item 4, operation. For 2006, we will use Marian's moneys to fund awards. The NTLTD invoice is on its way for the amount in the plan. There are no software maintenance costs but we do that ourselves now but will absorb. I do not think anyone will travel to NTLTD this year. So expenses over 2006 will be as per business plan minus (software maintenance + NTLTD expenses + awards). So $57 K + travel expenses. Levy across CAUL and CONZUL.

For 2007, add awards so $59 K plus travel expenses. Again, we will do NTLTD work via email.
### CAUL Budget 2006 (updated 13/9/06)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budgeted Income</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure</th>
<th>Budgeted Balance</th>
<th>Expected Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.65) 71,500.00</td>
<td>47,666.67</td>
<td>$44,643.00</td>
<td>-$3,023.67</td>
<td>-6.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>Admin Assistant 21,019.20</td>
<td>14,012.80</td>
<td>17,592.88</td>
<td>$3,580.06</td>
<td>25.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution</td>
<td>3,720.00</td>
<td>Office Expenses 7,000.00</td>
<td>4,866.67</td>
<td>4,047.77</td>
<td>-$618.90</td>
<td>-13.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting 7,300.00</td>
<td>4,045.00</td>
<td>4,045.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Rental 8,190.00</td>
<td>5,460.00</td>
<td>5,250.45</td>
<td>-$209.55</td>
<td>-3.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment 4,000.00</td>
<td>2,666.67</td>
<td>2,952.50</td>
<td>-$285.83</td>
<td>10.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Meetings 15,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,870.48</td>
<td>$870.48</td>
<td>8.76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Meetings 12,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,647.42</td>
<td>$647.42</td>
<td>8.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President's Meetings 5,000.00</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>710.67</td>
<td>-$2,622.66</td>
<td>-52.68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation of CAUL 3,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>1,578.24</td>
<td>-$421.76</td>
<td>-21.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings 2,000.00</td>
<td>1,333.33</td>
<td>1,74.85</td>
<td>-$1,158.48</td>
<td>-86.89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications / Web Site 500.00</td>
<td>333.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$545.45</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award 6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,545.45</td>
<td>$4,545.45</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IFLA Membership 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Operating)</strong></td>
<td>207,120.00</td>
<td>162,509.20</td>
<td>44,610.80</td>
<td>104,339.47</td>
<td>105,058.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALCC Levy 20,000.00</td>
<td>ALCC Membership 20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Membership 500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings 2,500.00</td>
<td>1,666.67</td>
<td>1,447.38</td>
<td>-$219.29</td>
<td>-13.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Copyright)</strong></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>22,166.67</td>
<td>21,947.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics Publication 27,610.00</td>
<td>27,610.00</td>
<td>24,738.40</td>
<td>-$2,871.60</td>
<td>-10.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics Meetings 1,000.00</td>
<td>666.67</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>-$652.12</td>
<td>-97.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Best Practice)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,460.00</td>
<td>-30,460.00</td>
<td>28,943.33</td>
<td>24,752.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>363.85</td>
<td>$363.85</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (ULA)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>363.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADT Membership Fees 73,440.00</td>
<td>Infrastructure (UNSW) 5,430.00</td>
<td>4,545.45</td>
<td>$4,545.45</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings 5,000.00</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>1,447.38</td>
<td>-$285.83</td>
<td>-10.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (ADT)</strong></td>
<td>73,440.00</td>
<td>67,000.00</td>
<td>6,440.00</td>
<td>6,440.00</td>
<td>6,440.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL)</strong></td>
<td>309,060.00</td>
<td>291,469.20</td>
<td>17,590.80</td>
<td>17,590.80</td>
<td>17,590.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEIRC Levy (CAUL) 60,480.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.35) 38,500.00</td>
<td>25,666.67</td>
<td>25,666.67</td>
<td>$23,943.33</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEIRC Levy (external) 52,440.00</td>
<td>CEIRC Assistant (0.85) 59,554.40</td>
<td>39,702.93</td>
<td>39,702.93</td>
<td>$34,851.47</td>
<td>54.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>check! 113,920.90</td>
<td>Meetings 5,000.00</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>1,447.38</td>
<td>-$285.83</td>
<td>-10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research 5,000.00</td>
<td>3,333.33</td>
<td>1,447.38</td>
<td>-$285.83</td>
<td>-10.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICOLC Meetings 5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>4,175.52</td>
<td>-$824.48</td>
<td>-16.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (CEIRC)</strong></td>
<td>112,920.00</td>
<td>123,054.40</td>
<td>-10,134.40</td>
<td>83,702.93</td>
<td>76,042.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)</strong></td>
<td>421,980.00</td>
<td>414,523.60</td>
<td>7,456.40</td>
<td>242,485.73</td>
<td>229,584.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,456.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support from members 8,500.00</td>
<td>SPARC Membership 8,500.00</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Scholarly Communication)</strong></td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datasets Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subscriptions Income 61,825.99</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61,825.99</td>
<td>61,825.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (AUD account)</strong></td>
<td>492,305.99</td>
<td>423,023.60</td>
<td>7,456.40</td>
<td>242,485.73</td>
<td>291,313.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subscriptions Income 475,587.82</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>384,120.42</td>
<td>384,120.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest 32,566.35</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32,566.35</td>
<td>32,566.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL USD</strong></td>
<td>508,154.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>384,120.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subscriptions Income 14,605.73</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,378.00</td>
<td>22,378.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest 4,175.09</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,175.09</td>
<td>4,175.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL £</strong></td>
