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AGENDA

863. *Introduction & Welcome. Andrew Wells. This is expected to be Eve Woodberry’s last CAUL meeting. Ainslie Dewe is attending her first meeting as the Latrobe University Librarian. Dan Archibald is attending his first meeting as a CAUL member. Martin Borchert and Jenny Ellis are attending their first meetings as a CAUL delegate.

864. *Attendance & Apologies. Expected to attend:

From CAUL: Jenny Ellis, UMelbourne; Martin Borchert, GriffithU; Jenny Peasley, Macquarie; Ian McBain, FlindersU; Ralph Kiel, UWA; Jim Graham, ACU; Wendy Abbott, Bond; Sharon Lenord, USC;
From CONZUL: John Redmayne, MasseyU;

Apologies: Stephen McVey, UNDA (no delegate); Con Graves, GriffithU; Des Stewart, SCU (no delegate); Maxine Brodie, MacquarieU; Professor Margaret Sheil, Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Research Council is now unable to attend, and is scheduled to attend CAUL 2009/1; Bill Cations, FlindersU; John Arfield, UWA; Alex Byrne, UTS (no delegate); Chris Sheargold, ACU; Linda O’Brien, UMelbourne;

865. *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.

866. *Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2008/1. (Paper included)

867. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings 2008/2, 2008/3, 2008/4. (Papers (3) included)

868. CAUL Elections. Ballot papers for the position of Deputy President for 2009-2010 are due Tuesday 16 September. Andrew Wells

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

a) *The University of Melbourne Futures Commission. Jenny Ellis

STRATEGIC PLAN

870. Review of the Strategic Plan.

Support for Research

871. CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC). Greg Anderson (Paper included)

a) CEIRC Review. Andrew Wells

b) *E-books. Hot Topic Greg Anderson, Martin Borchert, Andrew Wells

c) *SCOAP3. Hot Topic. Jenny Ellis

872. ERA (Excellence in Research Australia). (Standing item) Andrew Wells
873. Research Infrastructure.
   a) AeRIC (Australian eResearch Infrastructure Committee). Cathrine Harboe-Ree
      i) *ANDS (Australian National Data Service). Hot Topic Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   b) Institutional Repositories.
      i) *CAIRSS Proposal (CAUL Australian Institutional Repositories Support Service). Andrew Wells, Cathrine Harboe-Ree (Paper included)
      ii) ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. It is proposed that this item be subsumed under the CAIRSS program. Andrew Wells (Paper included)
      iii) Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) - Stage 2. Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   c) Australian Access Federation (AAF). Keith Webster
874. Open Access. John Shipp

Support for Learning & Teaching

875. *Learning Spaces. Hot Topic Keith Webster, Philip Kent
876. Information Literacy Working Group. Ruth Quinn (Paper included)
   a) ILWG Action Plan.
   b) *Information Literacy Survey. Hot Topic Ruth Quinn
877. University Library Australia. Shirley Oakley (Paper included)
   a) CAUL Principles and Guidelines for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to Support Teaching and Learning. Shirley Oakley (Paper included)
878. CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students to Support Teaching and Learning. Shirley Oakley (Paper included)
879. Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC, formerly Carrick Institute) Cathrine Harboe-Ree

Delivering Quality & Value

880. Best Practice Working Group. Helen Livingston
881. *Insync Surveys. Helen Livingston
883. Statistics. Craig Anderson (Paper included)
884. *Universities Australia Library Staff Development Conference. Andrew Wells (Paper included)

Advocacy & Influence

885. *Copyright. Derek Whitehead
886. Relationships with other Organisations.
   a) CAUL regional and sectoral groups.
      i) Go8.
      ii) LATN.
      iii) IRUA.
      iv) CAVAL.
v) QULOC.

b) CONZUL. John Redmayne
   i) *CONZUL tour of the UK. Hot Topic* Greg Anderson, John Redmayne

c) CHELSA (Committee for Higher Education Librarians of South Africa).
   http://www.chelsa.ac.za/ Alex Byrne has foreshadowed a potential collaboration between
   CAUL and CHELSA e.g. a possible study tour, in 2009 or 2010, of CHELSA members to
   academic libraries in Australia, perhaps coinciding with a CAUL meeting, or IFLA 2010, so
   that the visitors might participate and have the opportunity to meet most Australian (and
   New Zealand) colleagues.

d) National Library of Australia.
   i) Libraries Australia. Linda Luther, Anne Horn (Paper included)
   ii) Peak Bodies Forum. Greg Anderson (Paper included)

e) Collections Council of Australia. Linda Luther (Papers (2) included)

f) CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology) and
   ACODE (Australasian Council on Open, Distance and eLearning).
   i) EDUCAUSE 2009. Imogen Garner

887. Forthcoming Meetings
   a) CAUL Meeting 2009/1. Newcastle, 3-4 April, 2009
   b) CAUL Meeting 2009/2. Brisbane, dates to be confirmed.
   c) CAUL Meeting 2010/1.
   d) CAUL Meeting 2010/2.

CAUL Administration

888. CAUL Web Site Redevelopment. Andrew Wells, Diane Costello

889. CAUL Finances. It was suggested at CAUL 2007/2 that the Executive consider investing
   CAUL’s reserve funds, and that a proposal for the use of CAUL’s reserves be brought to the
   next meeting. Imogen Garner (Paper included)

   The full supporting reports i.e. balance sheets, profit & loss reports and cash flow reports are

   a) CAUL Budget 2007. Progress report. (Paper included)
   b) CAUL Budget 2008. Progress report. (Paper included)

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

891. Other business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th># pax &amp; Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>CAUL Executive</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>6 pax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Wells, Chair; Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Heather Gordon, Imogen Garner, Greg Anderson, Diane Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Information Literacy Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 pax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Quinn, Chair; Anne Horn, Leeanne Pitman, Linda Luther, Philip Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Best Practice Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 pax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Livingston, Chair; Liz Curach, Ruth Quinn, Greg Anderson, Derek Whitehead, Philip Kent, Heather Gordon, Leeanne Pitman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 pax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vic Elliott, Chair; John Shipp, Andrew Wells, Keith Webster, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Jenny Ellis, Ralph Kiel, Ray Choate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>LATN</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 pax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imogen Garner, Chair; Craig Anderson, Helen Livingston, Judy Stokker, Gabrielle Gardiner (LATN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>IRUA-L</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 pax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Borchert, Ian McBain, Margaret Jones, Greg Anderson, Heather Gordon, Ainslie Dewe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>CAUL Meeting – Business, to include:</td>
<td>Grand International Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of new members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Repository support – the CAIRSS proposal – Cathrine Harboe-Ree</td>
<td></td>
<td>30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Access – John Shipp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative storage arrangements – UKRR, Go8 – Vic Elliott</td>
<td></td>
<td>20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insync survey review – Helen Livingston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright – Derek Whitehead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm</td>
<td>Meeting closes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm for 7.30</td>
<td>CAUL dinner @ Pee Wee’s at the Point, Alec Fong Lim Drive, East Point Reserve, Darwin</td>
<td><a href="http://www.peewees.com.au/">http://www.peewees.com.au/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>ANDS - Cathrine Harboe-Ree</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930</td>
<td>Research Data Management Practices - Vic Elliott</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0950</td>
<td>Scoap3 - Jenny Ellis</td>
<td>10m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>E-books - Martin Borchert, introduced by Greg Anderson, Andrew Wells</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- results of QULOC's e-books survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- patron-initiated acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Tea Break</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Learning Spaces - Keith Webster, Philip Kent</td>
<td>60m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Results of ILWG survey - Ruth Quinn</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>CONZUL tour report - John Redmayne and Philip Kent</td>
<td>30m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm-2pm</td>
<td>Lunch - Meeting Closes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-lunch</td>
<td>2.00pm - 2.30pm Transport by bus from SkyCity to Casuarina Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.30pm - 3.30pm Tour of CDU Library Casuarina Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30pm - 4.30pm VC’s reception in the Chinese Gardens (about 2 mins walk from the Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30pm - Transport back to SkyCity and other city hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
834. *Introduction & Welcome. Andrew Wells welcomed those attending for the CAUL for the first time, Helen King, Elke Dawson and Liz Burke, and welcomed back those delegates who have attended before. He also extended a warm welcome to the three CONZUL members. Jeff Murray has been appointed Chief Information Officer at Glasgow Caledonian University and was congratulated in absentia, and warmly thanked for his contribution to CAUL and to the Executive Committee, and especially for his work on the new website specifications. Members noted that Gulcin Cribb will not be attending the next meeting due to her forthcoming consultancy in Turkey. Members wished her well.

835. *Attendance & Apologies.

**From CAUL:**
Chris Sheargold, ACU
Vic Elliott, ANU
Gulcin Cribb, Bond U
*Elke Dawson, CQU
Ruth Quinn, CDU
Shirley Oakley, CSU
Imogen Garner, Curtin U
Anne Horn, Deakin U
*Dan Archibald, ECU
*Catherine Brown, Flinders U
Con Graves, Griffith U
Heather Gordon, J CU
#Helen King, La Trobe U
Maxine Brodie, Macquarie U (day 1)
Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Monash U, Deputy President
Margaret Jones, Murdoch U
Judy Stokker, QUT
*Deidre Gillespie, 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
Andrew Wells, UNSW, President
Jan Gordon, UNSW@ADFA
Greg Anderson, U Newcastle
Stephen McVey, UNDA
Keith Webster, UQ
Helen Livingston, UniSA
*Alison Hunter, USQ
Joan Shipp, U Sydney
Linda Luther, U Tasmania

**From CONZUL:**
Janet Copsey, U Auckland
John Redmayne, Massey U
Ainslie Dewe, AUT

**Guests:**
Ross Coleman, Director of Sydney eScholarship, USyd
Dr James Dalziel, Professor of Learning Technology, Macquarie E-Learning Centre of Excellence (MELCOE)
Patricia McMillan, Project Officer, Middleware Action Plan and Strategy (MAPS)
Janette Wright, Chief Executive Officer, CAVAL

**Apologies:**
John Arfield, UWA
Bill Cations, Flinders
Jeff Murray, ECU
Liz Curach, UWS
Alan Smith, USQ
Debra Orr, CQU
Craig Anderson, RMIT

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

837. *Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2007/2.* Andrew Wells asked for comments or corrections. The minutes were accepted.

838. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings 2007/5, 2007/6, 2008/1. Minutes (including the draft minutes of 2008/1) were included with the agenda papers.

839. Business arising from previous meetings, not otherwise listed on the agenda.
   a) **CLOCKSS.** Vic Elliott reported that the CLOCKSS pilot ends shortly and will become operational in May/June. Eight institutions have committed to join CLOCKSS. He asked for members to let him know if they are interested in participating. *(Action: All)*
   b) **Australian Framework and Action Plan for Digital Heritage Collections.** Linda Luther has been invited by the Executive to review the document for CAUL. She is happy to receive feedback from members. *(Action: All)*

840. **CAUL Constitution.** A change to the constitution has been drafted to reflect the change in name of the AVCC to Universities Australia, to clarify terms of office for members of the Executive Committee, and to amend the winding-up provisions. The paper was included with the agenda, and as there were no comments or questions, the recommendations have been accepted. *(Action: DC)*

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

841. **Review of the Strategic Plan.** The Executive proposes some amendments to the 2007-2009 plan, generally updates relevant to changing circumstances. This item was not discussed, and the amendments consequently accepted. *(Action: DC)*

842. *CAUL Achievement Award 2007.* Andrew Wells read the citation for Ross Coleman, Director of Sydney eScholarship, The University of Sydney who was presented with his award and a cheque for $5,000. His presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/achievement2007coleman.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/achievement2007coleman.pdf) He stressed that e-scholarship is now in the university's strategic plan and is considered an intellectual enterprise rather than a management exercise. He described Sydney eScholarship and how it integrates digital content with new forms of access and technology. It ranges across the support of eResearch, the University Press, repurposing classics, pricing print on demand services, publishing journals and conference papers, etc. He discussed whose responsibility it is for page charges for publication by the university's researchers – at the University of Sydney, the DVC holds that it is a central, not a library, responsibility. He asked CAUL to consider whether a SPARC-type organisation was needed in Australia to support communication about the new modes of publication.

   a) **Criteria for CAUL Achievement Award.** The Executive proposed some clarification of the criteria for the award, to place greater emphasis on the national significance or breadth of the work undertaken by the nominees. This item was not discussed and the amendments consequently accepted. *(Action: DC)*

**Support for Research**

843. *CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEI RC).* Greg Anderson referred members to the report circulated with the agenda. In reference to the section on the American Chemical Society, he reminded members that the new pricing model for 2008 has already been implemented, but the internal cost reallocation among subscribing institutions was delayed for one year because of the late notice. The cost for 2009 will be 2008 plus 5%. ACS has moved away from 'current spend' model, starting with calculating Carnegie model for North American institutions, then taking into account gross national income (Australia and New Zealand are high), then total downloads (which for Newcastle in 2007 was 9000 leading to an initial $65,000 cost for the whole collection), but an adjustment for CAUL and a discount and for single invoicing and consortium handling reduces this further. After internal reallocation of the consortium cost, half CAUL subscribers will be paying more and half paying less. It would be
possible to continue to pay based on the old model, with the annual 5% increase. The current CAUL pricing is considerably better than the initial proposal in early 2007.

Vic Elliott expressed concern with using the World Bank GNI as a way of reducing costs to developing countries as it is really only a guise to charge what the market will bear. He suggested that libraries do not have a delegation to accept such a measure. He noted that institutions can pay 30 times that which the lower institutions pay, and suggested that it is the acceptance of the model in the market place rather the amount of money that is of concern. He volunteered to write a paper about the model. (Action: VE) It was agreed that learned societies appear the most rapacious in their subscription pricing.

Keith Webster expressed concern with price based on usage especially when trying to encourage use, and is more comfortable with models based on population size or potential use. John Shipp commented that transactional based charging may be used more often, but noted that it is the larger institutions that do use it most and get the main benefit, and the market may have to get used to it. John Redmayne noted that Massey was previously paying more than the University of Melbourne, and the new model appears fairer than the current model. It was confirmed that this is an international model, and unlikely that the ACS will make changes based on any CAUL concerns. Previous feedback has been that subscribers wanted to move away from the “current spend” model.

It was noted that ACS usage is a macro indicator, rather than a direct transaction cost, to ensure that each price tier contains other institutions who use it in a similar fashion. Vic Elliott’s concern about the move towards transactional pricing will be noted and conveyed to Andrew Pitts at ACS. (Action: GA, DC) The offer will be circulated again to CAUL to determine who is not prepared to renew under the new model. (Action: DC)

It was noted that the Harvard Business Review has adopted a practice of additional charging for coursework use, or even linking direct to articles. They apparently sell a lot of articles to course pack providers. They think they know who will have persistent URLs. It was questioned whether HBR was able to withdraw from the CAL/Universities Australia agreement, but suggested that this is not possible? CEIRC will follow up. (Action: DC)

a) **CEIRC Review.** Andrew Wells spoke to the Executive’s recommendations circulated with the agenda. He reminded members of the history of CEIRC, which is now 10 years old. He outlined the review process starting with an RFP in August, Claritas Australia appointed in September, the review of program benefits, strategy, legal strategy (with advice from Gadens Lawyers), and program operations. He called for general comments before stepping through the recommendations.

Members felt that it was useful that the Executive had drafted the recommendations. The program is greatly appreciated by members e.g. administrative support for subscription needs, the expertise of the CAUL Office. It was noted that the review was not intended to consider the program from the institutions’ end. The opt-in, opt-out model has made it simple to operate. The review constitutes the consultant’s view of how it may be made better, and the Executive has commented on the recommendations.

Some of the recommendations were discussed, and the others considered to be accepted:

2.1.1.a. More proactive identification of products to be presented to members. It was suggested that this could be a good idea but there is only so much resource to go around. The Datasets Coordinators meeting serves as the current way of highlighting priority products.

2.1.1.b. Increased time spent on communication. A revamp of the CAUL website is already underway. It was suggested that there be more training. More information should be fed back to CAUL following CEIRC meetings. It was suggested that the relationship between the University Librarian and the Datasets Coordinators is very important - the latter need to understand their brief, and the communication needs to be effective. What do members need to know and want to know and do they get it from their Datasets Coordinators?
2.1.1.c. Conveying information to vendors. It was noted that some vendors are invited to CEIRC committee meetings for discussion on service, processes, pricing models, etc. Otherwise, this relies on CEIRC and Executive officer. It was asked whether there are deficiencies that should be addressed.

2.2.2.d. More aggressive price negotiation with vendors. It was suggested that it is not clear whether there is actually much room to move, and possibly extremely limited scope to negotiate aggressively, especially with almost monopolistic entities, though CAUL seems to negotiate quite effectively on those that it can. One member reported that a genuine funding crunch could help with an aggressive approach i.e. if the alternative was to the vendor were losing the account altogether. This was discussed at the CEIRC meeting and agreed that vendors may allow gains on an individual basis because of a long term relationship, but this is harder within a consortium without damaging the relationship. It was suggested that current resources may not lend themselves to lengthy negotiations.

There was some support for an external negotiator, other support for an ad hoc strategic group to be formed, other support for the committee to be used. If it is felt that there is genuine room to negotiate, or something crucial to address, the Executive should establish a negotiating process to cover price benefits, service benefits, or both. (Action: Executive)

2.1.2. There are currently 75 participants in CEIRC, with the major beneficiaries and users of the program are CAUL and CONZUL members. There does not appear to be a strategic reason to include the external participants, so the Executive recommended that no more be accepted, noting that the market may already be saturated. External participants are not big subscribers, but add to the workload and bring in revenue. Without the revenue, member fees would most likely increase. Some members, including CAUL and CONZUL members, require more support from the office than others. It was suggested that a service level agreement could be implemented to address this. Members preferred not to add another layer of administration, but rather to improve the performance of Datasets Coordinators.

In discussion of CONZUL’s participation, it was recognised that they operate in the same pattern as CAUL, so are different from other external members, and that CONZUL members are colleagues rather than clients, and CONZUL is almost part of CAUL. Members were opposed to their being placed in a different category from CAUL members. CONZUL members present also stated that CEIRC was a highly beneficial program and that CONZUL should pay the full cost of their participation. It was also suggested that it was political advantageous for CAUL that it negotiates on behalf of all Australian universities, all New Zealand universities, and many other government research organisations.

The review did not specifically address CAUL’s relationship with CONZUL and the CSIRO, but it did identify that there was no clear principle underlying decisions to include them on the CEIRC committee. It was noted that CSIRO was the only external participant with the opportunity to sit on the committee, and agreed that the Executive review the current practices and costs, and clarify the relationships between CAUL and the two organisations. (Action: Executive)

Members agreed that CEIRC admit no new external participants. (Action: CEIRC)

2.1.3  This recommendation was not considered controversial. CEIRC will be reviewing KPIs for CEIRC operations.

2.2.1. It was noted that risk management issues and the unincorporated status of CAUL have been considered regularly over the years, and the review had considered earlier documents on the subject. It was suggested that the costs of incorporation are substantial, $100-200,000 for a small organisation, and may be inimical to the needs of the organisation. There are cost and resource burdens associated with incorporation and other heavier kinds of governance. The reviewer considered that operations and record
keeping are well done. There was some disagreement about whether CAUL should remain unincorporated, including whether the ANU was exposed to risk while the Executive Officer was a member of staff or whether individual Executive members were at risk. One member reported on an experience of embezzlement which would have been difficult had the executive not been covered.

The external legal advice had indicated that the processes, record-keeping and audits were in place, were transparent, the risks were managed appropriately, and do not warrant further action. It stated that the level of monies passing through the accounts was less important than how they are recorded, audited and managed. It was suggested that the processes be documented and made freely available on the web site. Diane Costello will consult Maxine Brodie about the desired level of detail. (Action: DC)

In discussion about whether legal advice should be obtained regarding liability of members of the Executive, it was suggested that they would most likely be covered by their university's insurance, as agents of the university. It was agreed that current members would check their coverage as committee members of an unincorporated association. (Action: Executive) Members were invited to send further comments on this subject to the Executive. (Action: All)

2.2.2. The conclusion is that public and personal liability in the CAUL office are being managed adequately.

2.2.3. Regarding contractual risks, it was recommended adding clarifying language when CAUL signs an agreement or head of agreement, so that it does not find itself in any litigation between a vendor and an institution.

2.2.5. The legal advice is that CAUL’s practices and policies mean it would not have any problems under the Trade Practices Act.

2.3.1.a. With regard to CAUL’s operations, it was noted that there exists a long tail of products with a relatively low number of subscribers and suggested that cost-benefit be reviewed. Approximately 150 products from 100 vendors are managed by CEIRC, and it was suggested that it withdraw from managing them once the number of subscribers falls below a given number. CAUL will survey other consortia to find out whether such a cut-off point is used. (Action: DC, CEIRC)

2.3.1.b. It was suggested that processing time could be reduced by implementing management software. It was noted that CEIRC interest revenue could be used to fund it. (Action: DC)

2.3.1.c. It was noted that the average amount of the Executive officer’s time spent on the CEIRC program is now 60%, but more like 90% in the renewals period. CAUL could decide to reallocate income and expenditure to reflect the current balance or could add additional staffing for CEIRC and increase fees accordingly. The Executive has considered the effect on revenue if the external participants were removed.

It was agreed that CAUL determine first what it wants the CAUL office to do, then determine the size of program needed to support that. (Action: Executive)

2.3.1.d. It was agreed that interest income is variable and should not be included in planned revenue, but used to invest in other resources e.g. software for cost containment.

844. *Open Access. Hot Topic* John Shipp discussed whether librarians should be involved in Open Access and if so, what could CAUL do? His presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/scholcomm/caul20081open-access.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/scholcomm/caul20081open-access.pdf) He suggested that the profile of OA advocates tends to be academic, mature and male. In a recent address, JISC’s Malcolm Read suggested that although librarians were less influential than previously, they should be playing a pivotal role in the development of institutional repositories. John Shipp prefers that repositories be used for grey literature, data, conference papers etc leaving post-prints to individuals and traditional publishers. Although the rapidly rising cost of journals was the trigger for the open access movement, those costs are no longer the central issue. He did add that some society publishers appeared to be leading a significant upward pressure on prices.
again. He suggested that with DEEWR, the ARC and the NHMRC all supporting open access through various means, including infrastructure support, CAUL should be actively involved. Although CAUL is an institutional member of SPARC, it does not take advantage of its programs. http://www.arl.org/sparc/ He recommended that SPARCAUL (sparkle) provide a focus for communicating with the academic community. He recommended making the work that individuals are now doing available to all CAUL, along the lines of CreateChange Canada, which was established by CARL but is independent. http://www.createchangecanada.ca/ He suggested working through discipline-based bodies rather than individual academics. He supported more international collaboration e.g. with ARL, CARL and SCONUL.

