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AGENDA

918. *Introduction & Welcome. Andrew Wells.

919. *Attendance & Apologies. Expected to attend:

From CAUL: New CAUL members, acting CAUL members and delegates for CAUL members:
Liz Burke, Murdoch U; Margaret Jones, UWA; Ralph Kiel, VU; Sue Craig, USQ; Lyn Bosanquet, Griffith; Sue Owen, Deakin U; Heather Pearsall, ACU;
From CONZUL: John Redmayne, Massey U; Gail Pattie, UCantebury;
Guests: Professor Tom Cochrane, DVC, QUT; Dr Hamish Coates, ACER;
Apologies: John Arfield, UWA; Alan Smith, USQ; Leeanne Pitman, UBallarat; Anne Horn, Deakin U; Chris Sheargold, ACU;

920. *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.

921. *Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2009/1. (Paper included)


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

924. CAUL Elections. Andrew Wells

STRATEGIC PLAN

925. Go8 Cost-Benefit Study. Vic Elliott

Re strategic plan item 22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative. Item 855 from CAUL 2008/1 - 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.

926. *Review of the Strategic Plan. CAUL strategic plan for 2010-2012. The Executive recommends restructuring the strategic plan to separate out the operational elements, and target the highest priority activities. It has drafted a revised plan and identified areas for discussion. As in previous reviews of the plan, breakout groups will be asked to work on specific sections of the plan, as well as to offer an overall view. Andrew Wells (Paper included)

Support for Research

927. Australian Research Council (ARC).

a) ERA (Excellence in Research Australia). (Standing item)

928. Research Infrastructure.

a) Institutional Repositories.
i) *CAIRSS (CAUL Australian Institutional Repositories Support Service). Helen Livingston

(1) *CAIRSS Governance. Andrew Wells

ii) Australasian Digital Theses (ADT) Program. Andrew Wells (Paper included)

b) *Research Support. Judy Stokker Hot Topic

929. Scholarly Communication. Andrew Wells

a) *Jockeying for position: research competition, open access & the race to the top. Professor Tom Cochrane, DVC, QUT (reprising a recent SCONUL presentation). Hot Topic

b) *Open Access. John Shipp, Maxine Brodie, Cathrine Harboe-Ree

c) *CAUL-Industry Think Tank 2009. Andrew Wells

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


ii) Scopus/ Web of Science 2011-. Andrew Wells

iii) Springer 2010-2012.


Support for Learning & Teaching

930. *Student engagement. Dr Hamish Coates (Principal Research Fellow, ACER) Hot Topic

931. *Learning Skills. Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Linda Luther Hot Topic


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

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

Delivering Quality & Value

935. *Leadership. Felicity McGregor Hot Topic

936. *Staff Development. Ainslie Dewe Hot Topic

937. Best Practice Working Group. Helen Livingston

938. Insync Surveys. Helen Livingston

939. Statistics. Craig Anderson

Advocacy & Influence

940. Copyright. Derek Whitehead

a) Universities Australia. Heather Gordon

941. Relationships with other Organisations.

a) CAUL regional and sectoral groups. Regional and sectoral groups are encouraged to provide a brief report to CAUL on their achievements and activities.

b) CONZUL. John Redmayne (Paper included)

c) *SCONUL & IATUL. Report on IATUL and SCONUL - Ainslie Dewe, Helen Livingston, Imogen Garner Hot Topic

d) CAUDIT (Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology) and ACODE (Australasian Council on Open, Distance and eLearning).
i) EDUCAUSE 2009. Imogen Garner
ii) EDUCAUSE 2011. Andrew Wells

e) National Library of Australia.
   i) Libraries Australia. Linda Luther (Paper included)

942. Forthcoming Meetings
   a) CAUL Meeting 2010/1. ANU, Canberra, March 25-26, 2010.
   b) CAUL Meeting 2010/2. QUT, Brisbane, September 16-17, 2010.

CAUL Administration

943. President’s Report. Andrew Wells

   a) CAUL Budget Principles. Imogen Garner (Paper included)
   b) CAUL Budget 2010. Draft. Imogen Garner (Paper included)
   c) CAUL Budget 2009. Imogen Garner, Diane Costello (Paper included)

945. CAUL Risk Assessment. Andrew Wells (Paper included)

946. CAUL Web Site Redevelopment. A progress report is included with the Executive Officer’s report. Andrew Wells, Diane Costello

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

948. Other business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Chair(s)</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Pax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday @ University of Sydney</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Executive</strong>&lt;br&gt;Andrew Wells, Chair; Ainslie Dewe, Heather Gordon, Imogen Garner, Greg Anderson, Diane Costello</td>
<td>Fisher Library Victoria Room</td>
<td>6 pax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11am-2pm</td>
<td><strong>Fisher Library Centenary.</strong> Afternoon tea will be served from 2.00pm in Maclaurin Hall which is located in the eastern wing of the Quadrangle opposite the current Fisher Library.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday @ Waterfront</td>
<td><strong>Best Practice Working Group</strong>&lt;br&gt;Helen Livingston, chair; Liz Curach; Graham Black; Ruth Quinn; Heather Gordon; Derek Whitehead; Jan Gordon; Greg Anderson; Des Stewart; Dan Archibald; Leeanne Pitman;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td><strong>Go8</strong>&lt;br&gt;Vic Elliott, chair; John Shipp, Andrew Wells, Keith Webster, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Ray Choate, Margaret Jones, Philip Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td><strong>Information Literacy Working Group</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ruth Quinn, CDU, chair; Graham Black; Anne Horn; Leeanne Pitman; Linda Luther; Philip Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td><strong>IRUA-L</strong>&lt;br&gt;Heather Gordon, chair; Ian McBain, Greg Anderson, Ainslie Dewe, Lyn Bosanquet, Liz Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td><strong>ULA Working Group</strong>&lt;br&gt;Shirley Oakley, Chair; Alex Byrne, Imogen Garner, Jan Gordon, Diane Costello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5pm</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting – Business</strong>, to include: 210m + tea&lt;br&gt;Strategic planning – structured groups with the executive to select a chairperson from each</td>
<td></td>
<td>60m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pm</td>
<td><strong>Afternoon tea</strong>&lt;br&gt;CAUL-Industry Think Tank – Andrew Wells&lt;br&gt;Open Access – John Shipp, Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Maxine Brodie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm or 5.30pm</td>
<td><strong>Meeting closes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 for 7.30pm</td>
<td><strong>CAUL dinner @ Après, 32 Orwell St, Potts Point</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday @ Waterfront**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Room/Room Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-1pm</td>
<td><strong>CAUL Meeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Venue:</strong> Waterfront – Settlers Hall, Opera, Trawler, Heritage</td>
<td>210m + tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-9.40</td>
<td>Jockeying for position: the research competition, open access and the race to the top (from SCONUL presentation) Tom Cochrane, Deputy Vice-Chancellor Technology, Information and Learning Support, Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>40m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.40-10</td>
<td>QUT research support – Judy Stokker</td>
<td></td>
<td>15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-10.30</td>
<td>E-textbooks: Issues for University Libraries. Graham Black and Judy Stokker</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11</td>
<td><strong>Morning tea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>Student engagement – Dr Hamish Coates (Principal Research Fellow, ACER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60-90m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-12.45</td>
<td>Learning skills – Cathrine Harboe-Ree (20-30m), Linda Luther (20m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-1</td>
<td>Report on IATUL and SCONUL - Ainslie Dewe, Helen Livingston, Imogen Garner</td>
<td></td>
<td>15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pm</td>
<td><strong>Lunch - Meeting Closes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45ish</td>
<td><strong>CAI RSS Steering Committee (tbc)</strong></td>
<td>Helen Livingston, chair; Heather Gordon, Judy Stokker, Derek Whitehead, Diane Costello, Kate Watson</td>
<td>Trawler 6 pax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following</td>
<td><strong>LATN</strong></td>
<td>Alex Byrne, chair; Imogen Garner, Craig Anderson, Helen Livingston, Judy Stokker, Gabrielle Gardiner (LATN) [Larraine Shepherd by teleconference, tbc]</td>
<td>Trawler 6 pax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CAUL Meeting 2009/2 – Sydney – 21-22 September, 2009 - Agenda*
27 Circular Quay W
The Rocks NSW 2000

At this address:
Restaurants of the Rocks
The Waterfront - 12 reviews
Waterfront Restaurant - 5 stars

Sponsored Links:
bel_mondo_restaurant
Mod Australian restaurant The Rocks
Fine dining 2 courses $48 The Rocks
www.belmondoro.com.au
892. *Introduction & Welcome.* Andrew Wells welcomed members to the meeting. He noted the apologies received. He especially welcomed delegates of those who were unable to attend and CONZUL guests, congratulated Philip Kent on his appointment to the University of Melbourne, and welcomed Dr Grace Saw to her first meeting as a CAUL representative. Judy Stokker introduced Grace to members, noting particularly her significant involvement in professional activities in many Australian states and as the inaugural University Librarian at the Auckland Institute of Technology.

893. *Attendance & Apologies.*

From CAUL:
* Jim Graham, ACU  
  Vic Elliott, ANU  
  % Grace, Bond U  
  Graham Black, CQU  
  Ruth Quinn, CDU  
  Shirley Oakley, CSU  
  Imogen Garner, Curtin U  
  Anne Horn, Deakin U  
  Dan Archibald, ECU  
  Ian McBain, Flinders U  
  Con Graves, Griffith U  
  Heather Gordon, JCU  
  Ainslie Dewe, La Trobe U, Deputy President  
  Maxine Brodie, Macquarie U  
  Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Monash U  
  # Del Shiers, Murdoch U  
  Judy Stokker, QUT  
  * Stephen Gillespie, RMIT U  
  Derek Whitehead, Swinburne U  
  Ray Choate, U Adelaide  
  Leeanne Pitman, U Ballarat  
  Anita Crotty, U Canberra  
  Philip Kent, U Melbourne  
  * Jack Bedson, UNE  
  Andrew Wells, UNSW, President  
  Jan Gordon, UNSW@ADFA  
  Greg Anderson, U Newcastle  
  * Michael Cullen, UNDA  
  Keith Webster, UQ  
  Helen Livingston, UniSA  
  Alan Smith, USQ  
  John Shipp, U Sydney  
  Linda Luther, U Tasmania  
  Alex Byrne, UTS

From CONZUL:
* John Redmayne, Massey U  
  Sue Roberts, VUW

Guests:
* Professor Margaret Sheil, CEO, Australian Research Council  
  Adam Chapman, ARC  
  Dr Ross Wilkinson, CEO, ANDS  
  Dr Ian Gibson, CEO, Intersect  
  Kerry Kilner, AustLit  
  Dr Rebecca Harris, Director Communication and Government Relations, Universities Australia  
  Paul Stubing, Universities Australia  
  Paula Callan, eResearch Access Coordinator, QUT

Apologies:
* Chris Sheargold, ACU  
  Stephen McVey, UNDA  
  Craig Anderson, RMIT U  
  Eve Woodberry, UNE

& not represented
% first meeting as CAUL Member
# Acting Director
* Delegate of CAUL Member
894. **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.

