CAUL Meeting Papers (2007/2)

20-21 September, 2007
Adelaide

Informal Dinner 7pm 19 September
Group Meetings 9.00-12.00 20 September
CAUL Meeting 1.00-5.00 20 September
& 9.00 - 1.00 21 September
CAUL Dinner 7 for 7.30pm 20 September

Venues:
University of South Australia, City West Campus
Hawke Building H6-03, H6-09, H6-10, H6-11
Informal Dinner @ Eros Ouzeri
CAUL Dinner @ Red Ochre
This page is intentionally blank.
804. *Introduction & Welcome. Eve Woodberry

805. *Attendance & Apologies. Earle Gow has advised members of his intention to retire in 2007. Janice Rickards has handed over her CAUL responsibilities to Con Graves on a permanent basis. Expected to attend:

From CAUL: Keith Webster, UQ, day 1 only; Jeff Murray, ECU, day 1 only; New members of CAUL: Con Graves, GriffithU; Attending first CAUL meeting: Alan Smith, USQ; Delegates for CAUL members: Sue Beatty, UNSW@ADFA; Jean McKay, MurdochU; Mark Sutherland, BondU;

From CONZUL: Ainslie Dewe, AUT;

Guests: Apologies: Sandra Jeffries, USC; Jan Gordon, UNSW@ADFA; Margaret Jones, MurdochU; Gulcin Cribb, BondU; Stephen McVey, UNDA;

806. *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.

807. *Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2007/1. (Paper included)

808. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings 2007/3, 2007/4. (Papers (2) included)

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

STRATEGIC PLAN

810. Review of the Strategic Plan. Eve Woodberry

Support for Research

811. CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC). Andrew Wells (Paper included)
   a) CEIRC Review. Andrew Wells


813. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells (Papers (2) included)

814. Research Quality Framework. (Standing item) Eve Woodberry
   b) *RQF and Copyright Permissions. Hot Topic Diane Costello
815. Research Infrastructure.
   a) AeRIC (Australian eResearch Infrastructure Committee).  Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   b) NCRI S (National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy).  John Shipp

FRODO Projects
   c) MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project).
      https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams  The steering committee doubles as the
      RAMP steering committee.  The Australian Access Federation’s (AAF) Shibboleth Trust
      Federation will be delivered by MELCOE and overseen by MAMS.  Eve Woodberry

MERRI Projects
      Murray
   e) RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure
      i) *RUBRIC Toolkit.  Hot Topic.  Alan Smith
   f) OAK-Law (Open Access to Knowledge (OAK) Legal Protocols for Copyright

New Projects:
   g) Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER) [will build on the Dataset
      Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project]  Cathrine
      Harboe-Ree
   h) RAMP (Research Activityflow & Middleware Priorities).  The steering committee
doubles as the MAMS steering committee.  Eve Woodberry
      i)  DRAMA (Digital Repository Authorization Middleware Architecture) is a
          sub-project within RAMP (http://www.ramp.org.au) that aims to develop a web
          front-end for Fedora repository, and to re-factor Fedora authentication and
          authorization into pluggable middleware components.
   i) Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) – Stage 2.
      Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   j) Legal Frameworks for e-Research [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright
      Management for Open Access project]  Eve Woodberry
   k) *Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) – Stage 2.  Hot
      Topic.  Vic Elliott
   l) Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS) [will
      build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure
      Collaboratively project]
   m) Australian Access Federation (AAF).  Maxine Brodie represents CAUL on the AAF
      Steering Committee.  (Paper included)

Support for Learning & Teaching

816. *Library 2.0. Hot Topic.  Alex Byrne

817. Information Literacy Working Group.  Ruth Quinn (Paper included)
   a)  ILWG Action Plan.

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

819. CAUL Principles for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to
      Support Teaching and Learning.  Shirley Oakley (Paper included)

820. *BONUS. Hot Topic.  Alex Byrne and Greg Anderson
821. Carrick Institute. Derek Whitehead
   a) *Carrick Exchange. Hot Topic. Derek Whitehead (Paper included)

Delivering Quality & Value


823. Best Practice Working Group. Liz Curach (Paper included)

824. Insync Library Surveys (Rodski). Liz Curach

825. Statistics. Derek Whitehead (Paper included)

Advocacy & Influence

826. Copyright. Eve Woodberry, Derek Whitehead (Paper included)

   b) *CONZUL (Council of New Zealand University Librarians). Hot Topic. Ainslie Dewe (Paper included)
   c) *IATUL (International Association of Technological University Libraries). Hot Topic. Ainslie Dewe

828. Relationships with other Organisations.
   a) National Library of Australia.
      i) Libraries Australia. (Paper included) Linda Luther, Anne Horn
   b) CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology) and ACODE (Australasian Council on Open, Distance and eLearning).
      i) EDUCAUSE 2009. (Paper included) Jeff Murray
   c) *Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA). Hot Topic. Derek Whitehead
   d) CAUL regional and sectoral groups.

829. Forthcoming Meetings
   a) CAUL Meeting 2008/1. Sydney (venue and date tbc) Andrew Wells
   b) CAUL Meeting 2008/2. Three offers to host the meeting have been received.

CAUL Administration

830. CAUL Web Site Redevelopment. Jeff Murray

831. CAUL Finances. Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   a) CAUL Budget 2007. Progress report. (Paper included)
   b) CAUL Budget 2008. DRAFT. (Paper included)


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

833. Other business.
## CAUL Meeting Schedule

### Wednesday 19 September, 2007
**Venue:** Adelaide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Chairs, Members</th>
<th># pax &amp; Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-2</td>
<td>AARLIN meeting</td>
<td>Craig Anderson, Alex Byrne, Imogen Garner, Helen Livingston, Judy Stokker, Ainslie Dewe, Gabrielle Gardiner (LATN)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>Dinner meeting</td>
<td>Maxine Brodie, Earle Gow, Bill Cations, Con Graves, Margaret Jones, Greg Anderson</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>Informal dinner</td>
<td>Eros Ouzeri, 277 Rundle Street, Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday 20 September 2007</strong></td>
<td>Colours indicate members with multiple commitments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venue:</strong> Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>CAUL Executive</td>
<td>Eve Woodberry, Jeff Murray, Heather Gordon, Andrew Wells, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Diane Costello</td>
<td>6 H6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Information Literacy Working Group</td>
<td>Ruth Quinn, Anne Horn, Leeanne Pitman, Greg Anderson, Linda Luther, Philip Kent</td>
<td>8 H6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Best Practice Working Group</td>
<td>Liz Curach, Ruth Quinn, Greg Anderson, Derek Whitehead, Philip Kent, Helen Livingston, Heather Gordon, Jeff Murray</td>
<td>10 H6-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>University Libraries Australia Working Group</td>
<td>Shirley Oakley, Imogen Garner, Jan Gordon, Alex Byrne, Diane Costello</td>
<td>5 H6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch Meeting @ Rockford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>CAUL Meeting – Hot Topics</td>
<td>The main CAUL room is.</td>
<td>H6-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The break out rooms are H6-09, H6-10, H6-11, H6-12. You may use any of these as they are all booked for CAUL although H6-12 is set up like a small lecture theatre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library 2.0</td>
<td>Alex Byrne - 60m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting Schedule</strong></td>
<td><strong># pax &amp; Room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carrick Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning</strong></td>
<td>30m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUT - Judy Stokker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch - Jean McKay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNewcastle - Greg Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCU - Des Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACU - Chris Sheargold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carrick Exchange.</strong> Derek Whitehead - 10m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus.</strong> Greg Anderson and Alex Byrne - 20m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.30pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting - Hot Topics, including the following .....</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATUL 2008. Ainslie Dewe - 10m</td>
<td>H6-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA2010. Keith Webster - 10m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance in university libraries.</strong> Keith Webster - 20m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLOCKSS, including LOCKSS.</strong> Vic Elliott - 20m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5pm</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meeting closes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7pm for 7.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAUL dinner @ The Red Ochre.</strong> War Memorial Drive, North Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday 21 September 2007</strong></td>
<td><strong>Venue:</strong> Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9am</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting - Business Meeting &amp; Hot Topics, including the following ...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUBRIC toolkit - Alan Smith - 10m</td>
<td>H6-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR)</strong> - Vic Elliott - 20m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQF and Copyright Permissions</strong> - Diane Costello 20m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALIA: an existential question for CAUL</strong> - Derek Whitehead - 20m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONZUL report</strong> - Ainslie Dewe - 20m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tea Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting - Business Meeting, including the following ....</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT business plan - Andrew Wells - 20m</td>
<td>H6-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Generation Universities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Curach, chair;</td>
<td>H6-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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772. **Introduction & Welcome.** Eve Woodberry welcomed members to the meeting – in particular Professor Ralph Alberico, Dean of Libraries and Educational Technologies at James Madison University, the six CONZUL members, and the first-time attendee, Debbie Orr from Central Queensland University. She particularly welcomed two new CAUL members, Judy Stokker who was introduced by Anne Horn, and Angela Bridgland who was introduced by Cathrine Harboe-Ree.

773. **Attendance & Apologies.**

**From CAUL:**
- Jim Graham, ACU
- Vic Elliott, ANU
- Gulcin Cribb, Bond U
- Debbie Orr, CQU
- Ruth Quinn, CDU
- Shirley Oakley, CSU
- Imogen Garner, Curtin U
- Anne Horn, Deakin U
- Jeff Murray, ECU
- Bill Cations, Flinders U
- Con Graves, Griffith U
- Heather Gordon, JCU
- Earle Gow, La Trobe U
- Maxine Brodie, Macquarie U (day 1)
- Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Monash U
- Margaret Jones, Murdoch U
- Judy Stokker, 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, U Melbourne
- Eve Woodberry, UNE, President
- Andrew Wells, UNSW, Deputy President
- Jan Gordon, UNSW@ADFA
- Greg Anderson, U Newcastle
- Keith Webster, UQ
- Helen Livingston, UniSA
- Alison Hunter, USQ
- John Shipp, U Sydney
- Linda Luther, U Tasmania
- Alex Byrne, UTS

**From CONZUL:**
- Gail Pattie U Canterbury
- Annette McNicol, U Waikato
- Sue Pharo, U Otago
- Janet Copsey, U Auckland
- John Redmayne, Massey U
- Ainslie Dewe, AUT

**Guests:**
- Dr Rhys Francis, NCRIS
- Robyn Riddley, UQ
- Jan Fullerton, NLA
- Tony Boston, NLA
- Dr Ralph Alberico, James Madison University

**Apologies:**
- Alan Smith, USQ
- Janice Rickards, Griffith
- Chris Sheargold, ACU
- Stephen McVey, UNDA
- Graham Black, CQU

Sandra Jeffries, USC
John Arfield, UWA
Liz Curach, UWS
Philip Kent, VU
In attendance:
Diane Costello, CAUL

%first meeting as CAUL Member
#Acting Director
*Delegate of CAUL Member
**Arrangement of the agenda.** Items were starred for discussion. For those items not starred, all items for noting were considered noted, and all recommendations will be considered approved.

**Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2006/2 Perth 18-19 September 2006.** The minutes were circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

**Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings 2006/5, 2006/6, 2007/1, 2007/2.** The minutes were circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

**Business arising from previous meetings, not otherwise listed on the agenda.** There was no other business arising.

### STRATEGIC PLAN

**Review of the Strategic Plan.** Printed copies of the strategic plan were provided to each member at the meeting. This item was not discussed.

**CAUL Achievement Award 2006.** Jocelyn Priddey (Senior Manager, Information Resources, University of Queensland) was presented with her award and a cheque for $5,000. Eve Woodberry discussed the genesis of the award, first awarded in 2002, to a member of CAUL institution staff who has made a significant contribution to CAUL’s strategic goals. Jocelyn Priddey’s contribution to the CEIRC program in particular and to acquisitions policies and processes in general were described.

Jocelyn described her path into library acquisitions, including her previous business experience and the value it contributed to her current role. She discussed the abilities needed by institutional Datasets Coordinators to perform their role –

- an understanding of their own acquisitions environment and the funding models;
- an understanding of their own academic institution and collection;
- an understanding of the publishers and their different types and models;
- an understanding of library supply and subscriptions;
- an ability to balance institutional, regional, sectoral needs;
- an understanding of CEIRC’s nature, i.e. a buying group rather than a true consortium
- an understanding of risk management and the relationship to licences – what level of risk is acceptable.

She noted that the timing of group agreements may mean beginning a licence individually and joining the group later. This meant that the University of Queensland often subscribed outside CEIRC but moved into the group agreement afterwards. She advised care in the analysis of usage statistics, taking into account the size and importance of the user group, comparing statistics across different types of products, whether federated searching is used.

She asked members to consider what they wanted from their Datasets Coordinators, and suggested that understanding and taking a broader view would make their work easier and more productive. She drew members’ attention to the induction kit for Datasets Coordinators. [<http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ds-coord-induction.doc>]

### Support for Research

**CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIR C).** A report from Andrew Wells was circulated with the agenda. He reported that Fairfax is of concern, both Fairfax Business Media and the SMH Digital Archive, with the vendors showing little awareness of the higher education sector. CEIRC is keeping in regular contact. The proposed licence includes an indemnity clause which universities are unlikely be able to sign, and CEIRC is working to try to change it. CEIRC is also planning a forum, coordinated by Neil Renison, to share knowledge and understanding of the usage of electronic resources. Both statistics personnel and Datasets Coordinators will be invited.

- **CEIRC Operational Plan 2007-2008.** The draft plan was circulated with the agenda. Andrew Wells noted that CEIRC is ten years old. It is now dealing with more than 150
long-term Access to Electronic Content – archiving and preservation, including Portico. Andrew Wells, Craig Anderson reminded members of the lack of continuity of content, and that there is no real guarantee of perpetual access. He recommended that CAUL members subscribe to Portico. Vic Elliott noted that, in the new environment, libraries buy access rather than own the content. Portico is effectively outsourcing to a third party. CLOCKSS is building a distributed global dark archive of electronic materials. Participants include Stanford, Virginia, Rice, Edinburgh etc and ANU is joining. There will be 15 servers world-wide. Access is not via subscription, but if there is a trigger event, it can be made available. He urged members to consider it as a serious alternative to Portico. This will be included as a hot topic for the September meeting and added to the CEIRC agenda. (Action: DC)

c) National Licensing Proposal. Heather Gordon provided an update. The reference group will meet again on May 9. Contracts have been signed for a number of products – three products in each of business, general reference and health information. The governance model has been accepted. An interim executive committee, taken from the current reference group, will be set up for six months. CAUL will not be involved further in the executive group though Heather Gordon and Diane Costello have represented CAUL very effectively. Some of these products are already offered by CEIRC, and CEIRC will coordinate as it does with all other offers. Some products are already taken by members, either individually or as part of a wider aggregation.

781. *ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.* A report by Andrew Wells was circulated with the agenda. He reported on the March workshop to look at the future of the ADT program after individual institutions have moved their theses into institutional repositories. He outlined the evolution of the program, referring to the ADT sites as mini institutional repositories. ADT supports sharing of knowledge and expertise as well as the software. The review process will examine what would the program need to do, what will be required, what form it will take. (Action: AW)

782. *Research Quality Framework.* Eve Woodberry reported how CAUL is assisting DEST in its communication with publishers. The RQF’s assessors will require access to the published version of articles included in the evidence portfolios. Various members of CAUL have previously discussed with DEST other ways of making these accessible, however DEST has decided to require deposit of evidence in institutional repositories. Access will be only available to the panel members, and DEST will manage the access.

At a Brisbane meeting in early March, which included representatives of DEST, CAUL, the AVCC and OAK-Law Project personnel, it was decided to prepare a briefing paper for publishers prior to inviting them to approve a simple approach to making this content accessible. Teleconferences will be held in the next week. Institutional repositories project managers should be briefed so that institutions do not approach publishers individually, but it is too early for detail to be published as the discussions have not yet been held with the publishers. (Action: All)

Diane Costello described the process being undertaken with DEST, how access to the targeted content will be limited and protected, and listed the publishers being approached in the first phase - all receive significant revenue from Australian universities. All have agreed to participate in the discussions, and none has indicated opposition to the approach. It was emphasised that it is a DEST exercise, and they will sign any subsequent agreements. DEST has agreed to support the cost of the CAUL office’s involvement in this process.
783. **eResearch.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that the ERCC (eResearch Coordinating Committee) final report has now been endorsed by both Ministers, DEST and DoCITA, but no funding is attached. PfC (NCRIS Platforms for Collaboration) relies heavily on the report, so it is expected that further developments will happen through it.

784. **Research Infrastructure.**

**FRODO Projects**
   b) **MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project).** [https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams](https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams) The steering committee doubles as the RAMP steering committee. The Australian Access Federation's (AAF) Shibboleth Trust Federation will be delivered by MELCOE and overseen by MAMS. A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

**MERRI Projects**
   c) **MAPS (Middleware Action Plan and Strategy).** [http://www.middleware.edu.au/](http://www.middleware.edu.au/) A report by Jeff Murray was circulated with the agenda. He added that first draft of the final report is available for comment and will be finalised in June. It covers the setting up of the AAF (Australian Access Federation). It is proposed that AAF be set up under AusCERT, though this is contentious, and he would prefer that it be set up under AARNet. He recommended that members consider attending the eResearch workshop in Brisbane in June.
   d) **RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively).** [http://www.rubric.edu.au/](http://www.rubric.edu.au/) A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.
   e) **OAK-Law (Open Access to Knowledge (OAK) Legal Protocols for Copyright Management).** [http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au/](http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au/) A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

**New Projects:**
   f) **Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER)** [will build on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project] This item was not discussed.
   g) **RAMP (Research Activityflow & Middleware Priorities).** The steering committee doubles as the MAMS steering committee. A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.
   i) **DRAMA (Digital Repository Authorization Middleware Architecture)** is a sub-project within RAMP ([http://www.ramp.org.au](http://www.ramp.org.au)) that aims to develop a web front-end for Fedora repository, and to re-factor Fedora authentication and authorization into pluggable middleware components. This item was not discussed.
   h) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) - Stage 2.** A This item was not discussed.
   i) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project] This item was not discussed.
   j) **Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) - Stage 2.** This item was not discussed.
k) Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS) [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project] This item was not discussed.

Support for Learning & Teaching

785. Resources for Law Libraries. Hot Topic. Vic Elliott’s report is included as Appendix II.

786. *Information Literacy Working Group. A report by Ruth Quinn was circulated with the agenda. She added that the group is planning a scoping project to ensure there are no overlaps with or threats to other organisations e.g. ANZIIL. They are planning an audit of the sector to see what is being done, and who is using the instruments available. They are reviewing assessment options, and looking for more simple instruments to assess if programs are effective. The group has drafted an action plan.

Janet Copsey commented that it was disappointing that practitioners had been left out of the working group, but CONZUL will discuss nominating a representative.

787. Services for Offshore Students. A report from the working group was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

788. *University Library Australia. Shirley Oakley reminded members that the composition of the ULA working group was recently changed to include only University Librarians. The group was asked to clarify the principles under which ULA operates, and devise principles for the provision of services via shop-front operations, particularly in capital city locations, and the library services provided to those students. The committee has written a document, but it appears that the principles for off-shore services are very similar, so it was suggested that a single document with multiple applications could suffice.

It was agreed that the service principles were similar, but it is better to have two documents because they will be presented to different people within the university. There may also be some differences within each university.

The original principles allowed some variation between organisations, e.g. whether to charge or not. There are two separate issues – the services for the institution’s own students, whether shopfront or offshore, and services for other institutions’ students. It is possible to restrict access to some collections on a temporary or permanent basis, and it is necessary to communicate this information better on institutional web sites, and more importantly to staff at the loans desk.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree recommended drafting a document for ULA based as closely as possible on the offshore document. (Action: SO)

Shirley Oakley noted that CAUL members affirm support for ULA at every meeting, but between meetings she receives many complaints from further down in the organisation about the use of other services and facilities – she strongly urged members to provide data, and contact the offending institution with details of the problem. Members suggested referring complainants back to the University Librarian. A continuing principle is that the program be kept as simple as possible. (Action: ALL Members)

a) Open University Australia. This item was not discussed.

789. Carrick Institute. This item was not discussed.

a) Learning and Teaching Performance Fund.

b) RIN (Resource Identification Network).

Delivering Quality & Value

790. Organisational Restructuring. Hot Topic. Derek Whitehead chaired a session on issues surrounding organisation restructuring, with case studies from CSU, SCU and Macquarie. The report of this session is included as appendix I.

792. **Print Collections - Usage Analysis.** Hot Topic. Graham Black was unable to attend the meeting, so this item will be held over to the next.