<td>18,784.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,378.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subscriptions Income 640.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest 0.00</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EUR</strong></td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>646.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>40 CAUL members @ $4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>1. EO full costs = salary, on-costs, salary admin, travel not related to specific program - divided 65/35 between CAUL and CEIRC, salary 84k from 11/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>19,000 in 2003; 22717 in 2004; 14014 to 30/6/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>&lt;$ 15% time allocated to general CAUL activity HEW4 incl o/c &amp; salary mgmt plus extra hours 0.15 for admin support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>replace PC purchased May 2000 &amp; fax &amp; printer purchased 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: Diane Costello: repositories forum 2005 = 2547; RQF forum = 2150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>Approved CAUL2004/2, not to be renewed caul2005/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>40 CAUL members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>1xALCC,CLRCSydney, LobbyingCanberra, Zwolle, IFLA?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>Library Consortium £335 ($500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>Income from 2004 recorded in liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: Diane Costello:</td>
<td>paid in December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>USD7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>39 CAUL members, CSIRO &amp; CONZUL = 48*1260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>24 external participants @1,890 + 1 @ 1800 + CONZUL external contribution 5280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>&gt;85% time on CEIRC activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>Interest on Foreign Currency Accounts expected to be AUD25k, not transferred to AUD account, but &quot;applied&quot; to CEIRC income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>USD5,000 (est.AUD 8,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: Diane Costello:</td>
<td>paid in December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td>Sponsored by individual CAUL members USD5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Income</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Budgeted Expenditure</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Budgeted Balance</td>
<td>Expected Expenditure to date</td>
<td>Actual Expenditure to date</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.65)</td>
<td>80,466.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>Admin Assistant</td>
<td>20,114.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution</td>
<td>3,720.00</td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President's Meetings</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation/Seminars</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications / Web Site</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IFLA Membership</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Operating)</strong></td>
<td>211,720.00</td>
<td>190,750.85</td>
<td>20,969.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCC Levy</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>ALCC Membership</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Membership</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Copyright)</strong></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Publication</td>
<td>30,512.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTER Membership</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILWG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Statistics Site Enhancement</td>
<td>5,643.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Best Practice)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38,005.00</td>
<td>-38,005.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (ULA)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (R&amp;D)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT Membership Fees</td>
<td>64,800.00</td>
<td>Infrastructure (UNSW)</td>
<td>49,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTLTD Meetings</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTLTD Membership</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (ADT)</strong></td>
<td>64,800.00</td>
<td>63,500.00</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL)</strong></td>
<td>305,020.00</td>
<td>323,755.85</td>
<td>-18,735.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (CAUL)</td>
<td>63,360.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.35)</td>
<td>43,317.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (external)</td>
<td>51,480.00</td>
<td>CEIRC Assistant (0.85)</td>
<td>53,239.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOLC Meetings</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL-industry ThinkTank</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (CEIRC)</strong></td>
<td>114,840.00</td>
<td>121,557.15</td>
<td>-6,717.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)</strong></td>
<td>419,860.00</td>
<td>445,313.00</td>
<td>-25,453.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>($25,453.00)</td>
<td>($25,453.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from members</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>SPARC Membership</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Scholarly Communication)</strong></td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datasets Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (AUD account)</strong></td>
<td>428,360.00</td>
<td>453,813.00</td>
<td>-25,453.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL USD</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL £</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EUR</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>40 CAUL members @ $4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>1. EO full costs = salary, on-costs, salary admin, travel not related to specific program - divided 65/35 between CAUL and CEIRC, salary 84k from 11/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>19,000 in 2003; 22717 in 2004; 14014 to 30/6/06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>&lt; 15% time allocated to general CAUL activity HEW4 incl o/c &amp; salary mgmt plus extra hours 0.15 for admin support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>9000 minus CEIRC contribution for external 8*630=5040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>315+GST per fortnight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>Approved CAUL2004/2, not to be renewed caul2005/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>40 CAUL members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>Library Consortium £335 ($500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40</td>
<td>40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>Income from 2004 recorded in liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: including awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H43</td>
<td>Diane Costello: paid in December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D46</td>
<td>USD7,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B51</td>
<td>39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL + CSIRO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B52</td>
<td>External members estimate for 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D52</td>
<td>&gt;85% time on CEIRC activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E55</td>
<td>1 meeting only in 2007 late April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F57</td>
<td>Interest on Foreign Currency Accounts expected to be AUD25k, not transferred to AUD account, but &quot;applied&quot; to CEIRC income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D64</td>
<td>USD5,000 (est.AUD 8,500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H64</td>
<td>40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Library Consortium £335 ($500)**