895. **Minutes of Previous CAUL Meeting CAUL 2008/2.** The minutes were included in the agenda papers.

   **Item 873(a) AeRIC.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree updated members, noting that AeRIC will be superseded by a new central committee to be established essentially to facilitate communication with government. AeRIC’s membership had duplicated that of the Steering Committees of the major infrastructure projects such as ANDS, AAF, etc, and the new committee will provide a more strategic view. She recommended that CAUL seek a role or an avenue for formal input into this new committee. *(Action: Executive)*

896. **Minutes of CAUL Executive Meetings 2008/5, 2008/6, 2009/1.** The minutes were included in the agenda papers.

   **Item 1827 Go8 ROI consultancy.** Vic Elliott advised members that the total cost of the project is USD 140,000 not USD 120,000 as recorded in the minutes. *(Action: DC)*

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

**STRATEGIC PLAN**

898. **Go8 Cost-Benefit Study.** Re strategic plan item 22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative. **Item 855 from CAUL 2008/1 -** 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.

   Vic Elliott reported that Go8 is ready to begin the study to assess in financial and qualitative ways the value that libraries deliver to the academic community. There is currently no market proxy so the methodology has to be developed. The project will ask academics to assess the time and therefore money to use library services and to assess the same if those services do not exist. It will cover both teaching and research communities, all pre- and post-doctoral students and those engaged in research support. Evaluation will be undertaken through focus groups particularly to assess comparability with other Go8 universities.

   The project will examine awareness of electronic resources; awareness of which resources are paid for by the library; investment in time spent; cost if services are not available – a contingent evaluation approach; happiness with current resources and services.

   The total project cost is USD 140,000. Vic Elliott thanked CAUL for contributing AUD 20,000 from its research fund. Ainslie Dewe outlined the process the Executive took when making the decision to contribute to the project. All CAUL members will have access to the outcomes of the project, including the report.

   The project is expected to begin soon, with the consultants visiting Australia to discuss acceptance of the methodology. It is expected to be difficult, but necessary, to assess the value of resources and services from libraries. There is not any specific reference to assistance with navigating around resources and finding out they exist, however this does get picked up in qualitative responses e.g. satisfaction, quality, etc. Outsell Consultants are leaders in the international library world, formed out of EPS, led by David Worlock, and working on both sides of the Atlantic. They have worked for the British Library, the Library of Congress and the California Digital Library.

   Participants will be the universities of Adelaide and Queensland and the ANU. All research-active academics will be involved. It will focus on the use of information resources for research purposes, not teaching, though some teaching academics also undertake research.

899. **Review of the Strategic Plan.** The Executive recommends restructuring the strategic plan to separate out the operational elements, and target the highest priority activities.
900. *CAUL Achievement Award.* The 2008 award was presented to Paula Callan, eResearch Access Coordinator, QUT. Andrew Wells introduced Paula by reading the citation for the award. She then addressed members, highlighting the dramatic increase in citations of QUT authors whose accepted journal manuscripts were included in the institutional repository, and which could not be explained in any other way than by the increased exposure. One prolific researcher had increased his citation rate from 300 to 1,700 per year and was now a very vocal support of open access institutional repositories.

Although institutional repositories were originally designed to provide open access to published research, their purpose has broadened considerably. Although the implementation and use of institutional repositories is ubiquitous, challenges remain, particularly in areas such as the creative arts e.g. how is sculpture described. Paula suggested that collaboration in the design of description rules was VITAL, and recommended that CAIRSS take a leading role, in the way that MACAR has previously done.

Advances have been made in integrating the deposit of research output into institutional repositories with HERDC reporting and later with research management systems such as Research Master. Researchers are also looking for ways to maintain their datasets but not necessarily on open access. Policies, strategies and skills sets need to be developed to handle these datasets in institutional repositories.

Copyright continues to be a challenge and it has been noticed that publishers appear to be pushing back on open access e.g. the Wiley-Blackwell contract specifically prohibits the deposit of the author’s manuscript in an open access institutional repositories. Paula recommended that researchers be encouraged to maintain some of their rights when negotiating with publishers and that CAUL might assist by developing an author’s addendum similar to that used by CARL. Instead of holding out for permission to make open access immediately, it may be easier to agree to open access after an embargo period. It is important to understand the relationship between copyright and the economics of publishing and to understand the difference between open access publishing and the archiving of the researcher’s publications in institutional repositories.

Paula referred to the article by Richard Poynder in which he discusses researchers’ disconnect between publication of their own work and the ability to use others’. The old model of free-to-publish with libraries paying to subscriber is being transferred to the new hybrid and full open access model where author fees are being transferred to the library. The Sherpa site shows that author fees range between USD 2k-5k.


Support for Research

901. *Australian Research Council (ARC).* Professor Margaret Sheil addressed members, highlighting the points of overlap between the ARC and CAUL: ERA, bibliometrics, open access and scholarly communication, repository management, especially data; Adam Chapman was available for answering specific questions regarding technical aspects of the ERA.

**Excellence in Research Australia (ERA).** The RQF (Research Quality Framework) was intended to be done quickly with a focus on the bibliometrics but the government wanted a more responsive system with the confidence of the research community. The response of academics tends towards publishing in better places and striving for better outcomes. The ARC received 103 submissions to the consultation and 114 to journal rankings, etc – with excellent engagement from the community.

Clusters were developed so like disciplines could be considered together e.g. chemistry and physics; the ARC is working with the NHMRC on health and medical sciences. There has been consultation about new RFCD codes, which are critical to the exercise – indicators are classified according to those codes, bibliometrics need them. The ARC will conduct a pilot, starting with disciplines at both ends of the spectrum; PCE (physical, chemical and earth sciences) and humanities and creative arts. The latter will have the least amount of bibliometrics.
There are eight discipline clusters; competing agendas between researchers and University administrators; what indicators are important to their discipline; esteem is always very important to researchers but difficult to collect by administrators – it will not be used in the trial round but the ARC is working on developing lists of esteem indicators; challenge of capturing and evaluating interdisciplinary research; avoid driving researchers away from really productive practical work.

The ARC tendered for a data supplier and chose Scopus. Peer review won’t be used in PCE, but there will be some in the humanities that will need outputs in repositories for peer review. Both ASHER and IAP are terminating programs.

**Open Access.** In discussion about what CAUL can do to promote open access it was asked whether the ARC or NHMRC would countenance an NIH-type declaration. Currently there are no plans for the ARC, noting that publishers will not extend NIH processes to other country agencies. It will not be included in the ARC funding rules but researchers will still be asked why not and the ARC will continue to promote it. It was suggested that the ERA does not support open access in practice. There is no reward for publishing in an open platform or to publish data before the article is out. It is recognised that open access increases awareness of research – evidence from QUT states that presence in the institutional repositories increases citations. This should lead to better outcomes for grants etc but need to do both; need to make the researchers aware.

Journal ranking and citation data are only two of the indicators and will not get the same results across all indicators. Being published in the top journals is a conservative indicator – getting published can be a result of which institution the author is from, while citations point to other value. E-presses are not yet considered prestigious but will gain respect over time. The drivers will have more impact, e.g. how the money is allocated, rather than winning the hearts and minds of researchers, so members would welcome a platform for an ongoing dialogue about the accessibility framework and how to influence behaviour in other ways.

Some concern was expressed about the proliferation of journals, the takeover of smaller publishers and the remainder expanding their lists with lesser quality content which is then included in publishers’ packages. The frequency of review of journal lists will depend on the ERA cycles but the ARC would not want to see them remain static. If institutions choose to buy the top hundred in each discipline this would give the publishers enormous power.

**ERA (Excellence in Research Australia).** *(Standing item)*

**902. Research Infrastructure.**

a) **ANDS (Australian National Data Service).** [http://ands.org.au/](http://ands.org.au/) Dr Ross Wilkinson’s presentation is at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20091ands.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20091ands.pdf) He suggested that research is much more efficient than it used to be because the collection of data is so much easier. ANDS is intended to support researchers in this area; reducing cost of collecting data, and to make Australia data-excellent in its research.

Managing data costs a lot in the short term but has major benefits in the long term. Researchers are becoming more data-intensive but do not know much about data management. It is no longer simply the by-product of research, but now a research output in its own right. The cost of data acquisition is low, but some will not be able to be collected again e.g. capturing dying languages. It is possible to defer the analysis but ensure its availability by capturing the data. Esteem can be associated with the data capture not just the analysis of it; more papers are written from the second use of research data than the first use. There is a strong correlation between citation strength and the underlying data being made available. The Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (the code) requires institutions to retain its research data.

Data preservation techniques are needed, plus policies and procedures, including best practice in responding to the code by an institution. ANDS is developing utilities to simplify the process for researchers. ANDS has a role in facilitating discussions around data management but cannot make the rules. Professional services are needed to enable...
data to be shared; research data analysts, research data carers/lifecyclists (managers has a different connotation); research data programmers, not [hackers].

ANDS is currently developing registration services. It is not funded to do storage but can advise on data capture and storage. Both skills and tools are needed to find the data and to use it; not just data created by researchers also government data, etc; a description of the data that can be found on Google - searchable and discoverable, creating a standard path into Australian research.

The amount of activity is currently overwhelming. ANDS will build solutions around the needs that have arisen; this means already speaking to those willing and able, not necessarily to those who should be brought in. This can show other researchers the value of making the data accessible.

b) *Intersect: eResearch support and innovation for NSW.*

Intersect provides the infrastructure to help researchers to manage their data. It has to be easy so that researchers are encouraged to do it properly. It aims to provide eResearch services; to increase the quality and visibility of research; to improve research but not do the research; provide solutions to specific problems, and may provide ongoing maintenance; trying to build on what is already available and contributing to the open source community; conduct projects for members and non-members at consultancy rates; help with data management plans; tools, hosting, social and technical networking.