793. **Best Practice Working Group.** This item was not discussed.

794. *Statistics.* A report from Derek Whitehead was included in the agenda papers. Andrew Wells asked whether CAUL statistics should continue to be open to the world, or should they be password-controlled and given out on request. He noted that consultants to UNSW had used the statistics selectively to provide a very negative report, without checking whether there might be deliberate reasons for the position in the rankings list. Derek Whitehead uses the principle “cheap, useful, fairly valid.” He stated that there is a certain level of rigour, but always room for interpretation.

Craig Anderson moved that the statistics be passworded, noting that the NLA had used library expenditure as the basis for a pricing model as though it were comparable across institutions, without considering whether it is appropriate because of the different elements included. It was noted that CAVAL fees are based on total operating expenditure. Others had observed that they have been used in mischievous ways. A University’s non-collection expenditure may increase because it takes on new activities.

Derek Whitehead was strongly opposed in principle, noting that they should not be made inaccessible because people mis-use them, contrary to CAUL’s principle of the free flow of information. It was noted that AUQA panel members use them, as do many others, and it would be very inconvenient to have to request access to them. Other members supported the basic principle of transparency.

A third option is to include an introduction about the care with which the figures ought to be used. This can be referred to if there is any mis-use of the data. It was suggested that the figures not be further published without permission, but it was noted that statistics are generally not copyrightable. It was agreed that the definitions for each element should be absolutely clear. All explanatory notes are now included in the online site, and it would be useful to include a mouse-over popup of the definition for each element.

Members supported keeping them open access, ensuring they are as valid as possible, and providing an explanatory introduction.  

*(Action: CSFG)*

795. **Standards.** (A standing item) This item was not discussed.

796. **Copyright.** A report from Eve Woodberry and Derek Whitehead was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

797. **International Engagement.**

a) **Study Tour of India.** Hot Topic. Vic Elliott reported on the recent study tour of India.

b) **CONZUL (Council of New Zealand University Librarians).** A report by Janet Copsey was included with the agenda. She highlighted issues of storage for city sites with growing numbers of students, developing contracts between members re levels of services, government policy for institutional repositories.

c) **IATUL 2008 (International Association of Technological University Libraries).** Auckland, April 21-24. Ainslie Dewe invited members to the IATUL conference being hosted by AUT. She advised that Imogen Garner and Derek Whitehead are members of the program committee and that they would welcome suggestions for speakers. Ainslie Dewe has been elected to the IATUL Board.

798. **Relationships with other Organisations.**

a) **National Library of Australia.** Eve Woodberry reported that she and Andrew Wells will attend the Peak Bodies Forum in Canberra next week, and will be meeting with Jan
Fullerton later in the month. She noted that the Peak Bodies Forum meets once a year, and comprises an unusual list of organisations e.g. law librarians group and health librarians group.

It was noted that the NLA already intersects very well with universities on a number of projects, but there is no overarching project or issue. It was observed that there is some misunderstanding from the NLA about responsibilities within universities and the priorities of the libraries within the universities. John Arfield will work with the NLA to develop a key issues paper on joint interests e.g. national discovery service. (Action: JA)

It was noted that there was a time when the NLA was seen by government agencies as able to speak for and on university libraries but this is no longer the case. CAUL and its members are invited directly to participate and respond to relevant issues.

Libraries Australia (formerly Kinetica). A report from Linda Luther and Anne Horn was circulated with the agenda, along with papers from the National Library of Australia. Jan Fullerton and Tony Boston joined the meeting at 9.30 on Friday to discuss Libraries Australia.

Eve Woodberry introduced the discussion by advising members that the CAUL Executive had held discussions with the NLA through the previous twelve months trying to find an acceptable and sustainable model for Libraries Australia subscriptions. It was found not to be possible, so the decision was effectively handed back to the National Library, who settled on a model based on library budgets.

Tony Boston outlined the current status of Libraries Australia including the system performance. Linda Luther reported on the teleconference in late March and the speedy distribution of individual letters to institutions regarding their revised subscriptions. She added that Libraries Australia could be seen as a small part of the overall relationship between CAUL members and the National Library. Anne Horn stated that more timely circulation of appropriate information for decision making is vital. She noted that some information is commercial in confidence.

Subscriptions & Costs. It was clarified that the overall cost of Libraries Australia is $5m, of which the NLA contributes $1m. The universities are major contributors, while others are NSLA, then public libraries. The model is not expected to change every year, even if the budgets do.

It was noted that the cost includes support for centralised cataloguing, but it is not clear how this is reflected in the costs to the users. The dialogue around the division of costs has not happened. Tony Boston responded that the cost of supporting the service has reduced from $7.6m to $4m in the last ten years through redevelopments, to deliver the service at the lowest cost possible, and to pass the savings on to subscribers. Based on total library budgets, the NLA believes that the university sector is paying about the right proportion of the total costs. He added that the NBD is extremely valuable but under-utilised.

Linda Luther had raised the issue of the cost per sector with the advisory committee. The CAUL libraries are the first to move to the new model. Although the NLA has done some research and analysis, it has not been discussed outside the advisory committee. She encouraged members to look at the NLA strategic directions document and feed back comments to LAAC representatives. (Action: ALL Members)

It was agreed that changing pricing models is always difficult. Another formula is necessary, but there have to be winners and losers. The consideration of special cases is important.

Service Levels. In discussion of expected service level, Tony Boston reported that the NLA has just conducted a user satisfaction survey which returned a satisfaction rating of 89%. The survey also revealed some areas which needs addressing. If
the normal processes are not dealing with problems, he invited members to escalate them to him.

**Communication & Relationship.** Members discussed the nature of the relationship, noting that university libraries are part of the service, contribute to the service and then buy it through subscriptions. Jan Fullerton said the relationship has not altered, merely the method for charging. The earlier model which involved credits was an accounting device.

It was suggested that a letter to major contributors and subscribers was an inappropriate way to communicate the increase in subscription costs. Budgets are unlikely to increase, even by CPI, and may possibly decrease. The overall library budget does not reflect what is available to spend on resources. There was also no liaison regarding the OCLC agreement. Some members subscribe through Unilinc and regard Libraries Australia as another subscription, requiring a standard agreement. It was recommended email communication with attachments replace posted letters to improve speed and efficiency.

Jan Fullerton apologised for the short notice at the end of the 18 months discussions and analysis. Members may approach the National Library if they feel they are in the wrong band.

It was suggested that the system of representation does not work as well as it might and many members want more direct communication. The funding model is just a catalyst for this discussion - the NLA is changing in many admirable ways and these need to be discussed. Many are more relevant to other parts of the community than to CAUL members.

**OCLC WorldCat.** Members expressed concern that there has been no discussion of giving institutional records to WorldCat. Others noted that the opportunities and potential, nationally or internationally, in the relationship with OCLC could be very valuable. The agreement with OCLC has not yet been signed. If records are contributed to either Libraries Australia or WorldCat the institutions become governing members of OCLC. This would give 800 Australian libraries a strong voice in the directions of OCLC.

**The Future.** It was suggested that the discussion started with money when it should have started with the service - how do we use it now and in the future to determine what value it is to us. Jan Fullerton asked members to reflect on whether such a service is still needed in Australia. *(Action: ALL Members)*

It was noted that funding for national information infrastructure is severely underdone, and suggested that another attempt be made to address this in the new election cycle.

b) **CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology) and ACODE (Australasian Council on Open, Distance and eLearning).** A report from Jeff Murray was circulated prior to the meeting. This item was not discussed.

i) **EDUCAUSE 2007.** April 29 to May 1. Melbourne. This item was not discussed.

c) **NSLA (National and State Libraries Australasia).** This item was not discussed.

d) **CAUL regional and sectoral groups.**

i) **QULOC.** A report from Jim Graham was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

799. *Forthcoming Meetings.* Members discussed whether to limit the meeting to two days instead of two days plus committee meetings. It was noted that it was harder to organise group meetings because of overlapping commitments. A number of members preferred to limit the meetings to two days. Eve Woodberry invited members to advise their preferences for longer sessions. *(Action: Eve)*
a) **CAUL Meeting 2007/2.** Adelaide, September 20-21, with committee/group meetings on September 19. Helen Livingston reported that the venue is in a brand new building, a case study room in two or three tiers with all audiovisual facilities.

b) **CAUL Meeting 2008/1.** Sydney - John Shipp and Andrew Wells have agreed to host the next meeting. CONZUL had invited CAUL to hold a joint meeting attached to IATUL but it was agreed to hold it independently. It is likely to be held in early April, and less likely to clash with IATUL.

c) **CAUL Meeting 2008/2.** This item was not discussed.

**CAUL Administration**

**800. CAUL Web Site Redevelopment.** Jeff Murray reported on the lack of response to the call for proposals. He asked for recommendations for organisations, which may be commercial, with the capacity to develop a web site. **(Action: All)**

**801. CAUL Finances.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree advised members that she has taken over the Executive role of treasurer and the budget reports are regularly reviewed by one of her staff members.

a) **CAUL Budget 2006.** The 2006 audit is in its final stages. $116,000 “profit” was earned because of a windfall from interest earned because of an increase in the volume of funds passed through the CEIRC program. CAUL’s current earnings (reserves) are $554,000, half of which is in the foreign currency accounts, being interest earned over the past ten years.

b) **CAUL Budget 2007.** A progress report was included in the agenda papers. This item was not discussed.

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

**803. Other business.**

a) **Learning Edge.** Anita Crotty reported that a number of institutions are implementing Equella software, for e-reserve and RQF objects, and asked whether members would be interested in participating in a community of interest. She offered to circulate an email asking for expressions of interest in participating. **(Action: AC)**

b) **Repositories Group.** Alison Hunter reported on developments with a new repositories group. A meeting held during EDUCAUSE attracted 36 participants who were very supportive of a more coordinated, but not formal approach to repository issues. This is essentially about practitioners. Communication was a major theme with many not understanding what was being used, who the contacts were and where the repository is. They are working with James Dalziel, Clare McLaughlin and Alex Cooke to make sure this information is available and kept up to date. This is already happening within SII projects, but is hard for those outside those projects. There were many lists, but no-one participates in all. They are attempting to consolidate these into a Google group. **(Action: AH)**

c) **CAVAL.** Craig Anderson reported that CAVAL is drawing up plans for a new storage module. Sue Henczel is acting CEO. A short list for Steve O’Connor’s replacement has been drawn up.

d) **University of Melbourne Structure.** Angela Bridgland advised members that the University of Melbourne still has an integrated division of information, though Linda O’Brien has recently devolved the positions of University Librarian and director of IT Services to the two deputy principals. Both deputies still have division-wide responsibilities – Angela Bridgland is responsible for services, including IT services and client services.

The meeting concluded at 3.20pm
Appendix I.

Agenda Item 790. Organisational Restructuring

Derek Whitehead introduced the session on organisational restructuring. His presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20071whitehead.pdf He began by looking at factors to take into account when reviewing staffing structures.
1. Campus-based vs functionality-based structure? Sometimes a hybrid approach is needed.
2. Changes in how people receive information.
3. How documents are used has changed dramatically – lending figures are down by 16%.
4. What kind of staff and structures are needed to manage the range of documents and collections?
5. Nature of enquiries e.g. real reference vs other kinds of inquiries dictates which type and level of staff required.
6. Current structure tends to reflect classification and skills level of staff - projects are breaking this down.
7. Outsourced functions need to be managed.
8. New tasks include marketing services to disabled students, international students, web site creators and management, security 24x7.
9. What stops so that new tasks can be taken on?
10. Very few reference enquiries so it is not efficient to employ professionals over weekends.
11. Move to self-service lending.
12. Technical services have been changing for some years.
13. Need to find people for new tasks from static staffing levels.

Des Stewart discussed the reasons for making changes at Southern Cross University, and the results of the almost-completed review process. His presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20071stewart.pdf The library has 45 staff and supports 14,000 students. The Coffs Harbour library is a joint service which caters for schools and TAFE. What began as an electronic library at the Gold Coast has emerged into a hybrid library. The campus at Lismore is more traditional. The key impetus for change arose from needed salary savings and changes in types of collections. Assisted by consultant the review began with collection services then client services. A skills audit was conducted to feed into planning process, addressing core skills, competencies and expectations. The results include a more consistent approach to liaison librarians and how academic staff are serviced, and more consistency in classification levels – all library technicians are level 4, coordinators are level 5.


The CSU library structure was formerly campus-based, almost completely self-contained, leading to duplication, reduced economies of scale, little interaction between campuses, no generic position descriptions and little room to take on new activities. Although 70% of students study via distance education mode, most services focused on face-to-face delivery. The feedback from clients was very good, and so was support in the print environment. Regional universities are the main employers in town so moving staff is less of an option. The campus culture was strong so that system-wide functions received less attention.

The restructure was driven from the top down. A staff working party designed the transition from the old structure to the new structure – even if they did not know what they were moving to, they knew how it would happen. Staff were trained to design role statements which were not based on task lists - Human Resources personnel advised on position classifications that would be accepted without further review. Generic duty statements were developed, with individuals responsible for
determining policies, procedures and resources needed to make the role work. The results will be reviewed in 6 months and 12 months, for tweaking but not reversing.

Maxine Brodie discussed the restructuring at Macquarie University. Her presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20071brodie.pdf The review was prompted by internal circumstances – job descriptions were task-based rather than role-based; there was no progression structure. It was found that most staff were classified at HEW 4-6, with a few at 8-9 and that the enterprise agreement did not cater for transformational change.

The restructure was based around the 6 middle management roles and library services – find, get and look after “stuff” – and the core business capabilities – IT development and business services, with direct links to campus services in these areas. Macquarie has identified non-core areas – any of these may be given up to the centre if ever necessary. The Project Office was essentially supported by funds previously used for casual staffing, and has the additional benefits of encouraging staff to move around and to learn project management skills.

The six principles were the most important part of the process. It provided an opportunity to refresh staff. Staff were involved in the whole process, though not necessarily with all the detail.

Appendix II.

Agenda Item 785. Resources for Law Libraries - report by Vic Elliott. The Council of Australian Law Deans (CALD) wanted to collect data on expenditure on law collections. CAUL members with law libraries had some concerns about the potential for misinterpretation of the data and its validity, but accepted that the budget and expenditure was the responsibility of the university, not of the law librarian. 27 of 29 CAUL members responded to a survey of 2006/2007 budget and 2006 expenditure, and John Shipp and Vic Elliott subsequently appeared before a meeting of 21 CALD members in March. They emphasized the need to take care of interpreting data - related to EFTSU and size of overall collections budget - institutional decisions are not fixed by any formula, and entail a great variety of conditions:

- e-resources cost more for bigger institutions for some resources
- law titles are sometimes funded from the general budget
- some have free deposit copy and exchange program related to own publications, some up to $200K
- some have no separate law library, and are not reported as a separate allocation
- strict comparability is difficult to achieve
- suggested looking at outputs of services, and establishing value framework

The Deans responded

- Data clear
- Models now understood and accepted
- Some problems with depreciated cost accounting
- Institutional repositories are not seen as a solution
- Wanted figures on law e-resources, which will vary across institutions - data are being collected now

Vic Elliott suggested that it was important to maintain a relationship with CALD.

- needs to be dealt with at university librarian level
- the issue of law library standards has not gone away - CALD has hired a consultant, Chris Roper, to develop minimum and aspirational standards. It was noted that standards can not be enforceable. Vic Elliott will endeavour to stay involved in this discussion. CONZUL wishes to be involved. (Action: VE)

- some law libraries are involved but not all have consulted with their university librarians
- some concern about the ready availability of statistics and how they may be used inappropriately
It was noted that CAUL has commissioned DEST statistics by narrow discipline group by institution, on an annual basis, linked to the Datasets coordinators page.

Appendix III.

Agenda Item 784(a)

National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy (NCRIS). Dr Rhys Francis

The NCRIS approach is to seek a consensus on support for infrastructure in nominated areas. Dr Rhys Francis is the facilitator of the Platforms for Collaboration (PfC) segment of NCRIS, intended to underpin technical infrastructure. It has funding of $75m over 4 years. The final report is available at http://pfc.org.au Its original aim was to identify the main problems that PfC could be used to address:

- easy to do high performance communications networks
- very hard to do data – do not even know what the questions are.
- who should decide who has access to specific resources – not the IT services – they should own the systems but let the researchers decide
- PfC investment principles
  - cooperative arrangements
  - simple tools
  - outsource to experts
  - of value to multiple communities

Barriers to access are more likely to be inside institutions and a result of relations between institutions.

The Australian Access Federation (AAF) should be funded by its users, e.g. mandate access via specific channels such as AREN or AAF.

The current process needs another 3-4 months to put in place services to address data

- want to provide a data service – for collections that have no home
- help people prepare their data
- ANDS – Australian National Data Service

Most money will go into operational infrastructure

- data - no money in this area
- interoperation
- computing - huge money in this area

High Performance Computing handles simple data very well but not social sciences data which is more complex. If the AARNet volume charging can be reduced, it should reduce the amount of data being taken off the network and lost. Charging for cost of use is expensive e.g. 70% telecommunications costs are in billing. There is a big cost in limiting access. Huge volumes of data are not useful unless you can visualise it - need tools for non IT users. Researchers should only have to consider what they want to do, not be concerned with the IT or the networking infrastructure.

Funding is available to build tools for data and for interoperation.

- Data management – ANDS – federation, services, stewardship, outreach.
- Interpretation – ICI
- Computing – APAC

Australian eResearch Infrastructure Council (AeRIC) – interim CEO is Rhys Francis

- Will contract people for ANDS, ICI and APAC.
- Cannot get agreement on who will host ANDS
- DEST believes data is critical so will not outsource outside the sector.
- AAF is potentially an entirely new entity – who will own it and how will the users run it?

NEAT – National eResearch Architecture Taskforce
only those doing eResearch, not theorists
how to spend money on the tools

Consultations re data.

- Big data collections are already funded e.g. geosciences, Bureau of Meteorology, and getting more to collect water data.
- Issues around sharing data because some want to use their data for creating other products - will not allow re-use.
- Much data is collected on a project basis, not currently retained or made accessible.
- No knowledge of how much research data is held in each institution
- CSIRO has a legal requirement to know where its data is.

Other missions will address finding, mining, access, authorise, not to do repositories.

Services - collection services and outreach activity, training.
Need to rationalise and nationalise authentication services.
Need to support less expert users.
Need to understand the data collection management.
If data is lost, do not worry about it – do not waste time going back.
Funding infrastructure rather than training.

Social Sciences is clearly a community which re-uses data. The analysis is also input. They are also highly protective of their data. The marine community have agreed models for managing their data.

**Agenda Item 791.**

*Data management at Monash - “the bit that is not Rhys’s problem”* Cathrine Harboe-Ree

Who is doing this well?
In North America, the librarians are leading the process.
If people have to pay for storage they won’t do it very well.

Monash has an eResearch coordinating committee.
- It is adopting central data storage, particularly if data is critical. Some data can be locally funded if centrally managed.
- They are road testing a data management plan, asking researchers to fill in template and find out where the barriers are.
- It is being handled by one library and one IT person.
- ITS has eResearch support group, and library involved.
- The process could not succeed without involvement of the right people, including central governance of the university.
- The data management policy is linked to the intellectual property policy, and the University solicitor is involved in the process.

What skill set will library staff need – metadata experts, develop schema, possible to learn on the job.

One problem is how to manage changing data, versioning, if validating later, then need to have a static version.

There are opportunities for CAUL to collaborate more in sharing the knowledge – it is hard enough for big institutions, very difficult for smaller institutions.
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1563. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells (Deputy President), Heather Gordon, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Jeff Murray. In attendance: Diane Costello.

1564. Minutes of CAUL Executive 2007/1 and 2007/2. There were no changes, and the minutes will be made available on the web site. (Action: DC)

1565. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1566. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).
   a) Publication. Ten copies are being distributed to each member. Additional copies are available if needed, from the CAUL Office.

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1567. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). Andrew Wells advised that Vic Elliott will discuss ANU’s entry into CLOCKSS during the discussion on long-term archiving. It was noted that Dawn Tomassi had asked for a place on the CAUL or CONZUL agenda to discuss Portico, but it was decided that members already had sufficient awareness of the program.

   The CEIRC Committee will be reviewing CEIRC operations and staffing levels, and a scoping document and budget will be prepared. The proposal for the review is expected to cost a reasonable amount, and would be brought to the CAUL meeting in September for approval. The risk management plan will be tied into this review of operations. It will feed into a discussion on all CAUL fees and levies.