- **EO full costs** = salary, on-costs, salary admin, travel not related to specific program - divided 65/35 between CAUL and CEIRC, salary 84k from 11/05.
- < 15% time allocated to general CAUL activity HEW4 incl o/c & salary mgmt plus extra hours 0.15 for admin support.
- 9000 minus CEIRC contribution for external 8*630=5040.
- 315+GST per fortnight.
- $5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting.
- Approved CAUL2004/2, not to be renewed caul2005/2.
- 40 CAUL members.
- Library Consortium £335 ($500).
- 40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005.
- Income from 2004 recorded in liabilities.
- 40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL.
- CAUL Executive Officer: including awards.
- Diane Costello: paid in December.
- USD7,500.
- 39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL + CSIRO.
- >85% time on CEIRC activity.
- 1 meeting only in 2007 late April.
- Interest on Foreign Currency Accounts expected to be AUD25k, not transferred to AUD account, but *"applied" to CEIRC income.*
Executive Officer’s Report to CAUL- April 1 to September 11, 2006

Parts of this report are taken from earlier reports to the CAUL Executive committee.

CAUL Office.

After 3 months as Finance and Administration Officer, Karen Mills was replaced by Alisha Davies on April 21. Training was therefore a significant activity in the first half of the year. Diane Costello took recreation leave between May 8 and June 5.

CAUL's Alisha Davies and Brigid Whitbread were awarded “employees of the month” by the ACT office of The One Umbrella employment agency. Alisha is operating effectively at full capacity, having been trained in all major areas of her responsibilities over the last five months. Brigid (5 hours per week) is working through major backlogs of paperwork, in concert with me – filing as appropriate, finding electronic versions where desirable, and recycling the rest.

Major Activities.

CAUL strategic plan; CEIRC renewals; ULA review; CAUL statistics – deemed list; CAUL Audit 2005; CAUL report 2003-4, draft 2005-6; IFLA survey on provision of library services for the visually disabled.

The ULA working group has been revising documentation for the web site, but the main activities have revolved around clarifying protocols to take into account the increasing number of universities with “shop-front” campuses in cities near universities with full library services, and the varying arrangements made with those universities. It is clear that these “shop-front” campuses should not base their services on ULA.

The CAUL statistics are not yet completed – DEST has changed its cycle for publication of population statistics, which are used for the official CAUL population statistics. The full year statistics from 2005 were published on September 12. I am chasing remaining figures for the “deemed list” – the number of journals included in packages, both publisher-based and aggregations.

113 new items have been added to the “What's New” page.