845. ERA (Excellence in Research Australia). (Standing item) Notes of a meeting with the ARC were circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

846. *eResearch. Hot Topic* Judy Stokker outlined QUT’s response to eResearch. Her presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20081eresearch.pdf QUT has a stated performance indicator to double the number of research students. The library is responding the demand, and the number of new staff, but creating new roles, looking at new service models, planning and staff development.

Two new, high impact, strategic positions were established with high performing staff to work outside the normal library structure. An eResearch coordinator is responsible for QUT eprints and institutional repository management, and provide leadership in research support. This position works across the Division, and with the Office of Research. The other role is within the Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation, IHBI, a premier research institute where three faculties work together. This person is immersed in the research environment, working with researchers, helping with grant proposals and research management. The position is jointly funded by the Library, the Division and the Institute.

The library has a seat on the university’s new eResearch committee. The Division has established an eResearch support team, and is looking at research management, staff needs and training. Preliminary results show that it is possible for the library to step into gaps. Some complications occur with research data – not clear who owns it, or has responsibility for it; some want to share data and others do not. Library staff need to know more about the research process, and this is being helped by feedback from the IHBI person. The library has established a voluntary reading circle where members bring articles of interest to the notice of others via a wiki.

847. Research Infrastructure.

a) **AeRIC (Australian eResearch Infrastructure Committee).** This item was not discussed.

b) **ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.** It was agreed at CAUL 2007/2 that options for the future of the ADT would be discussed by CAUL in early 2008. A report from Andrew Wells was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

c) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) – Stage 2.** This item was not discussed.

d) **Australian Access Federation (AAF). Hot Topic** Keith Webster has taken over from Maxine Brodie as CAUL’s representative on the AAF Steering Committee. He introduced James Dalziel and Patty McMillan to discuss Shibboleth and the AAF, stressing the importance of the AAF to university libraries, not necessarily for access to commercial resources, but to provide access to those outside the university environment e.g. hospital staff (if UQ could rely on credential from Queensland Health, the university would not have to manage these users.) His presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20081uq-shibboleth.pdf

Patty McMillan referred members to the AAF animation which shows how the federation should work. http://www.aaf.edu.au/aaf-federated-access-management-animation Her presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20081aaf.pdf She described how the federation facilitates trusted access to other bodies. The federation sets policies for
members to exchange and manage credentials. It has developed a number of “use cases” to show how it may be applied. For example, UQ shares content with UWA online learning resources – it is much easier to use a home account than to set up special privileges with the other organisation. It will be easier to provide shared resources e.g. data storage, applications and services. It would be easier to switch off individual users at the commercial provider rather than blocking the university; home resources can be used while visiting another university.

James Dalziel addressed the introduction of Shibboleth into universities. His presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20081shibboleth.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20081shibboleth.pdf). He discussed the advantages of using a home-institution-generated single identity to access a range of services, because these services trust the home institutions to know who their users are. MAMS has been running identity test-bed services for 2 year, with 14 identity providers, 27 service providers and 1m users. The AAF is being rolled out as soon as the legal structures can be put in place, particularly regarding ownership of the federation, most likely by the end of 2008.

Central units such as IT Services or Human Resources should manage the identities – security is actually improved when individuals do not have to handle multiple IDs. Library technical staff should be learning how to manage service provider configurations under Shibboleth e.g. for e-reserve, institutional repositories or other services. Libraries can advise their universities on access policies. User access can be provided independent of location, more simply than via EZProxy. More complex access policies are easier to manage under Shibboleth.

Members were encouraged to take advantage of available MAMS training workshops, either institution-specific, or combined with other universities. The workshops are designed for technical staff to be ready to deploy Shibboleth in 2009. (Action: All)

**Support for Learning & Teaching**

848. **Information Literacy Working Group.** A report from Ruth Quinn was circulated with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

a) **ILWG Action Plan.** This item was not discussed.

849. **University Library Australia.** Shirley Oakley referred to the tabled report, noting that the web site will be restructured to include user information up front, with member information elsewhere. The ULA working group discussed the SCONUL access proposal, and recommend to CAUL that it agrees to reciprocal agreements with other national schemes, establish a light agreement framework based on what members currently do, and prepare pro-forma agreements to facilitate members’ international cooperation. She ask for CAUL’s for in-principle support to pursue this plan further. CAUL members are currently being surveyed about their present processes, which mostly relate to staff on study leave but also students under enrolled programs. It was agreed to go ahead. (Action: ULA, DC)

850. **CAUL Principles for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to Support Teaching and Learning.** Changes recommended at CAUL 2007/2 were made to this document, and similar alterations made to the principles for off-shore students. This item was not discussed.

851. **Carrick Institute.** This item was not discussed.

**Delivering Quality & Value**

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

853. **Statistics.** A report from Diane Costello was included with the agenda. In a follow-up to the decision at the last meeting, it was reported that the deemed list (of the number of electronic titles in collections, packages and aggregations) is being prepared in-house again in 2008 while procedures and specifications are drawn up prior to “out-sourcing” the annual task. (Action: DC) It was noted that Craig Anderson is taking over the chair of the committee from Derek Whitehead.
**854. *ALIA Workforce Summit, Melbourne, 28 March 2008.*** Andrew Wells drafted CAUL’s submission to the summit, circulated with the agenda, and attended as CAUL’s nominee. Four CAUL members attended: Keith Webster from ALIA’s standing committee on education, Derek Whitehead as ALIA president, Andrew Wells as CAUL nominee and Alex Byrne as an interested party. Submissions are available from the summit website. http://www.alia.org.au/education/summit08/ A wide variety of sectors was involved, all with different perceptions. There was little engagement with the published submissions. CAUL’s submission tried to articulate what kind of skills and people are needed, at all levels.

It was noted that TAFE educators meet regularly but university educators do not. It was decided they should all meet together, with employers meeting with library educators. It seems that libraries are not succeeding at attracting the brightest and the best, both among school leavers and those changing careers. The latter is providing more recruits at the moment. Universities should be recruiting bright young graduates whereas educators focus more on school leavers. University libraries need to be more vocal about what they need and move the debate forward.

There was some focus on whether ALIA’s membership base should be widened, and what this means for accreditation and pathways into professional qualifications.

CAUL’s strategic plan has given this agenda to the BPWG, who were asked to bring an action plan to the next Executive. (Action: BPWG) This could articulate what CAUL, wearing the employer’s hat, might do to achieve what needs to be done. It was noted that other work has been done by LATN and UTS (on competency). The BPWG should review other current activity. It was noted that the UTas library is part of the library science program, practicum and seminars and is embedded in program. The UniSA school also has employers embedded in the program.

**855. *Value Statement for University Libraries. Hot Topic* Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported on a Go8 project to revisit the value of their institutions in a time of great change. She asked how libraries can defend a suggestion that it needs $1m less in the collection budget, or that it does not need xx amount of space. It is difficult to define outcomes, impact and value for libraries. The Go8 commissioned a report, Measuring the value of academic libraries, which is available at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/value2008go8.pdf The bibliography is excellent and it was noted that IRUA is updating it. Three categories were used to define institutional expectations of libraries:

- help to improve student performance and research performance;
- have excellent collections – is this being monitored or are libraries being judged less on this basis;
- have excellent management skills - Library staff are often drawn into university projects because they are excellent managers, have leadership and innovation skills, are seen as “honest brokers”, are experts in information management, publishing, copyright, internationalisation, etc.

The project aims to provide evidence that the library is making a contribution to the university, and can defend any contrary assertion. It tries to articulate where there might be evidence to support contribution to student performance e.g. results and retention, whether there are practical examples or research in this area done elsewhere. Outcome measurement might look at information literacy before and after assessments, the impact of open access institutional repositories on citations, interviews and focus groups, etc. It looks at other activity in the UK and the US e.g. SCONUL and ARL programs looking at the future of academic libraries, dependent on their abilities to align with university goals. It is not sufficient to measure only input and activity.

There is a strong body of evidence in information literacy. There is evidence of correlation, not causal evidence, between expenditure on collections and research performance. There are methodologies which measure collection impact, but they are not strong. Interviews with new staff could lead to a measure of collection impact for new staff.
The next stages of the project will be to look at contingent valuation – quantify how an organisation is valued – and develop a ROI methodology i.e. the return to the university for each dollar spent on the collection. It is much easier to do this in a corporate library than an academic library. An attempt to measure ROI at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign was published recently by Elsevier.

http://libraryconnect.elsevier.com/whitepapers/0108/lcwp010801.html

Members discussed how they might be involved in the Go8 work and it was suggested that CAUL might fund the development of the ROI methodology. (Action: Executive)

Advocacy & Influence

856. Copyright. A report from Eve Woodberry was included with the agenda.

a) *Universities Australia Copyright Forum, Sydney, 31 March 2008.* Derek Whitehead reported that the meeting was essentially about the CAL agreement, which provided for a 20% increase over a three-year term, with studies to be undertaken on electronic use. They will revisit the 2003 principle that copying is substantially done by central copying units, assuming that it is not done by academics, and CAUL should watch this closely. The Universities Australia expert group consists of Tom Cochrane, Derek Whitehead, Eve Woodberry and Robin Stanton, who have been given a large number of task to complete. CAUL has recommended to Universities Australia that more resources be provided and will continue to lobby for them. (Action: Executive)

Other education sectors e.g. schools and TAFEs, represented by Delia Brown from MCEETYA, the copyright area in DEEWR, and the Victorian TAFE directors who have employed Bill Kyrios, are all doing different things. AICTEC is still headed by Evan Arthur who maintains a copyright role. Government pays out most of the $105 million per year to CAL and should be reviewing how much is actually for government publications.

Eve Woodberry also reported. She asked what differences CAUL would like to see in the agreement. Are universities paying double because of the number of electronic resources now held? Universities are currently paying over $20m a year to CAL. ScreenRights and the music licence are additional costs. ScreenRights copying is currently very little so is expensive per transaction.

It was suggested that CAUL reviews the overlap between vendor licences and part 5b. EUS (Electronic Use) data should be reviewed to determine what is actually being copied. It may include a lot of licensed content or embedded images which are site logos.

b) Copyright Council Workshops. This item was not discussed.

857. Relationships with other Organisations.

a) CAUL regional and sectoral groups.

i) *CAVAL. Hot Topic* Janette Wright described changes at CAVAL over the last few year, and outlined some of the services it now provides. CAVAL began in 1978, and now has 25 staff and a turnover of $3.3m in 2007. It is a not for profit company limited by guarantee, providing free or discount services to members, and consultancy services to external organisations. Forthcoming services include scanning & digitising; copyright permissions; collection management; research in space planning; reviews, etc.

ii) *LATN (Libraries of the Australian Technology Network).* Imogen Garner’s presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20081latn.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20081latn.pdf) Hot Topic The ATN has records back to 1993, meets 4-5 times a year and now employs a part-time executive officer, funded via projects and member contributions. AUT is now also a member.

LATN has developed a consultancy framework to provide staff with development opportunities, to take on projects for each other in a friendly environment. Their Collaborative Online Workspace (COW) allows collaborative work to be stored online, to share information and conduct projects. Each community has a leader,
and all members have at least one contributor. One current project involves the 
information literacy of offshore students. Each member has overseas partners, and 
the project supports 2 staff each year visiting campuses in Malaysia, Hong Kong or 
Singapore to work with teaching and support staff on electronic resources. The 
LATN prototype for eGrad School, a module to support research students, is being 
transferred to Blackboard. In 2008, LATN will benchmark through a second LibQUAL+ survey, will prepare a white paper on citation analysis, and will host a 
study tour for delegates to the Auckland IATUL conference.

iii) *IRUA. Con Graves reported that JCU had joined IRUA this year. It is working on 
collaboration on repository development and eResearch. In 2008 they will submit a 
Carrick proposal, looking at the role of faculty/liaison librarians, how to measure 
their activity and benchmark their performance.

iv) QULOC. Alison Hunter reported that a joint Griffith / USQ survey on the use of e-
books is underway, both online and in print, to capture on-campus and off-campus 
respondents. They plan to interview academics and students, will present a paper 
to Sydney Online 2009.

b) National Library of Australia.

i) *Libraries Australia. A report from Linda Luther was circulated with the agenda. 
reported that the free Libraries Australia service had been operating for a year, and 
that the feature-added researchers’ subscription service was available to all CAUL 
through their subscriptions, but only 12 had yet turned the features on. The NLA did 
not turn this on automatically. (Action: All) She drew attention to the reports 
available and encouraged members to download them. She demonstrated the 
difference between the free service and the subscription service. In discussion 
about communication between the NLA and CAUL members, members reiterated 
their preference for direct communication from the NLA to the CAUL member by 
email. (Action: LL)

The agreement between the NLA and OCLC means that all Libraries Australia 
subscribers are officially governing members of OCLC. A recent election for a 
regional representative raised some protests because some ballot papers were not 
received. It is also not clear how this representative fits into the new structure.

c) CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology) 
and ACODE (Australasian Council on Open, Distance and eLearning).

i) EDUCAUSE 2009. This item was not discussed.

d) CONZUL. Ainslie Dewe reported that 12 major libraries had contributed funds to cleaning 
up catalogue records in Te Puna. An agreement had been reached on collective storage, 
discarding most bibliographic indexes and nominating one library to store the remaining 
print. TEC funding supported the establishment of institutional repositories, with many 
moving from their original Digital Commons implementation to others such as DSpace, 
etc. Four CONZUL and four CAUL members are attending a SCONUL meeting in June and 
touring the UK. KRIS (Key Research Information Service), a joint enterprise of the 
Ministry of Research, Science and Teaching, the IT directors, CONZUL, the NLNZ, and 
polytechnics, to open up publicly funded research and make it easy to find. 150 
registrations have already been received for the IATUL conference, with 30-40 from CAUL.

858. *Forthcoming Meetings

a) CAUL Meeting 2008/2. Darwin, 18-19 September 2008. Details are being added to 
the CAUL meeting page as decisions are made. Accommodation is reserved for CAUL at 
the venue, SKYCITY, though some will be released after June 18. Members were urged to 
book soon. (Action: All)

b) CAUL Meeting 2009/1. Andrew Wells asked members to consider if they wish to host 
meetings in 2009. (Action: All)
c) CAUL meeting 2009/2.

CAUL Administration

859. *CAUL Web Site Redevelopment.* Diane Costello reported on the multiple levels of documentation required before the actual technical development could commence. Acceptance documents had to be clearly specified before signing off as any additional work could otherwise involve additional costs. It was also important to clarify what control of site changes could be continued within CAUL and what needed to be programmed externally. (Action: DC)

860. CAUL Finances. It was suggested at CAUL 2007/2 that the Executive consider investing CAUL’s reserve funds, and that a proposal for the use of CAUL’s reserves be brought to the next meeting. Imogen Garner advised members that this would be brought to CAUL 2008/2 for their consideration. (Action: IG)

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

862. Other business.

a) The University of Melbourne Futures Commission. Hot Topic. Angela Bridgland outlined the university’s aims and process under its Futures Commission. Her presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20081unimelb.pdf She discussed the new teaching model at the university, and the development of a strategy for the whole information infrastructure for the university. The strategy was to encompass teaching & learning, research & research training, and knowledge transfer. A consultation paper was released in February and the university will formally be seeking CAUL’s views. All documents are available to the public, http://www.informationfutures.unimelb.edu.au/, and a recommendation is to be presented to Council in July. Its recommendations are likely to be useful to other institutions.

b) University of Wollongong. Library Cadetship Program. Hot Topic. Felicity McGregor's presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/meetings/caul20081.html#uow She described the difficulties in finding the right staff, and how the program aims to target graduates rather than school leavers and to train staff for leadership positions. Candidates are asked to make a presentation and to prepare a written assignment. The program addresses interpersonal skills as well as technical and professional skills. The positions are classified at HEW 3-4, with 55 hours/session study time, and scheduled rotations through a range of library areas. Cadets maintain portfolios, establish goals within each team, and are assessed each month. They are contracted to stay for 3 years. It has proved to be an excellent source of good people.

c) HEEF (Higher Education Endowment Fund). Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported on a meeting with Philip Clark, chair of HEEF Advisory Board, together with Alan McMeekin representing CAUDIT. The meeting was arranged at the invitation of DEEWR. She highlighted the limitations inherent in libraries operating within their institutions, who generally took the lead in seeking endowments. They discussed the need for investment in library buildings, noting that the success rate had improved with the more recent focus on teaching and the need for learning spaces. Mr Clark was complimentary about the demonstrated cooperation between CAUDIT and CAUL. The subsequent CAUL letter to Mr Clark will be circulated to members. (Action: DC)
d) **Universities Australia Library Staff Development Conference.** Members were reminded that the next conference would be held July 17-18 in Sydney, and that it was the last to be held under Universities Australia’s auspices. This could create a significant gap in staff development options. Cathrine Harboe-Ree encouraged members to send staff also to the CAUDIT-EDUCAUSE Institute, noting that the critical mass of library staff at the last Institute had been excellent. *(Action: All)*

e) **CAUL Meeting Agenda.** Members commended the reordering of the agenda to include the business session up front. They were encouraged to send further feedback on the structure and content of the meetings to the Executive. *(Action: All)*

The meeting closed at 1.15pm
1705. Attendance & Apologies. Andrew Wells (President), Cathrine Harboe-Ree (Deputy President), Heather Gordon, Greg Anderson, Imogen Garner (Treasurer). In attendance: Diane Costello.

1706. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2008/1, 18 February 2008. accepted

1707. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda. All action items are completed or are included on the agenda, except the following:

1684 John Shipp is speaking at CAUL on Open Access.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1708. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).

22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative (Ad Hoc Working Group) Cathrine Harboe-Ree will check with the Go8 regarding distribution of their report. they have agreed and CH-R will send a copy of the document for making available to CAUL.

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1709. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).

a) CEIRC Review. There have been no comments from CAUL members to date about the review. It is timely to review the membership of the CEIRC committee along with the review of fees, particularly for external members. The review has highlighted that there are inconsistencies in rights to participate on the committee. There was some discussion about the proposal to establish an ad hoc negotiating committees – it was agreed that it was likely to be limited to big budget proposals.

b) CAVAL proposal to manage CEIRC acquisitions. AMR Interactive has been appointed as the new monitoring body for the CAL/Universities Australia agreement so there is a potential conflict of interest. Universities Australia's Expert Group is discussing how to handle the part 5B copying. Andrew Wells will respond to Janette Wright. (Action: AW)

1710. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells will develop a proposal to bring to the September meeting. He will start with the Technical Committee. (Action: AW)

1711. Excellence in Research Australia (ERA). The report from the ARC meeting was included in the CAUL agenda papers for information of members. Professor Sheil has been invited to the September CAUL meeting.
1712. Research Infrastructure.

a) **AeRIC (Australian eResearch Infrastructure Council).** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that DIISR wants a consultation process around ANDS but the timeline will have to be adjusted to allow this to happen.

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

c) **Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) - Stage 2.** This is now complete and may be removed from the agenda. (Action: DC)

d) **Australian Access Federation (AAF).**


Some universities have expressed interest in basing their course development on aspects of the 2006 Conservation Survey. Linda Luther will be invited to review the document and offer advice to CAUL. (Action: DC)

**CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING**

1714. **Carrick Institute.** Carrick Citation applications close May 9. The March **Carrick Communiqué** includes feature on past Citation winners, including Des Stewart and SCU.

One CAUL member invited the Executive to write a letter of support of their application for Carrick funding. The project concerned could be useful as a relatively objective guide to building collaborative activity within institutions. Case studies which highlight structures which work might be useful.

It was suggested that project outputs ought to involve CAUL more specifically in order for CAUL to support it. Members asked whether being of benefit to the members sufficient for CAUL to write in support. What criteria should be used. Should a separate committee be tasked with evaluating submissions presented to CAUL for support. How does it help CAUL meet strategic objectives or the goals of the University. It was suggested raising with CAUL as a generic case. When can members ask CAUL for endorsement. When will CAUL endorse such applications. CAUL has previously established criteria for funding applications or for CAUL membership of external organisations.

It would be difficult to implement a fair assessment process e.g. if the application was not deemed to be well-written, etc. It was agreed that unless CAUL initiated a grant application, CAUL is not in a position to endorse it, but members should be otherwise supported in their applications. It was suggested including an item on the CAUL agenda to establish some processes for supporting applications, including international grant applications. (Action: DC)

Andrew Wells will discuss with the applicant. (Action: AW)

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

1715. **Benchmarking – CAUDIT Complexity Index.** CAUDIT is testing the use of a complexity index, using student and staff FTE, research income and geography, together with expenditure on IT, to assist in identifying similar institutions with which to benchmark. It was noted that CAUDIT finds it more difficult to compare institutions because the IT budget is not fully centralised as library services are.

1716. **Insync Surveys (formerly Rodski).** The working group has not yet completed its work.

1717. **Universities Australia Library Staff Development Conference.** July 17-18, 2008 at the Novotel Brighton Beach, Sydney. The program committee is Andrew Wells, Heather Gordon, Judy Stokker and Diane Costello. These dates clash with World Youth Day which may have problems for the airport and it was recommended that they be changed. (Action: DC)
http://www.alia.org.au/education/summit08/  Andrew Wells attended on behalf of CAUL.  
Other CAUL members attending in various roles were Keith Webster, Derek Whitehead and  
Alex Byrne. The facilitator was excellent. It was a large meeting, 80-100, with all possible  
sections being represented, including TAFE educators and university educators, large  
employers and small employers, teacher-librarians. It was suggested that the big employers  
and the educators need to talk more. This will be raised with CAUL.  (Action: AW)  
Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that Monash is offering a scholarship program for a final year  
student in any discipline to undertake a masters program in library science, with no guarantee  
of a job at the end of the scholarship. Flinders has been running a cadetship program for  
some time and participants have no problems finding a job afterwards. JCU would create an  
entry level position if it could be guaranteed to have someone to fill it, but they cannot afford  
to hold the position vacant.

COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

1719. Communication.  (Standing item)  
a) President’s Report. Andrew Wells reported his attendance at meetings with HEEF and  
the ARC, and the ALIA Summit.  
b) Public Relations/ Media Reports.  
c) CAUL Report 2007.  (standing item) A review of progress against the strategic plan is  
being prepared. Diane Costello has invited committee chairs to nominate highlights for  
the report. Contributions to the CAUL report are likely from the ULA WG, but not clear re  
BPWG. (Action: DC)  
d) Executive Officer’s Report. The report is included in the CAUL meeting papers.

1720. CAUL Web Site.  Further questions have been framed to ensure that the process is  
completely clear before signing off on the functional specification, as any later alterations  
would likely cost extra. The timeframe hasn’t yet been clarified. (Action: DC)  

1721. Copyright.  Heather Gordon reported on the meeting held March 31. The Expert Group has  
been asked to be more proactive prior to the next negotiations. Membership currently is Eve  
Woodberry, Derek Whitehead, Tom Cochrane and Robin Stanton. CAL and ScreenRights  
licences both expire at the end of 2010. It was suggested that record-keeping may be an  
appropriate alternative to the latter. It is very important to keep two CAUL members on the  
committee, in that if one leaves we are able to nominate a replacement.  (Action: AW)  
a) Australian Digital Alliance. Derek Whitehead has taken over from Tom Cochrane as  
chair of the ADA. The positions of several board members were renewed at the AGM on  
March 6. Diane Costello represented CAUL at the meeting. The ADA has yet to establish  
protocols for appointments and reappointments to the board.  
b) Prescription of universities as “key cultural institutions.” Under amendments to  
the Copyright Act, organisations may apply to the Attorney-General to be prescribed as  
key cultural institutions for the purpose of permitting pro-active preservation of rare and  
valuable materials. CAUL has written to the Attorney-General to foreshadow that a  
number of universities are expected to apply given the nature of their collections.  
c) Monitoring of University copying. On March 11, Universities Australia advised Vice-  
Chancellors and Copyright Officers that research company AMR Interactive Pty Limited  
has been jointly appointed by Universities Australia and CAL as the Monitoring body under  
the new Remuneration (Sampling) Agreement.

1722. Submissions to Public Inquiries.  CAUL should respond to both of the following.  (Action:  
DC)  
a) Innovation Review.  
ess.aspx
b) **Review of NCRIS roadmap.**

1723. Relationships with other organisations.

a) **Universities Australia.**

b) **CAUDIT & ACODE.**
   i) **EDUCAUSE 2009.** Standing Item. Imogen Garner reported that Chris Foley will take over as chair of the steering committee when Jeff Murray leaves for the UK. The conference will be held early May at the Perth conference centre.

c) **National Library of Australia.**
   i) **Peak Bodies Forum.** The 2008 meeting of the Peak Bodies Forum is scheduled for May 9. Minutes of the 2007 meeting were circulated for information. The National Library has asked for suggested discussion items. Data management; library space; workforce issues; Andrew Wells has written to the National Library, and will attend the meeting.

   ii) **Libraries Australia.** The agreement between the NLA and OCLC automatically means that all Libraries Australia members are also members of OCLC’s governing body. The election has been held for an Australasian representative, but it is not clear how the ballot papers were distributed, or to whom.

d) **NSLA (National and State Libraries Australasia).** A major report is due to be released soon and it was recommended that it be reviewed. *(Action: DC)*

e) **SCONUL.**
   i) **Library Access schemes [possible MoU with SCONUL?]** Diane Costello is surveying CAUL to establish current protocols and to ascertain whether an umbrella MOU or framework would be useful.

1724. CAUL Meetings.

a) **CAUL meeting 2008/1.** April 3-4, Sydney. Members discussed the agenda.

b) **CAUL Meeting 2008/2.** Darwin, 18-19 September 2008. The venues for the meeting and the CAUL dinner are confirmed, and accommodation is also booked.
   **Possible agenda items:**
   i) “Research libraries as knowledge producers.” ARL report
   ii) Learning Spaces.
   iii) Learning Skills. Cathrine Harboe-Ree
   iv) Australian Research Council. Professor Margaret Sheil has expressed interest in attending a CAUL meeting.

1725. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.

a) **Draft schedule for 2008.** Potential clashes:
   **2008 – ICOLC, San Francisco, April 13-16 (Diane Costello); IATUL 2008, Auckland, April 21-24; NPG Advisory Committee, New York, April 28-29 (Diane Costello); JISC-CNI, Belfast, June; IFLA Québec City, Canada, 10-14 August; ALIA, Alice Springs, 2-5 September; EDUCAUSE, Orlando, Florida, 28-31 October; CNI Washington DC 8-9 December;**
   Leave planned: Diane Costello, May/June (tbc); Andrew Wells in May 29-June 25; Heather Gordon, October; Greg Anderson, June 1-28; may 5 -23 Imogen Garner; Cathrine Harboe-Ree leave last week of June and first week of July.
   ACODE 47 - Massey University, Wellington Campus 19-20 June 2008
   ACODE 48 - University of Canberra from 20-21 November 2008
i) 2008/3. July 7, Brisbane, from 12-5, with dinner on the Monday night. in conjunction with CAUDIT and ACODE Executive Committees on July 8 from 8.30 to 11.30 – planning for CAUL 2008/2. CCA will be organised and chaired by CAUDIT. A CEIRC meeting will follow on July 8 (tbc)

ii) 2008/4. Monday August 4 Melbourne

iii) 2008/5. Wednesday 17 September in conjunction with CAUL 2008/2, Darwin

iv) 2008/6. November, Brisbane, in conjunction with CAUDIT and ACODE Executive Committees, November 27 from 9am to 11am. CCA will be organised and chaired by CAUL.

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1726. CAUL Finances. Imogen Garner

a) CAUL Budget 2006. [Link to budget2006.xls] The audit is complete and awaiting the final report from Walter Turnbull.

b) CAUL Budget 2007. [Link to budget2007.xls] The end of year figures are complete, at least until the 2007 audit adjustments are received. The audit began on March 12.

c) CAUL Budget 2008. [Link to budget2008.xls] Review software for CEIRC operations; Diane Costello will propose how many hours and the costs of bringing an extra person online over the peak of the CEIRC processing to Andrew Wells (agreed by the Executive). (Action: DC)

1727. Risk assessment for CAUL. Andrew Wells. [Link to risk-assessment2007.doc] This will be reviewed after the CEIRC review recommendations have been settled.

1728. Other business.

The meeting closed at 4.30pm
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1729. Attendance & Apologies. Andrew Wells (President), Cathrine Harboe-Ree (Deputy
President), Heather Gordon, Greg Anderson, Imogen Garner (Treasurer). In attendance:
Diane Costello.

1730. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2008/2, 2 April 2008. The draft minutes were
accepted without further change.

1731. Minutes of CAUL Meeting 2008/1. In process. (Action: DC) Diane Costello took
members through the recommendations/actions from the meeting.

Andrew Wells will further discuss the issue of communication between CAUL members and the
National Library & Libraries Australia. (Action: AW)

Greg Anderson reported that individual members advised him that they were comfortable with
the new ACS pricing model.

Some CAUL members later questioned why the Executive recommended that CAUL not be
incorporated. Other members appear to feel comfortable with keeping the processes simple.
The Executive noted that legal advice supported this latter approach.

UNSW, Monash, Curtin and JCU all cover insurance for staff involved in external bodies such as
CAUL. Nominees for CAUL committees will be invited to check their own organisation’s
handling of staff exposure to risk. (Action: DC)

There was support for keeping the business meeting earlier in the CAUL meeting schedule.
Andrew Wells will discuss with John Shipp the proposal that a more formal approach be taken
to support of open access issues. (Action: AW)

1732. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1733. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).

22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative
(Ad Hoc Working Group) Cathrine Harboe-Ree confirmed that the report to the Go8
Librarians could be made available to CAUL, and a copy was made available on April 9. The
Go8 has contracted Otsell to prepare a document on ROI. The work is continuing.
CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1734. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).
   a) CEIRC Review. The Executive recommendations have been updated following the CAUL meeting discussion.

   Some CAUL members would like a harder negotiation with Wiley-Blackwell, though others do not have a problem with the current model. It was agreed to invite CAUL members to identify elements they wish to include in the negotiations. It is likely that Wiley-Blackwell will be attending the September 1 meeting of CEIRC.  (Action: CEIRC)

   CONZUL has proposed that they fund their representative’s travel to the CEIRC meetings, and continue to pay the CAUL member fee. CAUL members clearly wish to retain the very close relationship with CONZUL. The CEIRC review highlighted a number of earlier decisions that were not based on any specific principle, but were appropriate for the time. Members recognise that the relationship with CONZUL is special.

   With respect to CSIRO’s seat on the CEIRC committee, it was suggested that the areas of contact with CAUL are more likely to be at the CAUL level rather than the CEIRC level. CAUL values its link with CSIRO, and extends a standing invitation to CSIRO to attend CAUL meetings. In the review of CEIRC principles, it was agreed that CAUL revert to CAUL/CONZUL only committee. It was noted that even CAUL members don’t have a right to be on the CEIRC committee, but all can refer matters to the committee at any time. Andrew Wells will discuss future relationships between CAUL and CSIRO with Cynthia Love and agreed that she be invited to a CAUL meeting to discuss changes in CSIRO.  (Action: AW)

   CSIRO will be asked to pay the CEIRC external fee from the next renewal.

   The CEIRC fee should reflect the actual cost of the program. The cost structure will be amended to reflect current hours spent on CEIRC. The new database software should relieve the Executive officer of some of the time devoted to CEIRC. Following the implementation of the new website and new software, the allocation of the Executive officer’s time will be renewed.  (Action: DC)

   CEIRC nominees should also be asked to check their institutions’ insurance coverage if they are elected to the CEIRC committee.  (Action: DC)

   b) CAVAL proposal to manage CEIRC acquisitions. Andrew Wells has responded to Janette Wright.

   c) ACS new pricing model. Following the CAUL meeting, Diane Costello confirmed with Andrew Pitts that all consortium members needed to take the same titles list, and then circulated a message to Datasets Coordinators and CAUL, noting:

   “This email is to alert those who do not wish to proceed under the new model, so that you may obtain your individual price quote from ACS. I am prepared to coordinate the quotes if you wish - please advise me of your request for an individual quote, listing those titles you wish to subscribe to, by April 30.”

   Eight responses were received, 3 non-subscribers interested in subscribing under the new model, one querying the high increase (but later confirming that selecting individual titles would cost them more, and their new price brings them into line with other high users) another two confirming the new model, one going directly to ACS for a quote, and one external participant asking for a quote for a single title.

1735. ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program. Andrew Wells will develop a proposal to bring to the September meeting.  (Action: AW) He advised that UNSW will continue to maintain the database, but essentially put no new resources into the support of the program. Members questioned whether the ADT discovery service be subsumed into the ARROW discovery service, or a new way of discovery be developed. One of the advantages of an ADT-specific program was the sharing of expertise and knowledge. There is currently a repositories list that covers most of these issues which could be one of a wider group of activities around institutional repositories. It is important to retain the facility to find theses in a simple, direct
fashion. The ADT was also a very good example of collaboration, but the technological side has been superseded. The ADT brand is still very important for CAUL.

It was noted that there is much more copyright work related to institutional repositories. It was noted that OAK-Law has just released a paper intended to assist authors. Understanding Open Access in the Academic Environment: A Guide for Authors. From the OAK Law Project: by Kylie Pappalardo (with the assistance of Professor Brian Fitzgerald, Professor Anne Fitzgerald, Scott Kiel-Chisholm, Jenny Georgiades and Anthony Austin)


a) ERA and Copyright. Alex Cooke has been in touch re CAUL’s interest in ongoing involvement with this issue. Some changes will mean that not as many published outputs are likely to be required, and it is possible that pre- or post-prints may be allowable. It is also possible that many fewer items will be required to be held in institutional repositories. The ARC plans to write to publishers to foreshadow the changes. They have asked if CAUL is prepared to continue its involvement. They will also follow up the previously outstanding issue of Crown Copyright versus licences with publishers with whom DEST did not have specific written permission to use the publisher’s version in institutional repositories.

Members agreed that the Executive officer would continue to support this process of discussion with publishers in the transition from the RQF to ERA. (Action: DC) There is concern with the level of influence the hands of commercial publishers such as Scopus and Thomson Reuters. It was noted that there are other utilities on the web and a range of open access options and journals. CAUL should endeavour to keep some of these issues in front of government. It was agreed to arrange another visit to the ARC (Margaret Sheil and Alex Cooke) and NCRIS. (Action: DC) It was noted that Clare McLaughlin now working with HEEF/IEF, but not known who is filling her position with NCRIS.

1737. Research Infrastructure.

a) AeRIC (Australian eResearch Infrastructure Council). Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported NCI and ARCS have both presented their business plans, and will be working further on managing expectations and engaging with their communities. The implications for libraries are in understanding the environment, so CAUL members need to be aware of what is in these documents. The ANDS establishment project has been extended to allow further consultation. It will be important to understand how this will engage the wider community, rather than just being limited to the participants. The earlier divisions of frameworks, utilities, repositories and research practice have been replaced by “seeding the commons” (for the latter two,) populating repositories and upskilling the sector. A discussion document is expected soon.

b) Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) – Stage 2. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that ARROW funding concludes at the end of the year, and there is consideration of some kind of community going forward. How will the discussion on repositories keep going forward with a project to link it to. Should there be a broader repositories forum – a strategic one, a management one and a technical one? It was agreed that CAUL does need a strategic forum, not limited to specific technologies. It has been suggested that libraries might support taking universities’ journals into the online environment.

c) Australian Access Federation (AAF). Keith Webster is now representing CAUL on the steering committee. It has been confirmed that Universities Australia will become the umbrella organisation. Shibboleth is not yet ready to be deployed, and it is unclear how ready universities are to take it up. It was suggested that it may be too technical for library technical staff and more appropriate for the wider university IT staff. Just two
CAUL members expressed interest in training, and they were asked to contact MELCOE directly. Members will be asked again prior to the CAUL meeting. (Action: DC)

d) MAMS/RAMP. Eve Woodberry has suggested that she be replaced on the Steering Committee. CAUL members were invited to nominate themselves or a senior member of staff. Members thanked Howard Amos (UNSW) for nominating and accepted his offer to represent CAUL. (Action: DC)

1738. UK Research Reserve (UKRR). A paper from Greg Anderson was tabled at the meeting. The project’s aim is to rationalise print serial runs with commitments from 3 individual UK libraries to retain print copies, with the British Library continuing to be the library of last resort to release 10,000 km of shelf space.

It was noted that the Go8 is exploring this issue at the moment, i.e. trying to identify specific titles and to quantify the task. This will be referred to Vic Elliott who is leading the project to ask if he will report on the exploratory stage to CAUL. (Action: GA)

The difference with previous projects is that the back-runs are retained in their own institutions. CARM was designed to be a last copy monograph store and ownership ceded to the store. CARM II will house collections owned by the universities. Many universities are limited by university accounting policies to withdraw no more than a given quantity each year. The size of the collection is still a factor in international university ranking tables and discard decisions should be made against reliable information.

1739. Australian Framework and Action Plan for Digital Heritage Collections. A progress report from Margaret Birtley was circulated in January. The Principles for creating and managing digital heritage collections was finalised in November 2007. The Collections Council is developing three documents to expand on the draft Framework. They have published a paper entitled “A new future for Australia’s past” that summaries their “big ideas for new partnerships.” Some universities have expressed interest in basing their course development on aspects of the 2006 Conservation Survey.

Linda Luther has agreed to continue as CAUL’s monitor and adviser in this area. She asked there is value in making commentary on the 2007 paper, and asked if there were more information on the universities taking action on course development. She suggested that it may be helpful to prepare some commentary on CCA documents in relation to university activities. It was agreed to defer to Linda Luther’s judgement on what might be of interest and value to CAUL. (Action: DC)

CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING

1740. Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC, formerly Carrick Institute.)

Cathrine Harboe-Ree received a message on May 29:

Dear Cathrine, Last year you were invited to be a member of an External Expert Reference Group to assist in providing professional feedback re the development of the Carrick Exchange. We now wish to inform you that we will not be establishing this group; however we wish to sincerely thank you for your willingness to be involved, and hope you will visit the Exchange.

You may remember that the Exchange was being developed by the Institute to provide a set of online services to enable collaboration and communication among members of the higher education sector – specifically on issues related to learning and teaching. The three main functions of the Exchange are the ability to search, to contribute and to discuss and network on learning and teaching related topics and issues. **

There have been some changes within the Institute, now known as the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC). Development of the Exchange has continued, however some activities associated with the development were scaled down, including the proposed involvement of the reference group. The ALTC (Carrick) Exchange was successfully released this month, being currently offered to those involved in ALTC related activities.

We invite you to access the Exchange as a visitor. We also welcome any feedback or comments, which you can send to our User Support manager, Robyn Philip.
DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE

1741. Insync Surveys (formerly Rodski). The working group drafted a set of revisions to the survey questions included in the BPWG minutes for April, 2008. Greg Anderson will ask the BPWG to prepare a report for the August Executive meeting. (Action: GA)

1742. Staff Development. It was noted that university libraries had contributed to the Nexus II survey. Members agreed that the workforce planning action in the strategic plan was too big for CAUL as stated. CAUL’s action plan will be amended to reflect this. (Action: DC)

Action 11. Investigate workforce requirements and skills development to ensure maintenance of quality services in a rapidly changing information environment.

a) Universities Australia Library Staff Development Conference. July 10-11, 2008 at the Novotel Brighton Beach, Sydney. The program committee is Andrew Wells, Heather Gordon, Judy Stokker and Diane Costello. The dates were altered because of a clash with World Youth Day.

b) CAVAL’s Horizon Executive Leadership Programme. Imogen Garner asked that as the current conference is the last to run by Universities Australia, would CAUL consider using Horizon to fill the gap, or adopt this as an alternative. It was noted that the structure is quite different and it is more expensive. The fee would generally be too high for anyone below the level of university librarian. Monash now has an active leadership program underway, so is unlikely to use such external courses. QULOC runs a half-day university librarians forum every year, targeted so far at senior staff, but will target more junior staff in future. It was agreed to watch the progress of the Horizon program. It was noted that CAUL could run a similar program. (Action: Executive)

c) CAUDIT EDUCAUSE Institute. Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that registrations for 2008 had begun, and noted that seven library staff attended the last one. She will remind CAUL members of its value. (Action: CH-R) She noted that the institute is pitched at middle level managers and has a focus on personal development - looking at oneself as a manager, managing up and down, etc. Cathrine Harboe-Ree retires from the institute faculty after next year, and believes it would be useful for new faculty members to shadow current faculty for a term.

1743. ALIA Education and Workforce Summit, State Library of Victoria, 28 March 2008. [http://www.alia.org.au/education/summit08/] It was felt that library schools’ curriculum is not sufficiently relevant to the needs of university libraries and there should be more communication between the two sectors. QULOC has asked Judy Stokker to discuss sourcing of graduates from QUT’s school, noting that positions cannot be held for library graduates unless the schools can guarantee the graduates to fill them. The UoW cadetship approach helps to bring into the profession people who may not otherwise have been attracted to it. It was agreed to take this item off the agenda until it is revived by members. (Action: DC)

1744. CAUL Statistics. The statistics collection began 21 May, with the due date for completion 20 June. 2006 DEEWR data will be used until 2007 data is available. Trial questions on e-books are included. ULA statistics are being collected as a parallel exercise. It was noted that CAUL did not pay for the printing of the statistics in AARL, so has not saved any money, however members were reminded that the printed statistics were out of date as soon as they were published.

1745. International Benchmarking opportunity with SCONUL and ARL. Greg Anderson reported on a meeting in York, UK, with Martha Kyriillidou, Jim Self, Steve Hilliard, John McColl and Stephen Towne. They are attempting to synchronise SCONUL/ARL processes and definitions, with a view to facilitating international benchmarking. They noted that different elements were counted in each data collection e.g. service points, etc. ARL also collects some interesting supplementary statistics. It was suggested that it might be simpler to identify similar sized and structured institutions and benchmark on a smaller scale, noting that questions from university administration or state governments are more about impact.
1746. **University Library Australia.** A letter to the CAUL President from NSW/ACT Indigenous Teacher Education Roundtable requests more comprehensive access to university libraries in NSW and the ACT for indigenous students from universities and TAFE. In discussion, members commented:

- it is not clear exactly what is being requested;
- are there access problems?
- libraries do not control computer laboratories;
- in some universities, ULA registration fees apply;
- not all libraries have provision for walk-in users;
- most universities are funded specifically for indigenous students and could support the current ULA system;
- are indigenous students not getting the resources that they need?

Andrew Wells will discuss with the head of the UNSW indigenous centre before drafting a letter in response. (Action: AW) Greg Anderson will also be discussing locally as part of the general service provision for indigenous students. (Action: GA)

It was suggested that CAUL use this as an opportunity to show what libraries actually provide. It was noted that QULOC conducted a survey on indigenous support in 2007.

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

1747. **Communication.** (Standing item)

   a) **President’s Report.** The following letters have been written by the President:

      to Janette Wright re presentation at CAUL meeting and response to CEIRC review offer;
      farewell letter to Jeff Murray on his appointment to Glasgow Caledonian University.

   b) **Public Relations/Media Reports.**

      i) **20/05/2008, Australia joins SCOAP³**. Australia has joined SCOAP³, through a partnership of six Universities: **Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide, Western Australia, New South Wales** and the **Australian National University**. See the SCOAP³ website. [http://www.scoap3.org/news/news39.html](http://www.scoap3.org/news/news39.html)

      ii) **The Australian scene.** Andrew Wells and Diane Costello SCONUL Focus - Number 42 Winter 2007 [http://www.sconul.ac.uk/publications/newsletter/42/](http://www.sconul.ac.uk/publications/newsletter/42/)

   c) **CAUL Report 2007.** (standing item) A review of progress against the strategic plan is being prepared. Diane Costello has invited committee chairs to nominate highlights for the report. (Action: DC)

   d) **Executive Officer’s Report.** Diane Costello advised that she had been on leave for five weeks, that the acquisition of software to support CEIRC transactions was in process, and that the CEIRC renewals process was already underway, somewhat earlier than usual. A written report was not prepared for this meeting.

1748. **CAUL Web Site.**

   a) **Web Site Redevelopment.** Two concept designs were received from William on May 29. On return from leave Diane Costello consulted with Andrew Wells and responded with comments on July 1. Howard Amos has been monitoring the project and related correspondence as an expert backup. Diane Costello will confirm the expected date for production. (Action: DC)

   b) **CAUL domain.** CAUL’s domain caul.edu.au has been renewed for a further two years to 31 August 2010.