   The Datasets Coordinators expressed great interest in a forum to focus on measuring usage – one is being planned for later in 2007. Neil Renison is formalising the agenda, expressions of interest in attendance will be called and CAVAL will handle the logistics.

   a) National Licensing Proposal. Diane Costello and Heather Gordon will attend the 4th National Licensing Forum in Canberra on May 9. It will be the last meeting attended formally by CAUL. Heather Gordon reported that there are no volunteers to date for the executive committee. It was noted that the members will be required to pay their own way to participate. A business plan has been drafted.

   b) CAUL Office Arrangements 11 May to 11 June. Diane Costello noted that Andrew Wells is also on leave for part of this time – from May 24. CEIRC related matters will be referred to Heather Gordon while both are absent. (Action: DC)

   c) Outsourcing maintenance of journal package lists to CEIRC members. Andrew Wells reported that CEIRC is planning to outsource the maintenance of CAUL package titles lists – some CAUL packages are not the full list. CEIRC members will already be
customising these lists for their own purposes, and it was decided that they be asked to do it officially on behalf of the group for an agreed level of remuneration.

1568. **ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.** Andrew Wells.

   a) **Workshop on the Future of the ADT.** Andrew Wells reported on a very interesting workshop. It covered the kind of issues which will bind the group together. These may have more traction when more institutions have repositories in place. It was suggested that the ARROW community may be a model, or that a broader group of repository managers be considered. It was agreed that a briefing paper be prepared for the September meeting of CAUL. (Action: AW)

1569. **eResearch.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that Senator Coonan has signed off on the ERCC report, though no funding is attached.

1570. **Research Quality Framework.** Eve Woodberry emailed CAUL members describing the process whereby CAUL is assisting DEST to obtain approval from major publishers to allow distributed access to RQF evidence for the conduct of the RQF. DEST will sign all agreements. If the meetings with the publishers are not concluded before Diane Costello starts her leave, Heather Gordon will take over this role. The publishers’ briefing paper will be circulated to the Executive. (Action: DC) It was suggested that CAUL members be encouraged to discuss this with their university copyright officers. (Action: EW)

1571. **NCRIS (National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy).** Dr Rhys Francis will discuss this at the CAUL meeting on May 4.

1572. **ARIIC (Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee).**

   **FRODO Projects**

   a) **MAMS (Meta Access Management System Project).** [https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams](https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams) The steering committee doubles as the RAMP steering committee. The Australian Access Federation’s (AAF) Shibboleth Trust Federation will be delivered by MELCOE and overseen by MAMS. Eve Woodberry reported that the next meeting will be held 14 May. It was suggested that the Shibbolising process was taking too long. Jeff Murray will discuss with the MAPS team, and Cathrine Harboe-Ree will discuss with the ARROW team. (Action: JM, CHR)

   **MERRI Projects**

   b) **MAPS (Middleware Action Plan and Strategy).** [http://www.middleware.edu.au/](http://www.middleware.edu.au/) Jeff Murray advised that the report will be finalised at the eResearch meeting in June.

   c) **RUBRIC (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively).** [http://www.rubric.edu.au/](http://www.rubric.edu.au/) Eve Woodberry reported that Sue Craig is now leading the project. A copyright group has been formed, and is collaborating with the OAK-Law project.

   i) **e-Framework.** It was suggested that reports from this group need to be clearer about the problems being addressed, and what the impacts are on institutions. (Action: CHR) Kerrie Blinco is working on a range of projects relevant to each of the CCA groups, and it was suggested that she be invited to the next CCA meeting. (Action: DC)


   **New Projects:**

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

   f) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) - Stage 2.**

   g) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project] Eve Woodberry
h) Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) – Stage 2.

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

j) RAMP (Research Activityflow & Middleware Priorities). The steering committee doubles as the MAMS steering committee.

i) DRAMA (Digital Repository Authorization Middleware Architecture) is a sub-project within RAMP (http://www.ramp.org.au) that aims to develop a web front-end for Fedora repository, and to re-factor Fedora authentication and authorization into pluggable middleware components.

k) Australian Access Federation (AAF). Maxine Brodie has agreed to represent CAUL on the AAF Steering Committee. There was some discussion about ownership and governance models and suggested that CAUL monitor progress.


CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING

1573. Information Literacy Working Group.

1574. ULA. This will be starred at the CAUL meeting because of some dissatisfaction with the conduct of the program, though it was noted that these reports are not supported by evidence.

1575. CAUL Protocols for Library Services to Offshore Students. The revised version of the CAUL protocols for offshore services have been circulated to the working group for confirmation.

1576. Carrick Institute. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that representatives of the Carrick Institute have invited individual members to specific workshops, but no official invitations to CAUL. It was suggested that CAUL approach Carrick Institute directly and suggest that CAUL wishes to be involved and that communication is best directed to the CAUL Office. (Action: DC, EW)

DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE

1577. Statistics. Members discussed whether CAUL statistics should continue to be openly available on the web site, or restricted to members. There was concern about how the statistics have been used negatively against the universities. It was noted that ARL statistics are freely available. This will be raised at the CAUL meeting. (Action: AW)

COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

1578. Communication. (Standing item)

a) President’s Report. Eve Woodberry. Letters have been sent this year to the following: Julie RAE, chair of the National Licensing Proposal reference group in response to her letter asking CAUL to reconsider its participation in the ongoing executive group; Eve Woodberry will meet with Jan Fullerton in late May.

b) Public Relations/ Media Reports. Library Life article by Emerald on CAUL’s five-year renewal.

c) CAUL Report 2005-6. This is ready for the final edit. (Action: DC)

d) Executive Officer’s Report. The report is included in the CAUL papers.

1579. CAUL Web Site. The request for proposals was circulated to CAUDIT and CAUL. No responses or questions were received by the closing date of March 30. Jeff Murray recommends asking for suggestions for external contractors. (Action: JM)

1580. Copyright.

a) ALCC (Australian Libraries Copyright Committee). Eve Woodberry. The financial report from 2006 was circulated. The next meeting is on May 25.
1581. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

a) **DEST Indigenous Higher Education Advisory Council.** DEST has invited CAUL to suggest appropriate indigenous persons for this council. It was agreed to circulate to members. Two nominations were received - Diane Costello followed up on April 2 to ensure that the appropriate forms would be completed.


1582. Relationships with other organisations.

a) **Proposed meeting of Higher Education Associations at AUQF2007, Hobart, July 2007.** An email from Ivan Staines, President, AAIR: To coincide with AUQF2007, representatives from ATEM, HERDSA and AAIR (who are also members of the Forum Joint Steering Group) will host a meeting to bring together associations which have a focus on higher education in Australasia, to which you or a representative of your association are very cordially invited to attend. It was noted that John Shipp and Felicity McGregor are likely to attend.

b) **CAUDIT & ACODE.**

i) **EDUCAUSE 2007.** Standing Item.

c) **National Library of Australia.** Eve Woodberry is scheduled to meet with Jan Fullerton on May 24. Penny Carnaby suggested that the CAUL Executive meet with NSLA. It was noted that members have relationships with their state libraries rather than NSLA. Members discussed what kind of relationship does CAUL want with the State Libraries and the National Library; what areas of influence are needed? It may help NSLA understand more clearly what CAUL is and does. This will be included on the next Executive agenda. (Action: DC) Andrew Wells will prepare a discussion paper. (Action: AW) Many members already have individual relationships and projects with the National Library. Diane Costello will survey CAUL to prepare a list of current projects. (Action: DC)

i) **Libraries Australia (Kinetica).** The National Library will be represented at the CAUL meeting to discuss Libraries Australia and ABN. It will allow a dialogue directly between members and the National Library. Members discussed the OCLC agreement, and noted that the conditions were unclear.

ii) **Peak Bodies Forum.** The next Peak Bodies Forum will be held Monday 7 May, 2007. Eve Woodberry and Andrew Wells will attend. Papers have been prepared on censorship and Google books.

1583. CAUL Meetings.

a) **CAUL Meeting 2007/1.** Melbourne, May 3-4. EDUCAUSE April 29 to May 1. The agenda is included in the CAUL meeting papers. Members discussed the structure and timing of the meeting.

b) **CAUL Meeting 2007/2.** Adelaide, 20-21 September 2007. Group meetings will be held on Wednesday 19 September.

i) **Learning Spaces.** JISC infoNet infoKit ‘Planning and Designing Technology-Rich Learning Spaces’: With Les Watson, creator of the Saltire Centre, as Lead Consultant we have worked with a range of people across the FE and HE sectors to illustrate the richness and diversity of developments in the sector. .... I am currently in negotiation to bring Les Watson to Australia for the two weeks 17 - 28 September and wondered if by any chance your September meeting coincided with this period and if you would interested in hosting a visit from Les Watson. I have a tentative agreement that he is willing and available during this period and thought I might flag this possibility with you to get a sense of whether his visit if of interest to CAUL. Dr Elizabeth McDonald, Carrick Institute. Thursday 20 September is being included in his schedule.
ii) **RFID.** Craig Anderson. Hold over until implementation can be discussed. Other potential contributors are Macquarie, Monash, UNSW.

iii) **Carrick Exchange.** Jenny Millea education.au has offered a presentation on the Carrick Exchange project. She is happy to speak at the September meeting and is pencilled in.

iv) **MAMS/ RAMP/ AAF.** James Dalziel has offered to speak on current projects.

v) **Management Information Systems Forum/ Workshop.**

c) **CAUL meeting 2008/ 1.** Sydney is recommended. Eve Woodberry will invite members to host meetings in 2008.

### 1584. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.

a) **Draft schedule for 2007.** Potential clashes:

   - 2007
     - IATUL, Stockholm, Sweden 11-14 June;
     - IFLA 19-23 August, Durban, South Africa;
     - EDUCAUSE 2007 Seattle, Washington October 23-26;
     - ARROW meeting 30 November;
     - Planned Leave: Diane – 11 May to 11 June; Andrew – Singapore/Hong Kong April 8-17; 25 May to 24 June;
     - 2008 – ICOLC, San Francisco, April ???; IATUL 2008, Auckland, April 21-24; IFLA Québec City, Canada, 10-14 August 2008;

   i) **2007/ 4.** Brisbane, Thursday 26 July, in conjunction with CCA, 27 July 2007 9am-1pm

   ii) **2007/ 5.** Adelaide, Wednesday 19 September, in conjunction with CAUL 2007/2.

   iii) **2007/ 6.** Sydney, Tuesday 20 November from 1pm and Wednesday 21 November from 9am, in conjunction with CCA, afternoon of 21 November. UNSW level 3, for the CCA meeting.

### CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1585. **CAUL Finances.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree

a) **CAUL Budget 2006.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2006.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2006.xls) The draft audit report is now available. Diane Costello reported that a windfall had resulted due to increase in interest rates which have been very low for a number of years, and to the increasing volume of funds processed through the office. The profit of $116,000 in 2006 is entirely due to interest income.

b) **CAUL Budget 2007.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2007.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2007.xls) Jeff Murray reported that no-one in the sector offered to handle the redevelopment of the CAUL website. He will next approach Eclipse. It was suggested asking CAUL members to nominate appropriate contractors. **(Action: JM)** Cathrine Harboe-Ree will advise members that she has taken over as treasurer and that her business manager assists with evaluation.


   a) High Risk items. For review.


   c) Options for CAUL Office location. Diane Costello will check with the University of Canberra. **(Action: DC)**

1587. **Other business.**

The meeting concluded at 11am.
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1588. Attendance & Apologies. Eve Woodberry (President), Andrew Wells (Deputy President), Heather Gordon, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Jeff Murray. In attendance: Diane Costello.

1589. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2007/3 – Melbourne 3 April 2007. The draft minutes were tabled; an unedited draft had been previously available. The minutes were accepted. (Action: DC)

1590. Minutes of CAUL Meeting 2007/1 – Melbourne 3-4 April 2007. A draft is available, though not yet fully edited. Members noted that having both the President and Deputy jointly chairing was a useful innovation and should be repeated. The minutes will be finalised and made available to CAUL. (Action: DC)

1591. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1592. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).

1593. CAUL Membership. An inquiry into access to membership of CAUL was received from the librarian of Te Wananga o Aotearoa in New Zealand. “We are the third largest Tertiary institution in NZ delivering undergraduate and some post-graduate degrees. We provide access to Doctoral degrees win conjunction with other wananga in New Zealand.” He was directed to information about CEIRC participation, and the email list “CAUL Circular2.”

It was noted that the CAUL constitution needs to be amended to refer to Universities Australia. (Action: DC)

1594. CAUL Elections. The terms of Eve Woodberry (President), Cathrine Harboe-Ree and Jeff Murray finish in 2007. This was Eve’s first full term, 2005 being the year she filled in for Madeleine McPherson. This was Cathrine’s second term and Jeff’s first (also appointed during 2005 to take the vacant position left by Madeleine.) The constitution is not clear on whether the “acting” year is considered as a term – it should probably not be considered as such, but the Executive may wish to consider clarifying the constitution. CAUDIT has a special section for casual vacancies, that implies that the fill-in position does not constitute a term.

CAUL Constitution: 4.Election of Officers:

1. The President and other members of the Executive shall be elected from among the members for a term of 2 years and shall be eligible for re-election but may not serve more than two terms consecutively.

CAUDIT Constitution: 7.5 Casual Vacancies

In the event of the resignation of any member of the Executive Committee, an election shall be held within 60 days to fill this casual vacancy. The person so elected shall remain in office only for the unexpired portion of the term of the person who resigned.
It was suggested setting a time limit on whether it is considered a full term or not; or whether it is casual to the end of the current election cycle. The constitution will be reviewed in full and be taken to the CAUL meeting. **(Action: AW, DC)**

Eve Woodberry is standing down as President. Nominations will be called for the 2008-2009 term. **(Action: DC)**

**CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH**

1595. **CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).** Andrew Wells

a) **CEIRC Review.** The draft RFP is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc2007review3.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/ceirc2007review3.doc) Andrew Wells asked members to confirm whether the document is ready for finalisation and to identify individuals or organisations who might do the job. The review will look at risk and financial issues, and business processes. The document will not be made publicly available. Andrew Wells, Craig Anderson, and Heather Gordon will act as the review committee.

3.3 is the main purpose for the review - the current and future role of the CEIRC program. Within that, it will look at operations and risk management. The report should include recommendations for the future, not just describe what is done now. It was noted that the primacy of CAUL members is covered in 3.1.

It was agreed that the criteria should include knowledge of relevant legislation, without specifying which legislation. Briefing of consultants should cover the risk management section, including issues relating to group purchasing.

It was noted that business principles do not currently influence the assessment of membership eligibility and it was recommended that the section on the business model be expanded e.g. the checklist of negotiation points changes in response to members’ needs - is not a rigid document nor is the business rigid.

The budget will be firmed up so that it can be implemented as soon as CAUL approval is received. A number of consultants were suggested: KPMG, Mann Judd, some PCW people who are no longer with the firm. It was recommended that seven referees be sought from whom three will be chosen.

Andrew Wells will finalise the text and will release following the approval of the Executive. Heather Gordon will provide documents from AARLIN as an example. **(Action: HG)**

Andrew Wells will call for expressions of interest, and asked members to suggest whom to ask, seeking competent individuals and organisations to respond to the call for interest. **(Action: AW)**

b) **ERA (Electronic Resources Australia – the National Licensing Proposal).** Diane Costello reported on the ERA process. A comparison between the ERA offers and current CEIRC offers/pricing was prepared, and an assessment made as to whether it was of benefit to members to move to an ERA model. It was confirmed that it makes no difference to other sectors if CAUL members participate or not. The main impact is political though there are some higher education colleges (not TAFE) who are not in CEIRC, and may not reach critical mass on their own. In several cases, there was little difference between ERA and CEIRC and any change between the two would be cost neutral to both the vendor and the subscriber. In one case, the ERA price was considerably better than the offer to CAUL, a database that had very low take-up previously. In other cases, the CEIRC model and price were much better and there was no way to make the ERA version attractive. Only three CAUL institutions expressed interest in any of the databases.

c) **NSLA.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that NSLA has proposed joining CEIRC so that the NLA could focus on ERA. Andrew Wells raised this with Jan Fullerton who confirmed they were interested in CAUL negotiating for the high-end databases. He advised her that CAUL was undertaking a review of CEIRC which would take into account other collaborations. It was noted that CAUL does not negotiate exceptions for individual institutions – exceptions are complicated and expensive.
**d) CEIRC budget.**

i) **CEIRC levy 2008.** The CEIRC committee recommended that the CEIRC levy be increased by a percentage equivalent to ANU’s enterprise agreement. This is an effectively static increase, recommended because a significant proportion of CEIRC’s budget is salaries related, and travel costs form the second largest expenditure item. The proposed review of CEIRC is expected to form a conclusion about necessary staffing levels for the conduct of the program, whether it is broadened or reduced.

http://info.anu.edu.au/hr/Salaries_and_Conditions/Enterprise_Agreement/2005-2008_HEWRR/_S2/_S2_2.asp The last two years’ increases have been 6%, and the next is 2% guaranteed plus any adjustment to take into account:

17.3.2 In addition to the 2% salary increase due in November 2007, the University will review its capacity to provide an additional increase at that time. Any additional payment will be made following a financial assessment and will have regard for the University’s capacity to pay, market competitiveness of salaries, and growth in revenue, especially from sources that give rise to discretionary (untied) income.

Members discussed whether it was needed given the amount of interest being earned in the foreign currency accounts. The interest income should be used for the CEIRC review. If the review reports an increase in the size of the program, then holding off any increase may result in a larger increase in another year. It is likely that the number of products being handled has a bigger impact on the load of the program than the number of members. The review may show that low-participant products should not be handled by CEIRC. It was also questioned whether fees should reflect demand and value rather than costs. Interest income is soft money, and changes from year to year. CEIRC is designed to be a cost recovery program. Why isn’t the interest which is being earned because of the program going back into the CEIRC program? If CAUL makes a profit then it can reinvest it in CAUL programs.

Options are to keep up with costs, i.e. keep the status quo until the review is completed, versus no change until after the review because the interest income will cover any deficit.

It was agreed to change the wording of the recommendation but recommend 2%. Include a paper about the review and the issues to be taken into account with the interest income. **(Action: AW)** The CAUL budget needs also to be reviewed in light of salary changes.

ii) **ICOLC representation.** The CEIRC Committee recommended that CAUL continue to be represented at the ICOLC North American meeting. Andrew Wells suggested that the Executive determine who should represent CAUL e.g. a representative of the Executive Committee, of the CEIRC Committee or an opportunity for one of the Datasets Coordinators on the committee? Diane Costello described how the meeting functions – a mixture of the business end of consortial purchasing from vendors, sharing experiences of consortial administration, new areas of consortial collaboration, new collaborative technologies and other infrastructure - and who attended - notably consortium managers and negotiators and, if more than one person attended, a collections representative. It was recommended that Diane Costello attend but should there be any potential impact on CAUL’s work, an alternative may be invited to represent CAUL, funded by CEIRC.

e) **CEIRC Forum on Managing Usage Statistics for Electronic Resources.** Diane Costello reported on the forum to be held in Sydney on August 31. Speakers include Derek Whitehead outlining which data should be collected and why it is needed; vendors of various types e.g. ILMS vendors, ERM vendors, aggregators, collators of usage statistics; CAUL/CONZUL staff managing the data collection and dealing with data manipulation; Diane Costello chairing. The forum arose out of the Datasets Coordinators meeting in January. CAVAL is handling the venue and registration logistics. Costs will be recovered from attendees so it should be cost-neutral for CAUL.

**1596. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.**
a) **NLA Proposals for Technical Development of the ADT Repository.** Andrew Wells referred to a proposal from the National Library to undertake the discovery aspect of the ADT service. He sees the ADT as an infant repository with a model that depends on the discovery service. With all universities developing institutional repositories, of which theses will be just one sub-set, and DEST pursuing its accessibility framework, the question arises as to the ADT’s future form. It was agreed that it was too early to make a decision, but that the question should continue to be kept on the CAUL agenda.

What is the case for a theses-specific discovery service? It was noted that the ARROW discovery service was developed as a program under ARROW within the NLA. It harvests non-ARROW institutions as well. Online theses will be accessible through Google and the ARROW discovery service – need to decide whether a theses discovery service is still needed.

What other issues should be considered? It is highly desirable to continue to badge the ADT under CAUL. It is important to retain the attention of the research community. A good community of practice has developed around these services.

It was agreed that the ADT needs to be kept at least through to the end of 2008, but without further enhancements. Andrew Wells also recommended withdrawing from the NDLTD.