655 unique pages and/or documents have been added, created or amended on the web site – 477 of these were CEIRC pages.

CEIRC.

The major office activity is currently CEIRC renewals. On June 13, CAUL's suppliers were invited to provide pricing for renewals and new subscribers for the 2007 subscription year. A timetable was suggested which would allow time for trial and review of the products, confirmation of subscriptions, invoicing in time for closure of university finance offices (getting earlier in December every year) and payment of the suppliers before the end of the year.

107 renewal offers have been received and processed since then, in a total of 114 in this reporting period. http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/offers.htm

Datasets Coordinators were sent reports of all the products invoiced through the CAUL office for 2006, with a view to preparing them for the renewals process.

Major renewals/negotiations were completed for Emerald (5 years), Blackwell Publishing (3 years) and Wiley InterScience (3 years), and an expanded set of options for ProQuest 5000. ARTstor is being rolled out, with an option to amortise the up-front archive capital fee over 10 years. Lexis.com is back to a transparent and predictable pricing model based on law/legal FTEs.

The major proposals still awaited are the new Springer journals offer and a formal offer for the complete collection of Sage journals.

It should be noted that there is ongoing discussion about commitment to multi-year agreements, with reminders that single year renewals leave us open to double digit price inflation. Price caps for multi-year agreements have been negotiated down to 4% in some cases, and opt-out clauses are now included in all multi-year agreements.

Finance & Audit.

The 2005 audit has been completed, the report circulated to the Executive, and the files “rolled over” to the 2006 financial year. A meeting was held with the auditors April 13 to discuss how the GST on USD is entered into the accounts. This is a reporting issue rather than a cash issue – the GST has been appropriately reported to the Tax Office.

The CAUL budget report has been further reformatted, following the very helpful advice from David Knox at Monash.
There have been no sales of CAUL's performance indicator kits in the last 12 months, though the Information Skills Survey Administration Manual has been selling consistently.

Meeting Planning - Agenda, Minutes, Travel, Venues

CAUL Executive 5-6 July, 2006 - Brisbane
CAUL / CAUDIT / ACODE 6 July, 2006 - Brisbane
DVC(R) Meeting, 28 July, 2006 - Wollongong - arrangements for Cathrine Harboe-Ree's attendance
CEIRC 22 August, 2006 - Brisbane
ADT Technical Committee 4 September - teleconference
CAUL 2006/2 18-19 September, 2006 and associated meetings & dinners - Perth
ADT Policy Reference Group 30 October 2006 - Sydney
CAUL Executive 7-8 November, 2006 - Melbourne
CAUL / CAUDIT / ACODE 8 November, 2006 - Melbourne
CEIRC 9 November, 2006 - Melbourne

Meetings/Events attended/ held.

April 5 - CAUL Executive Meeting, Canberra
April 6-7 - CAUL 2006/1, Canberra - agenda papers and venues
April 28 - ADT Technical Committee teleconference - organisation and minutes
May 1 - RQF Bibliometrics Forum, Sydney - financial and guest speaker arrangements, minutes.
May 2 - ULA Working Group meeting, Sydney
June 8 - CEIRC Committee, Brisbane - agenda papers, venues, travel and minutes
June 13 - AVCC Library Staff Development Conference planning committee teleconference
June 19 - Tricia Kelly, CSIRO Director of Libraries
June 22-23 - AVCC Library Staff Development Conference, Adelaide - program planning committee & session chair.
July 14 - ULA working group teleconference
July 19 - Richard Northam, CAUDIT re web-site redevelopment and survey software
July 20 - Denis Feledy, Carlton Crest (note that broadband is now available in all rooms)
August 10 - Sarah Waladan, ALCC/ADA
August 15 - CAUL Executive Meeting, Sydney - agenda papers, venues, travel and minutes
August 22 - CEIRC Meeting, Brisbane - agenda papers, venues, travel and minutes
August 23 - teleconference re IFLA International study on library services for visually impaired people - Geoff Payne, Jenny Wildy, Deidre Boland
August 28 - Vivienne Teoh and Deborah Hamilton, DEST re AICTEC secretariat
September 4 - ADT Technical Committee teleconference
September 5 - APSR briefing on JISC-CNI meeting (York), Middleware meeting (Sydney), and RQF developments

Meetings held - CEIRC-related.