Intersect staff have a balance of skills, both academic and technological understanding; language and communication to translate the problem into the solution; to build better data management practices by providing solutions, advice and a helpdesk; trialling new methodologies for supporting research, e.g. using secondlife for collaboration; play a role in e-infrastructures purchase through LIEF grants; helping coordinate LIEF applications for data management and data stores; take the management burden off researchers; provide an interface to commercial providers; hide the complexity of joining all the elements together; value add for cross-institutional cross-disciplinary research.

Intersect has 23 staff, 6 funded by the ARC, and will have an office within each member organisation; including software engineering students in projects; eResearch analyst will be responsible for communicating with all areas involved; will do business analysis and propose solutions.

c) *eResearch Case Studies.*

i) **Monash University.** Cathrine Harboe-Ree updated members on Monash’s research data management. Her presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20091harboe-ree.pdf The Research Data Management Advisory Group is modelled on the Copyright Advisory Group; Research Data Management policy includes implications, procedures and guidelines (to assist compliance with policy.) It is increasingly concentrating on the Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (the code), as is ANDS, the biggest driver of change at the moment. It is collaborating with ANDS to inform each other’s work.

They are identifying early career and late career researchers plus anyone who approaches them for help. They will work towards time when one cannot submit a grant application until the Research Data Management plan is in place.

The DARE project intends to provide all library professionals with skills to assist researchers with Research Data Management. CSIRO librarians are also participating. There are 3700 researchers, and now an army of staff to help disseminate this information, rather than having dedicated staff for this role. Staff have a checklist to support interviews with researchers. A copy of the checklist will be made available to CAUL.  *(Action: CH-R)* Small steps might include having all
data backed up properly even if it isn’t yet accessible elsewhere; copyright issues – need to obtain copyright clearance when making field recordings; etc.

ii) University of Technology, Sydney. Alex Byrne’s presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20091byrne.pdf He reported that data access has been added to UTS’s e-publishing and institutional repositories activities. UTS is part of Simon Fraser University’s Public Knowledge Project (PKP).

UTS is using DSpace and the ANZ research classification rather than be tied to today’s UTS structure. They are capturing all HERDC publications into a dark archive and working to make them more available. UTS is the NSW node for the Australian Social Science Data Archive (ASSDA), helping to redefine notions of collecting, particularly non-traditional collections. There is a need to support monograph publishing because of the almost total collapse of traditional scholarly publishing; not just e-text but using the technology capabilities. Libraries are probably the only part of the university to take a really long view.

iii) Swinburne University of Technology. Derek Whitehead’s presentation is at http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/caul20091whitehead.pdf He noted that Swinburne is also involved in the PKP project. There are various models for integrating institutional repositories with research management systems such as ResearchMaster. Because the repository has to start with all the metadata for the research output, and will never include all the full-text, Swinburne adopted the model of including content in the institutional repositories and then transferring relevant data to the research management systems. A symposium at EDUCAUSE will highlight case studies.

The NicNames project – names in context – is due to finish in June 2009. http://nicnamesproject.blogspot.com The database maintains researcher profiles, with a web interface to pick up data from other sources and to allow researchers to edit their own data.

d) Institutional Repositories.

i) *CAIRSS (CAUL Australian Institutional Repositories Support Service). (Paper included)* Helen Livingston referred to the summary of activity to date. She outlined the process to select the service provider – USQ through its Division of Academic Information Services, with Swinburne providing the copyright support. The service officially started on March 16. The contract was formally signed today. The budget is a little over $600,000. Discussions concern immediate work plans and the role for Steering Committee and CAUL.

The generic email is now set up, and a presence on the CAUL website until the CAIRSS website is established. A CAIRSS Google group has just been established to help drive the agenda. It is already being publicised in the market place, at “ERA: under the bonnet” and at EDUCAUSE. Kate Watson will be contacting repository managers in the next couple of weeks – all members are encouraged all to contribute thoughts and questions.

In discussion of MACAR, it was noted that it was included in the project specifications. MACAR is currently acting as a pseudo-standards body, with the involvement of the National Library. It has been valuable but overlaps with ANDS and CAIRSS. CAIRSS will operate in this space but will look at the terms of reference, and make some recommendations about how it might work. It was noted that the next ERA cluster will be a challenge where MACAR may need to be involved.

It was noted that CAIRSS is a support service not a software developer. The choice of project manager is a good one, and there is a good reporting structure in place. It recognises that there are many repository solutions – if there is any software development it would be cross-platform contingent.
The interim Steering Committee has been tasked with recommending an ongoing governance arrangement. It was recommended that the current Steering Committee stay on for the first year of implementation for continuity. APSR’s Adrian Burton is no longer participating. The Steering Committee could co-opt a repository manager (in the CEIRC committee mode) in his place. The link with ANDS is useful and David Groenewegen is fulfilling that role.

It was noted that some elements of the ADT naturally fit with CAIRSS – support, advocacy, advisory services – but the discovery element (and the potential use of the ARROW discovery service) and the future of the metadata repository are less clear. Technical support will eventually cease. The ADT and CAIRSS will propose options, and wind up the ADT governance mechanisms.

Members were encouraged send queries to CAIRSS now, including copyright queries, and to put more strategic issues on the agenda. **(Action: All)**

**903. *Scholarly Communication.***

a) **Open Access.** A paper from Greg Anderson, John Shipp, Andrew Wells was included with the agenda papers. Andrew Wells introduced the discussion by asking members first what they wanted to do, and then how do we pay for it? He referred to the CAUL statement on the global financial crisis and asked if CAUL can speak as one on such issues that affect all members. He stressed that the paper is not about individuals or CEIRC but about where CAUL puts its resources.

In the ensuing discussion, members stated the following:

SPARCAUL needs an identity to lead it in order to get traction – for a country the size of Australia to get noticed it needs an identity to lead it; it needs to be well known among publishers and respected; it needs money. We normally do not pay the true cost.

The statement re CAIRSS is correct; it will not have the capacity to expand to scholarly communication.

There was support for having a separate SPARCAUL group coordinating with CEIRC to not lose the bigger picture. CEIRC is valuable as it is.

What would SPARCAUL do that SPARC isn’t doing? Follow on from SPARC and the JISC committee for scholarly communication – take the toolkit and tailor for Australian circumstances; work with CEIRC on how to take the issues re publishing and scholarly communication forward.

Some Vice-Chancellors are supportive of open access – we could make more information available to creators about what is happening with their efforts.

There may be some leverage from current US financial problems now and worth taking a fresh look at how we buy our resources e.g. what is on ERA list that is needed in our organisation; can we afford aggregations and bundled resources that we cannot afford any more; if local deposit is mandated in institutions then cannot support publishers who will not allow deposit; need to try some other models, even if they eventually fail.

ERA will have quite an impact on scholarly communication – a conservative impact which may be a barrier to disseminating information. It is likely that the ERA will have some perverse effects.

What do we do with data; how will government manifest its accessibility framework?

Where is CAUL’s voice in articulating this when there is no longer a clear channel to government?

There was support for a group to look at scholarly communication but not linked with SPARC because it may tie CAUL to an older initiative that probably needs renewal anyway. CAUL’s Scholarly Communication Working Group lapsed because the environment improved.
A new group should determine what resources are needed to support it. Cathrine Harboe-Ree, Maxine Brodie and John Shipp volunteered to examine further. They will identify what could be done with no additional resources, plus outline what could be done if defined resources were available. (Action: CH-R, MB, J S)

This group could include an advocacy and educative role like SPARC; people will come at it from different perspectives; cannot be the answer to everything; the knowledge in this area is distributed e.g. there is significant knowledge in CEIRC; should not be a vehicle for a particular view; need to define the scope well.

The group needs to be effective, not just generate ideas. The link with CEIRC should be maintained. The CEIRC Think Tank should be a very useful event.

Indentify key people such as Terry Cutler, Macquarie’s Vice-Chancellor; DVC (Education) at Monash; those who are not librarians who can carry the message outside e.g. Malcolm Gillies was an excellent advocate.

b) *CAUL Statement on the Global Financial Crisis.* Andrew Wells called for comment on the draft statement that was included with the agenda. He suggested that members could adapt it and use it as needed, including as part of negotiations with publishers. It could be used for any appropriate audience. It was noted that SPARC also provides a great number of resources that can be adapted to various situations.

It was agreed that “global economic crisis” is a more accurate term. It was agreed to adopt it in principle and that members should forward any suggestions for amendment to the Executive. Liz Curach expressed concern about the meaning of some sections of the draft, and will assist the Executive in finalising the statement. (Action: Executive, Liz Curach)

c) **CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC).** A report from Greg Anderson was included with the agenda.

*Invoice payments.* He alerted members to problems with late payments noting the significant time taken in follow up and some resulting late payments to suppliers. He encouraged members to discuss this with their Datasets Coordinators.

In discussion, members made the following comments:

- CEIRC invoices coming out of sync are the cause of some difficulties;
- cash flow problems in universities;
- universities will get worse at paying in time, and it is suggested that some organisations can wait for their money;
- why should CAUL be treated any differently from any other supplier when a statement is received – it should be followed up;
- should CAUL continue to collect money?
- prefer to hear directly from the CAUL office rather than referring back to the Datasets Coordinators;
- chasing invoices is done by different people.

There are two issues – the payment process and the relationship with CAUL. Datasets Coordinators are currently the key point of communication; the role has changed over the years. It was noted that some CEIRC invoices are sent to other than the Datasets Coordinators, as nominated by each institution.

**CAUL Industry Think Tank.** The CEIRC committee has proposed holding a think tank to discuss the environment, focussing on the global financial crisis and the variations on scholarly publishing, including open access. Anne Horn is drafting the program and suggested that day 2 be broadened to sustainable models of publishing, not just focussed on open access. The publishers will be asked to outline their plans e.g. will they attempt to sustain just the top end of the market, noting that profit still around 17%. Some suggested speakers are David Prosser from SPARC Europe; an academic. Anne suggested that a good facilitator was needed and asked for suggestions. (Action: All)
will potentially be held July/August in Sydney. It was suggested that the Think Tank finish with a goal e.g. to establish SPARCAUL, to show that the discussion is ongoing.