1597. **eResearch.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported no recent action by CAUL’s sub-committee, and suggested that this remain as a topic, but the actions which do need to be done will be picked up by the NCRIS PfC program. She volunteered to continue to contribute to the agenda by sharing what she is doing.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree has been appointed to a newly formed committee called AeRIC (Australian eResearch Infrastructure Council), which essentially replaces ARIIC. Although she is not a CAUL representative, she will continue to report to CAUL. Members include Tom Cochrane as chair, Alan McMeekin ex officio as the CAUDIT president, Robin Stanton, Robert Woodcock from CSIRO, Chris Hancock from AARNet, Ian Wallace and DEST personnel.

ANDS (the Australian National Data Service) reports to AeRIC, is chaired by Rhys Francis, with Clare McLaughlin as Executive Officer. It is described in the PfC investment plan. The PfC covers discovery services, data management and outreach services, though the latter is now seen as part of the other two. They have recommended that all AeRIC documentation be published on the website. Then National Library and the National Archives are both members of the ANDS technical working group.

1598. **Research Quality Framework.** Following a number of individual inquiries, Diane Costello circulated an update of the DEST negotiations with the larger publishers seeking permission to host publishers’ versions of journal articles in evidence portfolios in local institutional repositories for the term of the RQF review. Action to gain permission for the long tail of smaller publishers has not yet been determined. Since the circular to CAUL, discussions have taken place with Sage Publishing, and follow-up discussions with Nature Publishing Group, both very positive. It should be noted that there is quite some discussion on the ANZ repositories list about copyright and the RQF, with some indication that posters are not in communication with their library director.

It was suggested that a supplementary agreement be requested from the publishers to keep the publishers’ copies in a dark archive rather than deleting them. It was agreed that any such request should wait until after the RQF, when the process can be reviewed. (Action: DC)

Eve Woodberry and Andrew Wells attended the workshop for the RQF Panel 11 on July 23. Panel 11 covers a mix of discipline areas not covered elsewhere, including law, education and the other professions. Kerry Smith and Don Schauder represented researchers.

It was reported that DEST is approaching Thomson and Elsevier to obtain citation information centrally rather than its being collated by individual institutions. Diane Costello will seek further information from DEST. (Action: DC)
a) **NCRIS** (National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy). SII (Systemic Infrastructure Initiative) is almost complete, and NCRIS will take over all similar activity under PfC (Platforms for Collaboration) and ANDS (Australian National Data Service). John Shipp and Linda O’Brien were both members of the NCRIS committee.

**FRODO Projects**

b) **MAMS** (Meta Access Management System Project). https://mams.melcoe.mq.edu.au/zope/mams/ This steering committee doubles as the RAMP steering committee. The Australian Access Federation’s (AAF) Shibboleth Trust Federation will be delivered by MELCOE and overseen by MAMS. Eve Woodberry reported that she will be absent for the next meeting, but suggests that no other delegate would be needed. Future activity of the AAF will be funded under NCRIS. It was noted that institutional repositories will need to be Shibbolised.

c) **MAPS** (Middleware Action Plan and Strategy). http://www.middleware.edu.au/ Jeff Murray reported that he had received a revised report and minutes of the July meeting. He has suggested that the report include more detail about what has been Shibbolised, what needs to be Shibbolised, and what work is left to be done. More information is needed about exactly what institutions need to do. It was noted that the UK’s Shibboleth program still has very few Shibbolised organisations listed.

d) **RUBRIC** (Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively). http://www.rubric.edu.au/ Eve Woodberry reported that the project finishes in 2007. It has created a good community of repository managers. There are concerns about migration from the current to the forthcoming version of VITAL.

e) **E–Framework for Research.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported. The project involves DEST working with JISC and is funded under RUBRIC, supporting the international standards network. There is no application, rather it informs development of applications such as ARROW. It is more a centre of expertise than a service. It was noted that Kerry Blinco is producing useful reports.

f) **OAK-Law** (Open Access to Knowledge (OAK) Legal Protocols for Copyright Management). http://www.oaklaw.qut.edu.au/ Andrew Wells suggested that the OAK-Law report takes a very conservative approach to copyright, particularly regarding theses. He will prepare a document identifying problems with it. (Action: AW) OAK-Law staff have approached the CAUL office for information about setting up a database of publishers agreements and open access policies. (Action: DC)

**New Projects:**

f) **Australian Research Enabling Environment (ARCHER)** [builds on the Dataset Acquisition Accessibility & Annotation e-Research Technologies (DART) project] Cathrine Harboe-Ree

g) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) - Stage 2.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that the current focus is on the new version of VITAL, though some may stay with an older stable version. She noted that ARROW was never intended to be software, but rather plug-in and plug-out service. FEDORA has received foundation funding to develop a DSpace-type service.

h) **Legal Frameworks for e-Research** [will extend Legal Protocols for Copyright Management for Open Access project] Eve Woodberry

i) **Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) - Stage 2.**

j) **Integrated Content Environment for Research and Scholarship (ICE-RS)** [will build on the RUBRIC: Regional Universities Building Research Infrastructure Collaboratively project] Eve Woodberry
k) **RAMP (Research Activityflow & Middleware Priorities).** The steering committee doubles as the MAMS steering committee.

i) **DRAMA (Digital Repository Authorization Middleware Architecture)** is a sub-project within RAMP ([http://www.ramp.org.au](http://www.ramp.org.au)) that aims to develop a web front-end for Fedora repository, and to refactor Fedora authentication and authorization into pluggable middleware components.

l) **Australian Access Federation (AAF).** Maxine Brodie represents CAUL on the AAF Steering Committee.

### 1600. Australian Framework and Action Plan for Digital Heritage Collections

The Collections Council has called for responses to this draft by August 3. The Executive agreed that a CAUL response should be prepared and that Linda Luther be invited to prepare it. Cathrine Harboe-Ree expressed concern that university collections are not included, even though the definition is broad enough to include them. She also recommended that CAUL seeks a position on the reference group, and consequently Andrew Wells approached Margaret Birtley of the Council. CAUL should consider whether it needs to be included in the working groups. It could provide the basis for a CAUL digitisation framework.  

*Action: AW*

### CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING

1601. **Information Literacy Working Group.** Diane Costello reported that the ILWG has drafted an action plan based on CAUL’s strategic plan, but it has yet to be circulated to Executive.  

*Action: DC*

1602. **ULA (University Library Australia).** No feedback has been received since the discussion at the CAUL meeting. It was noted that QUT has offered institutions a bulk registration process at a higher charge.

1603. **Carrick Institute.** Heather Gordon advised that she is a member of the Carrick Exchange DRM investigation reference group. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported her experience on the Carrick Institute citation award assessment panel this year. The awards are intended to be for general in addition to academic staff, for a sustained contribution, recognised within their own institutions, or by AUQA or other similar organisations. She recommended a review of the selection criteria to ensure that general staff are considered more fully. Eve Woodberry will approach the Carrick Institute to ensure that CAUL is officially invited to appropriate forums.  

*Action: EW*

### DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE

1604. **Statistics.** Diane Costello will write to Ross Harvey, the AARL editor, regarding the decision to cease publishing CAUL statistics in AARL. It was asked when the 2006 data would be published on the CAUL site.  

*Action: DC*

1605. **Workforce Planning.** A request for funding support for stage 2 of the neXus project, an institutional study, was received from ALIA President, Roxanne Missingham. The project will be conducted by QUT’s A/Prof Gillian Hallam. Members agreed that the surveys may be interesting and perhaps will provide some benchmark data, but the outcomes are not clear. It should be noted that CAUL works on cost-recovery basis and any project funded must be of clear, direct benefit to members. This project appears rather too generic to be of direct benefit. It was suggested referring to recent work by UTas, LATN, WAGUL and ACRL. Diane Costello will draft a letter.  

*Action: DC*

It was suggested that library schools be encouraged to run in-depth courses for practitioners e.g. a recent one-week QUT course for law librarians was deemed to be of great value.

### COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

1606. **Communication.** (Standing item)

   a) **President’s Report.** Eve Woodberry met with Jan Fullerton on May 24 in Canberra. She attended the Australian Book Industry Awards as chair of the Public Lending Rights committee; both Eve Woodberry and Andrew Wells participated in a workshop for RQF
panel 11 as CAUL’s nominees; Bruce Heterick, JSTOR, consulted with Eve Woodberry and Diane Costello regarding changes to JSTOR’s partners and how best to communicate that to the library community.

Letters have been sent this year to the following: IFLA – a letter of support for ALIA’s bid to hold IFLA 2010 in Brisbane; Jan Fullerton, Director-General of the National Library, congratulating her on the extension of her contract for the next 5 years; Gaynor Austen, congratulating her on the award of AM, Member of the Order of Australia in the Queen’s Birthday Honours list.

b) Public Relations/Media Reports.

i) inCite, v.28, issue 6, June 2007.

(1) p.6-7. CAUL, CONCERT and Amigos talk consortia. Interviews, including with Diane Costello, by Arnaud Pelle, EmeraldInsight.

(2) p.8. Looking at licences. Andrew Wells

(3) p.21. Evelyn Woodberry new Chair of lending rights committee. .. Senator Brandis’ acknowledgement of the outstanding contribution of predecessor, John Shipp. Members congratulated Eve on this appointment.

(4) ECU best public building in WA.

c) CAUL Report 2005-6. The report was “published” on the CAUL web site on May 8.

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

e) CAUL email list. One of CAUL’s vendors was concerned that CONZUL members had access to CAUL pricing through a message sent to the CAUL list. It was noted that it is rare for pricing to be different in the two markets.

CONZUL members, and representatives of CAUDIT and ACODE are members of the CAUL list as a convenience, so that relevant information does not have to be duplicated. It is understood that information clearly confidential to CAUL should remain so. It was agreed to send a reminder to list members about handling information from the list – e.g. they may come across information at times e.g. pricing or other more sensitive information, that may be inappropriate to pass outside CAUL. (Action: DC)

f) Atlas of Living Australia. CAUL has been invited to participate in a workshop on July 25-26 on this NCRIS-funded project. Two ANU staff will attend.

1607. CAUL Web Site. The request for proposals was circulated to CAUDIT and CAUL. One application was received by the closing date of March 30. Questions by another potential applicant were responded to by Jeff Murray and Diane Costello in the week of June 11. In the end, three applications were received. The quote does not include data migration. All bids including the use of a content management system.

The preferred applicant has specific requirements for infrastructure. ANU does not have the physical infrastructure to host the site proposed by Wiliam. It is possible that ECU could host the site. Jeff Murray will discuss with Vic Elliott, then the appropriate ANU personnel. He will check the cost of hosting software at Wiliam.

Jeff Murray will confirm how migration to new versions of the software is managed; what source code it is in; what resources are expected from CAUL, and for how long? (Action: J M)

Diane Costello expressed concern about resourcing in the office during the CEIRC review, the web site redevelopment and the normal office activities which are heavily CEIRC-focussed in the second half of the year. It was suggested bringing the web development forward as much as possible so that it doesn’t run in parallel with the CEIRC review. It was agreed to fund the additional $22,000 for the project from retained earnings rather than postpone it, and possibly have to repeat the appointment process. It could possibly be finished by late October.

Members thanked Jeff Murray for all the work he has put into the project so far.
1608. Copyright. It was noted that Heather Gordon has been appointed to the Carrick Exchange Digital Rights Management Reference Group.

a) **IFLA CLM Committee.** Eve Woodberry has been re-appointed to the committee for the two-year term of office, 2007–2009. She will not be eligible for another term. CLM meetings will be held in Durban on August 18 and August 24.

b) **Al CTEC Copyright Forum, Adelaide, 21 August 2007.** Eve Woodberry received an invitation to attend. It was agreed to ask Helen Livingston if she could attend and ask if it can be circulated to CAUL. *(Action: DC)*

1609. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

a) **DEST Indigenous Higher Education Advisory Council.** DEST invited CAUL to suggest appropriate indigenous persons for this council. The request was circulated to members, two nominations were received, one of whom was appointed to the council.

b) **Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Commission.** Submission to Material that advocates terrorist acts discussion. Alex Byrne represented CAUL and ALIA at a public hearing Tuesday 17 July in Sydney. Jeremy Fisher represented the Australian Society of Authors.

1610. Relationships with other organisations.

a) **CAUDIT & ACODE.** A joint meeting is scheduled for Friday 27 July. Eve Woodberry will chair the meeting.

i) **EDUCAUSE**


   (2) **EDUCAUSE Quarterly Review.** Heather Gordon starts a two-year term on the editorial board in October 2007.

b) **National Library of Australia.** Eve Woodberry met with Jan Fullerton on May 24.

   i) Libraries Australia (Kinetica).

   ii) **Peak Bodies Forum.** The Peak Bodies Forum was held Monday 7 May, 2007. Eve Woodberry and Andrew Wells attended. Andrew Wells reported that Resource Description and Access (RDA) is effectively AACR3. He will attempt to define what CAUL members need to know? *(Action: AW)*

   c) **NSLA (National and State Libraries Australasia).** At the last meeting, the benefits of the CAUL Executive’s meeting with NSLA was discussed and the decision held over to this meeting pending a discussion paper from Andrew Wells. *(Action: AW)*

1611. CAUL Meetings.

a) **CAUL Meeting 2007/2.** Adelaide, 20-21 September. At CAUL 2007/1, some members expressed a preference for a 2-day, rather than 2+ day, meeting. It was agreed to plan two days, starting with CAUL committee meetings on Thursday morning, with Hot Topics and CAUL business on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning, and sectoral meetings on Friday afternoon.

   Members discussed other topic options. Diane Costello will invite CAUL members to suggest other topics, and nominate who should address them. *(Action: DC)*

   i) **Archiving solutions.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree had advised the Michael Keller will be visiting Australia in September, and suggested inviting him to talk on CLOCKSS, in a session on this and other archiving solutions. It was later noted that he will not still be in Australia for the CAUL meeting time. Vic Elliott wishes to discuss CLOCKSS.

   ii) **MAMS/ RAMP/ AAF.** James Dalziel had offered to speak on the Australian Access Federation. He was pencilled in for Thursday 20 September but it was suggested that
the shortened agenda would make this unfeasible, and the presentation should instead be listed for the April meeting in Sydney.  **(Action: DC)**

**iii) Carrick Exchange.** Jenny Millea education.au has offered a presentation on the Carrick Exchange project. She is happy to speak at the September meeting and is pencilled in.

**iv) Learning Spaces.** JISC infoNet infoKit 'Planning and Designing Technology-Rich Learning Spaces': With Les Watson, creator of the Saltire Centre, as Lead Consultant we have worked with a range of people across the FE and HE sectors to illustrate the richness and diversity of developments in the sector. .... I am currently in negotiation to bring Les Watson to Australia for the two weeks 17 - 28 September and wondered if by any chance your September meeting coincided with this period and if you would interested in hosting a visit from Les Watson. Dr Elizabeth McDonald, Carrick Institute. This was tentatively scheduled for the morning of September 20, but it since appears that this is no longer possible.

**v) Risk Management.** It was suggested inviting Keith Webster to present a version of his presentation to the forthcoming governance conference. 30 minutes.  **(Action: DC)**

**vi) RDA.** Andrew Wells offered to introduce this topic to CAUL, to review how it might impact on member libraries.  Suggested 5 minutes.

**vii) Bonus.** Greg Anderson will be invited to provide an update on Bonus. 15 minutes

**viii) Key Performance Indicators.** It was suggested that representatives of LATN (Helen Livingston) and the Go8 be invited to discuss their work.

**b) CAUL meeting 2008/1.** April 3-4 tbc, Sydney (hosted by Andrew Wells and John Shipp.)  **(Action: AW)**

**i) Learning Skills.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree offered to lead a discussion on the Monash approach to learning skills at a later meeting.

**ii) RFID.** Craig Anderson. Hold over until implementation can be discussed. Other potential contributors are Macquarie, Monash Malaysia, UNSW Asia.

**c) CAUL Meeting 2008/2.** CAUL members will be invited to host the meeting.  **(Action: DC)**

**1612. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.**

**a) Draft schedule for 2007.** Potential clashes:

- **2007**
  - IFLA 19-23 August, Durban, South Africa (Eve away 8-27 August);
  - EDUCAUSE 2007 Seattle, Washington October 23–26;
  - ARROW meeting 30 November;
  - 2008 - Easter 21-24 March; ICOLC, San Francisco, April 13-16; IATUL 2008, Auckland, April 21-24; IFLA Québec City, Canada, 10-14 August 2008;

- **2007/5.** Adelaide, Thursday 20 September, in conjunction with CAUL 2007/2.

- **2007/6.** Sydney, Tuesday 20 November from 1pm and Wednesday 21 November from 9am, in conjunction with CCA, afternoon of 21 November. UNSW level 3, for the joint meeting.

**CAUL ADMINISTRATION**

**1613. CAUL Finances.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree

**a) CAUL Budget 2006.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2006.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2006.xls)  Diane Costello noted that the finalisation of the audit is still pending clarification of some entries relating to the GST on the foreign currency accounts, not related to actual payments but to the way in which they are entered. The budget documents will be finalised when the audit is completed.  **(Action: DC)**
b) **CAUL Budget 2007.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/budget2007.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/budget2007.xls) It was noted that the budget is tracking as expected. In the discussion on the CAUL web site development, it was noted that the expected expenditure could be closer to $50,000 than the budgeted $25,000, but that there were sufficient funds in hand because of interest earned over the last year.

c) **CAUL Budget 2008.** Diane Costello will draft and circulate to members, taking into account decisions under item 1595(d)(i) above – CEIRC levy. **(Action: DC)**

### 1614. Risk assessment for CAUL


a) **High Risk items.** For review. **(Action: AW)**

b) **New legislation.** How is new legislation tracked at ANU? Diane Costello has checked the web site without result, and will find an appropriate person to ask. **(Action: DC)**

c) **Options for CAUL Office location.** Diane Costello will check with the University of Canberra. Anita Crotty is happy to discuss this, but the discussion hasn’t yet taken place. **(Action: DC)**

### 1615. Other business.

a) **Richard Siegersma, DA Information Services** has suggested a discussion session with CAUL members on the environment and the future of libraries and their services. It was understood that he would like to establish an industry advisory group and asked if members would be interested in attending a forum. It was agreed that CAUL could facilitate it rather than sponsor it. **(Action: DC)**

b) **Insync/Rodski.** A letter from Keith Webster has been received with suggestions for changing the Insync/Rodski survey. Cathrine Harboe-Ree noted that the survey has always allowed the flexibility of adding questions, members participated in an all-CAUL review about 12 months ago, there are always restraints in limiting the number of questions. Most used this survey as a high level benchmarking instrument and a pointer to more specific surveys and focus groups. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will discuss with Keith as a follow-up to an earlier discussion with the Go8. **(Action: CH-R)**

The meeting concluded at 5pm.
## Section II. Contribution to research

### Action
Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchasing and licensing of electronic information resources

### Responsibility
CEIRC

### Time-line
Ongoing

### Activity since last report
Meeting held June 28 (Sydney).

### Achievements since last report

#### CEIRC Review
A Request for Quotation document was finalised and approved by CAUL Executive for release in early August. Responses are now being evaluated by three CAUL members (Heather Gordon, Craig Anderson and Helen Livingston). A recommendation will be made to the CAUL Executive in mid-September. An update will be provided at the CAUL Meeting.

#### Product and Vendor Negotiations
The Sage offer was finalised and released to members. 25 members have taken up the offer.

Little progress with Fairfax Business Media

#### Forum on Usage Statistics for E-Resources
This was held in Sydney on 31 August, attracting nearly 80 participants. Neil Renison managed the program and CAVAL the logistics for the event for CAUL. The program and presentations are available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/usagestatistics.html](http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/usagestatistics.html). Derek Whitehead gave the first presentation of the day

#### Electronic Resources Australia
Only three CAUL members expressed interest, and two pulled out in the end, one because ERA runs on a financial year, and the cost advantage wasn't worth the hassle when all their other subscriptions are calendar year. It is likely that, for those products that were the same as CEIRC or in the same ball-park, this was a good reason to stay within CEIRC.

For some products, the content wasn't appropriate, and for others, the CEIRC pricing model was better. A comparison follows:

#### ABI/INFORM(r) Global
This is a subset of the "Complete" product that is currently part of PQ5000, and available as a CEIRC database. PQ5000 subscribers won't need it. For the others, if there are fewer than 8000 FTE, the price will be less than the CEIRC price for Complete.

#### Asian Business and Reference(tm)
This database is included in PQ5000. ProQuest confirms that if any PQ5000 subscriber wishes to take the ERA offer, then their PQ5000 price will be
reduced by the amount they pay under ERA (zero sum result.) For non-PQ5000 subscribers, the ERA price is less than the CEIRC price, for all FTE levels, and all participation levels.