1749. **Copyright.** Andrew Wells has discussed briefly with Eve Woodberry and will report further. (Action: AW)
1750. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

   [http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/policy_issues_reviews/reviews/highered_review/](http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/policy_issues_reviews/reviews/highered_review/) It was noted and agreed that it is for Vice-Chancellors to respond.

b) **Funding to advance University Infrastructure.** 6/06/2008 5:45:00 PM Joint Media Release Julia Gillard The Minister for Education, and Minister for Innovation, Senator Kim Carr (Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations) Expressions of Interest for funding close at 5 pm (AEST) on 14 August 2008. These submissions will be considered, and those short listed will be invited to submit full applications. Successful projects will then be announced in July 2009.  
   [http://www.heef.deewr.gov.au/EIF/default.htm](http://www.heef.deewr.gov.au/EIF/default.htm) It was agreed that no response from CAUL was required.

c) **ARC seeks sector's views on journal rankings for ERA initiative.** Submissions close July 24.  
   [http://www.arc.gov.au/era/indicators.htm](http://www.arc.gov.au/era/indicators.htm) Comments in the media from academics are available at “ARC rankings poor on law”  
   [http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23916551-25192,00.html](http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23916551-25192,00.html) Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA) was one of the organisations consulted, with Curtin’s Kerry Smith coordinating feedback from the academic community. It was agreed not to get involved.

d) **Innovation Review.** The deadline for submissions was 30 April 2008. CAUL’s response was submitted April 30.  

e) **Review of NCRIS Roadmap 2008.** National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy The NCRIS Committee has agreed to undertake a review of the NCRIS Roadmap during the first half of 2008. Closing date for responses 14 May 2008. CAUL’s response was submitted May 9.  
   [http://www.ncris.dest.gov.au/development_ffolder/roadmap_review_2008.htm](http://www.ncris.dest.gov.au/development_ffolder/roadmap_review_2008.htm) The exposure draft was released July 4, with responses due July 18. Humanities and Social Sciences have been added as a discipline group, and it was noted that both the NLA and the Collections Council were mentioned in that section. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will draft a response.  
   (Action: CH-R)

f) **Inquiry into research training and research workforce issues in Australian universities.** Australian Government. House Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Innovation. Written submissions are due 30 May 2008. It was agreed that a CAUL response was not required.  

1751. Relationships with other organisations.

a) **CONZUL.** Andrew Wells will attend the CONZUL meeting at the University of Auckland on July 31.

b) **DEEWR.** JISC Library 2.0 and e-framework. CAUL was invited to nominate a delegate to the reference group on this project. Alex Byrne has agreed to participate and will report to CAUL.  
   [http://www.sero.co.uk/jisc-lms.html](http://www.sero.co.uk/jisc-lms.html)

c) **CAUDIT & ACODE.**

i) **EDUCAUSE 2009.** Standing Item. Imogen Garner reported that the program keynote speakers are being sorted out.
d) National Library of Australia.

i) Peak Bodies Forum. The 2008 meeting of the Peak Bodies Forum was held May 9. Greg Anderson attended as CAUL’s delegate, and his report was tabled at the meeting. Derek Whitehead attended as an ALIA representative. There was some concern about the implications of the introduction of RDA and whether CAUL will be required to commit resources, and noted that a forum is being held in October. Heather Gordon queried the item on DRM – Greg Anderson will follow up. (Action: GA)


f) Collections Council of Australia. The CCA held a forum of peak bodies in Canberra on May 21. Linda Luther represented CAUL. Linda has prepared a report for the Executive, and is prepared to discuss it at the CAUL meeting. The Executive has asked Linda Luther to offer advice on the range of issues being raised by the CCA.

g) ARL (Association of Research Libraries). ARL agreed to a CAUL request that Ray Choate be invited to the May ARL meeting in Miami, FLA. This meeting is the last for retiring Executive Director, Duane Webster.

h) JISC. Andrew Wells has been invited to contribute to a report on JISC 'Libraries of the future' initiative.

i) SCONUL. Diane Costello met with SCONUL Secretary, Toby Bainton, while holidaying in London.

ii) Library Access schemes - possible MoU with SCONUL. There was limited feedback from CAUL members to the survey on current practices for dealing with visiting students and staff from overseas, and for home users visiting institutions overseas. Diane Costello will draft a document based on information received. (Action: DC)

1752. CAUL Meetings. Keith Webster has offered to host a CAUL meeting in conjunction with IFLA 2010, 15-19 August 2010, noting that there will be a number of pre-conference satellite events both in Australia and in New Zealand. The International Medical Librarianship Congress will be held in Brisbane in 2009, and this would present an alternative option.

a) CAUL Meeting 2008/2. Darwin, 18-19 September 2008. The venues for the meeting and the CAUL dinner are confirmed, and accommodation booked. Professor Margaret Sheil is confirmed for the morning of September 19. The same schedule as the Sydney meeting will be repeated, with the meeting finishing at late lunch on Friday. Ruth Quinn has suggested organising a reception. Diane Costello will call for hot topics from members. (Action: DC)

Possible agenda items:

i) Australian Research Council. Professor Margaret Sheil has agreed to attend the Darwin meeting. It was suggested that we make this a substantial session, perhaps 90 minutes. (Action: DC)

ii) AeRIC. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will report.

iii) SCOAP3. Linda O’Brien or Jock Murphy (Angela Bridgland is not attending.)

iv) CONZUL tour report. All tour participants are attending the Darwin meeting.

v) University of Melbourne. Follow up from the Sydney meeting report.


vii) “Research libraries as knowledge producers.” ARL report
viii) Learning Spaces.

ix) Learning Skills. Cathrine Harboe-Ree asked whether other CAUL members are responsible for learning skills.

b) CAUL Meeting 2009/1 – Newcastle. Members accepted Greg Anderson’s offer to host the meeting. He reported that Tiger, Jetstar and Virgin now fly into Newcastle. Noah’s on the Beach is a good meeting venue, preferred to campus options, with some good hotels such as the Crowne Plaza. A tour of the city campus could be arranged, and members could head to the vineyards on the weekend.

Suggested topics:

i) RDA. Implications for CAUL institutions.

c) CAUL Meeting 2009/2 – Brisbane. It was agreed to organise in Brisbane. (Action: DC)

d) CAUL meeting 2010/1 - venue.

e) CAUL meeting 2010/2 - venue. Members suggested that it not be held alongside IFLA as the event would be too big.

1753. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.

a) Draft schedule for 2008. Potential clashes:

- 2008 – IFLA Québec City, Canada, 10-14 August; ALIA, Alice Springs, 2-5 September; EDUCAUSE, Orlando, Florida, 28-31 October; CNI Washington DC 8-9 December; Leave planned: Heather Gordon, October.

- ACODE 47 - Massey University, Wellington Campus 19-20 June 2008

- ACODE 48 - University of Canberra from 20-21 November 2008

i) 2008/4. Monday August 4 Melbourne. The venue will be Monash Collins Street. (Action: DC)

ii) 2008/5. Thursday 18 September in conjunction with CAUL 2008/2, Darwin

iii) 2008/6. November 27, Brisbane, in conjunction with CAUDIT and ACODE Executive Committees, November 27 from 9am to 11am. CCA will be organised and chaired by CAUL. (Action: DC)

CAUL ADMINISTRATION Move this item to the top of the agenda for future meetings. (Action: DC)

1754. CAUL Finances. Diane Costello has provided to the Treasurer some historical information on CAUL’s retained earnings, approved expenditure from these earnings, and current operational revenue and expenditure with a view to bringing a proposal to CAUL in September. Imogen Garner spoke to the paper circulated with the agenda. She noted that there was scope for investing some funds in higher interest funds without impinging on the total reserve or limiting CAUL’s ability to use the funds for special purposes. The proposal assumes that CAUL retains 110% of annual operational revenue/expenditure.

In discussion, members commented:

- What is the risk and how high is the risk?
- Did the CEIRIC risk appraisal take the current reserves into account when assessing a low financial risk?
- Why does CAUL have to have such a large reserve?
- Should we be giving it back to members rather than raising fees?
- Should CAUL be planning special projects two to three years hence?
- Are there development opportunities for staff?

Imogen Garner will redraft the document and circulate to the Executive. (Action: IG) It was agreed to look at moving some funds into interest bearing deposits. (Action: DC)

b) **CAUL Budget 2008.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2008.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2008.xls) Review software for CEIRC operations; Diane Costello will propose how many hours and the costs of bringing an extra person online over the peak of the CEIRC processing to Andrew Wells (agreed by the Executive). *(Action: DC)*

c) **CAUL Budget 2009.** Diane Costello will draft the budget for 2009, noting that while the reserves are healthy, it is possible to plan for a deficit budget. *(Action: DC)*


**1756. Other business.**

a) **CAUL Elections 2008.** The positions up for election are Cathrine Harboe-Ree, (available for re-election), Heather Gordon (available for re-election). On CEIRC, Philip Kent (available for re-election) and Colleen Cleary (Datasets Coordinators only serve one term). *(Action: DC)*

The meeting concluded at 5.30pm.
CAUL Executive Meeting 2008/4
4 August 2008
from 9am to 2pm
Monash University Conference Centre

DRAFT Minutes
(Updated 12/9/08)

1757. Attendance & Apologies. Andrew Wells (President), Cathrine Harboe-Ree (Deputy President), Heather Gordon, Greg Anderson, Imogen Garner (Treasurer). In attendance: Diane Costello.

1758. Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2008/3, 7 July 2008. The edited update was tabled at the meeting.

1759. Minutes of CAUL Meeting 2008/1. Action items were addressed at the last Executive meeting. In process. (Action: DC)

1760. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.
   a) National Library of Australia. Andrew Wells has written to the Director-General regarding preferred methods of communication with CAUL members.
   b) Open Access. Andrew Wells will discuss proposed CAUL Open Access activities with John Shipp. (Action: AW)
   c) CSIRO. Greg Anderson has discussed with Tom Girke the decision from the CEIRC review that CSIRO no longer be accorded an ex officio position on the CEIRC committee.
   d) MAMS. It was noted that the MAMS project will finish in 2008, so it will not be necessary for Howard Amos to attend the last meeting.
   e) Peak Bodies Forum. Heather Gordon queried the item on DRM – Greg Anderson will follow up. (Action: GA)
   f) CAUL strategic plan action 11. Workforce planning will be removed completely from the plan. (Action: DC)

1761. CAUL Elections 2008. The positions up for election are Cathrine Harboe-Ree, (available for re-election), Heather Gordon (available for re-election). On CEIRC, Philip Kent (available for re-election) and Colleen Cleary (Datasets Coordinators only serve one term.) (Action: DC)

STRATEGIC PLAN

1762. Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).
   22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative (Ad Hoc Working Group) The Go8 is committed to proceeding, but focussing more on contingent evaluation than return on investment.

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1763. CAUL Finances. Imogen Garner will use the feedback on her document re CAUL’s retained earnings to prepare a discussion paper for the CAUL meeting. (Action: IG)

b) **CAUL Budget 2008.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/budget2008.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/budget2008.xls) It was noted that the 2008 ADT expense is actually the 2007 payment, made after year-end because of the late receipt of the invoice. It was noted that President's expenses are currently running over the budgeted amount, but agreed that this figure is inevitably flexible because it is not possible to predict the meetings with government and other groups that may be required in any given year. The 2008 budget now includes new software for CEIRC operations; Diane Costello will document the number of hours and the costs of bringing an extra person online over the peak of the CEIRC processing in 2008 (agreed by the Executive). Diane Costello will prepare an estimate of the 2008 operational surplus for the next meeting. *(Action: DC)*

c) **CAUL Budget 2009.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/budget2009.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-docs/budget2009.xls) The 2009 draft budget was prepared by estimating CEIRC and other CAUL expenses, then calculating the income required to fully fund the CEIRC program - with the actual expected costs of $190,000.

To fund the CEIRC program fully through internal and external fees, retaining the 150% relativity, the following fees would apply:
- Internal fee: 2,250
- External fee: 3,380

The ADT program has been removed from the budget - if it is decided to restore it, the bottom line will be unaffected as the program has always been cost-neutral.

The CAUL membership fee needed to pay for the other CAUL programs and activities is $3,250 = $4,500 - $1,250, leaving the difference in total membership fees (CAUL + CEIRC) $350 cheaper overall (not counting the disappearing ADT levy)

This amount does not take into account a concomitant reduction in the CONZUL membership, so it was agreed initially to carry a 2009 deficit of $2,500. They will continue to pay 25% of the CAUL fee as their contribution to CAUL expenses. The presidents of CAUL and CONZUL will exchange letters to clarify this. *(Action: AW)*

It was noted CONZUL also pays one-sixth of statistics site maintenance costs. It has been agreed that CONZUL will pay the costs of their participation in any CAUL committees or working groups.

The CAUL constitution does not have a category for associate members. If such a category existed, what would be the implications for other institutions wanting to participate in CAUL. The constitution currently refers to “other nationally significant libraries in higher education institutions which are not represented on Universities Australia.”

It was agreed to write to CEIRC external participants to foreshadow the increase in fees and to call for intentions to renew their participation in 2009. *(Action: DC, GA)*

It was agreed to leave this budget as is for the moment.

It was noted that 3% was included in salaries increments for 2009 as it was actually 3% in 2008.

1765. **CAUL Web Site.**

   a) **Web Site Redevelopment.** A further discussion with the developer on July 16 promised a final statement of those sections of the site which needed to be hard-coded i.e. not able to be edited in the office. A tentative finish date was given as September, at which time the population of the site can begin. It should be noted that although there is a staffing allocation for migration of the data, it will initially require training of the office staff and the establishment of procedures and protocols.

**CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH**

1766. **CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).**

   Work-integrated learning was raised in discussions about trialling an EBSCO product in QULOC and in Queensland Health. It was suggested that CAUL might wish to sponsor a health information seminar to share knowledge about the range of products available and in use. It was suggested that this be a hot topic for the Newcastle meeting. **(Action: DC)**

   It appears that Thomson Reuters will be renegotiating the universities’ Web of Science agreement with Universities Australia. CONZUL has indicated that it would like to participate with CAUL, but it is not currently in CAUL’s bailiwick. It was agreed to write to Universities Australia to confirm their intentions regarding the negotiations and ask whether Universities Australia intends to negotiate for Scopus as well. A meeting will be arranged. **(Action: DC)** Elsevier is also talking to CAUL about an offer for Scopus.

   a) **CEIRC Review.** Greg Anderson has updated the actions in the review document as agreed. It was noted that Wiley-Blackwell is attending the September CEIRC meeting. Five responses have been received to the member survey on contract issues. Some consider that the difference between Blackwell and Wiley pricing is very high. A major concern is that the current agreements are not for the full collection and it is difficult having to manage new titles. The Go8 will nominate a representative for the ad hoc negotiating committee, which is also to include Greg Anderson and Diane Costello. **(Action: DC)**

1767. **Excellence in Research Australia (ERA).** The consultation paper was released early June, with responses due 30 June. [http://www.arc.gov.au/pdf/ERA_ConsultationPaper.pdf](http://www.arc.gov.au/pdf/ERA_ConsultationPaper.pdf) The government has asked for a report on the use of the ASHER funding. It was noted that this funding will continue in 2009.

   a) **ERA and Copyright.** Diane Costello has advised Alex Cooke that CAUL will continue to assist with publisher discussions regarding permissions to use content for the ERA. He has drafted a letter to the publishers who have agreed to allow universities to deposit publishers’ versions of their research output into dark institutional repositories advising them of the change from the RQF to the ERA, and a proposal to amend the current agreement as soon as the ERA protocols are finalised. **(Action: DC)**

1768. **Research Infrastructure.** The ARROW project still has unexpended funds, and is looking at options for good use of them e.g. Open access; Disability access; a CAUL program? A paper will be prepared for presentation to CAUL 2008/2. **(Action: CH-R)** It was noted that Peter Nicholson has replaced Clare McLaughlin as NCRIS support.

   Cathrine Harboe-Ree and David Groenewegen have discussed this with the ARC and DIISR and confirmed that repositories support under SII will not continue under the ANDS environment. They propose that the funds be used to support institutional repositories’ personnel and services. Institutional repositories now support a range of digital material in the HSS and the knowledge developed under these programs will be needed.
The ARROW community was asked to consider applying the ARROW surplus to support an ongoing community, preferably a national approach, and they agreed that, if CAUL were prepared to be involved, it could pay to provide ongoing central support e.g. a couple of staff at a reasonably high level based in an institution, to focus on where repositories are going and what is needed, to organise forums, for example on HERDC data or metadata etc – broader than any particular type of software.

It is thought that $500,000 could fund a couple of people for two or three years at which time CAUL could consider whether it wished to continue the funding. Good governance processes would be needed. The ADT has a process that could be mirrored for this. It would be seen as a CAUL program. It was recommended that the ADT fees collected for 2008 be used to supplement the ARROW funds.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree will submit a formal proposal to CAUL, with as much detail as possible, and a set of recommendations to generate conversation. CAUL should attempt to put it in place for 2009. It should be both support at the strategic and the technical committee, but the latter may be getting people together rather than solving specific problems, along the lines of the ADT technical committee. It could support the management of events. It will bring different software together and there are advantages in doing this. Working groups for specific areas or issues could be established e.g. to look at discovery services over the repositories. ANDS is very interested in the metadata group MACAR. ANDS is also interested in the health of repositories within institutions, an important place for storing content, though not the only one. It could take the RUBRIC toolkit and expand on it.

It was recommended that the Executive nominates the initial chair and calls for expressions of interest for the other positions. It was agreed that the committee should be no more than five or six. (Action: CH-R)

a) **ADT (Australasian Digital Theses) Program.** Andrew Wells was to develop a proposal for the September meeting. This will be now subsumed into the post-ARROW repository program.

b) **AeRIC (Australian eResearch Infrastructure Council).** Cathrine Harboe-Ree advised that the next meeting is August 5.

c) **ANDS (Australian National Data Service).** Cathrine Harboe-Ree reported that ANDS is on target to achieve its deliverables by August 31. The agreement and draft interim business plan are nearly complete. The position of Executive Director will be advertised. Discussions are being held with the original group of 40 involved in 2006, garnering affirmation of the business plan, interest in being involved and in the benefits of collaboration. Monash, CSIRO and ANU are leading the program.

d) **Australian Research Repositories Online to the World (ARROW) – Stage 2.** This item was discussed under item 1768.

e) **Australian Access Federation (AAF).** Keith Webster is now representing CAUL on the Steering Committee.

f) **MAMS/RAMP.** James Dalziel has been advised that Howard Amos will replace Eve Woodberry as CAUL’s representative on the Steering Committee. The program is being wound at the end of 2008 and can be taken off the agenda. (Action: DC)

1769. **Collections Council of Australia. Australian Framework and Action Plan for Digital Heritage Collections.** Linda Luther. Recommendations for CAUL response. CAUL has already responded to the national strategy, but it may not be sufficiently understood in the terms of reference for the BPWG. (Action: DC)

*That we respond to the National Strategy for Digital Heritage Collections to ensure the inclusion of university collections in their considerations, and encourage continued engagement with CAUL.*

That the Best Practice Working Group consider the CCA comments in relation to research performance of collecting organisations. How good is the performance of university libraries in supporting their scholars (both internal and external) and is there a need to develop measures for this?


**CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING**

1770. **Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC, formerly Carrick Institute)** Dates for grant applications were circulated to CAUL.

1771. **CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students to Support Teaching and Learning.** ESOS National Code Standard 14 and one of my colleagues queried whether we should make mention of this in our Principles document. Imogen Garner will draft an addition to the guidelines. *(Action: IG)*

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

1772. **Insync Surveys (formerly Rodski).** Helen Livingston provided a report on draft amendments to the survey questions. The questions were workshopped in November by Philip, Liz Curach, Keith Webster and Helen Livingston. The suggestions were then circulated to the BPWG and further refined at the April meeting in Sydney. Email feedback was also received from the group after that meeting.

It was suggested that the feedback on information resources is not very helpful because most respondents say they are inadequate, and questioned whether it could be broken down into something more meaningful. Some members are waiting to see if the comments analysis provides more information. It was noted that Monash has tracked the rising satisfaction rating with the increased expenditure on the collection. It was agreed that most students wouldn’t understand what is an institutional repository. It is not clear why books, etc are distinguished from electronic resources. It was considered best not to make radical changes. Feedback on section 6 will be sent to Helen Livingston. *(Action: DC)*

1773. **Staff Development.**

   a) **Universities Australia Library Staff Development Conference.** Feedback from delegates via their CAUL members has been very positive and it is recommended that CAUL run a similar session next year. As CAUL is already essentially responsible for the program, and delegates pay the conference fees and accommodation costs, the extra for CAUL would entail secretarial support for the program committee and arranging the venue and catering.

   Feedback from the participants has been made available, and was discussed by the Executive. It appears that the University librarians connect well with the delegates. All areas of the conference received very positive comments. It was agreed that it provides a good opportunity for the delegates to meet each other and to see each other in action.

   It was agreed that CAUL places a clear emphasis on its target group, the next generation of University librarians. The unique nature of this program should be retained, with its focus on what is happening in this environment. The smaller size, 20 instead of 30-35, of the recent event was good for bonding and interaction. There are usually 32 at CAUDIT-EDUCAUSE and at Aurora. It was agreed to run the next one within CAUL, and to consider its label. Andrew Wells will report to CAUL. It was agreed to include the feedback in the CAUL agenda papers. *(Action: DC)* Thanks were offered to the program committee - Andrew Wells, Heather Gordon, Judy Stokker and Diane Costello. It was agreed to ask presenters for copies of their presentations for the CAUL web site. *(Action: DC)*
b) **CAVAL’s Horizon Executive Leadership Programme.** Information about this program was circulated to CAUL on July 21. Applications close August 20. Graham Black and Andrew Wells have been approached to be mentors. QUT is planning to have two cadetships for recent graduates, with 3 month placements in various QULOC libraries. Curtin has trainee librarians in their final year.

c) **CAUDIT EDUCAUSE institute.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree completes her term on the faculty in 2009. The faculty will conduct a debrief in February and will nominate replacements.