**The Wiley-Blackwell** draft proposal for 2010-2012 has been received, and includes an opt-out clause. In principle, about the same content will be accessible at about the same price with a proposed 5.5% increase. As per recent Wiley agreements it includes a concession to members with a large spend. Greg Anderson, Jocelyn Priddey and Diane Costello will meet soon to work on the detail. It was noted that some institutions will require arrangements for one-year licences. *(Action: GA, DC)*

**Taylor and Francis.** It was suggested that many institutions will not make decisions before the May federal budget. It was noted that the 1-2-3 offer does not preclude members from retaining the original 2009-2011 agreement – all decisions are up to the individual institution. UWS has advised TandF they are cancelling and were told by TandF that under a clause in the contract, the intention to withdraw from the consortium would be referred to Diane Costello. It was noted that more than 30 members already subscribing.

It was suggested that this offer is highly arrogant in the current environment, and the head office should be made fully aware of this. It was suggested that the added package content is not always the appropriate quality, and members should push back about the cost of it. The Think Tank may provide an avenue in which to press home this message.

Greg Anderson reported that TandF have been invited to meet with the CEIRC committee three times in the last four years to discuss their consortial model.

**Fairfax’s AFR Search** is a database of articles - a cut-down version of afr.com - hence greater clarification of the content is needed. The pricing is a significant improvement over that previously offered. *(Action: DC)*

904. *AustLit.* A briefing paper from Kerry Kilner was included in the agenda papers. Her presentation is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20091austlit2.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20091austlit2.pdf) She outlined its current funding sources, including $350-450k annually from subscriptions and project funding via NCRIS/NEAT. AusELit is developing tools and services for leaders in Australian literature. Kerry suggested that CAUL members may continue to contribute via subscription, thus enabling the service to become open access for the public and genealogical researchers. It is proposed that Level 1 access would provide a basic search service while Level 2 tools and services would include federated search, data annotation, etc. AustLit will apply for ALTC funding to widen the service to learning objects. The proposed governance model would include the NLA and NSLA, with access extended via the Libraries Australia consortium.

Members applauded the move to open access but suggested adopting an alternate model e.g. the ANU currently funds the Australian Dictionary of Biography as a national service, the University of Sydney funds the Dictionary of Arts Online. AustLit cannot continue with the current grant funding model which leaves no room for maintenance.

Although Kerry Kilner left the meeting to catch a flight, members continued the discussion. They acknowledged that it was a resource that is used, and there are prior models of voluntary contribution to an open access service e.g. the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, but it is understood that whenever there is budgetary pressure, this will be the first to be dropped.

Institutions do have a role in supporting national services. AustLII survived the transition from research funding to broadly supported infrastructure. All are funded by government in one way or another, including directly e.g. ABS, GeoSciences Australia - perhaps an agency could be identified whose role this fits within. This model was recommended by the Cutler Report. It was suggested that CAUL ask DIISR what it plans to do with this recommendation. *(Action: Executive)*

Keith Webster advised members that the UQ Library provides 2 staff on secondment, space and technical support, while the university provides another 2 staff to AustLit. The ARC has funded it annually for approximately $300k. It was suggested that AustLit identifies the minimum funding required to support the core service and the additional services that users may be prepared to pay for. *(Action: AustLit)*
Support for Learning & Teaching

905. Information Literacy Working Group. A report from Ruth Quinn was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

906. University Library Australia. A report from Shirley Oakley was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

Delivering Quality & Value

907. *Best Practice Working Group. A report from Helen Livingston was included with the agenda. She reported on the materials availability survey; Eva Fisch and Stephen Parnell will scope a plan to update the survey; it will be made more readily deliverable as an online instrument and cover other than the catalogue; they will aim for completion by the July Executive meeting so that the cost may be included in the budget. (Action: BPWG)

908. *Insync Surveys. A report from Helen Livingston was included with the agenda. She reported on the final version of the revised survey, noting that some comments were diametrically opposed to each other so not all could be taken on board; access was removed from the category of information resources; there was significant discussion concerning part 3, the open ended questions; question b was removed from the standard survey but members can still use it if they wish; question d was removed because it was considered to be self-serving. It was noted that the weightings for each category contribute to an overall benchmark number - these have been included for many years.

Felicity McGregor expressed concern that benchmarking capability has been lost, as has any reference to quality. In response, Helen Livingston advised that questions 7 and 27 were assessed as being the same, but that it is possible to add back questions. The total number of questions was reduced from 35 to 27 so it is not directly benchmarkable. John Shipp suggested that each institution has only ever been benchmarkable against itself but not against others because they are too different from each other. Not all institutions use it, though most do. LATN will be using it in 2009-2010, with the standard survey plus a given number of extra questions. Cathrine Harboe-Ree considers it important because it sits within the Monash University benchmarking - they are generally satisfied with mapping from old version to the new.

The President expressed thanks to the working group and closed the discussion. This version will be forwarded to Insync in the next week. (Action: HL)

909. *Statistics. Judy Stokker reported that QUT has expanded its information literacy into academic skills and there is less activity able to be included under CAUL statistics. She recommended a review of CAUL statistics in view of the changing nature of their business. This was also discussed at the meeting of the BPWG re types and number of users' questions, mostly re reference and IL statistics, the differences between embedded vs voluntary IL. It was noted that many are collecting the data already. If statistics are looking less relevant than previously, members were invited to provide recommendations to the CSFG via Diane Costello to review the area, including reasons, suggested indicators and data for doing so. (Action: J Stokker, ALL)

Advocacy & Influence

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

c) *Universities Australia. Dr Rebecca Harris, Universities Australia advised members that copyright is now firmly back on Universities Australia's agenda. With the CAL licence finishing at the end of 2010 preparations for the discussions are underway. Universities Australia's priority is to support evidence-based advocacy in all areas, if necessary prepared under legal privilege by their legal team who will be tasked with commissioning the appropriate independent research. The CAL licence costs $23.5m per year, indexed by CPI. Universities Australia is seeking to collect information to feed into negotiations, and will require clear, unimpeachable evidence should they be required to front the Copyright
Tribunal. Universities Australia plans to use 2009 to gather and explore information, for negotiations with CAL in 2010.

There will be no assumptions e.g. questions will include:

is a CAL licence the best approach?
what other options for access to the content are there?
what are the risks in accessing third-party content?
what is Universities Australia’s role in supporting universities’ preferred approaches?
how should the sector be best consulted?
how are members currently using part VB?
how is the data being collected?
how accurate is the processing of the data?
are we paying for what we are using, or over-reporting so paying too much?
what would it cost to obtain the same information another way e.g. using permission systems, direct licences, etc

A second exercise will be to drill down into the data being collected:
how might the changes in patterns of usage contribute to changes in costs – should be remunerating copyright owners appropriately, neither too much nor too little;
understand the most cost-effective method for our users;
are reporting practices as good as they could be e.g. are academics still scanning documents and making available through LMS rather than linking via licensed library content;
analysing data from past EUS surveys;
any lessons to be learned from USQ’s experience;
need to know what licences the University has and what the conditions are;
any alternatives cannot be more complicated than the current process; part VB is extraordinarily simple, whereas a commercial provider might have to ask permission for everything and wait for an answer;
need to be appropriate for the purposes;

Swinburne is currently examining Blackboard content noting that part VB should be processed through the library; they are developing software to analyse content.

The use of FTEs to distribute costs is Universities Australia’s choice. It is noted that it has nothing to do with content or use.

Universities Australia proposes using a working group to assess the data, and this group would understand the workload and capacities of their colleagues in specifying how elements 1,2, 5, 6 could best be done. The group could identify the information that is already available, important and accessible. The data crunch and any other required work will be outsourced. It was noted that CAUL has already collected much data, and UTS has a licence database to identify what the content can be used for.

CAUL will clarify what the working group could do, what kind of membership is needed, then approach CAUL for contribution/volunteering. **(Action: Executive)**

On the subject of the renegotiation of Thomson Reuters’ Web of Science, an assessment group will include CAUL, CAUDIT and advise Universities Australia on how to progress. A proposal will go to the Universities Australia board next week, and wider consultation will be undertaken after that.

### 911. Relationships with other Organisations.

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

i) Go8.

ii) LATN.

iii) IRUA.

iv) CAVAL.
v) **QULOC.** Graham Black reported that QULOC has established a research reference group; it is looking at HERDC; a health reference group is working with Queensland Health and is trialling EBSCO's *DynaMed®*.

b) **CONZUL.** A report from John Redmayne was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed. The report noted that the second CONZUL meeting will be held 15-16 October in Christchurch, immediately after the LIANZA Conference. CAUL colleagues would be very welcome to attend.

c) **National Library of Australia.**

i) *Libraries Australia.* A report from Linda Luther and Anne Horn was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

(1) *NBD Survey Results.* The presentation by Anne Horn is available at [http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20091nbd.pdf](http://www.caul.edu.au/org/caul20091nbd.pdf). She reported on an NLA survey which quantified the size of the collections in Australian libraries which have no records in the NBD, approximately 1.5m monographs. The University of Melbourne experience indicated that there may not be much original cataloguing required. There was no indication of the level of duplication, however previous studies would suggest that it is quite low. It was suggested sharing more information about who is digitising what and the projects that are underway. It was suggested that most digitised materials will be going into institutional repositories, subject to the normal discovery services, and will not be “catalogued.”  **(Action: AH, LL)**

d) **OCLC.** Report on February 2009 Members Council Meeting. Vic Elliott spoke to the paper included with the agenda. He highlighted three issues; governance structure; transfer of OCLC records; new definition of OCLC membership.

   The governance structure was outlined in the report – regional councils were thought to be better able to promote local concerns and issues; improved representation on the global council; 4.5% on members council and 7% on global council; OCLC is not just a utility; members were encouraged to attend the first regional council 6-7/9/09; the OCLC board includes non-members such as Clifford Lynch.

   Policy for use and transfer of WorldCat records – a review board has been established, members are encouraged to respond to the recent online survey; the policy distinguishes between commercial and non-commercial use; it encourages attribution of OCLC WorldCat and the retention of the OCLC number and the link to the OCLC policy in the record; cannot transfer records if you don’t have holdings against it; there is no current restraint on access to the WorldCat catalogue, fully open access.

   OCLC membership definition – governing members (formerly all who have holdings on OCLC, but now all who participate in Libraries Australia and Te Puna), members and participants. The governing member category has now been eliminated because of the expansion in the numbers of these members; broadened to include a range of intellectual contributions; sharing materials expertise and content or metadata; specific mention of respect for others’ intellectual property.