**Australia & New Zealand Newsstand**
This database is not in PQ5000, but there is a CEIRC price. If there are fewer than 6000 FTE, the ERA price is better, otherwise not. (Only 3 CAUL institutions are this small.)

**Australia/New Zealand Reference Centre(tm)**
This database is included in EBSCO's CEIRC offers. The ERA pricing is in the same ball-park as CEIRC pricing, except that it decreases slightly as participation increases. The CEIRC pricing is fixed so potentially the ERA pricing is better.

**Oxford Reference Online Premium**
ERA pricing is per FTE, while the CEIRC pricing is banded FTE. OUP has provided pricing in AUD. At today's exchange rates (and those existing when the pricing was released) the CEIRC pricing is much better.

**World Book Online Reference Center**
There is no CEIRC offer for this.

**Consumer Health Complete(tm)**
EBSCO's Health Source Consumer Edition (HSCE) which is included in the MegaFile packages is similar to the Consumer Health Complete (CHC) database being made available via ERA. CHC is a considerably larger consumer health resource and actually includes all the content currently found within HSCE. EBSCO offer MegaFile customers a 30% discount on the ERA price for Consumer Health Complete, should they wish to take up this resource.

**Health & Wellness Resource Center**
Health Reference Center Academic
HRAC is part of Gale's offering to CEIRC. Pricing is by simultaneous user levels, plus participation levels. ERA pricing is unlimited users, plus participation levels. For unlimited users, ERA pricing is in the same ballpark as CEIRC pricing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</th>
<th>Approved minutes are available at <a href="http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/">http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/</a> and draft minutes are available at <a href="http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting$/ceirc-meetings.html">http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting$/ceirc-meetings.html</a>. Informal reports were emailed to CAUL list after the June 2007 meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Plan for forthcoming activity | Commence CEIRC review subject to satisfactory response to RFQ criteria, affordable price and CAUL Executive approval.  
Finalise scope and terms of reference of CEIRC staffing and operational review and seek CAUL approval, including funding.  
Maintaining title lists for CAUL packages on Serial Solutions etc.  
Expressions of interest have been received for a pilot project.  
Vendor response form. This is being developed from the checklist of issues to be raised and resolved with vendors. [http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/checklist-vendor-negotiations.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/datasets/checklist-vendor-negotiations.doc). It is likely to be most useful for those information providers with little or no experience of academic libraries or consortial purchasing.  
Next meeting in Melbourne on September 24, 2007 |
|---|---|
CEIRC Levy 2008

CEIRC levy for 2008 requires determination by CAUL. CEIRC recommended an increase in line with ANU enterprise agreement salary increase. The reasoning behind this recommendation noted that the majority of CEIRC Program expenses are salary related. The financial aim of the CEIRC Program is to cover costs and not return a profit to CAUL or require subsidy from CAUL.

At its July meeting, the CAUL Executive did not reach agreement on this recommendation, although it did agree that any raise to the levy should be limited to 2%. A range of views were put forward:

- Any decision on changes to the CEIRC levy should be delayed until the CEIRC review is complete
- The interest income in foreign currency accounts is not recognised in CEIRC income and expenditure, so is not a factor in calculating the CEIRC levy. Various views were put forward: it should be; it should not be and instead used for investment in program improvements and/or the CEIRC review; it varies each year so is difficult to plan around; use the interest income this year to cover any deficit arising from no increase to the levy while the CEIRC review is completed
- Should the CEIRC levy reflect demand and value rather than cost recovery

This matter needs to be discussed at the CAUL meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations to CAUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine the amount of any increase to CEIRC 2008 levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note remainder of report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-forma updated 8 March 2007
## Section II. Contribution to Research

### Action 5.

Continue the development of the Australian Digital Theses Program

### Responsibility

ADT Policy Reference Group

### Time-line

Ongoing

### Activity since last report

**Business plan revision**

The business plan has been revised (attached). The important revisions to note are:

- Section 2.2: withdraw from membership of the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NTLTD). The costs of participation do not bring benefits to CAUL.
- Section 3.2.a: developments in institutional repositories and the mainstreaming of digital theses programs will lead to questions about the need to maintain a separate ADT Program.
- Section 3.2.h: Incorporate copyright guides from OAK-LAW and the ARROW Project.
- Section 4.1.a: Cease distribution and customer support of the VT-ETD software
- Section 4.6. Reduction in costs leading to reduction of the levy to AUD900 for 2008.
- Appendix 1: Updating of copyright and metadata policies

Note achievement against performance indicators in Section 5, Program evaluation.

**OAI-PMH harvesting**

OAI-PMH harvesting successfully working with four members.

**Research discovery services**

The ARROW National Discovery Service continues to regularly harvest ADT records.

### Achievements since last report

**Membership**

The number of active members is 40. There have been no new members since the last report

**Theses**

There are 17,738 theses that link to a digital version of the thesis. 15,135 have been contributed directly by members and a further 2,603 have been loaded from the National Bibliographic Database. There are 143,216 records for theses on the database altogether representing those without links to digital theses.

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

The *Membership Survey 2006 report* was widely publicised in mid-June 2007 through relevant discussions lists.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for forthcoming activity</th>
<th>ADT Policy Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT Policy Reference Group met by teleconference on 21 August and discussed the outcomes of the ADT Futures Workshop held in March 2007; a National Library proposal for a metadata repository; ADT membership for degree-granting organisations that are not members of CAUL or CONSUL; the Membership Survey 2006 report; and a response to the OAK Law Project No. 1: Creating a legal framework for copyright management of open access within the Australian academic and research sectors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADT Technical Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Technical Committee is discussing standards on metadata for theses in an institutional repository and a recommended process for OAI-PMH harvesting. The ADT website will be updated once agreement has been reached. The Technical Committee is represented on the Metadata Advisory Committee for Australian Repositories, which is developing recommendations on metadata and devising templates for the MARC/XML, Dublin Core and MODS schema.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUL budget implications</th>
<th>Ongoing levy to CAUL and CONZUL members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations to CAUL</th>
<th>Endorse changes to business plan, incorporating reduction of ADT levy for 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
1. SUMMARY

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

The long term need for the ADT Program needs to be considered as institutional repositories expand to the management of a wide range of research outputs.

2. PROGRAM STATUS

2.1 Background

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

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

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

2.2 Program growth and development

The number of active participants and theses available online has exceeded targets in the 2002-2006 business plan. At the end of 2006, there were 39 active participants: 32 from Australia and 7 from New Zealand. The growth in theses available online over time is shown in the following table:
At the end of 2006, twenty Australian universities had policies requiring mandatory submission of digital versions of theses, with an additional four planning to introduce it in 2007. This will ensure continued rates of growth.
The ADT Program underwent significant development in 2004/5 with support from the Systemic Infrastructure Initiative, part of Backing Australia’s Ability. The ADT Program responded to a call for proposals from the Department of Science, Education and Training for projects that demonstrated improvements or research in information infrastructure. The key activity has been the expansion of the coverage ADT’s central metadata repository to include as many records for all PhD and Masters (Research) theses as possible. The functionality of the metadata repository was developed to support the OAI Metadata Harvesting Protocol, information retrieval protocols and improved data quality maintenance. Distributed Systems Technology Centre [DSTC] has been contracted to provide software for the metadata repository.

The ADT Program has been a member of the international Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations, with representation on the Board of Directors and several committees. ADT has been represented at every Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETD) Conference until 2005. The achievement of ADT has been internationally recognised and is being seen as a useful model for other countries. In September 2005, CAUL and UNSW Library hosted the eighth ETD Conference. The benefit of continuing membership to NDLTD is questionable now given that digital theses programs are in place at almost every university in Australia and New Zealand. The cost of membership is around US$7,000.
3. OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

3.1 Environment

The environment for the ADT Program in Australia and New Zealand is positive. Government and industry interest in making fundamental research available is frequently expressed. The ADT Program has won key sectoral support from academics and postgraduate students. Submission of electronic theses continues to grow.

The following ten areas describe factors that will influence the future development and form of the ADT Program over the next four years.

a. Institutional repositories

There has been considerable growth in software development for Institutional Repositories. Repositories now have features such as OAI-PMH harvesting, presentation software, self-submission, and storage of multiple file formats. Much of this software can or is being developed to manage digital theses. The ETD-db software is lagging in development and better choices are available to members.

The Australian Systemic Infrastructure Initiative has funded projects that are deploying a range of applications, including DSpace and VITAL/FEDORA to manage digital theses and other data types. The New Zealand Digital Strategy has led to an investigation of an infrastructure to capture the research outputs of publicly funded research, with three universities interested in being demonstrator sites. These projects and other e-publishing ventures are promoting rapid innovation in repository software.

Separate repositories for theses are likely to be subsumed by the establishment of robust research repositories. Developments in e-research will be supported through the Platforms for Collaboration stream in the National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy. While the future form of repositories and research data management is not clear, there will be changes in the next 2-3 years that will lead to questions about the need to maintain or transform the ADT Program.

b. The RQF and the PBRF

The Research Quality Framework in Australia and the Performance-Based Research Fund in New Zealand reward excellent research in universities with funding. They assess excellence through a review of the research output of a university.

The RQF will commence in 2007. The Expert Advisory Group has agreed that “a PhD thesis is not an acceptable Research Output for the RQF”. However, the plan to deliver the research outputs electronically to assessment panels will provide an impetus to establishing or growing repositories.

The PBRF has operated since 2004. The first quality evaluation was completed in 2003, followed by a partial evaluation in 2006, with a full round scheduled for 2012. Dissertations and theses are included as a research output. Electronic versions are preferred as evidence of research output, but they are to be supplied as e-mail attachments, on CD, or floppy disk. Thus the PBRF has not given a major impetus to establishing repositories.
In either case, the high quality research outputs are being supplied electronically and there is an opportunity for repositories to capture this output and play a pivotal role in supplying it for evaluation. The establishment of a robust repository is likely to mean that a separate repository for dissertations and theses will not be required.

c. Metadata repository – business need and technical issues

The DSTC Cooperative Research Centre that developed and maintained the Metasuite software for the central ADT service ceased operations at the end of June 2006. The software can evolve with in-house development. The ADT Program has the source code and has implemented a development/test environment. There is other commercial and open source software that provides the same functionality and may have better development paths.

The business need for a separate metadata repository will need to be examined. A technical option has emerged with the National Library of Australia proposing an alternative means of exposing and accessing theses through the ARROW Discovery Service.

d. Electronic publishing and review processes

Recent publishing software, such as the Open Journal Systems, allows peer review of submitted material, subsequent editing, and online publication. If applied to theses, it would result in a change in the submission procedures where a student would deposit their “final” thesis prior to assessment. The publishing software would facilitate the review and editing process leading up to the final marking, and then release the thesis for public access.

e. New formats

If theses are submitted only in electronic form it is likely that formats other than PDF will want to be lodged. Datasets, moving image, music scores, computer programs, and electronic art are examples. Some of these can be embedded in PDF or replicated in PDF. Standards, management, and preservation of these objects are not necessarily fully established or implemented.

f. Preservation

Format changes require ongoing monitoring and, when necessary, action.

g. Research finding services

The number, user take-up, and use of academic-focussed search engines continue to grow. Most use OAI-PMH to harvest. Some harvest just metadata, whilst others take in the digital object as well. Examples are the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations, Google Scholar, and Scirus. These services enhance the utility, awareness, and visibility of theses.

h. Copyright

Copyright and intellectual property issues require ongoing discussion and clarification, including the use of copyrighted material in a digital thesis and storage of the entire thesis in a research repository. The OAK-LAW (Open Access to Knowledge) project based at QUT has produced a report and guidelines on use of copyright material in theses. Swinburne University of Technology is producing a practical guide on this
issue for submission of a wide range of research outputs to institutional repositories as a part of the ARROW Project. The ADT Program will adopt these guidelines instead of creating a separate set.

i. Retrospective digitisation programs

ADT participants have expressed interest in retrospective digitisation to enable more rapid growth of a critical mass of online content. ADT ran a pilot project in 2005 to determine the costs of converting printed theses using in-house and commercial processes.

j. Continued mandating of digital theses

Policies mandating deposit of digital versions of theses will also promote growth of a critical mass of online content. In Australasia, there are some 6,000 higher degree completions each year.

3.2 Implications for the ADT program

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Institutional repositories | Future need for a separate ADT Program  
Transform ADT Program into something wider in scope  
Encourage uptake.  
Inform and influence metadata and object standards.  
Assist with data migration from VT-ETD.  
Evaluate repository software for usefulness with submission, storage, and delivery of theses, including local and hosted services.  
Cease supplying VT-ETD.  
Cease support for VT-ETD.  |
| 2. | The RQF and the PBRF | Contribute to discussion on self-submission, reports, delivery to assessment panels.  |
Review alternative software platforms.  
Decide on future development path.  
Consider NLA offer.  |
| 4. | Electronic publishing and review processes | Monitor developments, investigate potential to fund demonstrator.  |
| 5. | New formats | Monitor developments.  |
| 6. | Preservation | Monitor and address format changes affecting digital theses, particularly the PDF format that ADT relies on currently.  |
| 7. | Research finding services | Develop and maintain international linkages.  
Continue compliance OAI Metadata Harvesting Protocol of the ADT central metadata repository.  
Identify and join relevant finding services.  
Consider full text searching of theses.  |
| 8. | Copyright | Monitor, advise on, and resolve concerns about copyright issues.  |
| 9. | Retrospective digitisation programs | Identify best practice models.  
Potential for funding.  |
4. OPERATION

4.1 Program development

a. Technical infrastructure

Existing ADT Program members are installing general research repositories that will incorporate theses as one type of research output. The VT-ETD software is limited to managing theses and does not have a strong development path.

Active members should be encouraged and assisted to implement general repository systems to manage theses, including identifying and evaluating repository software for theses and assisting with migration from VT-ETD.

Support for testing OAI-PMH harvesting is required for each site as they change to repository software. Although OAI-PMH is a standard for interchange of metadata, in practice each site implementation is different and requires individual testing and customisation.

Members who are not yet active in ADT were contacted to determine their plans. All plan to use general research repositories to manage theses in the future rather than the VT-ETD software.

A timeline to cease distribution and support of the ADT-customised version of VT-ETD should be identified.

- Cease distribution of the VT-ETD software immediately.
- Cease support of the VT-ETD software December 2007.

A second task is the review of alternative software platforms or services (e.g., NLA) that can operate the ADT central service by December 2007, prior to investing time and effort in developing and maintaining the Metasuite program.

b. Linkages to research finding services

Theses are in high demand by research finding services. The ADT Program should enable the inclusion of theses metadata in these services. Identifying, reaching agreement on inclusion, and providing data and objects can be offered by the ADT Program.

Other research finding services, such as Google Scholar and Scirus, should be investigated on behalf of ADT members.

Some research finding services are moving to full text searching. The ADT Program policy to exclude full text searching should be reviewed in this light, including full text searching in the local repository, the central service, and research finding services.

The ADT Program will withdraw from the Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations from 2009. The cost of belonging to this program does not deliver benefits to members.

c. Retrospective conversion

The experience and costing gained as part of the Redevelopment and Expansion of the ADT Program Project should be built on to seek funding to create more digital
content. The outlook for government funding of digitisation programs is not promising.

New funding should be sought to prove and demonstrate innovative approaches such as electronic submission of a thesis for review and subsequent management of the assessment process.

4.2 Governance

The governance model has worked for both the ongoing program and the redevelopment project. A period of organisational stability, coupled with growing participation by those CAUL and CONZUL members still not active in the Program, will enable understanding of the consequences of the recent expansion and technical redevelopment for the operation and use of ADT. In parallel with growth, the program continues to develop with the increased adoption of mandatory submission movement and a growing number of options now available to university libraries to manage digital theses.

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

The ADT Policy Reference Group will meet no less than twice per year. The ADT Technical Committee will meet no less than twice per year. The membership of the Policy Group and Technical Committee are:

**ADT Policy Reference Group**

2 CAUL members (1 as Chair)
1 CONZUL member
1 representative of the Deans and Directors of Graduate Schools
1 representative of the Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations
1 representative of the New Zealand academic or postgraduate community
1 ADT Program Manager (UNSW)

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

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

CAUL Executive Officer will provide support.

**ADT Technical Committee**

ADT Program Manager (Chair)
ADT Technical Support representative (UNSW)
4 CAUL representatives
2 CONZUL representatives

4.3 Membership of ADT

The online Membership Form is at http://adt.caul.edu.au/memberinformation/howtojoin/applicationform/.

4.4 Access
Access to the ADT central metadata repository will continue to be free for any individual or organisation. Access to full text of theses is strongly encouraged. Metadata licensing and re-use policies are set out in Appendix 1.

4.5 Service Levels

UNSW Library agrees to provide service levels to members as set out in Appendix 2.
4.6 Financial Operation

a. Cost of operation

The University of New South Wales Library estimates the following annual infrastructure and membership costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management</td>
<td>0.1 x HEW 9</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical management, support and maintenance of Metadata Repository</td>
<td>0.1 x HEW 8</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site administration and maintenance</td>
<td>0.05 x HEW 5</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staff related Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>22,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support related costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/fax/courier</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/Online usage</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware costs - annualised over 4 years of business plan</td>
<td>Server cost = Server cost =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware maintenance</td>
<td>est.</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Support related costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,450.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel and Related costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Reference Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Travel and Related costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14,400.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40,850.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel assumptions:

Policy Reference Group - Assumption is that 50% will travel twice a year at av cost of $600 airfares + a single night accom. @ $200

Technical Committee - Assumption is that 50% will travel twice a year at av cost of $600 airfares + a single night accom. @ $200

b. Revenues

Levy to CAUL and CONZUL members would be approximately AUD900.

c. Financial Reporting

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Achievement in 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of active CAUL Libraries</td>
<td>80% by end 2006 90% by end 2009</td>
<td>89% at end of 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of active CONZUL libraries</td>
<td>60% by end 2006 85% by end 2009</td>
<td>87.5% at end of 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e. members of ADT but not yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributing theses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of online theses available</td>
<td>12,000 by end 2006 17,000 by end 2009</td>
<td>12,447 at end of 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of retrospectively converted theses</td>
<td>500 per year</td>
<td>Not collected. 49% of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available</td>
<td></td>
<td>members had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>undertaken some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>digitisation by the end of 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder relationships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of relationship with</td>
<td>Assessment of relationship</td>
<td>54% at end of 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholarly community</td>
<td>CAUL members with mandatory submission of digital theses: 50% by end 2006;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% by end of 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONZUL members with mandatory submission of digital theses: 10% by end 2006;</td>
<td>62.5% at end of 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% by end of 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search statistics for metadata repository</td>
<td>[To be determined]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance and management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs meet budget for centralised</td>
<td>Variation no greater than 5%</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL and CONZUL satisfied with</td>
<td>CAUL and CONZUL responses to ADT</td>
<td>100% response to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program management</td>
<td>reports, proposals and communication</td>
<td>2006 survey of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: ADT COPYRIGHT AND METADATA POLICIES

1. Contribution of member metadata

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

a) Access metadata on ADT members’ computer systems.

b) Harvest, copy, host and store all or part of the ADT members’ metadata in the ADT central metadata repository.

c) Convert harvested metadata whenever necessary to meet data format and data content standards used in the ADT central metadata repository.

d) Allow free access to the metadata by any users of the World Wide Web for their personal, educational and research use, and to allow the ADT Program to make the metadata available for discovery purposes.

2. Re-use of Metadata by members

a) ADT members may copy, download, store and/or make available metadata from the ADT central metadata repository for educational and research purposes. Typical uses would be subject listings, catalogues and other discovery tools in keeping with the purposes of ADT.

b) Commercial re-use of metadata must be approved by CAUL and CONZUL.