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

**1774. Communication.** (Standing item)

a) **President’s Report.** The letter from the president re the access to university libraries for indigenous students will be circulated to the Executive **(Action: DC)**

b) **Public Relations/ Media Reports.**

c) **CAUL Report 2007.** (standing item) A review of progress against the strategic plan is being prepared. Diane Costello has invited committee chairs to nominate highlights for the report. **(Action: DC)**

d) **Executive Officer’s Report.** The report is appended to these minutes.

**1775. Submissions to Public Inquiries.**


Alex Byrne reported that the UTS submission to the Bradley Review will be hard-hitting and will emphasise how far Australian higher education has slipped over the last decade (low investment compared to OECD; quality behind US and Canada; etc), and it was recommended that it not be subtle or confused with detail.

He asked whether CAUL is planning to make a submission and wondered whether we should have something brief and hard-hitting to show how the investment in CAUL libraries lags compared with overseas comparators. He suggested that CAUL repeats the exercise of some years ago where its top university libraries were placed in the ARL list to show how far behind they were. It could be possible to do the same again using CAUL, ARL and SCONUL data, and perhaps some from Singapore, HK etc, and identify where Australia’s best funded university library ranks.

The Executive agreed that international comparisons were difficult because of the range of ways in which data were collected. At this late stage, it was agreed to affirm the earlier decision to leave this to the universities.

It was noted that a number of libraries have received funding under EIF, the Education Infrastructure Fund.


c) **Review of NCRIS Roadmap 2008.** National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy. [http://www.ncris.dest.gov.au/development_ffolder/roadmap_review_2008.htm](http://www.ncris.dest.gov.au/development_ffolder/roadmap_review_2008.htm) The exposure draft was released July 4, with responses due July 18. HSS has been added, and it was noted that both the NLA and the Collections Council were mentioned. CAUL’s response was prepared by Cathrine Harboe-Ree.

d) **Inquiry into Improving Access to Victorian Public Sector Information and Data.** [http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/edic/inquiries/access_to_PSI/default.htm](http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/edic/inquiries/access_to_PSI/default.htm) CAUL was
invited to respond. Submissions close August 22. Andrew Wells will draft a response. He added that it is a very good report, covering both access and a clear view of public sector information. He noted that it should address the discovery aspects, and there is no more need to have an open source solution in this area than in any other.  

**1776. Relationships with other organisations.**

- **CONZUL.** Andrew Wells attended the CONZUL meeting at the University of Auckland on July 31. He spoke positively of the meeting and the engagement with members.

- **CAUDIT & ACODE.**
  - **EDUCAUSE 2009.** May 2009. Standing Item. Imogen Garner reported that acceptance of refereed papers has now closed, but other papers are still being accepted.

- **National Library of Australia.**
  - **Peak Bodies Forum.** Greg Anderson’s report will be included in the CAUL agenda papers.  

- **SCONUL.**
  - **Library Access schemes - possible MoU with SCONUL.** This item will be removed from the agenda.  

**1777. CAUL Meetings.** From Keith Webster:...the offer to try to accommodate something then, or at another time in 2009 or 2010 stands. There may be some merit in coinciding with the International Medical Librarianship Congress which is also here, next year.

- **CAUL Meeting 2008/2.** Darwin, 18-19 September 2008. The venues for the meeting and the CAUL dinner are confirmed, and accommodation is also booked. It was agreed to use the same schedule as the Sydney meeting, finishing with a late lunch on Friday. Ruth Quinn would like to organise a reception. Diane Costello will call for hot topics from members.  
  
  Possible agenda items:

  - **Australian Research Council.** At present, Professor Margaret Sheil is confirmed for the morning of September 19. She has asked for guidance as to her presentation – a timing, key points, message to be delivered. It was suggested that this be a substantial session, perhaps 90 minutes, covering ERA and the accessibility framework, her views on what the ARC is doing and where it is going, opportunities for libraries within the ARC program e.g. how changes in the LIEF guidelines will affect library applications - talk for 40 minutes with questions for 20.  
    
    **(Action: DC) Hot Topic**

  - **AeRiC.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree will report on ANDS. Hot Topic

  - **SCOAP3.** Linda O’Brien has agreed to speak about this proposal, and could ask for individual engagement. Hot Topic

  - **CONZUL tour report.** Philip Kent or Greg Anderson, plus John Redmayne. This will be scheduled towards the end of the meeting. Hot Topic

  - **University of Melbourne.** Futures Commission follow up. Linda O’Brien will be asked to report under business arising.

  - **Shared storage arrangements - UKRR and Go8.** Vic Elliott has agreed to lead a discussion of inhibitors. Hot Topic

  - **Learning Spaces.** A new JISC paper has been released. *How new college buildings are creating the ‘wow factor.’* [http://www.jisc.ac.uk/news/stories/2008/05/rscevent.aspx](http://www.jisc.ac.uk/news/stories/2008/05/rscevent.aspx) If the program is full, this item could be held over to the Newcastle meeting.

  - **(1)** Keith Webster will provide an update on the Carrick Learning Spaces project at UQ, and the main colloquium for 2008 in early October. UQ plans to report on what they did for first year engineers.
(2) Philip Kent will speak about VU’s Learning Commons Evaluation project. It will also be reported on the following week at the UQ Spaces and Places conference). He reported on a recent meeting with Mary Somerville around LC Evaluation. She was highly complimentary about the nature of their evaluation work and noted that VU was venturing into some ‘hard’ areas with this work, and particularly their multi-disciplinary approach including Teaching and Learning staff. Hot Topic

viii) Institutional Repositories – moving forward, from ARROW, APSR, RUBRIC, ADT, etc. Cathrine Harboe-Ree will bring a proposal to the business meeting. (Action: CH-R)

ix) Performance Indicators. Customer satisfaction survey/Materials availability survey on behalf of the BPWG. Helen Livingston has reported that she and Philip Kent are scheduled to meet with Insync Surveys and will report to the CAUL meeting.

x) ILWG. The group is finalising a CAUL survey on members’ approach to information literacy. It is planned for the first two weeks of August, and the ILWG proposes a presentation to CAUL on the results. Hot Topic

xi) Copyright. Laura Simes, ALCC, has been working on a manual relating to the use of section 200AB of the Copyright Act. It will present many options which were not previously possible. Derek Whitehead will report on this, and other current developments such as a recent ADA press release and statement of principles http://www.digital.org.au/submission/ACTA.htm jointly with the IIA, CHOICE, and ALIA, with a focus on universities. Perhaps with the title “Everyone copyright police now?” Hot Topic

xii) Results of the QULOC eBook Survey. Martin Borchert has offered to do a presentation to show and discuss survey results on the awareness, acceptance and usage of eBooks at Griffith University and the University of Southern Queensland. A full paper will be later available at the 2009 Information Online Conference. QULOC members have already seen the presentation. Greg Anderson will introduce the segment. Hot Topic

It was noted that the survey covered the user perspective. Some interesting results have emerged from the EBL trial of user-selected acquisitions. The issue of textbooks is still fluid, while publishers are still protecting print.

xiii) Research Data Survey. Members noted the recent publication Investigating Data Management Practices in Australian Universities by Margaret Henty, Belinda Weaver, Stephanie Bradbury and Simon Porter. Australian Partnership for Sustainable Repositories (APSR) has also published a data management manual. It was agreed to ask Vic Elliott to speak to this item and include in the same session as the ANDS report. (Action: DC)

xiv) Library tour of CDU. Ruth Quinn will invite the Vice-Chancellor to the dinner.

b) CAUL Meeting 2009/1 - Newcastle, late March, early April, perhaps 2-3 April. Members accepted Greg Anderson’s offer to host CAUL. He noted that Tiger, Jetstar and Virgin now fly into Newcastle. Noah’s on the Beach and the Crowne Plaza are good options for venue and accommodation. Additional tours could be to the vineyards on the weekend and to the city campus.

Suggested topics:

i) RDA. Implications for CAUL institutions.

ii) Learning Skills. Are there other CAUL members responsible for learning skills? How is it related to information literacy. Cathrine Harboe-Ree

iii) AUQA. It was suggested having a ‘hot topic’ on AUQA round 2, for example, the changes in approach as experienced by SCU, Newcastle & Swinburne. It was noted that the Griffith report is due out soon.

c) CAUL Meeting 2009/2 - Brisbane, mid-September. It was agreed to organise in Brisbane. Keith Webster has offered to host a meeting, and has agreed to host it in 2009.
He noted that UQ will be hosting the International Congress on Medical Librarianship 31 Aug - 4 Sept 2009, expecting around 1,200-1,500 delegates and a major exhibition (http://www.icml2009.com/) at the Convention Centre. If there is interest in having CAUL meet shortly afterwards it would give colleagues an opportunity to do a bit of exhibition visiting etc if they wished. (Action: DC)

d) CAUL meeting 2010/1 - venue. It was suggested that it was time to return to Canberra, with the previous meeting held in 2006. (Action: DC)

e) CAUL meeting 2010/2 - venue. Members agreed that it not be held alongside IFLA as the event would be too big.

1778. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.

a) Draft schedule for 2008. Potential clashes:
   2008 - IFLA Québec City, Canada, 10-14 August; ALIA, Alice Springs, 2-5 September; EDUCAUSE, Orlando, Florida, 28-31 October; CNI Washington DC 8-9 December;
   Leave planned: Heather Gordon, October.

   ACODE 48 - University of Canberra from 20-21 November 2008

   2009 -
   2009 January 20-22 Sydney Information Online 2009;
   2009 January 23–28 Denver American Library Association;
   2009 March 30 - April 1 Torquay, UK UKSG;
   2009 April 10-13 - Easter;
   2009 April 15-18 ICOLC, Charlottesville, VA;
   2009 May 3-6 Perth, Western Australia EDUCAUSE Australasia;
   2009 July 9-15 Chicago American Library Association;
   2009 August Milan, Italy World Library and Information Congress: 75th IFLA;
   2009 November 3-6 Denver, Colorado EDUCAUSE.

i) 2008/5. Thursday 18 September in conjunction with CAUL 2008/2, Darwin

ii) 2008/6. November 27, Brisbane, in conjunction with CAUDIT and ACODE Executive Committees, November 27 from 9am to 11am. CCA will be organised and chaired by CAUL. The Executive will follow on the 27th. Note that Cathrine Harboe-Ree is unavailable on the 26th. and Heather Gordon is unavailable on the 27th because of a JCU senior staff conference. (Action: DC)

1779. Other business.

a) Statistics. It was noted that Craig Anderson is now chairing the committee. Leeanne Pitman has also joined the group. CONZUL members have asked for the collection to be started earlier.

b) Investment of CAUL reserves. It was agreed to move $150,000 into an investment account for 12 months then review. Diane Costello will prepare document which shows the cash flow requirements for the 12 months. (Action: DC)

c) Directors’ liabilities. JCU has asked all staff what directorships they hold, and they are especially interested if the institution hasn’t nominated the individual. Staff are being given the opportunity to attend a directorship course.

The meeting concluded at 1.30pm
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### 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**

CEIRC Meetings held on the 8 July and 1 September 2008.

### Achievements since last report

#### A. CEIRC Review

The recommendations of the CEIRC Review are being implemented. A summary of the recommendations and actions arising from discussion at the April CAUL and subsequent CAUL Executive meetings is available at: [http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting$/executive-meetings.html](http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting$/executive-meetings.html)

Items to note include:-

1. *An ad hoc* negotiation team (Greg Anderson, Diane Costello and Jocelyn Priddey) has been set up for the upcoming Wiley-Blackwell 2010-2012 deal.
2. The CEIRC Program is now closed to additional external members.
3. CONZUL will continue to pay the internal membership fee and will meet travel costs to attend CEIRC Committee meetings.
4. CSIRO will no longer have a representative on the CEIRC Committee and will pay the external member’s fee.
5. A standard notice has been incorporated into the election process to ensure members check their institution’s insurance cover to protect them against liability before standing or joining the CAUL Executive or CEIRC Committee.
6. Exit strategies for under-performing offers particularly looking at those with low take up over time will be implemented. The CEIRC Committee approved the removal of ALPSP Learned Journals Collection (ALJC) from the CEIRC Program at the September 1 meeting.
7. The role and responsibilities for the dataset mentoring program have been defined. Dataset coordinators will be invited to become mentors and be assigned to mentor new dataset coordinators.
8. The CEIRC Risk Assessment plan has been updated to incorporate the recommendations arising from the CEIRC review.

#### B. Product and Vendor Negotiations

*Wiley-Blackwell*

Representatives from Wiley-Blackwell met with the CEIRC Committee on 1 September to provide an overview of the 2010-2012 deal. Reed Elfenbein outlined the framework for a new combined agreement with CAUL to be finalised by April 2009. Main points from the discussion:-

- Wiley-Blackwell will recognise the level of expenditure with price caps, that have been in place for 9 years. Fees will be “about the same” in the old deal for “about the same content”.

---

**Author:** Greg Anderson  
**Date:** 10 September 2008  
**Date of previous report:** 22 April 2008
• Core subscriptions will need to be retained however there will be flexibility to subscribe to subject collections only or the full collection. The basis for calculating the top up fee to access the full collection will be based on a combination of a percentage of the cost of "unsubscribed" titles plus the size of the institution based on a 7 tier FTE-base which includes students and faculty members.
• A competitive Price Increase Cap (PIC) for a 3 year deal will be available.

Diane Costello will provide a brief overview of the discussion at the CAUL meeting.

CCH
CCH will provide the contents of the 2009 Academic Online Package to CAUL members well before January 2009. This package will be a fixed list of web titles and will run from October 1 2008 to September 1, 2009.

Fairfax Business Media.
Negotiations with Fairfax are progressing slowly. Contention remains over the price, lack of IP authentication capability and potential liability for unauthorised access.

C. Dataset Coordinators
The Advanced Excel training program for manipulating usage statistics was highly successful with 98 participants attending seminars in 7 cities in Australia and New Zealand. A surplus of $4,700 was generated due to a higher number of registrations than planned.

### Publicity, reports, publications since last report

Approved and draft minutes are available at:
http://www.caul.edu.au/meeting$/ceirc-meetings.html
Informal reports are posted via the CAUL mail list after each CEIRC meeting.

### Plan for forthcoming activity

Planning is well advanced for the 2009 Dataset Coordinators Forum which will be held in conjunction with Sydney Online, 20-22 January. The themes of the Forum will be the role of Dataset Coordinator mentors and e-book models.

Next CEIRC meeting will be held on 13 November 2008.

### CAUL budget implications

**CEIRC/CAUL Levy**
The principle of CEIRC Program funding has always been that the membership fees will fully fund the direct costs of the program. Previous budgets have been based on 35% of the Executive’s Officer's time and 85% for the assistant. Growth in the program means that these figures have grown to 60% and 92% respectively. For 2009, the CAUL Executive has proposed that the internal and external fees for CEIRC increase by 67%; from $1,350 to $2,250 for CAUL members and $2,025 to $3,380 for external members.

A shift in resources from CAUL to CEIRC activities will reduce the CAUL membership levy from $4,500 in 2008 to $3,250 in 2009. Therefore, the proposed overall cost to CAUL members for 2009 is $250 less than 2008.

### Recommendations to CAUL

Approve the increased CEIRC levy for internal and external members and the adjusted CAUL levy for 2009.
Note the remainder of the report.
Report from Wiley-Blackwell discussions at the CEIRC meeting, 1 September, 2008:

Wiley-Blackwell representatives attended the meeting from 10-12.30pm. Reed Elfenbein outlined the framework for developing the new combined agreements, and the planning process for completing a CAUL agreement for 2010-2012 by April 2009.

**Framework:**

Wiley-Blackwell will be offering a number of standard collections: Full, STM, Medical & Nursing, SSH. There will also be an option for a consortium to define its own collection, which may be a shared collection, or specified title-by-title.

Participants will be required to maintain their subscription base. Wiley-Blackwell will recognise the current expenditure, with the price caps that have been in place for 9 years, as the base spend. They will "lock in the savings already made against list prices and give further benefits across all holdings."

The basis for calculating the top-up fee will be a combination of a percentage of the cost of the "unsubscribed" titles and the size of the institution – in 7 FTE-based tiers, where FTE is the sum of students and faculty members. This will be adjusted so that CAUL subscribers pay "about the same price for the same content as before."

New, standardised pricing from 2009 --> list prices. Average price increase has been about 9%, Blackwell's was a little higher than Wiley's. Some titles FTE based pricing, most have a single fixed price (what proportion)

Standardised currencies, £, EUR and USD only – CAUL will pay in USD.

Core collection enables a price cap on current titles.

Titles lists confirmed in August for the following year.

Single site, not single institution (not clear how this is defined)

Complimentary subscriptions for the first two years of start-up titles, not just one.

Multi-year contract only – minimum of two years.

**Discussion:**

When members expressed concern about Blackwell pricing increasing to Wiley levels, Reed Elfenbein responded that they looked at pricing across the 5 discipline areas; generally starting this process every January; they may apply an average price increase across a program, but make exceptions for differences in individual titles; they still look at the history of the title, and a prestigious journal will continue to be priced higher than a lower level journal. There is no intention to establish pricing that will bring Blackwell journals to the level of Wiley or vice versa.

**Negotiation points:**

Wiley-Blackwell indicated that they may be able to be flexible regarding the base subscriptions, recognising that, over time, continued subscription to duplicates is unsupportable, and content changes may need to be made. Swapping of titles may be possible.

Perpetual access for the full collections back to 1997 for unsubscribed as well as unsubscribed titles. This would be clearer, and reduce administration for both Wiley-Blackwell and the institutions.

Clear principles for adding new titles to the consortium package should be developed. The standard formula is list price x (70% of number of members offering "advanced degrees" in relevant subject.)

Statistics of usage of start-up journals during the free period are needed.

Ask for an option for a one year contract with a higher price cap for those who don't want to commit for longer.

**Questions for Wiley: (Action: DC)**

Detailed usage reports for all institutions for all titles are needed by the time the detailed proposal is ready. Title by title selection – are the add-ons to the package under the same licence i.e. all institution-wide licence rather than site-specific licences as in the list price options.

Clarify access to perpetual content from Blackwell – QUT has a written statement from Blackwell that it applies to the full collection, not just subscribed titles.

**Timeframe for completing the contract:**

Wiley-Blackwell will start the subscription reconciliation process immediately so that correct subscriptions can be used for the detailed proposal.

By January 2009, Wiley-Blackwell will make a detailed proposal, for discussion at CEIRC in January.
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CAUL Australian Institutional Repository Support Services (CAIRSS), 2009-2011

Proposal to the Council of Australian University Librarians

1. Background

Through various Strategic Information Infrastructure (SII) projects, the Australian government has supported a number of initiatives that have driven the establishment and development of institutional repositories in higher education institutions in recent years. Through projects such as APSR, ARROW and RUBRIC considerable momentum has been achieved. This momentum is at risk of evaporating with the finalisation of all SII projects by the end of 2008.

While it is understood that all Australian universities currently have access to software in some form, most are still in the early stages of and setting up and populating their repositories. In addition, although Excellence in Research Australia (ERA) is not expected to rely as heavily on repositories as the Research Quality Framework (RQF) was going to, ERA will require some repository support, and the Accessibility Framework is expected to be dependent on institutional repositories to a great extent. Also highly relevant is the fact that the forthcoming Australian National Data Service (ANDS) will place the onus on universities to supply a greater level of repository support, as will the National Health and Medical Research Centre’s new Code for the responsible conduct of research.

During this period it has become clear that, while repository software offers challenges, there are many other aspects of repository management that also require guidance and assistance. Repositories are still relatively new – critical areas such as metadata, access control, copyright issues, collaborative options and policy are still in a state of flux, and most managers are still feeling their way around the issues.

Following discussions with the Department of Innovation (DIISR) and the CAUL Executive, the ARROW Management Committee is now proposing the establishment of a service with the suggested name of CAUL Australian Institutional Repository Support Service (CAIRSS), to provide support for all institutional repositories in Australian universities, regardless of the software being used. CAIRSS would be overseen by CAUL and funded in the main by ARROW, to provide support beyond the end of 2008.

2. Objectives

The recommended aims of CAIRSS are as follows:

1. Continue and expand forums, communication channels and other contact between repository managers and technical support staff across the sector.

2. Provide technical and practical advice on the running of repositories and the issues surrounding repositories (such as metadata, policy issues including copyright, etc), regardless of the specific software used.

3. Support the expansion of the role of repositories to assist them in becoming part of the Australian Data Commons, as defined by ANDS.

4. Provide an advocacy role of the needs of the group, as appropriate.
3. Proposed nature of the service

The primary function of CAIRSS would be to offer support for repository managers in the higher education sector in Australia. This would encompass the following:

• Provision of communication channels for repository managers, both software agnostic and software specific. This might include forums, meetings, seminars, development support or virtual communication.

• Support (such as meeting organisation or provision of communication channels) for interest groups across the sector, such as MACAR (Metadata Advisory Committee for Australian Repositories: http://macar.wikidot.com/) and the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADT). Other groups may also emerge, such as a group for technical support.

• Support and development of a toolkit, using the RUBRIC Toolkit (http://rubric.edu.au/packages/RUBRIC_Toolkit/) and other material as appropriate.

• Provision of technical and policy support for areas such as data migration, metadata, standards compliance, import and export, harvesting, ingest of new forms of digital material.

• Assistance with the integration of repositories with the requirements of the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) and the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) exercises.

• Assistance with the integration of repositories with the requirements of the Australian National Data Service (ANDS: http://ands.org.au) and the associated Australian Data Commons.

• Assistance with the understanding of managing copyright issues in the repository environment, and linking with other groups such as the OakLaw Project.

• Assistance with the application of best practice to help repositories meet the requirements of the Australian Access Federation (AAF) and the application of access control within the repository.

• Oversight of any outstanding ARROW Mini-projects, tracking open source code developed by the various Systemic Information Infrastructure projects (APSR, RUBRIC, ARROW, etc) and support for new software developments that might be required by the community.

• Adopting a watching brief on trends and developments in repositories, both in Australia and overseas, and acting as a clearing house for communicating these effectively across the sector.

4. Selection of service provider

In the interest of ensuring that the services provided are suitable and cost effective, it is recommended that expressions of interest be sought from CAUL members’ institutions. Not all services need to be provided by a single member, however this would be preferred. If the services are not offered by a single provider, the primary service provider must be asked to specify how services would be distributed and coordinated. In addition, the service provider may wish to host all their staff locally, or offer a more distributed model.
The expression of interest should indicate:

1. Details of how services will be provided.
2. Which elements of the proposed service model the primary service provider will be able to provide, and how other services will be provided.
3. The estimated annual cost of providing the service as described above, or a subset of that service if preferred, including staffing levels.
4. A description of the experience and knowledge that the proposed provider be able to apply to the service.
5. A willingness to travel to other institutions as needed.
6. The details of potential other service providers or collaborators, if any.