   There is now recognition that there is value in data which has not been copyrightable, and the OCLC push is into this area and an attempt to gain property rights over it – this should not be encouraged, and CAUL should resist the turning of such content into private information. There was a similar controversy regarding ABN in 1987. The re-use of OCLC records is covered in the Libraries Australia agreement and won’t change unless the agreement is changed.

e) **Collections Council of Australia.** This item was not discussed.

f) **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.
g) **IFLA.** IFLA 2010, Brisbane, August 15-19. [http://archive.ifla.org/IV/ifla76/index.htm](http://archive.ifla.org/IV/ifla76/index.htm) Keith Webster reported briefly on the organisational structure of the conference, shared between IFLA and the Congrex Group, with the local organising committee handling the social program and tours and organising satellite events. The local committee will shortly be calling for volunteers to assist.

**912. Forthcoming Meetings.** This item was not discussed.

c) **CAUL Meeting 2009/2.** Sydney, 21-22 September 2009.
d) **CAUL Meeting 2010/1.** Canberra (tbc)
e) **CAUL Meeting 2010/2.**

**CAUL Administration**

**913. President’s Report.** A report from Andrew Wells was included with the agenda. This item was not discussed.

**914. CAUL Web Site Redevelopment.** This item was not discussed.


c) **CAUL Budget 2009.** (Paper included)
d) **CAUL Budget 2008.** (Paper included)
e) **CAUL Budget 2007.** (Paper included)

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

**917. Other business.**

Andrew Wells thanked all guest speakers and those who prepared presentations. Thanks were also offered to Greg Anderson for hosting the event.

The meeting closed at 12.50pm

Members moved to lunch, to be followed by a tour of the Callaghan campus of the University of Newcastle.
CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/2

1 April, 2009
from 10am to 5pm
The Conservatorium
The University of Newcastle

Minutes
(Finalised 12/8/09)

In attendance: Diane Costello.

1845. *Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/1 – February 4 2009. The minutes were accepted.

1846. *Minutes of CAUL Meeting 2008/2. The minutes have been finalised. The following is business arising, not yet actioned.

a) In reference to the Cutler Report on innovation, Cathrine Harboe-Ree noted that recommendations regarding governance of innovation are likely to mean a change in the nature of AeRIC. She strongly recommended that CAUL seeks to retain representation of the library community. (Action: Executive) The most recent meeting of AeRIC was held August 2008.

b) Helen Livingston recommended that CAUL that allocate funds to develop a materials availability survey regarding electronic discovery tools and online information resources. The BPWG will prepare a brief, taking into account how LibQUAL+ and others have addressed electronic resources. The intention is to develop something of use to all CAUL, with the option of adding localised questions as with the Insync surveys. (Action: BPWG)

c) The BPWG will also examine the standard terms of agreement as it appears that Insync owns the data. (Action: BPWG)

d) Vic Elliott agreed to share the Go8 contract re sharing responsibility for print journal retention as an example for other groups planning a similar activity. He has provided a copy to the South Australian group, and will make it available to other members on request.

1847. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda. All items are included in the agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1848. *Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item). It was agreed to review the progress of the strategic plan at the February Executive meeting, and include as a major agenda for CAUL 2009/2. It was last reviewed thoroughly at CAUL 2006/1.

A skeleton of the 2010-2012 plan has been prepared, separating out the operational (business as usual) activities from the new activities planned for the next year to three years.

QULOC is revising its strategic plan and doesn't wish to duplicate any CAUL activities. Diane Costello will pull together the documents for background e.g. Universities Australia plan, etc. (Action: DC) Ainslie Dewe has already started putting some flesh on the skeleton. The plan...
should consider how CAUL can make a difference as a group rather than as individual institutions. why doesn't CAUL have a vision. what should we aspire to. moving away from visions into strategic intent.

From 2007-2009 plan:

22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative (Ad Hoc Working Group) The Go8 proposes to pay a consultant to undertake a cost-benefit study for a total of USD 140,000 (previously reported as USD 120,000). Seven of the Go8 will share the cost and asked CAUL to contribute USD 20,000. The request for CAUL funding was received from Vic Elliott on February 16. It was confirmed that the income from CAUL's special levy of $500 per institution in 2004 was recorded as income rather than as a balance sheet liability. This means that its expenditure will cause a reduction in CAUL's retained earnings rather than its liabilities.

Ainslie Dewe confirmed that, following consultation with the Executive and a discussion with Vic Elliott:

- CAUL would consider a contribution of A$20,000
- We accept that it is not possible to include a non-Go8 Library since they are putting up most of the cost (only 3 of the Go8 will be surveyed)
- We need to be able to assure CAUL members that the results of the report, which we will have access to, will have information that CAUL libraries can use i.e. it is transferable to some extent

On this basis I am happy to recommend that CAUL makes this contribution.

Diane Costello has informed Vic Elliott of the Executive’s decision. It was suggested that the previously mentioned report by Price Waterhouse Cooper is possibly too dated to be useful background here.

CAUL ADMINISTRATION

1849. CAUL Finances. The 2009 budget has been updated. It was suggested that members discuss what programs would be useful to invest in e.g. SPARCAUL. Options for funding include reserves, levy or increased membership cost. Anything that is ongoing needs to have additional income, but a pilot/test could be funded out of reserves. It was noted that the end of year balance sheet 2008 was $227,935.28.

In discussion of the amount of overdue CEIRC invoices in the 2008-2009 renewals period it was agreed to present to CAUL the importance of keeping the money flowing. A draft budget for 2010 will be prepared for the July meeting, and any additional levies should be identified. (Action: DC)

a) *CAUL investments. The proposed $150,000 interest-bearing deposit will be completed as soon as the bank has completed the establishment of the Cash Deposit Account. This account can be used for multiple types of deposit - at-call interest-bearing funds; term deposit (where the CAUL funds will be invested) and interest-bearing bonds, which are not of interest to CAUL. The account has been established.

b) *CAUL Budget 2007. [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2007.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2007.xls) The final journals have been received from the auditor. Key changes which affect the retained earnings are the gain/loss on foreign exchange, the value of which must be shown in AUD, even though it has no bearing on the cash in that account, and a write-off against unbalanced GST transactions from 2005 when GST (payable in AUD) was included on USD invoices from two vendors. The former is AUD 74,137 (gain on foreign exchange) and AUD 19,747 (write-off). Notes will be included in the audit report.

c) *CAUL Budget 2008. [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2008.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2008.xls) The balance sheet was updated following the finalisation of the 2007 accounts, but will not be finalised until after the audit is completed and any journals entered. The audit is scheduled to start in April.
d) **CAUL Budget 2009.** [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2009.xls](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/budget2009.xls) The budget report has been updated. Additional funds for CEIRC staffing August-December have been updated, and adjustments made to the CEIRC income following the loss of two members, and CAIRSS/ADT income following CONZUL’s decision not to contribute after 2008. A separate worksheet has been added for CAIRSS. Both the ARROW income and CAUL’s ADT levies have been recorded in a liability account, against which monthly CAIRSS costs will be accrued.

**1850. Risk assessment for CAUL.** Andrew Wells. [http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/risk-assessment2007.doc](http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc$/risk-assessment2007.doc) This will be reviewed after the CEIRC review recommendations have been settled. (Action: DC) This should also inform the strategic plan. (Action: AW) Ainslie Dewe considers that the unincorporated status is still a risk.

**1851. CAUL Web Site.**

a) **Web Site Redevelopment.** Development is complete and the site has been handed over to CAUL for population and testing. An introduction to Sitedock, the administration module, was conducted at William’s offices in Sydney on March 26. Diane Costello and Alisha Davies attended. Its design outline can be seen currently at [http://caul.dev.wiliam.com.au/](http://caul.dev.wiliam.com.au/) The site population will be a high priority following the CAUL meeting.

**1852. ACT!, by Sage, database software development.** [http://www.thecontactgroup.com/](http://www.thecontactgroup.com/) Diane Costello is preparing a report on the efficiency of using the new software compared with the current processes, including data entry comparison, ease of production of and functionality of reports. Members were reminded that this implementation is a recommendation from the CEIRC review intended to improve the process efficiency.

**CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH**

**1853. CAIRSS (CAUL Australasian Institutional Repository Support Services).** Heather Gordon reported on the meeting with the USQ team at Brisbane Airport to review issues from previous meeting. They discussed money, the action plan, and what was to be achieved in the quarter, and what are the universities looking for from CAIRSS?

It is acknowledged that CAIRSS cannot really take the issue of scholarly communication very far, other than any technical aspect. It was noted that there is a significant difference in the maintenance requirements of institutional repositories depending on which software is being used. CAIRSS is intended to be independent of platform and there was some concern about the focus on the technology. Katy Watson is contacting all repository managers and technical staff to determine what they need and would like from CAIRSS. CAUL members will want CAIRSS to be scanning the environment and be able to advise where institutional repositories are going. It is expected that the website will be up sooner rather than later.

Thanks will be extended to the Steering Committee for bringing the program to fruition in good time. (Action: AW)

a) **ADT.** Members discussed the questions being handled via UNSW and the CAUL office re the ADT. The handling of the metadata repository will be a good place for CAIRSS to begin to determine which elements of the ADT can be undertaken by CAIRSS. Andrew Wells as ADT@UNSW will approach CAIRSS about how to untangle ADT. (Action: AW)

a) **ERA and Copyright.** Questions were forwarded to Margaret Sheil re issues to be addressed at the CAUL meeting viz ..... A message on the ANZ-repositories list asking for repository managers to use consistent terminology instead of preprint and postprint e.g. version of record (VoR): “Perhaps the NISO terminology is something this group could petition the ARC to adopt before the “real” ERA exercise in 2010. I assume that there are ARC people listening in on this list, so they will take the message, hopefully. Otherwise CAUL should take it up. The ARC should be very receptive to using international standards.” It elicited this response from Alex Cooke from the ARC: We will be looking at this in the context of ERA for 2010 given the views. Our intention has been to follow recognised standards where possible, which is why the 2009 exercise went with the Sherpa/Romeo classification (as referred to on page 36 of the Submission Guidelines), as well as because we expected institutions to consider this or the OAKlist when looking at copyright issues related to storing research outputs in repositories for peer review.