April 19 - Sue Butler and Victoria Nash, Macquarie Dictionary, Macmillan
April 26 - NLP (National Licensing Proposal) Reference Group teleconference
April 27 - ARTstor participation fees teleconference - Bruce Heterick and Barbara Rockenbach
June 9 - Neil Lader, American Psychological Association re organisation of APA roadshow in July
June 9 - Julie Stevens, ProQuest, Brisbane re ProQuest 5000 renewal options.
June 14 - NLP (National Licensing Proposal) Reference Group teleconference
June 28 - Gary Gibson, representative of Paratext Inc and Alexander Street Press teleconference
July 12 - Audrey Braun, Lexis Nexis
July 13 - Bruce Heterick, Portico and JSTOR, teleconference
July 25 - Peter Giavorno and Neil Lader, APA, with Vic Elliott
July 26 - Jane Woolnough and Nicky Hewlett, Swets
August 1 - Jon Ward and David von Rothenburg, Ovid
August 1 - Shaun Eliastam, HCN
August 3 - Jerry Rabas, EIU
August 7 - Sally Stone, Elsevier Health, teleconference
August 8 - Tamara Joyner, Palgrave Macmillan
August 15 - Suzanne Bell (Senior Vice President, Higher Education) and Julie Stevens, ProQuest.
August 18 - Bruce Heterick, Barbara Rockenbach and Javanica Curry, ARTstor teleconference
August 31 - Ben Cartwright, Adam Matthew Publications
September 1 - Victoria Nash, Macquarie Dictionary Online teleconference

Diane Costello
13 September 2006
## CAUL Strategic Plan
### Report to CAUL

Author: Maxine Brodie  
Date: 13 September 2006  
Date of previous report: 15 September 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Advocacy and Communication: Relationships with Other Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Represent CAUL on the MERRI E-Security Framework Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Maxine Brodie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>June 2006-June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>E-Security Framework Project Steering Committee met in Brisbane on 8 September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td>E-Security Framework Project established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td>Draft Terms of Reference and Progress Report discussed at 8 September meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>Copy of Progress Report attached for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAUL Strategic Plan

### Report to CAUL

Author: Maxine Brodie  
Date: 13 September 2006  
Date of previous report: None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Advocacy and Communication: Relationships with Other Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Report on Research Activityflow and Middleware Priorities (RAMP) Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Maxine Brodie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>31 July 2006-30 June 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity since last report</strong></td>
<td>Ministerial Press release 31 July 2006 outlining allocation by DEST of a further $15 million to SII projects, including RAMP ($2.9m).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievements since last report</strong></td>
<td>Macquarie E-Learning Centre of Excellence (lead) and partners in the process of establishing project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Publicity, reports, publications since last report** | Project Summary:  

*Lead institution: Macquarie University*  
*Partners: University of Melbourne, The Australian National University, Charles Sturt University, University of Southern Queensland, Macquarie University Library, ADL Australia*  
RAMP project will improve national research effectiveness by addressing two challenging components of the national research information infrastructure: the development and implementation of open standards authorisation for protected repositories; and research into and demonstration of people-oriented research workflows (often referred to as research activityflows).  
The first component of the RAMP project on open standards authorisation is recognised nationally and internationally to be of critical importance to the effective inter-operation of digital repositories. There is an increasing need for management of protected content as part of repositories such as Institutional Repositories, e-Reserves, etc, but most approaches to protected content rely on hardwired or proprietary authorisation mechanisms that are inefficient, costly and promote system lock-in. Earlier work of the Meta Access Management System (MAMS) project has demonstrated the feasibility of an open standards approach to authorisation. The RAMP project will take this work to the next stage and develop robust technology solutions that can be adopted by a wide range of digital repository systems.  
The second component of the project will examine and model the range of processes involved in conducting research, and develop a generic architecture and software solution to research activityflows that can be shared, re-used and adapted. This approach draws on the success of “Learning Design” (e.g. LAMS) within e-learning, and applies it to the challenges of people-based workflow in e-Research. |
| **Plan for forthcoming activity**            | Attend Project Board meetings                                    |
| **CAUL budget implications**                 | Nil                                                              |
| **Recommendations to CAUL**                  | For noting                                                       |