3. Copyright

a) CAUL and CONZUL will jointly own copyright in the ADT web site.
Appendix 2: Service Level Agreement between CAUL and CONZUL members and UNSW

1. User support

1.1 UNSW will provide each new member advice and support during all stages of implementation.

1.2 UNSW will respond to non-urgent requests from members by next business day.
Urgent requests received [Business Hours, Australian Eastern Standard Time] shall be responded to within 5 hours for problems involving the metadata server. All urgent problems have to be emailed to adt-support@unsw.edu.au

1.3 Each member will commit to adherence to standards recommended by the Technical Group and endorsed by the Policy Group

1.4 Each member will inform UNSW Library ADT support in advance of any changes that may affect harvesting and/or access to the local ADT servers

1.5 Each member will promptly advise UNSW of any actions which may affect access to theses contributed by that member

2. Metadata repository and web-site

2.1 UNSW will maintain the ADT central metadata repository to the following standards:
- Backup each working day
- Harvesting of metadata from member sites each working day
- Disaster recovery to be consistent with UNSW standards for business continuity
- Repository to be available on a 24 x 7 basis
- Scheduled downtime to be advised to members with a minimum of 72 hours notice
- UNSW Library will regularly check the metadata to ensure quality and continuous access. UNSW will notify members if problems detected are at the local site
- Usage statistics will be produced regularly and be available on the ADT website

2.2 UNSW will seek approval for upgrades to hardware and software through the ADT Policy Committee based on the advice of the ADT Technical Committee

2.3 UNSW will maintain the ADT Web site, including but not limited to:
- Current news
- Discussion list & bulletin board
- Data relating to technical advice and expertise
- ADT standards and recommended guidelines for accessibility, copyright and any other information useful to the community
- Links to international initiatives

3. Advocacy

3.1 Each member will be responsible for advocacy of digital theses within their own institution
3.2 Each member to share information and promotional materials and activities within the ADT community

3.3 UNSW will provide support for institutional advocacy through:
   • Advice
   • Promotional materials
   • Promotional visits/conferences/seminars/etc
# CAUL Strategic Plan
## Report to CAUL

**Author:** Maxine Brodie  
**Date:** 10 September 2007  
**Date of previous report:** 13 September 2006 (eSecurity Framework Project)

<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 Australian Access Federation Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Maxine Brodie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity since last report</strong></td>
<td>Meetings held in June, August, September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievements since last report</strong></td>
<td>Australian Access Federation Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Publicity, reports, publications since last report** | The Australian Access Federation (AAF), with its policy framework and infrastructure, will facilitate trusted electronic communications and collaboration within and between higher education and research institutions both locally and internationally as well as with other organisations. The project will build on the existing DEST funded work in the first phase of the e-Security Framework project (based at the University of Queensland) and the MAMS (Meta Access Management System project, based at Macquarie University). This Project involves three linked components:  
**Part 1:** The development of overarching governance and policies for the whole Trust Federation (these are independent of delivery technologies)  
**Part 2:** The development of specific policies, technical implementation and rollout of PKI for a Trust Federation; and  
**Part 3:** The development of specific policies, technical implementation and rollout of Shibboleth for a Trust Federation.  
Project Objectives are available at: [http://www.aaf.edu.au/objectives](http://www.aaf.edu.au/objectives) and include outreach activities and workshops.  
The Australian Access Federation Project has been coordinating a number of working groups to receive input on this project from the sector:  
- The [auEduPerson working group](http://www.aaf.edu.au/objectives) is tasked with drafting and recommending data attributes for use with the AAF, based on the community's requirements and on interoperability with other key federations.  
- The [Grid working group](http://www.aaf.edu.au/objectives) is tasked with providing expert support and advice to the AAF project team to ensure that the solution proposed by AAF meets the expectation of the Grid community and the wider higher education and research sector, while maintaining compatibility with international Grids such as the IGTF.  
- The [Levels of Assurance working group](http://www.aaf.edu.au/objectives) is tasked with providing expert support and advice to the AAF project team to ensure that the identification, authentication and authorisation levels of assurance |
implemented under the AAF are suitable and adhere to international implementation, as to not exclude AAF from participating in the international environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan for forthcoming activity</th>
<th>Meetings via Access Grid and teleconference planned for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27th September 1330 - 1530 AEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd October 0930- 1230 AEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25th October 1000-1200 AEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th November 1400 - 1700 AEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29th November 1000-1200 AEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10th December 1400-1700 AEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27th December 1000-1200n AEST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUL budget implications</th>
<th>Nil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>For noting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAUL Strategic Plan
Report to CAUL

Author: Ruth Quinn
Date: 12 Sep 2007
Date of previous report: April 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1. Contribution to Teaching and Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>2. Review global best practice in information literacy and make it available to CAUL members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Information Literacy Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>• First face-to-face meeting held 3 May 2007: <a href="http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/ilwg20071.doc">http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/ilwg20071.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Action plan for 2007-2008 finalised: <a href="http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/ilwg.html">http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/ilwg.html</a> - will be updated at ILWG meeting to be held 20 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Literature review in progress at CDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Web page updated by Diane Costello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td>• Three Carrick Citations for Outstanding Contribution to Student Learning awarded in the area of Information Literacy: Merrilee Albatis et al from Murdoch, Judith Peacock from QUT, Jacqueline Hicks from Uni Syd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>Refer to Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>None at this stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>That the report be noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-forma updated 11 September 2007
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## Section 1. Contribution to Learning and Teaching

### Action
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.

### Responsibility
ULA Working Group

### Time-line
Ongoing

### Activity since last report
- Review of the procedures and protocols.
- Consideration of guidelines for the provision of services to remote campus students based on the CAUL guidelines for the provision of Services to Offshore Students. Services to students at remote campuses fall outside the scope and intent of ULA which is designed as a supplementary service not a primary library service. The Guidelines address the provision of primary services.

### Achievements since last report
Production of draft “CAUL Principles for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to Support Teaching and Learning”

A copy is attached. Please note that at its meeting on Thursday 20th September immediately prior to CAUL 2007/2, ULA-WG may amend the draft Guidelines. Any amendments will be reported to the CAUL meeting.

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

### Plan for forthcoming activity
Update of Web site

### CAUL budget implications
Nil

### Recommendations to CAUL
That CAUL endorse the Principles for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to Support Teaching and Learning”

---

*Pro-forma updated 8 March 2007*
CAUL Principles for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to Support Teaching and Learning

Context

The following guidelines have been developed as an aid for Australian university librarians providing services to students enrolled at Australian universities on onshore campuses which are remote from the main campuses of the university, whether they are campuses operated:

- by the University; or
- by a partner on behalf of the university

International students studying onshore form a significant cohort. The total enrolment of international students at Australian universities in Semester 1 2007 was estimated at 210,956 or 17.3% of the total student population in Australian universities. Of these, 70% study onshore, 6% offshore via distance education or online and 24% at offshore campuses of Australian universities (http://www.idp.com/research/fastfacts/article406.asp accessed 11 September 2007).

The Australian government recognises the importance of quality assurance for international and transnational education. Australian Education International’s Transnational Quality Strategy (18 November 2005) is based on the principle that “Australia is committed to ensuring the high quality and integrity of Australian education and training, regardless of the location in which it is delivered”. A key principle of the strategy is that “Courses/programmes delivered within Australia and transnationally should be equivalent in the standard of delivery and outcomes of the course, as determined under nationally recognised quality assurance arrangements”.

The Australian Universities Quality Agency conducts audits of Australian Universities, components of which include consideration of translational education and library support services. The second cycle of audits has as a theme the quality assurance of academic outcomes in international activities including the international student experience (onshore) and transnational education and evidence of equivalence (http://www.auqa.edu.au/qualityaudit/auditmanuals/index.shtml accessed 11 September 2007).

Universities Australia in its publication Universities and their Students: Principles for the Provision of Education by Australian Universities (AVCC August 2005) states that universities Should have policies and procedures to ensure that courses are relevant and of high quality. To achieve this they should [among other things] Ensure that the needs of students are met in relation to physical resources, learning resources and support and fair assessment practices.” and “In maintaining a partnership arrangement with another institution, the university should ensure that the academic and support services offered under the arrangement are of comparable quality to those offered by the university.”

Australian university librarians have responded to the needs of onshore students at remote campuses in a variety of ways. These include the provision of services to remote students from the ‘home’ library; arrangements for provision of services by local partners; and agreements for service provision from other local libraries.

It is important that students studying at onshore remote campuses have access to library information resources and services equivalent to those provided to students studying at the home campus and that these services are monitored through quality assurance mechanisms. The Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) encourages library quality assurance...
through mechanisms such as client satisfaction surveys, benchmarking and a range of best practice measures. These principles aim to provide assistance to Australian universities in ensuring the provision of quality library resources and services to all students of the university regardless of location.

**Definition of Onshore Students at Remote Campuses**

An onshore student at a remote campus is a student who is enrolled in an Australian higher education course and who is undertaking study onshore with the home university’s staff or with local staff employed by, or employed in consultation with, the home university, but who is located at a campus remote to the home campus of the university. The remote campus may be operated by the university or by a partner on behalf of the university. A remote campus is typically located in a different city or state to the location of the home university. The distance is such that students and staff cannot be expected to travel to the home institution to obtain services.

**Definition of Onshore Staff at Remote Campuses**

Onshore Staff at Remote Campuses are staff who provide teaching and support services to Onshore Remote Campus Students. Onshore Remote Campus Staff may be:

- employed directly by the home institution;
- employed by a contractor of the home institution;
- employed by the host institution; and
- **they may be employed on an ongoing or contractual basis.**

**Distinction between Onshore Remote Campus and Distance Education Students**

Distance Education Students are considered to be students (based onshore or offshore) who do not require on-campus attendance (except perhaps for block work). Library services and information resources for Distance Education Students are provided directly by the home institution, and are not covered by these guidelines.

**Types of Onshore Remote Campus Arrangements**

These Guidelines apply to a wide variety of Onshore Remote Campus arrangements including:

- Direct teaching at an onshore institution remote to the home institution
- Partnering with an onshore educational institution to teach an Australian university course
- A commercial partnership with an onshore agent to teach an Australian university course
- A fully-owned and run onshore campus of an Australian university remote to the home campus

**Principles**

1. Onshore Remote Campus Students will have access to core library services and information resources to support their learning.
2. Onshore Remote Campus Students will have access to the learning support spaces and facilities, including technology, required to support their learning.
3. Onshore Remote Campus Students will be authenticated for remote access to a range of library services and information resources arranged by the home institution.
4. Appropriate access to the home library’s services and information resources will be made available to the Onshore Remote Campus Staff to support onshore remote campus teaching and learning.
5. The home institution’s planning; accreditation; quality assurance; and decision-making processes will take into account the requirements for Onshore Remote Campus Students to access library information resources and services.

6. The cost of providing library services, information resources, learning spaces and support facilities to Onshore Remote Campus Students and the staff supporting them shall be recognised in university budget allocations and costing models.

Guidelines

1. Planning

1.1 A Library Impact Statement (see example Appendix 1) should be completed as part of the formal university planning, accreditation, quality assurance and implementation process for all onshore remote campus courses.

1.2 The Library Impact Statement should be considered prior to finalisation of agreements with partners.

1.3 Agreements with partners should include a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for the provision of library services, resources and spaces. The SLA should clearly identify responsibilities and quality assurance processes.

1.4 Student computer workstations should meet minimum hardware and software specifications which enable Onshore Remote Campus Students to access home library electronic services and information resources.

1.5 The home institution or partner should ensure access to internet enabled computers with bandwidth suitable for accessing home institution electronic library services and information resources. Filters or other restrictions should not prevent access to teaching materials and resources necessary to support the course.

1.6 The Library should confirm whether proposed locally provided library services and resources are adequate for the Onshore Remote Campus Student cohort and academic programme/s.

1.7 The Library may facilitate agreements with local library providers to provide adequate services and information resources for Onshore Remote Campus Students.

2. Library Services and Information Resources

The Library will ensure access to adequate levels of service and information resources for Onshore Remote Campus Students and Onshore Remote Campus Staff.

Core services will include:

2.1 Access to physical collections sufficient to meet the core reading requirements of courses offered to Onshore Remote Campus Students.

2.2 Access to learning support spaces, physical facilities and technology sufficient to meet the core support requirements of courses offered to Onshore Remote Campus Students.

2.3 Access to the full range of electronic information resources provided to home campus students; including electronic journals and databases, e-reserve articles, past examination papers, lecture notes etc.

2.4 Licence agreements for electronic information resources will include access for enrolled Onshore Remote Campus Students and Onshore Remote Campus Staff.
2.5 Access to a range of appropriate library information communication services (e.g. phone, postal, email, web), including a help service which provides assistance with passwords, access and guidance in the selection and use of resources.

2.6 Access to information literacy training programs which may be virtual, interactive, face-to-face, etc.

2.7 Access to a document delivery service for designated Onshore Remote Campus Student cohorts and Onshore Remote Campus Staff equivalent to that provided to home campus students and staff.

2.8 Advice and training for Onshore Remote Campus Staff on library services and information resources available prior to programs being offered, including information literacy training for academics to enable them to assist Onshore Remote Campus Students.

2.9 Feedback mechanisms and quality assurance processes to monitor the quality and appropriateness of the library services and information resources available to Onshore Remote Campus Students and Onshore Remote Campus Staff.

2.10 Where library services and spaces are provided by the partner, the home institution library will ensure they meet the minimum standards provided to home campus students. Where they are provided by an independent local library, the home institution library is responsible for negotiating adequate provision.

2.11 Where services specific to Onshore Remote Campus Student cohorts and Onshore Remote Campus Staff are provided, these must very clearly communicated to students through the home institution library’s website and other communication mechanisms.

3. Funding

The cost of providing library services and information resources to Onshore Remote Campus Students and Staff should be recognised in costing models and funding disbursements.

3.1 The Library should receive adequate funding for the onshore remote campus services and information resources provided.

3.2 Specific charges may need to be negotiated for additional services eg creation of learning centre/library remote campus print collection, and additional licence costs for onshore remote campuses.

3.3 Payments to local library providers may be necessary to ensure access and borrowing privileges for Onshore Remote Campus Students and Staff.
Attachment 1

ONSHORE REMOTE CAMPUS COURSE LIBRARY IMPACT STATEMENT

This form should be completed by the course / program coordinators, in consultation with the Library, for any proposed course being taught at a remote campus onshore.

A. REMOTE CAMPUS RESOURCES AND LIBRARY FACILITIES

1. Details of existing collections in print and electronic, available for students that would support the proposed course.

2. Is there an agreement in place with a local educational institution to facilitate library access to remote campus students? What services and resources does it cover?

3. What are the resources required at the remote campus, not currently available? Estimated cost to Faculty/School supplying resources.

4. Do the students have access to computer facilities? What computer facilities are available?

5. Do the students have Internet access adequate to access learning support resources and services provided by the home library?

6. What study areas are available for students? e.g. for private study, group study silent study, internet access, etc.
B. SERVICES/SUPPORT NEEDED FROM HOME LIBRARY

1. Will the students need access to home Library e-reserve and electronic databases (subject to licence agreements)?

2. How will the students receive information literacy training support – from the home institution or the partner/institution?

3. Will academic staff, whether home or remote onshore, require access to and training in the use of electronic resources?

4. Will academic staff and/or students require access to document delivery services from the home library?

C. CONSULTATION WITH LIBRARY

1. Outcome of consultation with Library (including any Library cost implications)
THE CARRICK EXCHANGE

The Carrick Institute and the RIN

The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education Ltd was established with the purpose of raising the standard of teaching in higher education. Lots more information at http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au

The Resource Identification and Network portfolio is a program of the Institute which was originally conceived as a repository of learning resources. Its goal was set out as being “to develop effective mechanisms for the identification, dissemination and embedding of good individual and institutional practice in learning and teaching in Australian higher education.” A forum was held on 29 August 2005 and a Think Tank was held in Melbourne on 1 September 2006. I reported on that to the September 2006 CAUL meeting. Now RIN has transformed, butterfly-like, into the Carrick Exchange.

There have been many efforts to establish distributed repositories of shareable education materials, and the main lesson from these experiences is that people are less willing to share than one might hope. Widening the scope to include other kinds of communication and interaction makes sense, as does the use of contemporary web technologies to facilitate this. So the concept has widened out considerably, and the whole thing has been renamed the Carrick Exchange.

About the Carrick Exchange

The Carrick Exchange is a new online service to support those who teach, manage and lead learning and teaching in Australian higher education. It will provide:

- Access to quality resources that support teaching and learning by searching and browsing;
- Access to learning materials available for sharing and repurposing;
- Information about new technologies that impact on teaching practice and student learning experiences;
- Ideas about learning and practice;
- Opportunities to network with other academics with similar interests in group spaces and/or through creating networks of colleagues;
- The ability to save resources and search results;
- The ability to comment on and exchange ideas on the relevance and usefulness of particular teaching resources and to view the comments of others;
- The ability to participate in discussions, debates and dialogue about teaching in higher education.

Although the CE began as a repository, it is now wider in scope, and is conducting research into why standalone repositories have nee unsuccessful. A goal is to engage potential users and meet their needs. They want to do this by

- Making it really easy to use
• Enhancing the value of resources through quality control, good metadata, “semi-formal commentary” on resources and formal peer review
• Providing a facility to personalize a MyExchange facility
• Introducing Web 2.0 software tools such as the ability to tag and comment on resources, contact other people, contribute resources, form communities, set up a personal profile, and locate colleagues with similar interests – all of them tools such as those available in Facebook or MySpace
• Systematically archive content

The resources available through the CE will be for teachers in higher education, and will include learning, teaching and curriculum resources, resources generated through group methods (social resources), technology resources, and others.

Recent Developments

We have attended several meetings of parts of the Carrick Exchange – those below were attended by either Derek Whitehead or Teula Morgan from Swinburne.

Blue Sky Thinking Day (15 May) – attendees were mainly from Education.au, the Carrick Institute, and ASCILITE. There were six others, including Teula Morgan. The purpose was to speculate and imagine – new technologies, recent software projects, recent experiences. The focus was on issues such as the e-framework, re-use of e-learning content, technical standards, repositories experience to date, identity and access management, Web 2.0 software, the edna experience, and more.

A core question was “What is out there that we should consider for the future of the Carrick Exchange – something that will help us reach our goals and go beyond?”

Metadata Schema – the Carrick Exchange has developed a complex metadata scheme covering not only learning object or resource metadata, but also metadata relating to persons, to groups (e.g. a project team), organisations, (e.g. a university), events (e.g. a conference), collections, administrative information, and Web 2.0 technologies (e.g. tags). This work has been substantially completed in September 2007.

The DC metadata standard is the basis for most of this work, and this distinguishes it from other approaches which have used the LOM standard, or aimed to bridge the two. Adopting this approach has made it possible to provide a higher level of integration and interoperability between the different kinds of metadata.

The Carrick Exchange Metadata Reference Group includes people representing ARROW, APSR, the National Library, RUBRIC, ACOC, education.au, and others. There have been several meetings/teleconferences; Derek Whitehead has attended for CAUL.

Digital Rights Management – the initial meeting of the Rights Management Reference Group on 20 August 2007 highlighted some of the issues for the Carrick Exchange which have not been adequately addressed. In particular
  o Need to clarify whether the CE will be open access, or closed, or some combination.
  o Need to clarify what licences will be used – open licences, commercial licences, others, or a combination.
The lessons of preceding learning object repositories need to be clearly absorbed and the ways the CE is different need to be clarified. Some rights issues need further work – third party copyright issues, dealing with infringements, ownership of material produced in universities. The material prepared for the meeting included a number of useful scenarios – a good way to deal with rights issues. Teula Morgan attended the meeting.

Why the Carrick Exchange is important for CAUL

1. It has very considerable resources being put into it from DEST funds.
2. The main drivers in the Carrick Exchange, other than the Carrick Institute, are ACODE, ASCILITE, and education.au, and they are anxious to ensure library involvement as well; they partner with us in a number of areas.
3. There is a clear overlap between creating a collaborative knowledge and networking environment for the education sector which is being created in the Carrick Exchange, and what a library does.
4. The CE is self-consciously innovative, and so should we be.
5. The issues being dealt with in thinking about the CE are issues libraries deal with too – e.g. metadata, resource sharing, archiving, Web 2.0 technologies, digital rights management.

A number of people working in libraries have been involved in development of the Carrick Exchange. For example, Kathryn Greenhill from Murdoch University has a nice blog posting about the CE; it is worth reading Kathryn's informative and enthusiastic post.

More Information

The Carrick Exchange has a website at http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/go/home/rin/cache/offonce/pid/381;jsessionid=C23464FC67224A76BEA75BB3D4EFACDF and this includes some background information and a FAQ. In July 2007 Education.au began to publish a newsletter, the Technology Bulletin, which is mainly about technical developments in the Carrick Exchange. See http://www.educationau.edu.au/jahia/Jahia/home/tech_bulletin

Derek Whitehead
10 September, 2007
3.45

**Discussion and Synthesis**

(a) Learning perspectives  
(b) Technology perspectives

To sum up the day let us revisit the key question; are we embracing the future or are we in danger of just tweaking the edges? This is an important question for looking at sustainability issues.

Three key external attendees (David Cummings, Teula Morgan and James Dalzeil) provided synthesis on the issues from the day - thinking about tomorrow to help us move into the future.