1855. Research Infrastructure.

a) **AeRIC (Australian eResearch Infrastructure Council).** It was noted that the last meeting of AeRIC was held in August 2008.


i) **Building Capabilities Program.** Australian Research Data Commons Capabilities Forum. The President supplied a list of potential contributors to Margaret Henty, but was concerned that those selected did not seem to allow for new perspectives, and those not selected were advised by ANDS rather than through their own university librarian. It was noted that ANDS is highly distributed. It was recommended that future requests should be handled more formally through CAUL. (Action: AW)

There will be follow up regarding the expectations of the delegates and how progress can be reported back to CAUL. (Action: DC)

1856. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee). A workshop has been proposed for Datasets Coordinators on evaluation of agreements for decision-making (Action: CEIRC) The paper from Andrew Wells and Greg Anderson is included in the CAUL agenda for discussion.

The subject of criteria for withdrawing from agreements has again been raised – it was agreed to try to measure the benefits from CEIRC to the local level e.g. how much time would the institution otherwise spend on pulling together the same information. It is suggested that this needs to be known when looking at the size of the CEIRC program – if it continues to grow it will result in another fee increase. This review needs to show both the value that CEIRC offers and also provide an opportunity for libraries to review their own work processes. The value of CEIRC does not seem to be as obvious to all members.

The issue of whether open access will save money is still not fully understood: publishers who package content for specific academics often ask the library to pay for it, but this information is generally not available outside that course. Generally, if the content is not available to the whole institution the Library will not pay for it.

a) **Global Financial Crisis.** In response to some inquiries from publishers seeking to survey members about the impact of the GFC and their plans for 2010, the CEIRC committee considered preparing a CAUL statement to supplement the ICOLC statement.

b) **Wiley-Blackwell 2010-2012.** Some comments on a first view of the proposal from Wiley-Blackwell: the 5.5% proposed price cap looks too high; cancelling print is not new for us; the opt-out clause needs clarification. Greg Anderson, Jocelyn Priddey and Diane Costello will review this thoroughly, perhaps at ICOLC. (Action: DC)

c) **Campus Review.** Diane Costello reported on correspondence from Universities Australia regarding the Campus Review terms and conditions.
d) **Think Tank.** It was agreed to run the program over two days rather than one, and hold a dinner the intervening night. Suggested publishers to invite: Thomson Reuters, Elsevier, ProQuest, Wiley-Blackwell, EBSCO, Swets, Sage, Springer, Thomson Legal. When inviting publishers, it was agreed to invite the person with regional responsibility and the person to whom they report. *(Action: DC)*

A good facilitator is needed. *(Action: AW)*

The program should start with the global environment, followed by an Australian perspective, the publishers perspective, perceptions of value and where these may be different; a feedback session to be facilitated. The issues raised in the CAUL statement could be used to shape the discussion at the meeting e.g. the dot points under the section on the future; include CAUL members discussing “what it is like for my library” e.g. JCU spending $3.9m out of $4.2m on subscriptions. Statistics will be even more important to show the ROI e.g. what percentage is being spent on online, does the download cost more than inter-library loan.

The second day should address new models of publishing, including but with no undue focus on open access. A good rapporteur will be needed e.g. John Shipp, Vic Elliott, Cathrine Harboe-Ree and perhaps a publisher e.g. YS Chi, Elsevier, and finish with a look at the future.

**CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING**

1857. Copyright

a) **Universities Australia negotiations with CAL.** Rebecca Harris will be addressing CAUL on Friday. Universities Australia intends to gather data through two studies. CAUL’s role is likely to be in the provision of data e.g. expenditure on electronic packages; usage for major datasets which are licensed and therefore not remunerable. CAUL can provide trend data re the growth in take-up of the large journal packages. *(Action: DC)*

Data may not be available for LMS use but it will be for e-reserve. It should be possible to demonstrate the increase in resources provided, versus the number of loans, and show the trends. Including licensed material in LMSs may mean paying for content that is already licensed. Swinburne is auditing their Blackboard content and will share the code for analysis with other institutions. Additional information should be available from the EUS surveys.

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

1858. Insync Surveys.

1859. Statistics. CAVAL will begin work on the agreed online site enhancements in the 1st week of April and make them progressively available, planning for the work to be completed by the end of May.

1860. Staff Development.

a) **UNISON Staff Development Fund.** UNISON has offered to move the remainder of its funds to CAUL for the support of staff development. The accumulated monies are held by the University Library at the University of Technology, Sydney and currently total $46,381.07.

It was envisaged that the fund might support travelling fellowships, investigatory projects or other initiatives which would enhance the development of leaders in Australia’s university libraries. Although the guidelines for its operation would be determined by CAUL, it would be appropriate for the fund to be named in recognition of UNISON.

In discussion of the administrative options, the following suggestions were made: the naming should be a given; the interest on the funds will not amount to much, but running it down over about 10 years would not necessarily be a problem; the selection and monitoring is a significant task;
does it need to be annual?
it could be supplemented by any profits from the CAUL staff development program.

In discussion of the professional options, the following were suggested:
Should it be focussed on a particular professional area?
Does it duplicate what is being done in home institutions?
Could someone be sponsored to an ALA staff development program?
Limit to only future university librarians rather than lower levels.
Investigatory projects that would enhance the development of leaders?
Assist with the cost of a staff exchange program? QULOC has such a program, which works very well in a defined geographic area.

Shadowing a university librarian for sufficient time to get a really good view of their role, but it is expensive to backfill staff; an essay to select; ask if anyone wants to be shadowed for a month or two; may not be in a block; if not local, then would cost subsistence allowance as well; either shadowing a UL or doing something for them; could get people to come in and do a particular piece of work; the requirements are fairly broad; perhaps shadow a state librarian? the focus is leadership rather than how a library operates. It was noted that the INU (International Network of Universities) and ACRL websites have information about their shadowing programs.
http://www.latrobe.edu.au/inu/staff/shadowguides08.htm
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/proftools/growth.cfm

Andrew Wells will advise Alex Byrne that a proposal will be prepared for the September meeting. (Action: AW)

b) CAUL Library Staff Development Conference 2010. It was agreed that it be held in Melbourne in June/July. (Action: DC)

COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

1861. Communication. (Standing item)
a) President’s Report
b) Public Relations/ Media Reports.
c) *CAUL Report 2007-2008. (standing item) It has been agreed that another biennial report be produced i.e. for 2007-2008. Diane Costello has invited all office-bearers to write something for the report, both against actions in the strategic plan and significant other achievements. She will confirm who has yet to respond. (Action: DC)
d) Executive Officer’s Report. The report is included in the CAUL agenda papers.

1862. Submissions to Public Inquiries. It was agreed to ask CAUL if any members had asked for Prescription as a Key Cultural Institution to enable them to make preservation copies of material that is of cultural or historical significance to Australia, and if so, what response did they receive. (Action: DC)
a) Public Consultation on IP Rights Reforms. Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research today called for written submissions on proposed reforms to the intellectual property (IP) system. 27 March 2009 The closing date for submissions is Friday, 8 May 2009. CAUL does not need to respond.
   i) ‘Getting the Balance Right’ – Raising patentability standards and giving greater certainty in the validity of granted patents.
b) SICTAS - Strategic ICT Advisory Service - invitation to CAUL for submission - due April 10, 2009  [http://www.educationau.edu.au/jahia/jahia/pid/757](http://www.educationau.edu.au/jahia/jahia/pid/757) The submission was sent February 27, and included a brief letter, a list of references and an invitation to respond to more specific questions.

c) Cultural Heritage Act and Regulations. The following was received by the President on January 20:

[The] Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts announced the review of the Protection of Movable Cultural Heritage Act 1986 (PMCH Act) and the Protection of Movable Cultural Heritage Regulations 1987 (PMCH Regulations) on 15 January 2009. The Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts is undertaking the review in consultation with the National Cultural Heritage Committee. An important part of that review process is consultation with and input from key stakeholders.

Your input, and input from the Council of Australian University Librarians, is invited. We would appreciate your comments on the issues raised in the attached discussion paper, and any other matters of concern in regard to the operation of the PMCH Act and the PMCH Regulations. Please note that the closing date for submissions is 6 March 2009. It is anticipated that the review will be completed by 31 May 2009.

A fact sheet on the review is also attached for your information. Further information on the review process is available on the website at: [www.arts.gov.au/public_consultation](http://www.arts.gov.au/public_consultation). CAUL need not respond to this one.  (Action: DC)

d) Key Cultural Institution Guidelines. CAUL members were asked to report if they had applied for designation as a Key Cultural Institution and if they had, whether or not this had been approved. Only one reported applying – they were refused, but have not said if they were given a reason. Two others have said they intend to apply, and another that they hadn’t but their university may have. This will be left to members.


Roundtables to discuss draft report March-April 2009
Supplementary submissions due 10 April 2009
Final report 13 May 2009

h) **Innovation Review.** The deadline for submissions was 30 April 2008. CAUL's response was submitted April 30. The final report was released September 9. Comments on the Review report were accepted up until 30 September 2008. [http://www.innovation.gov.au/innovationreview/Pages/home.aspx](http://www.innovation.gov.au/innovationreview/Pages/home.aspx) The government response will be included in the budget proposals.

1863. **Relationships with other organisations.**

   a) **CONZUL.** It was noted that John Redmayne is now president of CONZUL, and is likely to attend both CAUL meetings.

   b) **CAUDIT & ACODE.** ACODE leadership program – it was noted that the program includes a presentation by an IT director but none by a library director. Discussions have been held between the chairs of ACODE, CAUDIT and CAUL – all are keen to work together.

   i) **EDUCAUSE 2009.** May 2009. Standing Item. Imogen Garner reported that sponsorship had picked up. She invited members to chair sessions and all agreed. The number of registrants so far is only 200 of the target 450. She advised that experience has shown that early bird registrations do not make a good indicator of the final numbers i.e. low numbers of early birds are not necessarily a problem.

   c) **Universities Australia.** In discussion of staff in member libraries who may provide expert advice to Universities Australia on the functionality of Scopus and Web of Science, the following were suggested: Gabrielle Haddow, who has done a comparison for LATN, a health librarian from Newcastle, someone from UNSW. *(Action: AW, GA)*

   d) **National Library of Australia.** Greg Anderson will attend the Peak Bodies Forum; Diane Costello will circulate the report re take-up in schools and public libraries under ERA. *(Action: DC)* Diane Costello has discussed the various linkages that the NLA may have with CAIRSS with Warwick Cathro. He will be in touch with Kate Watson.


   f) **SCONUL.** Ainslie Dewe reported that three will attend SCONUL following the IATUL conference - Ainslie Dewe, Imogen Garner and Helen Livingston.