The service provider would need to provide regular reports on progress, activities and expenditure to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee would choose the service provider(s).

5. Governance

It is proposed that CAIRSS should be overseen by CAUL through a Steering Committee that would meet no less than twice per year (the Committee can determine whether it wants to meet in person or by teleconference). The Steering Committee should consist of a minimum of six and a maximum of ten participants from the following:

- Three members of CAUL, including one member from the CAUL Executive.
- Two repository managers, technical support staff or similar, from CAUL member institutions, to provide input on the issues affecting the running of repositories.
- A representative of the service provider(s)
- CAUL Executive Officer (ex officio)
- Representatives of other interested parties (e.g. the National Library of Australia, ANDS, CAUDIT (the Council of Australian Directors of Information Technology)) might also be asked to join, subject to requirements.

It is proposed that the initial Steering Committee membership be nominated by CAUL Executive Committee. The Steering Committee can then decide what process will be implemented to rotate or alter the membership.

It is also proposed that the Chair of the Steering Committee should be a CAUL member, and that the membership of the Committee should be reviewed annually.

6. Funding and costs

If CAUL accepts the proposition outlined in this paper, the ARROW Project would provide a sum in the order of $600,000, which is expected to cover a three year period. Institutions submitting proposals for running the service should specify how they would utilise the funds, and for what period.

It is recommended that the funds collected by CAUL for ADT support annually be transferred to CAIRSS, together with responsibility for providing an ongoing forum for considering ADT issues. These funds would supplement the amount available for CAIRSS. Please note that this has not yet been discussed with the ADT Policy Group.
The ANDS Establishment Project Management Committee has expressed strong interest in CAIRSS and has indicated that it would expect ANDS to fund discrete projects and initiatives.

The total funded amount will be paid to CAUL, to be disbursed in agreed instalments. The service provider will be required to provide regular financial statements to CAUL.

It should be noted that, with the bulk of the funds coming from Australian government sources, CAIRSS would be an Australian, rather than Australasian, service. However, such a service would generate information and create forums of relevance to New Zealanders, who would presumably be welcome to participate in many CAIRSS activities at their own expense.

7. Timelines
September 2008: Basic proposal is agreed by CAUL.
September 2008. Steering committee created.
September 2008: Call for expressions of interest to run the service.
November 2008: Decision is made on service provider(s).
November 2008: Funds sent to CAUL.
January 2009: Service provision begins.

8. Recommendations
1. That CAUL endorse the establishment of the CAUL Australian Institutional Repository Support Service (CAIRSS), as outlined in this paper.
2. That a Steering Committee be formed to select a service provider and oversee the service.
3. That approval be given to the notion of the funds collected by CAUL for ADT support annually be transferred to CAIRSS, together with responsibility for providing an ongoing forum for considering ADT issues, subject to ADT Policy Group approval.

This paper was prepared by Cathrine Harboe-Ree (ARROW Project Director) and David Groenewegen (ARROW Project Manager) in consultation with the CAUL Executive, the Department of Innovation and the Australian Research Council (ARC).

3 September 2008
## 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
Changeover to OAI-PMH harvesting continues with ten members now using their repository to deliver theses to the central ADT service, up from seven in March.

Members testing OAI-PMH harvesting from their repository are: Lincoln University, University of Wollongong, Monash University, Swinburne University and the University of New South Wales.

### Achievements since last report
**Membership**

The number of active members has risen by one to 41, with Monash University successfully testing the loading of records, to be followed by a full load soon.

**Theses**

At the end of August there were 25,462 theses that link to a digital version of the thesis. 23,473 have been contributed directly by members. A further 1,989 have been loaded from the National Bibliographic Database, which is slightly down from previous months due to the removal of duplicate records. There are 151,072 records for theses on the database altogether representing those without links to digital theses.

### Publicity, reports, publications since last report
Discussions were held with AUSTLII on 5 September to harvest and load relevant digital theses records from ADT into the AUSTLII service.

### Plan for forthcoming activity
**ADT Policy Group**

ADT Policy Group to be convened to discuss future of program in light of CAIRSS proposal (elsewhere in agenda papers).

### CAUL budget implications
UNSW does not propose to invoice CAUL for the 2008 management fee, but proposes that fees collected from CAUL for the ADT in 2008 be incorporated into the CAIRSS fund. (elsewhere in CAUL papers)

### Recommendations to CAUL
Incorporate program in CAIRSS (subject to discussion at meeting)
**CAUL Strategic Plan**


**Report to CAUL**

**Author:** Ruth Quinn  
**Date:** 9 September 2008  
**Date of previous report:** 2 March 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contribution to Teaching and Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>2. Review global best practice in information literacy and make it available to CAUL members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Information Literacy Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Activity since last report** | 2 Teleconferences held and one face-to-face meeting will be held 18 Sep. Minutes of meetings available on CAUL website [http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/ilwg.html](http://www.caul.edu.au/info-literacy/ilwg.html) – ILWG meetings  
Approved access to the Info Skills Survey instrument for a QUT student who had difficulty accessing information – info lit web pages amended by Diane as a result to ensure clarity  
Activity in the area of IL generally since last CAUL meeting documented – see attached at the end of this report |
| **Achievements since last report** | Survey of University Librarians re Info Lit finalised and circulated to CAUL – results to be presented to September meeting |
| **Plan for forthcoming activity** | IL Practitioner survey to be conducted early 2009 |
| **CAUL budget implications** | None so far – CDU currently absorbing teleconference costs |
| **Recommendations to CAUL** | That the report be noted |

Pro-forma updated 29 July 2008
1. **Significant reports/reviews/publications on IL since last meeting**
   - Sheila Webber has updated Seven Headline Skills: [http://www.sconul.ac.uk/groups/information_literacy/headline_skills.html](http://www.sconul.ac.uk/groups/information_literacy/headline_skills.html)
   - Whole issue of ITALICS, v.5, issue 1 on the topic of Information Literacy: challenges of implementation: [http://www.ics.heacademy.ac.uk/italics/vol5iss1.htm](http://www.ics.heacademy.ac.uk/italics/vol5iss1.htm)
   - Whole stream of IL at the Lifelong Learning Conference held in Rockhampton by CQU held in June 08, proceedings now available: [http://lifelonglearning.cqu.edu.au/2008/program.htm](http://lifelonglearning.cqu.edu.au/2008/program.htm)
   - UNESCO have a published a report called *Towards Information Literacy Indicators*: Conceptual framework paper prepared by Ralph Catts and Jesus Lau. UNESCO, Paris, 2008. It provides a basic conceptual framework for measuring information literacy and is designed to serve as a reference to facilitate the elaboration of information literacy indicators.
   - The Research Information Network (RIN) has published the results of a study, *Mind the skills gap: Information-handling training for researchers* (June 2008), that reviews the extent, quality and impact of information literacy teaching for academic researchers: [http://www.rin.ac.uk/training-research-info](http://www.rin.ac.uk/training-research-info)

2. **Awards or citations given in the area of IL since last meeting**
   - Carrick Citation 2008: The University of Newcastle. Debbie Booth, Michael Carr, Susan Day, Ann Stokes and Helen Lloyd. For the development of an online resource that assists students to learn bibliographic referencing and that has been acclaimed nationally and internationally

3. **Government activity in the area of IL since last meeting**
   - None
### 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

1. CAUL (Meeting 2008/1 Agenda item 849) endorsed the *Principles for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to Support Teaching and Learning* and the document is on the ULA web site.

2. ULA content on the CAUL web site being updated in line with the review endorsed by the ULA-WG.

#### Achievements since last report

CAUL Principles for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to Support Teaching and Learning revised to reflect:

- Standard 14 in the 2007 version of the National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students
- AUQA’s TNE Framework 2008

These changes reflect similar changes in the CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students.

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

- Ongoing review of the web page content and structure

#### Plan for forthcoming activity

Ongoing review of the web page content and structure

#### CAUL budget implications

None

#### Recommendations to CAUL

That CAUL note the updated *Principles for Library Services to Onshore Students at Remote Campuses to Support Teaching and Learning* (attached)

Pro-forma updated 29 July 2008
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CAUL Principles and Guidelines 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 at 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 form a significant cohort of students enrolled at onshore remote campuses. IDP Education Pty Ltd estimates that the total enrolment of international students at Australian universities in Semester 1, 2007 was 210,956 or 17.3% of the total student population in Australian universities. Of these, 70% study onshore. The importance of quality assurance for international and transnational education, and hence of services to these students, is recognised by the Australian government, The Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) and Universities Australia.

The Australian Government’s National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students Standard 14 requires that registered providers must have and implement policies and procedures to ensure their staffing and resources (which specifically include library resources) are adequate and have the capabilities as required by the quality assurance framework applying to the course. Where the course is not subject to an appropriate quality assurance framework, the registered provider must ensure it has adequate resources as are needed to deliver the course to the students enrolled and ensure that the resources and premises are sufficient to support students to achieve their course outcomes.

The Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) conducts audits of Australian Universities, components of which include consideration of transnational education (TNE) and library support services. The TNE Quality Framework of AUQA (Section xiii) published in 2008 addresses the assessment, provision and evaluation of library services including access to library services and resources, how they are determined and evaluated, how they compare with services provided at the home campus.

Universities Australia in its publication Universities and their Students: Principles for the Provision of Education by Australian Universities states that universities 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, Australian universities should ensure that the quality of academic provision and academic support services offered under the arrangement are comparable to that offered by the Australian university with regular quality assurance guidelines being evaluated.”

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.

Definitions

1. **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.

2. **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.

3. **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.

4. **Types of Onshore Remote Campus Arrangements**

These Principles and 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, costing models and partner agreements.

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 partner agreements, 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.

Related CAUL Documents

CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students to Support Teaching and Learning (http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/offshore.html)

Appendix 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)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students
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 offshore campuses of Australian universities.

There has been significant growth in the number of students studying at offshore campuses of Australian universities over the last 10 years. In 1994 there were around 10,000 such students; in 2003 there were over 40,000.

The total enrolment of international students in Australian universities has increased to an estimated 210,956 in semester 1, 2007. International students represent approximately 17.3% of the total population of Australian university students. In addition, there are an estimated 61,331 transnational students, of whom approximately 11,622 are studying off-campus (distance/online) and estimated 49,709 students are studying at offshore campuses. (http://www.idp.com/research/fast_facts/higher_education.aspx).

Australian university librarians have responded to the development of offshore courses in a variety of ways. These include the establishment of new campus libraries offshore, arrangements for provision of services by local partners; agreements for service provision from other local libraries and provision of electronic services from the onshore library in Australia.

It is important that students studying on offshore campuses have access to library information resources and services that are monitored through quality assurance mechanisms.

There are currently no international standards which could be applied to the Australian situation. Standards which have been developed in the UK and the U.S. fall into the category of services for off campus students rather than services for offshore students.

The Australian Universities Quality Agency conducts audits of Australian Universities, components of which include consideration of transnational education (TNE) and library support services. The TNE Quality Framework of AUQA (Section xiii) published in 2008 addresses the assessment, provision and evaluation of library services including access to library services and resources, how they are determined and evaluated, how they compare with services provided at the home campus.

The Australian Government’s National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students Standard 14 provides that providers must have and implement policies and procedures to ensure their staffing and resources (which specifically include library resources) are adequate and have the capabilities as required by the quality assurance framework applying to the course. Where the course is not subject to an appropriate quality assurance framework, the registered provider must ensure it has adequate resources as are needed to deliver the course to the students enrolled and ensure that the resources and premises are sufficient to support students to achieve their course outcomes.

Universities Australia’s Code of Practice and Guidelines for Provision of Education to International Students provides that Australian universities should endeavour to provide services and facilities ‘at a level equivalent to a counterpart university/learning environment in the host country’.

CAUL Principles for Library Services to Offshore Students
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 offshore campus library resources and services.

Definition of Offshore Student

An Offshore Student is considered to be a student who is enrolled in an Australian higher education course and who is undertaking study offshore with the home institution’s staff or with local staff employed by, or employed in consultation with, the home institution.

Definition of Offshore Staff

Offshore 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 Offshore and Distance Education Students

Distance Education Students are considered to be Australian (or overseas) based students 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 Offshore Arrangements

These Guidelines apply to a wide variety of offshore arrangements including:

- Direct teaching at a local institution
- Partnering with a local educational institution to teach an Australian course
- A commercial partnership with a local agent to teach an Australian course.
- A fully-owned and run offshore campus of an Australian university.

Principles

1. Offshore Students will have access to core library services and information resources to support their learning.
2. Offshore Students will be authenticated for remote access to a range of library services and information resources arranged by the home institution.
3. Appropriate access to the home library’s services and information resources should be made available to the partner teaching and support staff to support offshore teaching and learning.
4. The home institution’s planning, accreditation, quality assurance and decision-making processes will take into account the requirements for offshore students to access library information resources and services.
5. The cost of providing library services and information resources to offshore students shall be recognised in university budget allocations and costing models.
Guidelines

1. Planning

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

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

1.3 Student computer workstations should meet minimum hardware and software specifications which enable offshore students to access home library electronic services and information resources.

1.4 The home institution or partner must ensure access to internet enabled computers with bandwidth suitable for accessing home institution electronic library services and information resources. National filters should not prevent access to teaching materials and resources.

1.5 The Library should confirm whether proposed locally provided library services and resources are adequate for the offshore student cohort and academic programme/s.

1.6 The Library may facilitate agreements with local library providers to provide adequate services and information resources for offshore students.

2. Library Services and Information Resources The Library should ensure access to adequate levels of service and information resources for offshore students and the academic staff teaching them.

The core services should include:

2.1 Access to a range of electronic information resources, reflective of those provided to onshore students; for example electronic journals and databases, e-reserve articles, past examination papers, lecture notes etc.

2.2 Licence agreements for electronic information resources should include access for enrolled offshore students and registered staff.

2.3 Access to a range of appropriate library information communication services (e.g. phone, postal, email, web etc), including a virtual help service which provides assistance with passwords, access and guidance in the selection and use of resources.

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

2.5 Access to a document delivery service for designated offshore student cohorts and academic staff.

2.6 Advice for academic staff on library services and information resources available prior to programs being offered offshore, including information literacy training for academics to enable them to assist offshore students.

2.7 Feedback mechanisms and quality assurance processes to monitor the quality and appropriateness of the library services and information resources available to offshore students.
2.8 Library staff at the home institution may need to liaise with offshore library providers to facilitate access to locally provided library services and information resources. If physical collections at local sites are to be provided, consultation with academic staff regarding development of those collections may be required. It will be important that if services specific to offshore-located students are provided, these are very clearly communicated to students through the website and other communication mechanisms.

3. **Funding.** The cost of providing library services and information resources to offshore students and staff should be recognised in costing models and funding disbursements.

3.1 The Library should receive adequate funding for the offshore services and information resources provided.

3.2 Specific charges may need to be negotiated for additional services e.g., creation of learning centre/library offshore print collection, and additional licence costs for offshore campuses.

3.3 Payments to local library providers may be necessary to ensure access and borrowing privileges for offshore students and staff.
## OFFSHORE 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 offshore.

### A. LOCAL (offshore) RESOURCES AND LIBRARY FACILITIES

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details of existing collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do the students have access to computer facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer facilities details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do the students have Internet access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet access details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What study areas are available for students? e.g. for private study, group study, silent study, internet access, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study areas details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 offshore partner/institution?

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

(NB Print resources are not normally available to offshore students.)

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)
### Section
3. Delivering quality and value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Collect and publish statistics on Australian university library outputs and activities (CSFG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>CAUL Statistics Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>A meeting/teleconference was held at RMIT on September 2. It was Craig Anderson’s first meeting, and his first as chair. The collection of 2007 is all but finalised, awaiting one CAUL response. DEEWR data was received earlier this year than last, but the previous year’s population data was used again as an interim measure so that members could perform analyses before the full population data was available. All were asked to report on their e-book statistics, and comment on how they currently collect their e-book data. This data is yet to be analysed but it was noted that this is being handled in a great variety of ways at the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>Cathie Jilovsky is preparing specifications for proposed amendments to the online statistics site, to improve and expand usability of the site. Some suggestions are: the ability to generate the annual results spreadsheet directly from the data rather than being prepared as a separate exercise; that a currency conversion function be included, from NZD to AUD; to allow the input data to be made available progressively rather than waiting for the complete input; integrating the deemed list into the site, etc. Members will be invited to respond to a call for expressions of interest in compiling the deemed list for the next collection. It is proposed that this take place to enable the compilation to be prepared in December/January. This was approved by CAUL in 2007. The 2003 CAUL survey will be reviewed to determine if it needs redoing. The BPWG has been invited to consider whether particular KPIs might be instituted for CAUL, and whether additional data needs to be collected to support them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CAUL budget implications

Budget implications will be known when the specifications for the site enhancements have been completed. They will be presented to the Executive in the first instance.

The cost of outsourcing the deemed list is yet to be determined, but is not expected to be significant.

### Recommendations to CAUL

That CAUL endorses in principle further enhancements to the statistics site and authorises the Executive to commit appropriate funds in 2009.

---

Pro-forma updated 29 July 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wonderful to hear similar experiences at other universities and University libraries - Has given me the inspiration to look outside and upwards to build my knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very well structured and an excellent opportunity to liaise with others/ share ideas and discuss what is happening in other places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My personal objectives have definitely been met. The seminar has been exceedingly helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I wasn't sure of the value of the program but found that it exceeded my expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hoping for an opportunity to hear about the experiences of others and the current issues in the sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It was a great opportunity to do some high level thinking around management topics in libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good for trend analysis, best practice and ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Affirming - openness and honesty of speakers - positive about future of ULs great bunch of people; practical advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent; very useful on many fronts. Thankyou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wonderful how prepared the Uls were to be so honest and open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you rate the overall structure and balance of the seminar?

4
5 Good mix with honest and open interaction
5
5 Excellent to hear the views of experts
   Generally really good - long first day (but also really good) and mix9?) on
4 second day
4
4
4
4
5

5 It is good to have the interview to state personal experiences
4 Perhaps more in promoting(?) changes to students
5

5 Very well balanced - intersting sessions, good length, lots of networking time

High

5 Useful mix of presenters and topics to cover major issues in sector
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>How would you rate the overall quality and relevance of the sessions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 10 July 2008</td>
<td>Dr Glenn Withers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Very enlightening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 I learnt a lot - looked at things from a new perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A helpful overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Set the context pretty well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Very interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Perhaps more on changes since the election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Rushed things so missed a lot of the content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Very relevant and interesting overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the top 3 challenges I am facing</td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sessions were all interesting and varied. Maxine’s story about how she achieved approval for a new building understated the work involved, I’m sure. John is brave undertaking his alliance (?) with IT but he is committed and will be successful, I’m sure. Shirley’s challenges were very different and offered insight into a different library structure.

I really liked the honesty and openness of the presenters - their willingness to share, quite openly, their experiences.

All different but all relevant and interesting.

5 Best session! All? Very (?) levels (?)

I think that the group work could have been more specific and challenging. The questions were a bit easy.

Very good sessions but found the breakfast session not as valuable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR issues and industrial framework</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>David Ward</th>
<th>Ian Argall</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obvious challenges ahead. Highlighted various areas to keep an eye on in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These sessions were both so informative and dealt with real problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>An honest assessment of the reality of managing in this complex area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These were the best 2 sessions. Very relevant and informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David's case studies were particularly interesting and relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always great to hear /be informed about industrial and HR issues. Managing staff remains my greatest challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not learn a lot more about HR conflict. Would have preferred more about innovation(?) in HR practice(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the session could have been broader in coverage rather than focused specifically on UNSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising - What should libraries be doing?</td>
<td>John Shipp</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Interesting - not something I have thought much about as yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Very amusing speaker and skilled at audience engagement. John dealt with what I find an uncomfortable subject with wit stories and honesty. This is not an area I have experience with but given the funding models may become more imperative for libraries to learn how to manage in future. Useful tips.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Very entertaining. Useful advice delivered in a memorable format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 very entertaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>I felt this session was the least directly relevant and was a bit too long. There were other parts of the program that would have usefully been longer and this shorter. (But I realize that availability of some speakers only at particular times was probably a factor here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Not my favourite subject but a great performance with real experience to impart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Very entertaining but at the same time a useful insight into the area of fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>It's interesting that we don't know that there are so much potential doners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 John Shipp is always entertaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Great storyteller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Very entertaining. Perhaps would have been improved by having two perspectives - one GO8 and one less affluent institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Very entertaining but also very valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration: with peak bodies like CAUDIT as well as at organizational level</td>
<td>Cathrine Harboe-Ree</td>
<td>Graham Black</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>These sessions highlighted plusses and minuses involved when collaborating. Lots of strategies were outlined and the presentations were clear and well articulated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>I really appreciated the honesty of these presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4 High</td>
<td>Very interesting especially the analysis by Graham about the content/IT/pedagogy relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 5</td>
<td>Really interesting and candid. Quite thought provoking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td>Interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4 High</td>
<td>Good perspective on the complexities and the issues around the reasons for and against collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 High</td>
<td>Good to know the good and bad side of collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>Cathrine was very interesting(?) Graham ? ? ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Heather Gordon</td>
<td>Andrew Wells</td>
<td>Craig Anderson</td>
<td>Felicity McGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. How would you rate the venue and meals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Venue was good with lots of good food supplied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High quality venue and excellent meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Great - especially being away from the CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Good food and comfortable venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The restaurant for lunch was excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Food V good. Location terrible for Sydney people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.5 How would you rate the seminar dinner venue and meal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent menu, food on the table so quickly and quality excellent (delicious)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A wonderful conference dinner. Beautiful food promptly served. Pleasant and conveniently located venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5 Local and great food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 Excellent food!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Delicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. How would you rate the Universities Australia administration of the seminar, including enrolment process and the administrative support during the seminar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seemless - everything just flowed so smoothly. Congratulations to Susan and Arminia High Bouquets to all involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>An excellent ratio of top presenters: delegates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It was a bit stop start before it was confirmed and really wasn't very well promoted. I am unsure if this is a UA problem or @ uni librarian level of ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. Any other feedback, suggestions or comments?