---

**David Cummings:**

1. Keep in mind that the exchange is a network but it is also part of a network. It is part of something a lot bigger and has to link to larger things.
2. Don’t expect the Carrick Exchange to be able to do anything more or greater than what you would expect in real life.
3. When you work at the bleeding edge, you are going to get cut. Expect to be cut but don’t be put off by the cuts and bruises. It’s exciting, dynamic and could be world class, so be brave.

---

**Teula Morgan:**

1. As someone without a background in this project, I was interested in ideas around boundaries between me as an individual and me and as a representative of the institution.
   - What are the differences?
   - Who owns rights?
   - What about third party material?
   - My institution might have an opinion on who can use my material.
   - People are used to acting as individuals but what does this mean when we bring this into an institutional context (i.e. social networking)?
2. Our understanding of the audience.
   - What people expect from learning and teaching repositories.
3. The university as a publisher.
   - Dealing with material that hasn’t been published.
   - Learning material and multi-media objects.
     - We are not just becoming publishers we are becoming film producers.
   - What skills are we giving people to deal with intellectual property in a new environment?

---

**James Dalzeil:**

Three Cautions:

1. Carrick exchange is not the centre of the universe.
   - It is one node within a federation of research repositories.
   - It needs to be built in a way that it will play well with others.
   - Same issue comes up on community side (i.e. how do I benefit from the Carrick Exchange?)
2. There is the challenge of managing innovation with new and cool stuff and what the community wants, along with the traditional things that will be expected.
   - The Carrick Exchange is running too far ahead of the community.
     - If most of what is done is visionary, then you run the risk of creating a gap with core constituents.
3. What is going to motivate people to use this?
   - No really compelling reasons.
   - There needs to be a larger and more obviously compelling list about why using the Carrick Exchange is going to help me as a user.

The following points were made during group discussion:

- **Spaces (personal and community)**
  - People who do and don’t want the Carrick Exchange space as their home.
    - Might be appealing to those that do not have a space yet.
    - Be aware that innovators will already have a ‘life’ somewhere else in another space. The chance that they are going to move from their “home” is not good.
  - Need to work on models used to link online spaces with each other.
    - Look for a mechanism to accommodate people’s different requirements.
    - Look at the Carrick Exchange becoming a set of services separate from the Carrick Exchange website (i.e. not just available through the site itself).
  - Need to work on building that community.
    - Work hard on populating it.
      - Once it has critical mass, it will take off.
      - Need to engage leaders/champions.
      - Value could come from people commenting on resources.

- Be wary of stereotyping academics.
  - Academics talk about teaching.
    - There is an impulse that can be tapped into about being good teachers.
    - Comes as much from teachers as it does from research.
  - Need to be reasonable and realistic, and be seen as such with the colleagues you are trying to entice (e.g. language can disenfranchise).

- The Carrick Exchange was always an idea of networking and other methods of promoting.
  - This is just one component. It’s a much bigger than just this.

- A lot of work is happening around discipline networks. Both are about forming networks.
  - Some is through existing structures, i.e. teachers forming teaching networks.
  - Online makes things accessible.
  - How do we use this to get the sector to adopt technologies?

- The Carrick Exchange is all about people.
  - The Carrick exchange is merely a component of a bigger Carrick Institute mandate which is about dissemination, sharing etc.
  - Part of the reason the word ‘exchange’ was chosen was because it’s a good metaphor.
    - It’s about the ‘exchange’ of ideas and communication between people.
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### CAUL Strategic Plan

**Report to CAUL**

**Author:** Liz Curach  
**Date:** 13.09.07  
**Date of previous report:** 07.09.06

<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 / insync surveys |
| **Responsibility** | Best Practice Working Group |
| **Time-line** | Ongoing |
| **Activity since last report** | Interim Chair (Liz Curach) appointed, following Felicity McGregor’s stepping down from the role;  
Identification of actions for BPWG from current CAUL Strat Plan:  
- Benchmark performance measures with comparable international organisations and contribute to the development of international performance measures;  
- Continue to develop, extend, scope and cost a range of agreed performance measures;  
- Investigate workforce requirements and skills development to ensure maintenance of quality services in a rapidly changing information environment;  
- Workforce Planning – explore options for CAUL’s contribution following the work of LATN and WAGUL;  
- Review CAUL’s document delivery performance indicator as measuring tool following the resource-sharing forum;  
CONZUL representation (Annette McNicol, University of Waikato) on BPWG |
| **Achievements since last report** | - Review and comparative compilation of statistical benchmarking of CAUL, ACRL, ARL, CARL and SCONUL completed.  
- Preliminary work on enhancements to CAUL Materials Availability Survey, led by Monash and UniSA |
| **Publicity, reports, publications since last report** | - Presentation to AGLIN (Australian Government Libraries Information Network) Conference. |
| **Plan for forthcoming activity** | - Focussed effort on those activities identified above  
- Further review of Rodski  
- Election of Chair |
| **CAUL budget implications** | Nil |
| **Recommendations to CAUL** | For noting |

Pro-forma updated 11 September 2007
## Section 3. Delivering quality and value.

### Action
Collect and publish statistics on Australian university library outputs and activities (CSFG)

### Responsibility
CAUL Statistics Focus Group

### Time-line
Ongoing

### Activity since last report
1. The CAUL Statistics Focus Group met on Monday 10 Sept at RMIT.
2. CEIRC held a one-day statistics seminar on Friday 31 August in Sydney.
3. The 2006 data has been collected and published on the online statistics website.
4. The group is considering an appropriate set of key performance indicators for CAUL members, which can be benchmarked and which will be robust and meaningful.
5. The group plans to explore benchmarking statistical data with Asian university libraries in Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand.
6. The group will explore the IFLA Global Library Statistics Project with ALIA.

### Achievements since last report
A range of enhancements to the online statistics website have been completed.

### Publicity, reports, publications since last report
See above. The publication of a statistics supplement in AARL has been discontinued, but the spreadsheet will still be provided online.

### Plan for forthcoming activity
1. Data collection for 2007 will commence in March 2008. As part of this, a small consultancy to manage the deemed list will be proposed; the reason for this is that assembling the data for the list is a significant task which has sometimes been a cause of delay in the process of collecting the data.
2. A specification for trend analysis for CAUL statistics data over the past decade or more will be developed and proposed to CAUL.
3. Additional measurers will be considered. These include e-books (a trial will be conducted shortly), the 3 COUNTER measures of use of full text online resources (to be trialled shortly), and computers/ computer use.
4. The next meeting of the CSFG will be held on Thurs 7 February or thereabouts.

### CAUL budget implications
The trend analysis is likely to cost approximately $20,000 if and when commissioned.

### Recommendations to CAUL
That this report be approved by CAUL.

Pro-forma updated 8 March 2007
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**CAUL Strategic Plan**
**Report to CAUL**

**Section** 4. Communication and influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Orphan Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Eve Woodberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity since last report**

A review of this area was announced by the Attorney-General’s Department last year and again in 2007 as a priority issue, but little has happened yet. In the meantime, IFLA (the International Federation of Library Associations) and the IPA (International Publishers Association) have agreed on a joint approach. It includes these agreed elements:

- A “reasonably diligent” search for the copyright owner
- Clear and adequate attribution
- Remuneration or restitution if the copyright owner appears
- Any injunctive relief should take into account good faith investment by the user
- Use is non-exclusive


Orphan works are important to us because a large volume of material which is in copyright (estimated sometimes to be as much as 75%) is inaccessible for copying, because the owner cannot be contacted or is unknown.

**Section 200AB**

A new flexible exception in s 200AB allows for broader uses of copyright material by educational institutions than those previously allowed, although this section does not override other applicable sections of the Act.

The section may be used by a library or archives, an educational institution (for giving educational instruction), or by a person with a disability or someone else for obtaining a copy of the material in a form which assists the person with a disability.

There are three examples of possible uses of this section which have been given:
• a library using a work without the copyright owner’s permission because the copyright owner could not be identified or contacted
• an educational institution converting into another format a video cassette of teaching material because the material is no longer commercially available, or
• a person with a print disability (or their family, friends or an organisation) converting a hard copy of a book into a read-aloud or more appropriate version.

Any use of section 200AB must not be made for commercial advantage. In addition the use must meet what is referred to as the 3-step test. That is; the circumstances of the use must amount to a special case, the use must not conflict with normal exploitation of the material and the use must not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the copyright owner. How the 3-step test will be interpreted in Australia is still unclear.

The AVCC plans to provide universities with advice on the use of this provision, and the issue is also seen by the ADA and ALCC as a major issue for work in the remainder of 2007. Individual universities are also beginning to use it. One way or another, we should have guidelines for use of this section by the end of 2007.

**The Copyright Act – Criminal Provisions**

One of the features of the Copyright Act, following the amendments passed into law at the end of 2006, is enhanced criminal provisions. While we do not expect these to have a significant direct effect on universities, they are interesting. There are now three levels of criminal offence
- An indictable offence (up to 5 years imprisonment)
- A summary offence (up to 2 years imprisonment)
- A strict liability offence (up to $6600) which does not require proof of fault, and for which an infringement notice can be issued by Federal or State police.

Draft guidelines have been developed by the Government on the use of infringement notices and other matters relating to use of the criminal provisions. Although our understanding was that these notices would be used against street vendors or people who import counterfeit material, the draft material does not confirm this understanding. The ADA and ALCC are likely to comment on this draft.

**Copyright and the RQF**

DEST has now released versions of Specifications for the RQF, and Technical Specifications. These include a number of matters which relate to copyright, with a general approach of ensuring that infringement is avoided. The only publications which now must be made available through a repository are the four selected publications for each researcher. Each of these must be fully copyright cleared for use in the RQF and, if not, an explanation given.
CAUL and DEST have negotiated with ten publishers and obtained agreement to copy research outputs for RQF purposes. These publishers have agreed to allow inclusion of their material in repositories for the purposes of the RQF only, without charge. Further negotiations are under way.

**IFLA CLM Durban 2007**

Eve attended the IFLA congress as the Australian representative on CLM. The two programmes offered by CLM on *Traditional Knowledge* and *Reprographics Rights Organisations* were well attended. [http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla73/Programme2007.htm](http://www.ifla.org/IV/ifla73/Programme2007.htm)

The CLM Executive Board also attended a meeting with IFRRO to discuss possible areas for cooperation between IFLA and IFRRO. The meeting was similar to those with CAL. Further discussion is required before any agreement can be reached.

**ALCC meetings**

An ALCC meeting was held in 25th May, which was the first for Laura Simes as the new Copyright Advisor. The agenda covered the changes in the Copyright Act which came into effect on the 1st January.

Since the meeting Laura has been providing a series of copyright up-dates in capital cities and will consider requests for the presentation in other areas as required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements since last report</th>
<th>ALCC meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>An ALCC meeting has been set for the 13th December 2007 with a provisional agenda including: CAL Electronic Use Negotiations ; Collecting Societies Code of Conduct Review; Libraries Training Program ; S200AB advice ; Orphan Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WIPO study**

WIPO has commissioned a study on exceptions and limitations for libraries to be prepared by Professor Kenneth Crews (USA). Among other issues, the study will examine copyright exceptions for libraries in national legislation as well as case studies on a range of matters such as digital preservation and archival, interlibrary digital supply, etc. WIPO hopes that the study will help to identify policy issues related to, or affecting, copyright and related rights that Member States may be called upon to address at some point in the near future. CLM has offered Professor Crews whatever support will be most useful to him.

**CAUL budget implications**

ALCC meeting in 2008, Canberra

**Recommendations to CAUL**

That this report be accepted.
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1. Institutional repositories Seminar, Christchurch

CONZUL sponsored a Second Institutional Repositories (IR) Forum in late May in conjunction with the Institutional Repositories Aotearoa (IRA) Project which was a collaboration between University of Auckland, Victoria University of Wellington and Canterbury University. Tom Cochrane was the keynote speaker and Alan Smith also joined us from the RUBRIC project. Over 80 people attended, and topics canvassed included the state of play with IR, issues and challenges with implementing IRs, forging partnerships with the research offices within universities, and measuring the success of IRs. Six of the eight CONZUL members have selected DSpace for their institutional repositories through either the IRA or LCoNZ collaborations, and the other two universities have also selected DSpace or are intending to use it.

Presentations can be viewed at: http://www.conzul.ac.nz/ir.htm

2. CONZUL Distributed Storage Consortium

CONZUL is responding to the shift from print to digital collections by proposing a formal contract between universities to keep a single copy of bibliographic indexes and abstracts (which are duplicated by online services) to protect the availability of information in the event of a catastrophic event resulting in the loss of international internet access. The intent is to allocate the paper copy of each bibliographic index to a specified university library which would agree to keep the titles and to make access available in the event of a catastrophe. The proposal will also alleviate space issues facing CONZUL libraries. Because it involves the transfer of material between libraries a consortium agreement is required. Material will be transferred to the Library that has the most extensive holdings for each title, and duplicates may be discarded.

Agreement has been received from 5 universities, with the other 3 expected to confirm agreement before the end of the month.

Work is progressing with the next phase of the Distributed Storage Consortium Project which is to establish the level of duplication between electronic and print copies of serials from the major publishers.

3. New Zealand Research Discovery Service

The National Library of New Zealand has established a pilot National Research Discovery Service. This pilot project to harvest publications in institutional repositories has included the development of a website that makes it easy to find the research held in institutional repositories in New Zealand, for the mutual benefit of researchers, research users, and research institutions.

CONZUL are in discussion with the National Library regarding the governance of the New Zealand Research Discovery Service which CONZUL believes should focus on the future direction and management of the nzresearch.org.nz website and service, the ongoing preservation of New Zealand research publication outputs (excluding data sets), and capability / funding issues in the area of repositories. Ainslie Dewe, University Librarian and Director of Knowledge Management, at AUT University, has accepted the National Library’s invitation to Chair the proposed new governance group with the purpose “to determine policy and associated practices in regard to the management and future direction of the New Zealand Research Discovery Service and alignment with participating institutions’ strategies and practices”.

4. Tertiary Funding Changes

The Minister for Tertiary Education announced reforms to the funding of tertiary education institutions in 2006. The new funding arrangements are now being negotiated within individual institutions prior to the 2008 financial year and are proving challenging for both the Tertiary Education Commission and the individual universities. Reasons given for the reforms were to align planning, funding, quality assurance and monitoring.
The reforms will result in two payments to universities – one for the student component and the second, smaller payment, on the basis of the PBRF results (performance based research fund) and alignment with government policies.

More information on the tertiary education reforms can be found at:

5. LIANZA Remuneration Survey
LIANZA (Library and Information Association of New Zealand Aotearoa) are undertaking a remuneration survey of staff employed in New Zealand libraries. It is expected that this survey will be completed late this year and the full report made available to members.

This survey was last run two years ago.

6. EPIC
EPIC (Electronic Purchasing in Collaboration) announced that they have negotiated all of country access to Knowledge Basket’s New Zealand Index. This is a unique archive of New Zealand content containing over 1.9 million records. It is a composite of five separate indexes of New Zealand newspapers, magazines and journals.

7. New Zealand Digital Content Strategy
The National Library released the New Zealand Digital Content Strategy on the 6th September 2007. In their release the National Library said:

“Creating a Digital New Zealand is about making New Zealand visible and relevant in a connected digital world. It aims to ensure that we are innovative, informed and capable in telling our stories, experiencing our heritage and cultures, and creating our digital future. To that end, an important starting point for the strategy is recognising that the value of content is in what it delivers and enables for end-users. The strategy presents the key digital content influences in New Zealand’s environment, an analysis of digital content issues, and the digital content challenges that face us as a nation. The first steps towards creating a digital New Zealand are outlined in a series of government actions, while related actions from other strategies that contribute directly to the outcomes of this strategy are identified.”

A copy of the strategy is available at:
http://www.digitalstrategy.govt.nz/templates/Page____120.aspx

8. - KAREN Workshop
KAREN (Kiwi Advanced Research Network) hosted a conference in July to demonstrate how KAREN can enhance current collaborations and enable new activities with remote colleagues and resources.

Papers from the conference are available at: http://www.karen.net.nz/forum-programme/

Ainslie Dewe,
University Librarian
AUT University

on behalf of Janet Copsey, University Librarian, The University of Auckland
Chair, CONZUL
September 2007
# Advocacy and Communication

**Action**

Relationships with other organisations – Libraries Australia Advisory Committee

**Responsibility**

Linda Luther and Anne Horn

**Time-line**

ongoing

**Activity since last report**

The Libraries Australia Advisory Committee has held one meeting since the last report; on 5 September 2007.

The 2007 Libraries Australia Forum was held on 6 September 2007

**Achievements since last report**

The new subscription model for universities has now been implemented. Discussions have now commenced with State Libraries and public libraries.

The agreement has now been signed between NLA and OCLC regarding access to WorldCat for Libraries Australia subscribers. Those libraries with holdings on WorldCat have been contacted regarding the loading of those holdings on Libraries Australia. A plan is being developed for synchronisation of holdings between WorldCat and Libraries Australia. A review of OCLC governance is underway and will be completed in November 2007. The LAAC recommended that an Australia/New Zealand zone be established. Australia is presently part of the Asia zone, and our interests would be quite different from many libraries in that area.

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

The Nielsen/NetRatings report was discussed. Among CEOs there is a generally positive perception of Libraries Australia. Amongst practitioners, the majority of needs are being met. Whilst the survey has some shortcomings, it does provide some direction for future activity. There is a general view that Libraries Australia service is for librarians and library staff, and not for the general public, and the differences between the free and subscription services are not well understood.

**Plan for forthcoming activity**

A value statement is being developed, which will outline the value of Libraries Australia to Australian libraries and to the wider community

A strategic plan for 2008 to 2010 is under development. Within this, work will continue on a Business Integration Project to integrate the digital library functions and resource discovery services of the NLA.

**CAUL budget implications**

**Recommendations to CAUL**

It is recommended that CAUL note the report

---
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### CAUL Strategic Plan

**Report to CAUL**

Author: Jeff Murray  
Date: 13 July, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>IV. Collaboration and International Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Work with partners in the sector, especially ACODE and CAUDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>CAUL members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Activity since last report

**Educause 2009 update**

A Steering Committee has been formed comprising:

- Jeff Murray (Chair), Director – Knowledge & IT Service Centre (KITSC)  
  ECU
- Sonja Bogunovich, Manager - Staff Development - Office of the Provost  
  The University of Notre Dame Australia
- Chris Foley, Director - IT Services and CIO Murdoch University
- David Howard, Manager - Library Collections & Access (KITSC)  
  ECU
- Ian Hunter (Via Phone Link), Executive Officer  
  CAUDIT
- Mark Ridge, Sponsor Committee (Chair), Manager – IT Support Services  
  (KITSC)
- Suzanne Stocker Executive Officer (KITSC) ECU
- Dan Archibald, Manager – Library Services (KITSC) ECU
- Linda O’Brien, Vice-Principal Information (immediate past Chair)  
  University of Melbourne

The group met on 2nd of July and the following outcomes achieved.

#### Venue

An initial look at the Perth Convention Centre was completed and it is proposed further negotiations take place with that venue. Food costs have not been identified or compared – although the space costs roughly equate to those used in Melbourne (75k) + CPI with the current quote at $85k.

#### Timing

Various dates in May, 2009 are being considered and a table of competing conferences, semester dates, school holiday terms is being compiled prior to a decision being made at the next meeting in August.
**Committee structure**

The committee structure will follow the Melbourne Example and the following Chair people identified:

- **Steering Committee** - Jeff Murray (Chair)
- **Programme Committee** - David Howard (Chair)
- **Sponsorship Committee** - Mark Ridge (Chair)
- **Social Committee** (Chair TBC)

**Web Site Development**

The website will be managed by ECU staff and hosted with CAUDIT.

**Conference Organisers**

A closed call for expressions of interest in being appointed as the Conference Organisers will be held and completed prior to the October meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievements since last report</th>
<th>As above – this is in inaugural meeting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td>As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td><strong>Joint meeting of CAUL, CAUDIT ACODE (CCA) Brisbane, July, 2007.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>To note the report and discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Budgeted Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution</td>
<td>3,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication / Web Site</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services WG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ULA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research &amp; Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (CAUL)</td>
<td>63,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (external)</td>
<td>51,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (internal)</td>
<td>118,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)</strong></td>
<td>411,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>($25,453.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS</strong> (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USD ACCOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>30,627.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL USD</td>
<td>1,843,279.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GBP ACCOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>4,061.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GBP</td>
<td>98,647.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUR ACCOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EUR</td>
<td>11,290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest earned on Foreign Currency Accounts (@ given exchange rate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD account</td>
<td>37,322.84 @ 8206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBP account</td>
<td>11,223.97 @ 0.4064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR account</td>
<td>0.00 @ 0.6012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in AUD</td>
<td>48,546.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40 CAUL members @ $4,500

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

This is the combined interest expected on the four caul accounts, based on the previous year's interest earned.