1864. **CAUL Meetings.**

   a) **CAUL Meeting 2009/1 - Newcastle, 2-3 April, 2009 at Noah's on the Beach.** The agenda and papers were made available March 27. In discussion of agenda items, members suggested that the AustLit proposal for CAUL support of an open access product is not within CAUL’s remit. Diane Costello will circulate the principles for CAUL’s membership or sponsorship of external organisations. *(Action: DC)*

   b) **CAUL Meeting 2009/2 – Sydney, 20-22 September,** in conjunction with the celebration of the University of Sydney anniversary. The meeting will be held at Waterfront, 27 Circular Quay West, The Rocks. The Executive will meet on Sunday morning, followed by the University of Sydney afternoon tea. The following items have been held over from previous meeting agendas:

   i) **AUQA.** It was suggested having a 'hot topic' on AUQA round 2, for example, the changes in approach as experienced by SCU, Newcastle & Swinburne. suggestion to invite Dr Anne Young, Director of Strategic Planning and Quality to speak at CAUL about AUQA Round 2. Dr Young has managed Newcastle's audit and would be an interesting speaker. She has offered to provide an overview of how libraries are being assessed as part of the deep audit themes e.g. student experience/Internationalisation.

   ii) **Learning Skills.** Are there other CAUL members responsible for learning skills? How is it related to information literacy. Cathrine Harboe-Ree
iii) RDA. Implications for CAUL institutions.
   http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/rda.html

c) CAUL meeting 2010/1. Canberra - ANU

d) CAUL meeting 2010/2 - venue. Members agreed that it not be held alongside IFLA as the event would be too big. Some suggestions were Perth, Hobart and New Zealand.

1865. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.

a) Draft schedule for 2009. Potential clashes:
   2009
   Leave/absences currently planned:
   Ainslie Dewe, IATUL, June 1-4 plus 2 weeks;
   Imogen Garner February 17-24, n/a 2-4/3, IATUL June 1-4 plus ??, 31/7, 24-25/11;
   Heather Gordon, 26-27/11 (JCU planning) + ??
   Andrew Wells, May 11-29 inclusive;
   Diane Costello, Jan 23-30; April 15-23; May/June (tbc);

   2009 April 10-13 - Easter;
   2009 April 15-18 ICOLC, Charlottesville, VA and 20-21 NPG Library Committee, New York;
   2009 May 3-6 Perth, Western Australia EDUCAUSE Australasia;
   2009 June 1-4 Leuven, Belgium, IATUL;
   2009 July 9-15 Chicago American Library Association;
   2009 August 23-27 Milan, Italy World Library and Information Congress: 75th IFLA;
   2009 November 3-6 Denver, Colorado EDUCAUSE.

   2010

i) 2009/3. May 7, Perth, morning following EDUCAUSE May 3-6. Imogen Garner will organise space at Curtin. (Action: IG)

ii) 2009/4. July 29, Brisbane in conjunction with CCA 2009/1. This meeting will consider the CAUL meeting agenda and the 2010 budget. (Action: DC)

iii) 2009/5. September 20, Sunday, in conjunction with CAUL 2009/2, Sydney September 21-22. It is recommended that the Executive revert to holding its meeting on the day prior to the other group meetings to enable more flexibility with scheduling. This takes into account that CAUL meetings scheduled on Friday afternoons are not generally well attended. It will be held at UNSW on the morning of the Sunday. (Action: DC)

iv) 2009/6. November 18, Melbourne, in conjunction with CCA 2009/2.

1866. Other business.
CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/3
7 May 2009
from 9am to 3pm
Curtin University Library

Minutes
(Finalised 12/8/09)

1867. *Attendance & Apologies.* Andrew Wells (President), Ainslie Dewe (Deputy President), Greg Anderson, Imogen Garner (Treasurer). Heather Gordon.
In attendance: Diane Costello.

1868. *Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/2 - April 1 2009.* All items arising are included on the agenda.

1869. *Minutes of CAUL Meeting 2009/1 - April 2-3 2009.* The draft will be held over until the next meeting. (Action: DC)

1870. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1871. *Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).* It was agreed to review the progress of the strategic plan at the February Executive meeting, and include as a major agenda for CAUL 2009/2. It was last reviewed thoroughly at CAUL 2006/1.
A skeleton of the 2010-2012 plan has been prepared, separating out the operational (business as usual) activities from the new activities planned for the next year to three years.
Where do we want to concentrate our activities?
What has happened in the last few months?
What programs bring benefit to everybody?
The outward vision is missing from the current plan. The internal activities are happening anyway, and should not take the same prominence in the plan.

The Plan.
Perhaps encourage or implement more connection between the strategic plan and the hot topics.

Communication and Advocacy.
Put communication and advocacy up front. The advocacy section is too big and needs to be focussed.
How do we communicate with people we depend on, or need to have a close relationship with?
Keep communication and advocacy as a separate goal because it needs to be seen as a core activity.
How do we engage with government on open access? Until the government policy changes, the publishing model won’t change. The ERA consolidates the model. Would prefer that government not be involved in academic promotions.
Engage with CAUDIT and ACODE but still retain our identity. Need to keep asserting our expertise in content. Each have their roles but need to work together e.g. in eResearch management. CAUDIT has a much stronger relationship with ARCS than CAUL has with ANDS. CAUL needs to find a better way to engage with NCRIS. The universities’ directors of learning and teaching are not usually the ACODE representatives – it can be difficult in some institutions to identify who holds this role?

### Teaching & Learning.

CAUL needs to focus more on teaching and learning. CAUL has a contribution to the development of scholarly methods, but is not the only player. How can CAUL change its agenda on teaching and learning? Libraries do not have resources to cater to all students for embedded learning. Are libraries doing this because they have failed with academic staff? The teaching staff are moving into the electronic space and see libraries as partners in this area because libraries are good with using the technology. How do we integrate learning support more into the teaching model?

Currently ULA, information literacy and services for offshore delivery are the main features of the teaching and learning goals. They continue to be libraries’ business. The document on offshore delivery has been very successful and used by the broader community e.g. AUQA uses it.

CAUL could develop a theme on learning skills and other areas under teaching & learning. How does this come together with the current responsibilities?

Learning spaces – sharing information and evaluation of changes.

We haven’t been able to demonstrate our impact on learning and teaching, even though it is understood that it does help. Libraries are making multi-million dollar changes in the learning spaces and environment on the premise that it will improve learning outcomes. This latter terminology is not even used. Graduate attributes is not even mentioned now. Scholarly method is one terminology. How does CAUL contribute, as a group, to learning outcomes? Who else do we engage with?

Is the development of course management systems affecting what we do? It will change the way teachers are developing content. Content will be better integrated with the curriculum. The pedagogy won’t change until the technology makes it easier to do.

Focus more on impact, learning spaces; effectiveness of learning technologies; the library has bought into this in a big way with looking at the technologies.

Looking at resource discovery e.g. web-based browsers over the top of ILMS. New forms of discovery tools, and web technology tools for discovery. Libraries make the content findable and discoverable.

CAUL hasn’t discussed research training.

### Contribution to Research.

The goals haven’t changed, and the overall rationale is still valid.

The focus on research does not reflect the priorities of all CAUL institutions – need to balance the agenda across the different areas.

### Scholarly Communication.

Publishing is currently grouped under research but it perhaps need to be separated, and called scholarly communication or publishing. It crosses teaching and learning and research. It covers content, licensing, delivery, etc. Separate scholarly communication from research.

### The Planning Process.

Andrew Wells will do a broad call for input from CAUL immediately, under the assumption that the planning process is starting from scratch; invite suggestions about actions from the community. **(Action: AW)** This will provide the opportunity for all members to voice their priorities.
Andrew Wells will draft a skeleton plan / framework and questions, for refinement at the July Executive, rather than starting the process at the CAUL meeting from scratch. At CAUL, this should need only an hour in discussion as the shell will have been circulated before the agenda papers. The shell document will have the five areas discussed above.

What process do we want to use? The Canberra process was very productive. Should each group be asked to look across all areas? Avoid self-selection of working groups. Refine the document, and come up with some actions. Ask the groups to flesh out the proposed actions.

Ask the teaching and learning group the question about demonstrating impact on learning outcomes.

Review CAUL’s working groups and determine whether there is still a role for them e.g. BPWG, ILWG. Consider groups that reflect the priorities in the strategic plan e.g. there is currently no advocacy group and no research group. Consider whether they should be ad hoc or ongoing groups.

**From 2007-2009 plan:**

22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative (Ad Hoc Working Group) The Go8 proposes to pay a consultant to undertake a cost-benefit study for a total of USD 140,000. Seven of the Go8 will share the cost and CAUL will contribute AUD 20,000. CAUL hasn’t yet received its invoice though this is likely to be soon. The ANU, UQ and UAdelaide are the selected libraries.

**CAUL ADMINISTRATION**

1872. **CAUL Finances.** The 2009 budget has been updated.

   a) **CAUL investments.** The proposed $150,000 interest-bearing deposit has been processed. It was suggested that the CAIRSS funds be invested. For consideration at the next meeting. *(Action: DC)*


   d) **CAUL Budget 2010.** The increased statistics cost will be included in the budget for 2010. CONZUL has also agreed to contribute to the additional cost, in proportion to their size. *(Note email from John Redmayne of December 19, 2008)*


   This will be reviewed after the CEIRC review recommendations have been settled. Andrew Wells has proposed some amendments. It was noted that the incorporation issue is unlikely ever to go away. The legal advice obtained during the review indicated that CAUL need not be incorporated. A footnote should be added saying when the review was done and linking to the document. It was suggested reporting on the activities on a regular basis. The Executive should address the strategy re the succession of the Executive officer? “Strategies” will be renamed as “actions.” *(Action: DC)*

   In discussion of financial risk, it was suggested that statements be sent to the CAUL members rather than the Datasets Coordinators when invoices are 60 days old i.e. 30 days overdue. Payments are made in the native currency, so that risks are handled by the CAUL institutions not the CAUL office. Note that CAUL has produced the CAUL statement on the global economic crisis and has circulated it to publishers. This document should be included in the CAUL papers for September, and put on the July agenda. *(Action: DC)*

1874. **CAUL Web Site.**

Diane Costello will analyse Alisha’s report on the comparison between the two systems. *(Action: DC)*

**CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH**

1876. **CAIRSS (CAUL Australasian Institutional Repository Support Services)**. Heather Gordon reported on the meeting of the CAIRSS Steering Committee held yesterday. The establishment phase is essentially completed, and CAIRSS Central has developed a template to report on activities, have set up the web site and the communication strategy, which shows the various communication options and examples of how to use them. The work plan is based on quarterly projections.