Comments
I'm glad I had the opportunity to attend such a wonderful event - its clear to see why our ULs are in the position they are - they stand apart and are a great inspiration.
So sad to hear this is the last of these sessions.
I've been in the sector a long while but I've grown a lot over the last two days.
I have found this seminar extremely useful and relevant. I hope that something equally as good will be arranged for people in the future.
I really valued the openness and obvious commitment (time, content/honesty, etc) of the participating University Librarians and others - this made the program. Always useful networking opportunities too but the opportunity to openly engage with our library leaders was great.
Well managed and conducted event. Very useful to have big picture perspectives and to discuss issues with colleagues.
This is the second of these conferences I have attended. Both very relevant, interesting, and informative.
Please lets keep something like this going It was a great opportunity for me.
n/a
n/a
Hope to continue such event.
Perhaps hold the conference in a more central location so it can be combined with follow up visits and tours of other libraries.
Great if the good work could be continued. Particularly enjoyed final panel.
n/a
n/a
Hope these can continue in the future despite lack of UA support.
An extremely useful seminar. I hope CAUL takes on the responsibility of running similar seminars or opportunities in the future.
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Date of previous report: March 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Advocacy and Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Relationships with other organisations – Libraries Australia Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Linda Luther and Anne Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity since last report**
The Libraries Australia Advisory Committee has not met since the last report. OCLC governance – congratulations to Vic Elliott on his election as a delegate from the Asia Pacific region to the Members Council.

Debbie Campbell is continuing her round of meetings with University Librarians. Some more meetings have been scheduled for September, and others will occur after the Libraries Australia forum.

Regarding end user access, which was demonstrated at the last CAUL meeting, Debbie advises that it has to be specifically activated by Libraries Australia because of the many options to choose from. Then each library has to select further parameters once it is set up. Contact Libraries Australia via the Help Desk in order to set it up. There is information on personalisation in the Libraries Australia Search Manual http://www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/documents/LibrariesAustraliaSearchManual.pdf, pp. 146-149, including the benefits and how to set it up.

**Achievements since last report**
The number of records containing non-roman scripts has increased significantly. This will be of interest to scholars of these languages or cultures.

Authority records
- Chinese – 3972
- Japanese – 99
- Korean – 61

**Bibliographic records**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Script</th>
<th>Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>21264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>438799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrillic</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>8186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>339350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>101639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any script that is supported in Unicode UFT-8 can be loaded into the NBD via the Record Import Service. Any library not using RIS can contact Libraries Australia http://www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/batch.html.

There will be brochures at the CAUL meeting with further information.

**Publicity, reports, publications since last report**
None
| **Plan for forthcoming activity** | The Libraries Australia forum will be held in Sydney on 23 October 2008 at the Powerhouse Museum. Registration is only $135, so it is hoped that many librarians from the Sydney area will be able to attend. The Libraries Australia forum provides an opportunity to participate in discussions regarding the strategic directions of Libraries Australia. The next Libraries Australia Advisory Committee will be held in conjunction with the Forum |
| **CAUL budget implications** | None |
| **Recommendations to CAUL** | It is recommended that CAUL note the report |
Notes from the Peak Bodies Meeting – NLA 09/05/08

1. National Site Licensing and the future of ERA (Pam Gatenby)
   - ERA is now 1 year old with 470 participants. Collectively there are 1,000 subscribers to 9 products which are offered on an opt in/out basis. The workload for managing the consortia is significant due to the low take up of offers.
   - Consortia supports calendar/financial budget cycles with consideration to amalgamate with the NSW consortium.
   - 1st User Forum on Monday (11/09/08) to consider issues including removal of confidentiality clauses, perpetual access and meetings with publishers. CAUL has been invited to attend.
   - Offer to CEIRC to move some of the non-higher ed. offers to ERA. ERA would be interested in a list of CEIRC subscriptions/deals.
   - I summarized the main outcomes of the CEIRC Review including the recommendation not to extend membership.

2. OCLC membership (Pam Gatenby)
   - All Libraries Australia subscribers have access to unlimited searching via WorldCat which has recorded an increase in the number of searches since 6.9m records were loaded in 2007. The NLA is still developing processes to regularly upload records.
   - Only signed up members to the Resource Sharing service on WorldCat can request or receive documents which should address CAUL members’ concerns about their holdings being loaded onto WorldCat.
   - Members of Library Australia can vote for a representative on the WorldCat committee. The recent election process was a shambles with the NLA being kept in the dark about the process. Vic Elliot was nominated and appointed.

3. Physical library spaces (Greg Anderson)
   - I highlighted issues affecting the re-use of library space to support emerging styles of learning using a PowerPoint presentation. Similar issues are confronting other sector libraries. The presentation is available at:

4. Workforce issues (Greg Anderson/Derek Whitehead)
   - Derek and I provided an overview of CAUL’s perspective on workforce planning focusing on issues raised in CAUL’s response to the ALIA’s Workforce Summit. The discussion incorporated item 8. Education for information with general agreement that the Summit was less than satisfactory in terms of addressing the problems affecting the sector. These include an urgent need for employers and library educators to meet to ensure that curriculum is aligned with employer requirements and expectations. A forum is planned for 2009. There was also a suggestion for educators to share course modules across institutions although this is occurring to some extent. There was also concern that the image of the profession is failing to recruit the “bright & young” to the profession. ALIA’s role in course recognition was important however it was noted that some employers did not understand the significance of this and were employing unqualified people into professional roles. It was noted that recruitment of non-library qualified staff with other skills and qualifications e.g. marketing was a growing trend in the Higher Education sector.
   - Sue Hutley (ALIA) took the comments on board and emphasized ALIA’s willingness to work more closely with educators and employer groups to identify current gaps, develop strategies to recruit new blood into the profession and continue to develop life long learning programs to support staff development. ALIA
will be spending $15-20K attending trade fairs during 2008 to assist with recruitment initiatives.

5. **E-Research, data management (Derek Whitehead)**
   - Derek provided an overview of what is e-research and the government’s initiatives including NCI, ANDS, copyright, Shibboleth and the issues specific to eResearch and libraries. Cathrine Harboe-Ree’s power point presentation was extremely useful (thanks!).
   - Warwick Cathro suggested that there should be greater recognition of the needs of humanities researchers with the implementation of a national digitization strategy.
   - Other issues raised in the discussion included the need to develop skill sets to support data management and digitization across all sectors.

6. **Re-imagining Library Services Strategic Plan (RLSP) - National & State Libraries Australia (Margaret Allen)**
   - The RSLP is a collaborative strategy to put clients at the centre of NSL services and focuses on making content available to all. Three strategies involving ten “quick win” projects include:
     - Redefinition of service models ensuring users have a consistent and easy experience across NSL libraries.
     - Embedding a transformed culture and workplace which promotes client culture and supports new services using emerging technologies.
     - Ensuring content accessible and clients are empowered to find, share and create content.
   - Although the RSLP was acknowledged as a positive strategy concern was raised that although some of the strategy overlaps with other sectoral activities, NSL is not looking to include non NSL partners. It was also recognised that the level of involvement of the public library sector still needs to be defined.

7. **Managing Special Collections (Margy Burns)**
   - Management and promotion of special collections is a cross sectoral activity providing opportunities for closer collaboration although this is potentially restricted to NSL due to the boundaries of the RSLP. The NLA will be promoting the use of standardizes tools e.g. the Archivist tool kit. Margy also provided an update on the NLA’s map digitization project. Progress as of 31 December 2007: 7225 items, consisting of 13 704 images, from the National Library’s Maps Collection have been digitised.
   - The Library’s long term plan is to complete digitisation of the following categories of its map material:
     - pre-1900 maps
     - post-1900 out of copyright Australian maps, including topographic and other series mapping at large, medium and small scales published by national and state mapping authorities; these total over 200 000 items
     - cadastral county and parish maps, road and tourist maps, electoral maps and other thematic mapping held for all Australian states and territories.

8. **Resource Description and Access (RDA) link. (Pam Gatenby)**
   - RDA is the new descriptive cataloguing standard that will replace AACR2 in 2009. Two international bodies are responsible for development of RDA; the Joint Steering Committee for RDA (JSC) and the Committee of Principles (CoP). Membership of these two groups is drawn from professional associations in the
US, Canada and the UK as well as the Library of Congress, the British Library and the NLA.

- JSC is responsible for developing the new rules in consultation with stakeholders and report to the CoP which is responsible for overarching policy, budget and management issues.
- RDA goes beyond AACR2 providing guidelines on cataloguing digital as well as traditional resources. It has a strong emphasis on resource discovery via relationship management between creators and works by clustering bibliographic records for different editions, translations or physical formats of a work using FRBR (Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records). RDA will support integration of library catalogue records with those produced by other metadata communities.
- RDA records will be compatible with AACR2 and will reside side-by-side in online catalogues and there will be no need for retrospective conversions although there will be some global changes to headings. Some changes to cataloguing systems will be required locally to receive records from Libraries Australia and WorldCat. The NLA will be working with LMS vendors.
- Key dates are:-
  - August – October 2008; final draft via online tool available for comment.
  - March 2009; RDA is published.
  - March – December 2009; preparing for implementation (developing workflows, testing export/import, preparing training modules & documentation).
  - Early 2010 – Implementation.

- Communication strategies will involve an RDA section on the ACOC website (already there) including what is happening in Australia. An RDA email list is scheduled to be launched at the end of May. Brochures and a series of articles will appear in InCite etc. RDA will be featured at the ACOC seminar in Sydney on Oct 24th.

9. Newspaper Digitisation Program (Pam Gatenby)
   - The Australian Newspaper Digitisation Program commenced in late 2006 with an aim to digitize 1 major newspaper from each state and territory for the period 1893-1954 with coverage of papers in regional areas to be considered down the track.
   - 1m pages have been scanned using a commercial firm. Another firm is converting scanned images to OCR which is a far slower process with only 50,000 pages completed.
   - The NLA will be developing a search and retrieval system which should be available in 2009 and be offered free of charge. Links will be available via People Australia e.g. obituaries.

10. Rights Management System: NLA (Warwick Cathro)
   - The NLA is implementing a “Rights Management System” to predict the copyright status of collection items. Warwick noted that he was interested in pursuing interoperability with CAL.

11. VuFind (Warwick Cathro)
   - The NLA intends to replace its Voyager OPAC system with VuFind which is an open source resource OPAC system offering Web 2.0 capabilities, tag clouds, searching across multiple resource collections and will support CJK. VuFind does require in-house technical support. If successful, the NLA will consider developing other open source modules.
12. **IFLA 2010 (Derek Whitehead)**
   - Derek reminded participants that the 76th IFLA 2010 will be held in Brisbane in August 2010 with 4-5,000 delegates expected to attend. Satellite meetings will be held in other locations around Australia.
   - The theme of the Conference is *Libraries: Engaging, embracing, empowering*
   - ALIA will not be holding its biennial conference in 2010.

13. **NLA Strategic Directions – input from Peak Bodies (Jan Fullerton)**
   - The NLA will be redefining its strategic directions for the next 3 years and invites input and suggestions. The new strategy will have strong links with the RSLP. The new plan will be ready for 2009.

14. **Relevance of Peak Bodies (Jan Fullerton)**
   - Jan sought feedback on the value of holding the meeting. Overall, the feedback was positive and there was general agreement that the meeting was worth having. It was also noted that the matters discussed at the current meeting were beneficial to the participants.


Greg Anderson
The purpose of the Round Table was to bring together representatives of peak bodies and national programs in the Australian collections sector. Through sharing information and building awareness of ‘hot topics’ within the sector, challenges facing the sector were identified. This will inform the Collection Council’s planning, including for its next Summit in 2009 on *Sustainability and collections*.

There were 33 bodies represented at the Round Table. They included professional organisations, e.g. ALIA, museum representatives, e.g. Museums and Galleries of New South Wales, specific collections e.g. Council of Heads of Australian Entomological Collections, and grants coordinators, e.g. Community Heritage Grants.

The first part of the day was spent with each organisation having ten minutes to introduce itself and identify ‘hot topics’ for its organisation. The CAUL information that I presented is attached.

There was then an opportunity to discuss and identify issues that were recognised in common. All organisations mentioned funding as an issue, but particularly the museums sector indicated that they felt poorly funded compared to the library sector. There was general agreement that while funding is important, we need rather to understand what we are trying to achieve and what specific activities we wish to undertake first, before we ‘cry poor’.

Issues that resonated for me were:

**The Health of Australian collections:**
- Sustainability
- Conservation of original/physical records
- Preserving digital collections

**Training and Skills**
- Standards for good practice
- Professional skills and training programs
- Succession planning

**Cultural economic value**
- Cultural tourism – providing digital access that encourages a personal visit
- Responsibility for collections internationally e.g. in times of war and natural disaster

**Managing collections**
- Management of donations
Storage of material not on display/open access
Minimising duplication and overlap – distributed national collection

My impression from the day is that libraries are not necessarily better funded than the museum sector, but we do seem to have been collaborating and sharing our collections more strongly. The notion of a Distributed National Collection is well recognised and valued by libraries, but seems to pose some threat to others.

Key messages identified by the CCA from the day are:

- Advocacy
- Collaboration and cooperation
- Education
- Community engagement

The museums sector was interested in instigating an Australian Government enquiry into the collections sector.

There was specific concern about the diminution of Community Heritage Grants. Jan Fullerton expressing how the National Library of Australia was having its funding reduces and so would be unable to support these as it had in the past.

The report from the day will be placed on the CCA website soon. [http://www.collectionscouncil.com.au/](http://www.collectionscouncil.com.au/) It comprises the introduction paper from each peak body and the notes from the discussion session.

I appreciated attending the Round Table on behalf of CAUL. It made me aware of issues in the Australian Collections sector as a whole. I have some awareness of the Tasmanian environment through the Tasmanian Cultural Collections group. If it is helpful, I am willing to continue to represent CAUL to this group.

Linda Luther

27 June 2008
CAUL – Linda Luther
Council of Australian University Librarians

What is our organization?

CAUL members are the University Librarians or Library Directors of all Australian universities. There are 38 Universities Australia member libraries, the Australian Defence Force Academy and the University of Notre Dame Australia.

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

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

Learning and Teaching

CAUL librarians play a significant role in teaching and guiding students through the complex information environment to become independent learners.

Physical facilities in university libraries are being reconceptualised to provide a variety of learning environments, including group study and access to computers. Collaboration is being facilitated through the Carrick Institute, e.g. Next Generation Learning Spaces Colloquium, Brisbane October 2008.

There is a consortial approach to collection development through CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). This now takes a significant amount of the CAUL Office time. The Office negotiates with suppliers for the consortial purchase of electronic resources by university libraries.

Research

The Research Quality Framework has now been superseded by ERA (Excellence in Research for Australia). This is a methodology for comparing universities on their research activities. It requires library involvement through the creation of digital repositories of academic publications. Librarians also assist with the interpretation of citation data, which indicates how often an academic’s work has been referred to by other researchers.

The Australian Digital Theses project has enabled the preservation and access to Australian theses. These form one of the collections within each university’s digital repository.
CAUL libraries are also involved in NCRIS, to support eResearch and research infrastructure. There is a role of assisting academic staff in preserving their research data, There is a risk that they store their research data on their laptop without considering the value of the data for future researchers. Librarians can create metadata to assist in cataloguing and retrieval of research information.

Digitisation of collections is becoming an increasing area of activity. This provides access for researchers throughout the world to fragile print collections. Supported by exhibitions of print collections, digitisation provides a showcase for the university’s collection. This can lead to donations of additional material to develop a collection, to funding for conservation of material, or funding for further digitisation to occur.

Quality and value

CAUL librarians undertake surveys and monitor best practice to ensure the continuous improvement of library services.

Communication and influence

There is cooperation between university librarians on a number of dimensions. There are state groups, e.g. QULOC in Queensland. There is cooperation between libraries in university groups, e.g. ATN (Australian Technology Network). These groups and CAUL as a whole operate to provide advocacy on such issues as copyright, research information, research infrastructure and university funding.

Which hot topics/issues/challenges face our organization and our constituents?

Space issues: developing the appropriate balance between print collections and study spaces for students.

Academic collaboration: to ensure students have the skills to find information, to evaluate it and use it effectively.

Managing print collections: how or whether to store lower use print materials. Consideration of opportunities for collaborative storage. What is it important for us to store for the future. As we move into the digital era, what are the print items we should collect and conserve for the next 500 years?

Digitising collections: finding the funding to undertake these projects.

Research infrastructure: contributing to research through the creation of ePrint repositories and in the management of research data.
Collections Council of Australia

Update to CAUL Executive on matters of common interest

A national strategy for digital heritage collections

This is an overview of the Council’s position on digital heritage collections. It provides a description of present activities among collecting organisations, primarily State and Territory government collecting organisations.

The outcome from the Australian Framework and Action Plan for Digital Heritage Collections will be two discrete independent projects:
- Development plan
- Advocacy plan.

CCA’s objectives for the Development Plan are:
- To develop a national strategy for the care and management of digital heritage collections.
- To provide ‘thought leadership’ on a key strategic issue for the collections sector.
- To facilitate co-operation and collaboration across the archive, gallery, library and museum domains.
- To promote best practices within the collections sector.
- To build collections sector sustainability, particularly in regional Australia.

CCA primary objectives for the Framework are that it will:
- Guide the future care, management and development of Australia’s digital heritage collections.
- Underpin advocacy to governments and other stakeholders for policy and resources to sustain the work of the collections sector with digital heritage collections.

The advocacy plan is to seek recognition and funding to resource the development and implementation of the Framework.

There are a number of the activities in the Development Plan that are relevant to CAUL libraries. It is not clear how it will progress without funding to be achieved through the Advocacy Plan.

Recommendation
That we respond to the National Strategy for Digital Heritage Collections to ensure the inclusion of university collections in their considerations, and encourage continued engagement with CAUL.
Excellence in Research for Australia Initiative: Consultation Paper

The CCA submission to the consultation paper is available at http://www.collectionscouncil.com.au/collections+and+research+excellence.aspx

Honorary and adjunct staff
CCA has supported the inclusion of non-salaried staff (honorary and adjunct) be counted in the FTE staff reporting. They have also suggested inclusion of staff of collecting organisations outside the higher education sector. This begs the question about library staff within the higher education sector who collaborate on research projects. I would not think CAUL would expect library staff to be included, unless they make a significant contribution as a partner in a research project.

Research performance of collecting organisations
CCA has alerted ARC that ‘there are no coordinated benchmarks for the research performance of collecting organisations. There are also no benchmarks for determining how successful collecting organisations are at meeting expectations for external access by scholars’.
How strong are university benchmarks in this area? Our surveys tend to be weighted in relation to undergraduate satisfaction rather than researcher satisfaction. Is there more we could/should do in this area?

Exhibitions
CCA has recommended indicators that capture the translation of research into exhibitions. UTAS Library would be among other university libraries that have small exhibition facilities. To have scholarly museum-style exhibitions and exhibition catalogues included as research indicators, gives an additional dimension for library staff to work with researchers.

Student publications
CCA is supporting the recognition of student publications in the ERA. This would have implications for the inclusion of such works in digital repositories.

Recommendation
1. That CAUL executive note the submission
2. That the Best Practice Working Group consider the CCA comments in relation to research performance of collecting organisations. How good is the performance of university libraries in supporting their scholars (both internal and external) and is there a need to develop measures for this?

Collections and the NCRIS Roadmap
CCA supports the notion of a National Repository (p.8) “We also support the request for a National Repository of models to be used in collaborative workspace environments, ‘where experts from different disciplines can interact and work together for short/medium/long-term periods and identify research gaps’ in the field, and the call for ‘Integration of databases across organisations and jurisdictions…under the NCRIS Platforms for Collaboration capability, several of the other NCRIS capabilities and the social sciences.’”

It is important for CAUL to remember the wider environment and not focus just on sharing research data between universities.

The largest part of the submission relates to Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, which makes reference to ‘A national strategy for digital heritage collections’. (May 2008) which has been commented on above.

Recommendation
That CAUL note the submission.

Linda Luther
21 July 2008
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CAUL Retained Earnings

At the CAUL meeting in Adelaide in September 2007 the CAUL Executive was asked to investigate proposals for investing its money including proposals for managing retained earnings and bringing forward a document for discussion to CAUL in 2008.

The “reserves” or retained earnings are reflected in the balance sheets of the AUD account and the three foreign currency accounts. The three foreign currency accounts are neutral except for interest earned and the AUD account provides an indication of CAUL “profits” from its operations.

In 1997 and again in 2003 it was confirmed by CAUL that the aim was for retained earnings to be held at 110% of annual revenue/expenditure to provide a safeguard for CAUL as an unincorporated association to cover any potential liabilities and entitlements accruing should the organisation cease to function. It was suggested that the reserves be called provisions or contingency to indicate a planned build up over time.

CAUL annual expenditure for operational activities is approximately $400,000 - $450,000 and therefore the aim for retained earnings in the AUD account should be around $440,000 - $495,000. The Balance Sheet as at 31/12/07 showed retained earnings as $320,896.33. As at 18/6/08 retained earnings are $339,807.79 or around 77% of annual expenditure. In addition retained earnings are also held in the Foreign Currency Accounts. Retained earnings held in the foreign currency accounts provide a reasonable level of cash flow to meet payments in a timely manner.

CAUL through the Executive allocates funds from retained earnings to seed projects with the understanding that funds could be returned if necessary to retained earnings through a subscription or levy on the CAUL members. Recent projects funded from retained earnings include the CAUL Statistics Online interactive web site development ($37,583 + GST), CEIRC Review ($39,750 + GST) and the CAUL web site redevelopment ($47,000 + GST).

Members of the current CAUL Executive have considered the treatment of retained earnings and recommend the following approach:

- That the primary role of these funds should be to provide a cash flow buffer, identified in advance as part of the next year’s budget process;
- Retained earnings should continue to be used for strategic initiatives, subject to members’ approval;
- These funds should not be used to cover debts and liabilities.
- Some of the retained earnings should be invested in longer term interest bearing accounts.