19,000 in 2003; 22717 in 2004; 14014 to 30/6/06

< 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

including awards

USD7,500

39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL + CSIRO

External members estimate for 2007

>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.
CAUL Budget Report

Introduction
(for comments on current earnings, see the Summary tab)
updated 6 September 2007

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, P&L reports, and Cash Flow Statements for each of the four currencies.

CAUL Retained Earnings
CAUL's "reserves" are reflected in the balance sheets of the four accounts - called "retained earnings". This is the accumulated "profit" from CAUL's operations. The annual profit is called "current earnings."

The AUD account is the best indicator of CAUL's "profits".

Each of the three foreign currency accounts, except for interest earned and bank fees paid, is essentially a neutral balance account - income from members' datasets subscription payments is equal to the expenditure on those same subscriptions. The normalised value of the retained earnings in the foreign currency accounts is included in the annual audit report. The normalised value is set at a fixed exchange rate, so is an

Due to fluctuating exchange rates, it is difficult to forecast what the accumulated retained earnings will be. For example, at June 30, 2007 there was $38k earned in interest with another six months worth of interest yet to come. This is an indicative amount only and will vary over the next 6 months. The normalised value of the retained earnings in the foreign currency accounts is included in the annual audit report. The latest audit report available is for 2006 and is available at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/audit2006draft.pdf

CAUL, on the recommendation of the CAUL Executive, may decide what amount from the Reserves may be spent in the next fiscal year and/or on what projects or initiatives to expend reserve funding. This would be reflected in a budgeted deficit for the year.

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.

Interest Earned
The interest earned in the AUD account is shown in the operations budget. That earned in the foreign currency accounts is shown in the native currency, with an estimate of the current value based on the exchange rates at the time of the report. The value is not realised unless and until any monies are transferred into the AUD account. Until then, they are retained in the foreign currency accounts as cash flow against late payments of CEIRC invoices to CAUL.

**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" (and the foreign currency accounts EUR, GBP and USD)**

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. Other than interest earned, the income and expenditure should be identical.

**Liabilities**

Provisions have been made for Annual Leave and Long Service Leave for the Executive Officer, expensed in 2005, retained as liabilities from 2006.
Audit of 2006 CAUL accounts
The audit of the 2006 accounts confirmed a “profit” of $.... (to be entered when the final audit report is received.) of which $... was a surplus to the budgeted amount, and the remainder effective “income” from interest earned and “gain/loss on foreign exchange” on the foreign currency accounts. Retained earnings amount to $427,979 across all accounts. Cash held at the end of the 2006 financial year was AUD 3,131,029

At the end of 2006, retained earnings were AUD 274,629 added to current earnings (2006 “profit”) of AUD 47,780, to begin 2007 with a total of AUD 322,410. According to the audit report, the total value, including the foreign currency accounts, was ?????? (to be entered when the final audit report is received.)

Expected “reserves” at the end of 2007
The budgeted 2007 deficit is $25,453
The 2007 expenditure is running $21,398 under budgeted expenditure
If the expenditure for the rest of the year matches the budgeted expenditure, then the deficit would be reduced to $4,085

The retaining earnings at the end of 2006 were $322,410
The new retained earnings would be $318,325 (ie the amount in reserve - in AUD)

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 (1.0 FTE) 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 - these allocations are being reviewed in 2007

Interest earned on the foreign currency accounts is 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 cash 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.

The revised budget of $47,000 reflects the best offer received in response to the RFP. An upfront payment of $18,585, incl GST, has been made.

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.

The meeting expenses have exceeded the budget to date in 2007 due to an extraordinary meeting called to discuss the future of the ADT. This workshop was held in Sydney on March 20, and attendance included participants from Perth (2) New Zealand (3) and Brisbane (1).
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## CAUL Budget 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted Income</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure</th>
<th>Expected Balance 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.65)</td>
<td>82,056.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>Admin Assistant (0.3)</td>
<td>23,298.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>3,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>President’s Meetings</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>Representation/Seminars</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Meetings</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>Publications / Web Site</td>
<td>3,717.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>CAUL Membership</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Operating)</strong></td>
<td>213,600.00</td>
<td><strong>168,661.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,938.59</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>$0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PROGRAMMES**  |                      |                          |                            |            |              |
| Copyright       |                      |                          |                            |            |              |
| ALCC Levy       | 20,000.00            | ALCC Membership          | 20,000.00                  | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| ADA Membership  | 500.00               | Meetings                 | 2,500.00                   | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| **Sub-total (Copyright)** | 20,000.00 | **23,000.00**           | **-3,000.00**              | 0.00       | **$0.00**     | **$0.00** | #DIV/0! |

| **Best Practice** |                      |                          |                            |            |              |
| CONZUL contribution | 5,045.00         | Statistics Publication  | 30,512.00                  | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| Statistics       | 1,000.00            | COUNTER Membership       | 850.00                     | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| ILWG             | 0.00                 | Statistics Site Enhancement | 0.00                      | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| Offshore Services WG | 0.00            | CAUL Membership          | 0.00                       | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| **Sub-total (Best Practice)** | 0.00 | **32,362.00**           | **-32,362.00**             | 0.00       | **$0.00**     | **$0.00** | #DIV/0! |

| **ULA**         |                      |                          |                            |            |              |
| Meetings        | 0.00                 | CAUL Membership          | 0.00                       | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| **Sub-total (ULA)** | 0.00            | **0.00**                | **0.00**                  | 0.00       | **$0.00**     | **$0.00** | #DIV/0! |

| **Research & Development** |                      |                          |                            |            |              |
| Research & Development | 0.00                 | Research & Development   | 0.00                       | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| **Sub-total (R&D)** | 0.00                 | **0.00**                | **0.00**                  | 0.00       | **$0.00**     | **$0.00** | #DIV/0! |

| **ADT Program**  |                      |                          |                            |            |              |
| ADT Membership Fees | 43,200.00          | Infrastructure (UNSW)   | 26,450.00                  | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| Meetings         | 14,400.00           | NTLTD Meetings          | 0.00                       | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| NTLTD Membership | 0.00                 | **43,200.00**           | **40,850.00**              | **2,350.00** | **0.00**     | **$0.00** | #DIV/0! |
| **Sub-total (ADT)** | 43,200.00          | **264,873.41**          | **11,926.59**              | 0.00       | **$0.00**     | **$0.00** | #DIV/0! |

| **CEIRC PROGRAM** |                      |                          |                            |            |              |
| CEIRC Levy (CAUL) | 64,800.00            | Executive Officer (0.35) | 44,184.00                  | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| CEIRC Levy (external) | 54,675.00        | CEIRC Assistant (0.65)  | 66,011.00                  | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| Audit & Accounting | 13,600.00           | Research                | 5,000.00                   | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| Research          | 5,000.00             | ICOLC Meetings          | 5,000.00                   | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| CAUL-Industry ThinkTank | 0.00            | CAUL/Industry ThinkTank | 0.00                       | 0.00       | $0.00        | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |
| **Sub-total (CEIRC)** | 119,475.00         | **264,873.41**          | **11,926.59**              | 0.00       | **$0.00**     | **$0.00** | #DIV/0! |

| **SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)** | 396,275.00 | 413,668.41 | -17,393.41 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0! |

| **Surplus / (Deficit)** | ($17,393.41) | 

### Datasets Subscriptions

| Subscriptions Income | Subscriptions Payments | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

### FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)

#### USD ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscriptions Income</th>
<th>Subscriptions Payments</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### £ ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscriptions Income</th>
<th>Subscriptions Payments</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL £</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EUR ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscriptions Income</th>
<th>Subscriptions Payments</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Bank Charges</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EUR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interest earned on Foreign Currency Accounts (@ given exchange rate)**

- **USD account**: 0.00 @ 0.8811
- **GBP account**: 0.00 @ 0.4281
- **EUR account**: 0.00 @ 0.6369

**Total in AUD**: 0.00
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CAUL Budget Report
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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, P&L reports, and Cash Flow Statements for each of the four currencies.

CAUL Retained Earnings
CAUL’s "reserves" are reflected in the balance sheets of the four accounts. In particular, the AUD account is the best indicator of CAUL’s "profits" from its operations. Each of the three foreign currency accounts, except for interest earned and bank fees paid, is essentially a neutral balance account - income from members’ datasets subscription payments is equal to the expenditure on those same subscriptions.

The normalised value of the retained earnings in the foreign currency accounts is included in the annual audit report. The normalised value is set at a fixed exchange rate, so is an indicative amount only.

At the end of 2006, retained earnings were AUD 274,629 added to current earnings (2006 "profit") of AUD 47,780, to begin 2007 with a total of AUD 322,410. According to the audit report, the total value, including the foreign currency accounts, was ?????? (to be entered when the final audit report is received.)

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.

Interest Earned
The interest earned in the AUD account is shown in the operations budget. That earned in the foreign currency accounts is shown in the native currency, with an estimate of the current value based on the exchange rates at the time of the report. The value is not realised unless and until any monies are transferred into the AUD account. Until then, they are retained in the foreign currency accounts as cash flow against late payments of CEIRC invoices to CAUL.

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" (and the foreign currency accounts EUR, GBP and USD)
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. Other than interest earned, the income and expenditure should be identical.

**Liabilities**
Provisions have been made for Annual Leave and Long Service Leave for the Executive Officer, expensed in 2005, retained as liabilities from 2006.
Audit of 2006 CAUL accounts
The DRAFT audit of the 2006 accounts confirmed a “profit” of $116,193, of which $40,567 was a surplus to the budgetted amount, and the remainder effective “income” from interest earned (AUD 124,174 notionally) and “gain/loss on foreign exchange” on the foreign currency accounts. Retained earnings amount to $544,672 across all accounts. Cash held at the end of the 2006 financial year was AUD 3,131,029

Salary Expenditure for 2008 (NB: ANU has been requested to use a 3% rise in salaries for budget purposes, but 2% is used here because that is all that has been confirmed through EB.)
The Executive Officer total is based on the expected 2008 salary of $90,820 plus on-costs and salary administration (ANU) of 39% 126,240.00
The Finance and Administration Officer (1.0 FTE) is based on the expected 2008 salary for HEW 4/2 of $46,627 plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7% 66,070.00
The Administration Officer (0.15 FTE) is based on the expected 2008 casual rates of $32.46 for HEW 4/3 plus plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7% 11,590.00

CEIRC Income & Expenditure for 2008
CEIRC Income is based on a 2% increase over last year's fees, for both the 48 internal (CAUL, CONZUL and CSIRO) members at $1,350 and the 27 external participants at $2,025.
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 - these allocations are being reviewed in 2007

Interest earned on the foreign currency accounts is 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 cash float.

As foreshadowed in 2007, 80% of the expenditure on Audit and Accounting has been allocated to CEIRC, reflecting the fact that a great proportion of the book-keeping transactions and audit work is generated through the CEIRC program.

Publications / Web Site for 2008
An amount for 100 hours work by a HEW 3 has been included to assist with migration of data from the current web site to the new platform.

Travel Costs for 2007 onwards
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 2008 - Andrew Wells.
The revised business plan proposes an expenditure in 2008 of 40,850.00 which requires a levy of approximately $900 per member.

It was agreed that the ADT withdraw from the NDLTD, at a saving of USD 9,000

CAUL Office - Equipment
An amount of $3000 has been allocated for a replacement computer. The newest is used by the Executive Officer, whose "discard" is rolled over to the Finance & Administration Officer, whose "discard" is rolled over to the Administration officer and the book-keeper. This third-level machine is now too slow to be effective - it was purchased in mid-2000. The other two were purchased mid-2003 and early-2006.
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Report to CAUL - July 26 - September 13

This report includes edited excerpts from the last report to the CAUL Executive.

CAUL Office.

Diane Costello took recreation leave from May 11 to June 11 inclusive, and Alisha Davies from July 7-22. Both have been tracking time spent on CEIRC versus other CAUL support since February - Alisha’s proportion is currently 92%, Diane’s is 50% (currently 85% and 35% of salary costs respectively are charged to CEIRC.)

Between May 9 and July 19, teleconferences were held with nine publishers seeking permission to store and use publishers’ version of nominated RQF evidence in local institutional repositories. Another two were held by DEST personnel, Alex Cooke and Margot Bell, while I was on leave. All have been very supportive of the proposed process, and most have signed the simple two page agreement with DEST. One is yet to be finalised.

The fourth floor of the Chifley library was reopened to the public in May, following the replacement of the carpet tiles and ceiling tiles on the whole floor, including the CAUL Office. Unfortunately some furniture damage was incurred during the recarpeting process.

In response to various calls for information or representation, authors were sought for articles on higher education for the August edition of inCite (Keith Webster and David Groenewegen); CAUL nominees for the RQF Panel 11 workshop (Eve Woodberry and Andrew Wells); representative of ALIA for the Public hearing of the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Commission (Alex Byrne); interviewees for an article in The Australian HES re the Open Coursework Movement (no-one available at late notice, and ACODE members are not listed on their web-site); a CAUL nominee for the NCRIS project the Atlas of Living Australia (ANU’s Adrian Burton and Scott Yeadon.); call for nominations to Panel 11 as end-users or international (Eve Woodberry and Colin Steele were nominated.)

I have registered for three seminars conducted by the ANU’s legal office – Introduction to Contracts; Privacy; Trade Practices Seminar. All relate to keeping up with legislation, as per the risk management discussions. They are each 2-3 hours, conducted on-campus in September and October.

Further on risk management, I have found (with some help from Sue Kosse) sections of the ANU web site which relate to updates on HR, finance and legal matters, including legislative changes, and their risk management portal. These are now linked to the Executive Meeting Papers page for easy checking. Sue commented:

“Once upon a time, A-Gs would inform statutory bodies of new or amended legislation, especially as if effected that particular body. That is no longer the case. Even when the ANU Act is amended, the ANU finds out by monitoring not by being informed by A-Gs.

“Currently, the ANU has no single way of keeping track of legislative developments or amendments. ANU relies upon its relevant experts in HR, Finance, Audit, telecommunications, Library etc being aware and informed about pending legislative developments or amendments in their respective fields, together with information coming from the networks of the ANU Legal Office and ANU membership of bodies such as Universities Australia, G of 8 etc which also monitor legislation relevant to universities.”

On July 19, I provided the two CAUL staff members with a copy of the Workplace Relations Fact Sheet. ANU provided me with my copy on July 27.

CEIRC.

Those offers that have been individually most labour-intensive include Sage Publishing, ERA (Electronic Resources Australia) and Fairfax Business Media – the latter two for very little gain so far. A report on the ERA outcomes is included in the CEIRC report from Andrew Wells.

The Sage proposal was released while I was on leave, and has since been taken up by nineteen institutions, all but 2 beginning in July 2007. Fairfax discussions are still underway, with an agreement to implement IP authentication within the next three months, but ongoing work by Fairfax
on an appropriate pricing model. A survey indicated that all members are using A&I services to target the content, then using print or microform backup for the full-text. Feedback from users regarding this approach has not been overly negative.

The ProQuest-CSA merger has implications for CEIRC offers - in general, there is less transparency in pricing, particularly between current and new subscribers, and a greater tendency to work with customers individually rather than as a group. This has led to more confusion about pricing and subscription options.

The second half of the year is very heavy transaction-wise, mostly CEIRC-related - in the last four months:

The annual call for renewals from publishers and vendors took place on June 25.

99 offers have been added to the CEIRC offers page – 31 of these for new products, 48 with multiple products per offer.

600 pages/documents have been created, edited or uploaded to the web-site. Some pages will have been edited multiple times, e.g. the CEIRC offers page updated at least 99 times, the What's New page 250 times, etc.

Finance & Audit.

A draft of the 2008 CAUL budget was prepared and circulated to the Executive on July 30. Salary costs were updated to expected 2008 levels, under the committed ANU EB increase of 2%. ANU has been asked to include 3% in its own budget planning. No changes were made to either the number of office hours, or to the proportion of time spent on CEIRC activity (35%/85% for EO/FAO), although this is currently sitting at 50%/92%.

A sum was included for 100 hours of HEW 3 to assist in migration of data from the CAUL web site to the new platform.

A sum was included for the replacement of one of the three office computers, purchased in early 2000. The new computer will be allocated to the EO, and the other two cascaded down to the FAO and the casual administration and book-keeping staff.

CAUL has a new banking “relationship manager” - the previous one has taken long service leave pending “retirement.” It is likely that the new compliance requirements resulting from the Anti-Money Laundering and Counter Terrorism Bill have placed significant burdens not only on clients but also on bank staff.

The 2006 audit has been pending finalisation for some time. The auditors are reviewing some anomalies pertaining to GST on foreign currency transactions. These anomalies do not affect the amount in credit/debit to the Tax Office, merely the way the transactions are reflected in the accounts. These complications won’t occur in future because we are refusing to accept foreign currency invoices with GST attached. The two companies involved, HCN and Lexis Nexis, have agreed to alternate procedures.

Meeting Planning & attendance - Agenda, Minutes, Travel, Venues

CAUL Executive meeting Melbourne 3 April 2007
CAUL meeting Melbourne 3-4 April 2007
ALCC meeting Canberra 25 May 2007 – attended by Eve Woodberry
CEIRC meeting Sydney 28 June 2007
RQF Workshop Canberra 23 July 2007 – attended by Eve Woodberry and Andrew Wells
CAUL Executive meeting Brisbane 26 July 2007
CCA Joint Executives meeting Brisbane 27 July 2007
ADT Policy Reference Group teleconference 20 August 2007
CAUL Statistics Focus Group meeting Melbourne 10 September 2007
CAUL Meeting 2007/2 Adelaide 19-21 September 2007
CEIRC meeting Melbourne 24 September 2007
Other Meetings/Events attended/held.

April 30 - May 2 EDUCAUSE Australasia Melbourne
May 2 Gabrielle Gardiner, LATN Executive Officer – Melbourne
May 9 Alex Cooke and Margot Bell and various publishers re RQF – 3 teleconferences
May 10 Alex Cooke and Margot Bell and various publishers re RQF – 5 teleconferences
June 27 Cameron Slatyer, Director Australian Biological Resources Study, Parks Australia re Australian University libraries contribution to database development, including the Atlas of Living Australia, an NCRIS project.
July 13 Jeff Murray and Jenny Dewar re CAUL website applications – teleconference
July 19 Alex Cooke and Margot Bell and publishers re RQF – 2 teleconferences
August 3 RQF teleconference at DEST with Alex Cooke and John Ochs, ACS.
August 14 RUBRIC event at Macquarie University, speaking on DEST work on copyright for the RQF
August 16 Anita Crotty, University of Canberra, re CAUL Office options
August 29 Michael Samarchi, Insync and Liz Curach – Canberra
August 30 Representatives of the CAUL Executive and William Pty Ltd re CAUL website redevelopment – teleconference

Meetings held/attended – CEIRC-related.

April 30 Jay Glaisyer, EBSCO, re Sage Publishing negotiations – Melbourne
May 7 Leebonie Douglas, Aspect Huntley – Canberra
May 7 Dean Leith, Jane Brimacombe and Robert Gibson, Fairfax re SMH licence indemnity clause – teleconference
May 9 National Licensing Forum – Canberra
June 14 Gordon Murdoch, Emerald Publishing – Canberra
June 26 Tamara Joyner, Palgrave Macmillan re Nature Publishing Group – Canberra
June 27 Nicky Hewlett, Swets – Canberra
July 5 Patrick Doogue, Institute of Physics Publishing – teleconference
July 9 Jonathan Hixon, Keessings – Canberra
July 9 Rick Bremble, Fairfax re Australian Financial Review – Canberra
July 11 Eva-Maria Scheer and Heather Crosbie, Wiley Blackwell – Canberra
July 24 Jeroen Reiners and Geeho Liu, Thomson Scientific – Canberra
July 24 Vivienne Fox, Taylor and Francis – Canberra
August 17 Anne Harvey, Scopus Sales Manager, Elsevier Australia – Canberra
August 21 Belinda Sharp & Paula Westgate, Ovid Technologies – Canberra
August 22 Mohamed Al-Baghdadi and Douglas Seto, ebrary – teleconference
September 4 Paul Stoiber, BioMed Central – teleconference
September 5 Barbara Rockenbach, Elizabeth Berenz, ARTstor – teleconference
September 5, 6, 7 Portico Webcast – Dawn Tomassi, Ken Fiore and CAUL members and staff (one test, one aborted, one successful)

Diane Costello
13 September 2007