For Discussion.
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### OPERATING

| Membership | 180,000.00 | Executive Officer (0.65) | 80,446.60 | 80,446.60 | $49,881.31 | -30,565.29 | -37.99% |
| Interest on Cash | 30,469.00 | Admin Assistant | 20,114.25 | 20,114.25 | 19,299.21 | -$815.04 | -4.05% |
| CONZUL contribution | 3,720.00 | Office Expenses | 7,600.00 | 7,000.00 | 4,619.07 | -$2,380.93 | -33.46% |
| Publications | 131.30 | Audit & Accounting | 10,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 4,818.00 | -$5,182.00 | -51.82% |
| Office Rental | 8,190.00 | Office Rental | 8,190.00 | 8,030.10 | -159.90 | -$159.90 | -1.95% |
| Executive Meetings | 12,000.00 | Executive Meetings | 12,000.00 | 11,654.39 | -345.61 | -$345.61 | -2.88% |
| President’s Meetings | 2,000.00 | President’s Meetings | 2,000.00 | 2,510.25 | $510.25 | 25.51% |
| Representation/Seminars | 4,000.00 | Representation/Seminars | 4,000.00 | 754.80 | -$3,245.20 | -81.13% |
| Joint CCA Meetings | 1,000.00 | Joint CCA Meetings | 1,000.00 | 289.10 | -$710.90 | -71.09% |
| Publications / Web Site | 47,000.00 | Publications / Web Site | 47,000.00 | 16,905.00 | -$30,095.00 | -64.03% |
| CAUL Achievement Award | 6,000.00 | CAUL Achievement Award | 6,000.00 | 4,822.17 | -$1,177.83 | -19.63% |
| CEIRC program review | 39,750.00 | CEIRC program review | 39,750.00 | 14,604.18 | -$25,145.82 | -63.74% |

**Sub-total (Operating)**: 214,320.30

### PROGRAMMES

#### Copyright
- ALCC Levy 20,000.00
- ADA Membership 500.00
- Meetings 2,500.00

**Sub-total (Copyright)**: 20,000.00

#### Best Practice
- CONZUL contribution 5,045.00
- Statistics Meetings 1,000.00
- COUNTER Membership 850.00
- Statistics Site Enhancement 5,643.00
- Offshore Services WG 0.00

**Sub-total (Best Practice)**: 0.00

#### ULA
- Meetings 0.00

**Sub-total (ULA)**: 0.00

#### Research & Development
- Research & Development 0.00

**Sub-total (R&D)**: 0.00

#### ADT Program
- ADT Membership Fees 64,800.00
- Meetings 4,000.00
- NTLTD Membership 10,000.00

**Sub-total (ADT)**: 64,800.00

#### CEIRC PROGRAM
- CEIRC Levy (CAUL) 63,360.00
- CEIRC Levy (external) 51,480.00
- Meetings 15,000.00
- Research 5,000.00
- CAUL-Industry ThinkTank 0.00

**Sub-total (CEIRC)**: 114,840.00

#### SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)
- Surplus / (Deficit) ($84,602.70) 16,750.19

**SUB-TOTAL (AUD account)**: 1,996,904.99

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

#### USD ACCOUNT
- Subscriptions Income 1,582,944.69
- Bank Charges 0.00

**TOTAL USD**: 1,582,944.69

#### £ ACCOUNT
- Subscriptions Income 4,072,147.96
- Bank Charges 0.00

**TOTAL £**: 4,072,147.96

#### EUR ACCOUNT
- Subscriptions Income 21,190.00
- Bank Charges 0.00

**TOTAL EUR**: 21,190.00

**Interest earned on Foreign Currency Accounts (@ given exchange rate)**
- USD account 58,793.74 @ 0.8840
- GBP account 41,703.55 @ 0.4509
- EUR account 0.00 @ 0.5956

**Total in AUD**: 100,497.29
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>40 CAUL members @ $4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>40 CAUL members @ $4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>1. EO full costs = salary, on-costs, salary admin, travel not related to specific program - divided 65/35 between CAUL and CEIRC, salary 84k from 11/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i5</td>
<td>Corrected to actual expense 2/1/07 ie 40% of EO time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>This is the combined interest expected on the four caul accounts, based on the previous year's interest earned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>19,000 in 2003; 22,717 in 2004; 14,014 to 30/6/06; Budgeted 23,000, received 30,469 in 2007;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>9000 minus CEIRC contribution for external 8*630=5040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Budgeted 5000, received 131.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>315+GST per fortnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Website review budgeted amount increased from 25k, approved CAUL 2007/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>Approved CAUL 2007/2, AW approved +$6,000 for DC survey 6/12/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>40 CAUL members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>Library Consortium £335 ($500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A40</td>
<td>40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>Income from 2004 recorded in liabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>CAUL Executive Officer: including awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K44</td>
<td>Futures workshop not budgeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D48</td>
<td>USD7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B51</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i51</td>
<td>Corrected to actual expense 2/1/07 ie 60% of EO time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B52</td>
<td>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cell: D52
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
>85% time on CEIRC activity

Cell: E55
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
1 meeting only in 2007
late April

Cell: F57
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
Interest on Foreign Currency Accounts expected to be AUD25k, not transferred to AUD account, but "applied" to CEIRC income.
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### OPERATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Budgeted Income</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure</th>
<th>Budgeted Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180,000.00</td>
<td>23,202.00</td>
<td>17,473.50</td>
<td>18,808.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>$35,242.58</td>
<td>$3,000.49</td>
<td>-7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,600.00</td>
<td>5,599.30</td>
<td>3,507.00</td>
<td>55.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>2,550.00</td>
<td>2,444.00</td>
<td>-4.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2,250.00</td>
<td>2,050.00</td>
<td>-11.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td>9,956.43</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,360.17</td>
<td>-9.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Meetings</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,003.59</td>
<td>-66.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>203.86</td>
<td>72.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications / Web Site</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
<td>6,142.50</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Review 2007</td>
<td>5,599.30</td>
<td>3,507.00</td>
<td>55.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total (Operating) 213,600.00

### PROGRAMMES

#### Copyright

| ALCC Levy                                      | 20,000.00       | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |
| ALCC Membership                               | 20,000.00       | 20,000.00             | 0.00%            |
| ADA Membership                                | 500.00          | 500.00                | 0.00%            |
| Meetings                                      | 1,875.00        | -1,702.27             | -90.79%          |

Sub-total (Copyright) 20,000.00

#### Best Practice

| CONZUL contribution                          | 6,141.67        | -3,000.00             | -50.79%          |
| Statistics Publications                      | 33,500.00       | 32,102.00             | -4.17%           |
| Statistics Meetings                          | 1,000.00        | -362.17               | -36.22%          |
| COUNTER Membership                           | 850.00          | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |
| ILWG                                          | 0.00            | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |
| Statistics Site Enhancement                   | 0.00            | 155.85                | #DIV/0!          |
| Offshore Services WG                          | 0.00            | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |

Sub-total (Best Practice) 6,141.67

#### ULA

| Meetings                                      | 0.00            | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |

Sub-total (ULA) 0.00

#### Research & Development

| Research & Development                        | 0.00            | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |

Sub-total (R&D) 0.00

#### ADT Program

| ADT Membership Fees                          | 43,200.00       | 49,500.00             | #DIV/0!          |
| Meetings                                      | 14,400.00       | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |
| NTLTMD Meetings                               | 0.00            | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |
| NTLTMD Membership                             | 0.00            | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |

Sub-total (ADT) 43,200.00

#### CEIRC PROGRAM

| CEIRC Levy (CAUL)                             | 70,200.00       | 49,500.00             | -4.16%           |
| CEIRC Levy (external)                         | 48,600.00       | 3,750.00              | -100.00%         |
| ICOLC Meetings                                | 5,000.00        | 3,874.84              | -22.50%          |
| CAUL-Industry ThinkTank                       | 0.00            | 0.00                  | #DIV/0!          |

Sub-total (CEIRC) 118,800.00

#### SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)

| Surplus / (Deficit)                           | 401,741.67      | 320,670.78            | 32.08%           |

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

| USD ACCOUNT                                    | 1,559,016.85    | 1,560,303.83          | -0.85%           |
| Interest                                      | 24,936.45       | 869.31                |                |
| TOTAL USD                                     | 1,583,953.30    | 1,561,173.14          |                |

| £ ACCOUNT                                      | 52,821.13       | 71,910.83             |                |
| Interest                                      | 15,167.13       | 64.99                 |                |
| TOTAL £                                       | 67,789.26       | 71,975.82             |                |

| EUR ACCOUNT                                    | 11,885.00       | 11,885.00             |                |
| Interest                                      | 0.00            | 17.80                 |                |
| TOTAL EUR                                     | 11,885.00       | 11,902.80             |                |

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

| USD account                                   | 30,992.36 @ 0.8046|                |
| GBP account                                   | 33,183.91 @ 0.4569|                |
| EUR account                                   | 0.00 @ 0.5695     |                |
| Total in AUD                                  | 64,176.27        |                |
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 91k from 11/07

AID account only, based on the previous year's interest earned.

19,000 in 2003; 22,717 in 2004; 14,014 to 30/6/06
17,000 to 23/7/07;

< 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*675=5400

CAUL Office replacement computer - asset rather than expense

Includes CRM software 3,507, not in original budget

Estimate for migration of the website to the new platform - 100 hours of HEW 3 PLUS outstanding cost of redeveloping the site

$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting

ex GST

2007 cost invoiced in 2008

40 CAUL members

Library Consortium £365 ($545)

CEIRC expense - DEST FTE figures for narrow discipline groups

40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005

Income from 2004 recorded in liabiliites

40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL

including awards

2007 cost invoiced in 2008

USD7,500

2007 expense

2007 cost invoiced in 2008

40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL

2007 cost invoiced in 2008
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:  
39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL + CSIRO (includes extra 675 / conzul from conzul contribution)

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:  
External members *24

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:  
>85% time on CEIRC activity

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:  
includes DC's forum/meeting

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:  
1 meeting only in 2007  
late April
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Salary Expenditure for 2009 (NB: ANU was requested to use a 3% rise in salaries for its 2008 budget purposes, but 2% was used for CAUL in 2008 because that is all that was confirmed through EB at the time of the budget proposal to CAUL 2007/2.)

The Executive Officer 2008 total was based on the expected 2008 salary of $90,820 (91,710 updated 3/3/08) plus on-costs and salary administration (ANU) of 39%. The 2009 salary is unknown. This budget assumes a 3% increase over 2008. Based on a salary of $94,461 plus 39%.

The Finance and Administration Officer (1.0 FTE) was 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%. The 2009 salary is unknown. This budget assumes a 3% increase. Based on a salary of $50,113 plus 41.7% at HEW 4/3.

The Administration Officer (0.15 FTE) was 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%. The 2009 salary is unknown. This budget assumes a 3% increase. Based on a casual hourly rate of $33.76 plus 41.7%. An additional 10 hours per week was approved in 2008 to support the processing of CEIRC renewals in September, October and November. Based on an expected 2009 casual hourly rate of $31.60 at HEW4/1.

CEIRC Income & Expenditure for 2009

2008 CEIRC Income was 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 particpants at $2,025.1,320.00 1,346.40

CEIRC Expenditure varies with the cost of travel of the committee, and increases annually because of salary costs, calculated at 35% of the Executive Officer and 85% of the Finance and Administration Officer - these allocations were reviewed in 2007 and the actual time proportion is used in the 2008 expenditure figures.1,980.00 2,019.60

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.

From 2008, 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. Total audit costs increased to $10,000 in 2006, and the budgetted expenditure has been increased accordingly. From July 1, 2007, the book keeping fees were increased by a third, which "reflects the average increase in our charge rates during this time considering the skills shortage in this industry."

For 2009, the fee has been changed to reflect the resources currently allocated to the CEIRC program, 60% of the EO, 85% of the FFA, and 130 hours of casual support in Q4, retaining the current relativity between the internal fee, paid by CAUL and CONZUL members (47), and the external fee, 150% of the internal fee, paid by the rest (25). Internal External Formula: Total = (47n + 1.5f) $190,409 $2,353 $3,380 Check $190,409

Total expenses $190,409

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 preferring to 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. Costs will also increase if more flexible fares are chosen.

ADT Budget 2009

The ADT budget has been reduced to zero for 2009 - if it is reinstated, it will not affect the bottom line because the levy is intended to balance out program expenditure.

CAUL Office - Equipment - 2009

An amount of $3000 was allocated for a replacement computer in 2008. 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 was too slow to be effective - it was purchased in mid-2000. The other two were purchased mid-2003 and early-2006.

It is proposed that the 2003 machine be replaced in mid-2009.
## Budgeted Income $ | Budgeted Expenditure $ | Budgeted Balance Expected Expenditure to date (dd/mm/yy) | Expenditure to date | Difference | Difference %
---|---|---|---|---|---
**OPERATING**
Membership | 130,000.00 | Executive Officer (0.4) | 52,520.32 | 0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Interest on Cash | 30,000.00 | Admin Assistant (0.3) | 24,747.37 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
CONZUL contribution (membership) | 6,500.00 | Office Expenses | 7,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Publications | 0.00 | Audit & Accounting | 3,400.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Office Rental | 8,190.00 | Equipment | 3,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Executive Meetings | 12,000.00 | President’s Meetings | 2,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Representation/Seminars | 2,000.00 | Joint CCA Meetings | 1,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
PUBLICATIONS / Web Site | 0.00 | CAUL Achievement Award | 6,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
CEIRC Review 2007 | 0.00
**Sub-total (Operating)** | 166,500.00 | 136,857.68 | 29,642.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!

**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 (statistics) | 6,300.00 | Statistics Publication | 35,500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Statistics Meetings | 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
**Sub-total (Best Practice)** | 6,300.00 | 35,350.00 | -29,050.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
ULA
**Sub-total (ULA)** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Best Practice
Research & Development
**Sub-total (R&D)** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
ADT Program
ADT Membership Fees
**Sub-total (ADT)** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
SUB-TOTAL (CAUL)| 192,800.00 | 195,207.68 | -2,407.68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!

**CEIRC PROGRAM**
CEIRC Levy (internal) | 105,750.00 | Executive Officer (0.6) | 78,780.47 | 0.00 | $0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
CEIRC Levy (external) | 84,500.00 | CEIRC Assistant (0.85+) | 73,028.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
check! | 0.00 | Meetings | 15,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Audit & Accounting | 13,500.00 | Research | 5,000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
ICOLC Meetings | 5,000.00 | CAUL-Industry ThinkTank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
**Sub-total (CEIRC)** | 190,250.00 | 190,408.53 | -158.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)| 383,050.00 | 385,616.21 | -2,566.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!
Surplus / (Deficit) | ($2,566.21) |
**Sub-TOTAL (AUD account)** | 383,050.00 | 385,616.21 | -2,566.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $0.00 | #DIV/0!

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

**USD ACCOUNT**
Subscriptions Income | 0.00 | Subscriptions Payments | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!
Interest | 0.00 | Bank Charges | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!
**TOTAL USD** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!

**GBP ACCOUNT**
Subscriptions Income | 0.00 | Subscriptions Payments | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!
Interest | 0.00 | Bank Charges | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!
**TOTAL EUR** | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!

Interest earned on Foreign Currency Accounts @ given exchange rate
USD account | 0.00 | @ 0.9777 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!
GBP account | 0.00 | @ 0.4870 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!
EUR account | 0.00 | @ 0.6144 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!
Total in AUD | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | #DIV/0!
Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 CAUL members @ $4,500-$1250 (change in CEIRC fee)

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
40 CAUL members + 8 CONZUL

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL + CSIRO (includes extra 675 / conzul from conzul contribution)

Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:
External members *24
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DS2  | CAUL Executive Officer:  
>85% time on CEIRC activity, plus 10h/wk casual staff Sept/Oct/Nov |
| I53  | CAUL Executive Officer:  
includes DC's forum/meeting |
| E56  | CAUL Executive Officer:  
1 meeting only in 2009  
late April |
CAUL Office.

ACT! The Contact Group, which markets and supports the Sage ACT! Contact Management System, as recommended during the CEIRC review to improve the efficiency of the handling of CEIRC transactions, provided an online demonstration on April 9, followed by a quote on April 28.

The software was ordered May 13, and following Diane Costello's return from leave, a teleconference to scope the project was held July 14 with a first run-through of the database on July 29. This highlighted a number of areas needing clarification and redesign. It is more complicated than they first thought if we are going to be able to extract the required data at least as easily as we can now from Excel. The software was due to be installed on August 22, but not completed until August 28 because upgraded permissions were required for use of an office PC as a server. Inquiries about hosting the software on an ANU server led to a quote for a $1,000 setup fee with an annual maintenance cost of $5,000. It is being hosted on a CAUL office PC instead.

The total cost is $4,608 including data setup and training costs. The software is intended to combine the current functionality of email records, spreadsheet data capture, and MS Access database content, with links to the MYOB bookkeeping system. The key elements in the system will be the CEIRC institutions and the CEIRC products – all other details flow from, and connect, these two elements.

The current procedures will continue in parallel until the new system is running smoothly and can be evaluated. Many changes to the current workflow are expected. All offers received will be entered into the new system, and 2009 offers already in process will be entered retrospectively as time permits.

CAUL Website. The CAUL web site build is in process and is expected to be ready for population in October. A vendor visit to run through the prototype is scheduled for September 16.

The final sign-off of the specification was done May 14. Following some further discussion on the site design, Wiliam prepared a number of concept designs for review on May 29. As Diane Costello was on leave, this was copied to Howard Amos who was helping to keep an IT-literate eye on the project. Approved feedback was sent on July 1 and amendments duly made by Wiliam. Sign-off on the designs is awaiting (at July 23) confirmation from Wiliam of the features that must be hardcoded versus editable within the CAUL office. A tentative schedule says that the site will be ready to receive content in September.

While Diane Costello was on leave from May 17 to June 23 (5 weeks), Alisha Davies managed the correspondence for the office – processing CEIRC responses as usual, responding to inquiries wherever possible, or otherwise recommending a wait till late June or referring upwards to the president or CEIRC chair. All evidence points to this being handled most competently.

CEIRC.

Annually, in late June, CAUL's vendors are invited to provide their pricing proposals for the forthcoming year, and are given CAUL's preferred timing to ensure that invoices are paid before Christmas. This year, many have been received earlier than usual, which is excellent for institutions preparing their budgets, but it means the processing hump has been brought forward by a month over previous years. August has been unusually busy for CEIRC transactions. Since the beginning of April, the office has handled the following:

- renewal proposals received (many for multiple products) - 80;
- new offers received - 41;
- web pages & documents loaded or updated (many on multiple occasions) - 560;
- updated spreadsheets (records & summaries of proposals) - 190;
- ad hoc invoices paid to vendors (for mid-year take-up of current offers) - 43;
In preparation for the first meeting with Wiley-Blackwell to discuss the next agreement combining the current Wiley and Blackwell contracts, members were surveyed to find out their views on the current contracts and their preferences for the new one. A full report was circulated to members prior to the meeting.  

In anticipation of discussion at the CAUL meeting about funding of the CEIRC program and rebalancing the budget to reflect the actual cost of the program, I wrote to the external participants to ask if the proposed increased levy would lead them to withdraw from the program. Of the six institutions who responded, all have indicated their intention to stay with the program.

**CAUL Finances.**

CAUL’s CBA relationship manager has supplied information about options for investing CAUL’s retained earnings to earn higher interest. The rates depend on how much is invested, whether or not it is fixed term, and how long is the term.

CAUL’s auditor has advised that there are no standards or documented policy for determining how much an organisation should retain over and above the amount needed to support its cash flow. He added:

> From an audit perspective, having cash reserves in excess of 100% of operating costs would be a healthy financial position. .... From a governance point a view, any investment strategies should be endorsed by the Council.

The auditors have introduced a new element to the annual audit, a document called “Understanding the accounting process,” which will cover the same kind of questions that have arisen through discussions with CAUL Treasurers and with the CEIRC review. The document will be published on the CAUL website when completed.
Meeting arrangements - travel, venues, agendas & minutes.

CEIRC Committee Meeting 2008/2 Sydney 2 April 2008
CEIRC Committee Meeting 2008/3 Melbourne 8 July 2008
CEIRC Committee Meeting 2008/4 Melbourne 1 September 2008
CAUL Meeting 2008/1 Sydney 3-4 April 2008
CAUL Meeting 2008/2 Darwin 18-19 September 2008
CAUL Meeting 2009/1 Newcastle April 2009
CSFG Meeting 2008/2 Melbourne 2 September 2008
CAUL Executive 2008/2 Sydney 3 April 2008
CAUL Executive 2008/3 Brisbane 7 July 2008
CAUL Executive 2008/4 Melbourne 4 August 2008
CAUL Executive 2008/5 Darwin 18 September 2008
CCA meeting Brisbane 8 July 2008

Other Meetings/Events attended/held.

March 31. Joel Reid and Sylvia Wise, Commonwealth Bank
April 7. Universities Australia Library Conference 2008 program committee teleconference
April 7. Ingrid Wilkins, Walter Turnbull auditor
April 9. Brett Goshorn, The Contact Group, ACT! online demonstration (webcast)
May 15. Mitchell Barber, Wiliam, website functional specification teleconference
July 1. Universities Australia Library Conference 2008 program committee teleconference
July 14. Brett Goshorn, The Contact Group, ACT! scoping session, teleconference
July 17. Mitchell Barber, Wiliam, website design teleconference
July 29. Brett Goshorn, The Contact Group, ACT! CAUL database demonstration, webcast
August 1. Kerry Blinco, Link Affiliates
August 8. Brett Goshorn, The Contact Group, ACT! CAUL database demonstration, webcast
August 18. Rebecca Harris & Paul Stubing, Universities Australia re Web of Science, etc
August 22. ACT! Software installation.
August 27. Christina Parolin, Australian Academy of the Humanities.
August 29. ACT! Training

Meetings held/attended - CEIRC-related.

April 4. Diahanne Senko, Thomson Legal & Regulatory
April 8. Michele Gaca, Swets
April 13-16 ICOLC Meeting, San Francisco, CA
April 24. Maureen Quinn, Cassandra Perry and Stephen Pugh, Coutts Information Services
April 29. Elizabeth Berenz, ARTstor, New York, NY
May 12. Electronic Resources Australia Forum. Presentation on CEIRC.
May 13. Tamara Joyner, Palgrave Macmillan (NPG and CRC Press)
June 24. Tamara Joyner, Palgrave Macmillan (NPG and CRC Press) teleconference
June 25. Marika Whitfield, Cengage
June 27. Gayle Villaume, DA Information Services
July 22. Rachel Lee, University of California Press teleconference
July 24. Julie Stevens, Alexander Street Press
August 5. Tanya Torres & Bruce Heterick, JSTOR. Teleconference
August 20. Patrick Doogue, IOP Publishing.
August 20. Eileen Lawrence & Julie Stevens, Alexander Street Press.
August 22. Peter Shelley & Andrea Gilbey, Emerald
September 2. Jock Murphy, University of Melbourne, Melbourne

Diane Costello
Executive Officer
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