A presentation and soft launch was undertaken at the ERA Under the Bonnet forum, plus presentations at the copyright officers’ meeting and at EDUCAUSE. Kate Watson, the CAIRSS project manager, has contacted all repository managers and technical people, using TRAC software to record all activities. CAIRSS reports are being made available to members on the CAUL CAIRSS page. Diane Costello will direct CAUL members to the CAIRSS site to see what is covered. *(Action: DC)*

The first online conference addressed creative arts metadata for the ERA. The Steering Committee has asked for the feedback from the teleconference, but noted that there were no outcomes specifically. It has been stressed that such events need more focussed outcomes, and discussed with the project managers how to raise issues and have them forwarded to the most appropriate body. It was noted that the budget has barely been touched yet.

Members discussed which services will be offered to members only, noting that the web site is only open to all. It was suggested that CAIRSS Central could spend a lot of time responding to inquiries from non-members, so the customer group needs to be clearly defined.

a) **ADT.** Andrew Wells reported on action to date. Tom Ruthven and Kate Watson have begun discussion on how the ADT will migrate into CAIRSS e.g. how the discovery service will work, and have asked them to keep Diane Costello in the loop. The ADT Policy Reference Group will continue to exist until the ADT functions have been reallocated appropriately. It was noted that it includes members of DDOGS and CAPA.

1877. **Excellence in Research Australia (ERA).** Australian Research Council.

a) **ERA and Copyright.**

1878. **Research Infrastructure.**

a) **AeRIC.** From Cathrine Harboe-Ree to Andrew Wells 9/4/09: Clare McLaughlin advised that the NCRIS Committee is to be re-constituted as NRIC, and a new AeRIC (perhaps by another name) formed as a sub-committee of NRIC. It was suggested that CAUL advise DIISR that it would welcome opportunities to have input into the national discussion about research infrastructure, either formally through a committee or in other ways suggested by DIISR. This might be a good time to do this, as they might not have finalised membership.

Andrew Wells met informally with Claire McLaughlin during EDUCAUSE. Tom Cochrane will chair the new sub-committee and would like CAUL to be included.

b) **ANDS.** It was suggested that CAUL should engage more with ANDS directly. CAUL’s representative should have some capability in the area, but has not necessarily been involved before at this level. It was noted that there will be no ASHER funds in 2010. In some institutions the ASHER funding is supporting the ERA process rather than institutional repositories.

Cathrine Harboe-Ree is currently a member of the ANDS board.

1879. **CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).**

a) **Go8 meeting with publishers.** Andrew Wells has written to CAUL with a brief report of the meeting between the Go8 and four publishers on April 29.
The publishers included were Elsevier, Springer, TandF and Wiley-Blackwell. Elsevier's delegation included Arno ... from Belgium, with Nigel Ashworth, Anne Harvey and Linda Dunne. Springer was represented by James Mercer. TandF discussed shareholders, authors and societies. Sarah Blatchford and Vivienne Fox attended. Wiley-Blackwell brought Andrew Lau from Singapore, Heather Linaker from Brisbane, and others. All will respond by the end of May. It was noted that the cost per usage across the Go8 is vastly different; there has been no flexibility in reducing costs. The intention is not to disrupt the forthcoming CEIRC agreements, nor to be an ongoing activity, but the longer term changes needed. They would prefer one CEIRC-wide agreement. Heather Gordon expressed concern that CEIRC is not undermined. It was recommended that the chair of CEIRC be included in any such activity to emphasise that it is a consortium view not just the Go8.

b) **Global Economic Crisis.** The CAUL statement has been released. Responses in the news are included in the media reports item below.

c) **Wiley-Blackwell 2010-2012.** A brief meeting between Greg Anderson, Jocelyn Priddey and Diane Costello was held during ICOLC. Wiley-Blackwell has been asked for a comprehensive breakdown of the consortium statistics, as well as the preparation of institutional data for local decision making. The current documentation does not show individual institutional costs.

Greg Anderson had a brief discussion with Reed Elfenbein regarding currency rates. When the dollar is strong, institutions tend to buy additional content such as back-sets. It is in the publishers’ interest to maintain the level of uptake in the collections.

Some advances have already been included in the proposed licence e.g. simplifying document delivery, alumni access and offshore campuses.

d) **Scopus and Web of Science.** The Universities Australia board has approved setting up a panel. CAUL will prepare a panel of experts who understand the two products and can provide product advice.  

(Action: DC)

e) **Think Tank.** Members reviewed the revised program circulated by Anne Horn.

It was decided to stage the event Tuesday/Wednesday 18-19 August 2009, at least a month before the CAUL meeting. The last meeting was held at the National Maritime Museum with a dinner in Ultimo/Pyrmont. Vendors were charged AUD 500 each and were able to bring two personnel. It was agreed that all delegates, including CAUL members, pay a registration fee to cover the costs of the program including the dinner.  

(Action: DC) All CAUL will be invited to attend, though numbers may be limited.

Facilitator. Brenda McConchie and Angela Bridgland were recommended as good options.  

(Action: DC)

Content. The second day will cover new modes of publishing, including open access. Other options should be discussed e.g. getting authors to pay and whether this is sustainable, taking the money out of their grants, getting it from HERDC, who has tested it within their institutions. This session will include two publishers, a librarian and an academic. It was suggested changing the terminology from GFC to GEC.

Speakers. Members discussed which CAUL members should be invited speakers.  

Timing. It was suggested that more time may be needed on day 2. At the end of day 1, CAUL members will be invited to stay behind and reflect on the day, to prepare for day 2.
CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING

1880. University Library Australia (ULA). The CAVAL reciprocal borrowing group applied to CAUL via the ULA Working Group for approval to use its delinquent user database to manage ULA borrowers, and to extend that database across all ULA. (Paper available) The working group considered the submission at a brief meeting in Newcastle. In response, Shirley Oakley wrote:

The ULA Working Group met at the CAUL Meeting in Newcastle to discuss (among other things) the submission from the CAVAL Reciprocal Borrowing Program Executive re: use of the CAVAL NRAMS database to manage blocking of defaulting staff and students from ULA member libraries located outside Victoria.

We determined that the proposal made does not warrant a change in the ULA guidelines which state in relation to delinquency:

*There will be no central block list. A central block list has implications for borrower privacy, and imposes an unnecessary extra step in the registration process.*

The Working Group felt that the small number of delinquencies reported in the statistics provided did not substantiate any need for changes to the Guidelines and that there is no need for any central service or subcontractor to provide data on ULA activities.

However the Group would like to draw your attention to the Guideline relating to host Libraries which states:

*The host library will use normal means to manage overdue books by ULA borrowers.*

Since NRAMS is the normal method used by CAVAL Libraries to manage delinquent borrowers, there appears to be no reason why CAVAL members cannot implement NRAMS to manage ULA delinquencies in the same way that it is used to manage other delinquencies, whether or not the ULA borrowers’ home institution is located outside Victoria. You made it clear in your submission that ULA borrowers are notified of the privacy implications of the data about them held by CAVAL members as required to facilitate their borrowing. Therefore such use of NRAMS by CAVAL members as host libraries does not require any change to the existing ULA Guidelines.

Most Victorian libraries are now part of BONUS and its protocols automatically cover delinquency. It was noted that ULA has, from the beginning, avoided setting up another layer of administration.

1881. Copyright.

a) Universities Australia negotiations with CAL. Heather Gordon attended the meeting of copyright officers in Sydney where Universities Australia gave a similar presentation to the one at CAUL. The research methodology is not yet specified though it is being worked through. The method of selection of the test institutions is not yet known, nor whether they will have access to the data collected. Part of the output will be guidelines for institutions to reduce their copying costs. It was asked how many Australian publishers’ agreements include references to part VB? Such clauses are not relevant if linking directly to the licensed content. It was noted that CEIRC licences generally cover course-packs and e-reserve and Universities Australia need not be involved. The CAUL office is preparing a document detailing which packages are subscribed to by which CAUL members, and how many titles are included in those packages. (Action: DC)

DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE

1882. Staff Development.

a) UNISON Staff Development Fund. UNISON has offered to move the remainder of its funds to CAUL for the support of staff development. The accumulated monies are held by
the University Library at the University of Technology, Sydney and currently total $46,381.07.

*It was envisaged that the fund might support travelling fellowships, investigatory projects or other initiatives which would enhance the development of leaders in Australia’s university libraries. Although the guidelines for its operation would be determined by CAUL, it would be appropriate for the fund to be named in recognition of UNISON.*

Andrew Wells has advised Alex Byrne of discussions to date.

It was suggested that the funds could support a secondment to the CAUL office. It was noted that accommodation in the office would be difficult unless the position were part-time. Options might include a secondment for the CEIRC program, or someone to shadow Diane Costello to look at the wider role of the Executive Officer. Diane Costello will consider the options. **(Action: DC)**

b) **CAUL Library Staff Development Conference 2010.** June/July 2010 in Melbourne. Members will consider who might participate in the program committee. **(Action: Executive)**

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

1883. Communication. (Standing item)

a) **President’s Report** news reports, also send to

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


ii) References to the CAUL statement on the global economic crisis:

(1) *Restrain prices or we’ll both suffer, libraries warn publishers* by Jeremy Gilling
    *Campus Review* 04 May 09

(2) *University libraries prepare for a rough ride.* *Australian Library News,* 7 May 2009, p.4


iv) References to CAIRSS:


(4) [http://repinf.pbwiki.com/Repository-support-organisations](http://repinf.pbwiki.com/Repository-support-organisations)

(5) [http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Services_to_support_repository_managers](http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Services_to_support_repository_managers)


(7) [http://www.bibalex.org/a2k/ImportantLinks/ImpLinks.aspx](http://www.bibalex.org/a2k/ImportantLinks/ImpLinks.aspx)


c) **CAUL Report 2007-2008.** (standing item) It has been agreed that another biennial report be produced i.e. for 2007-2008. Diane Costello invited all office-bearers to write
something for the report, both against actions in the strategic plan and significant other achievements and is editing their responses. (Action: DC)

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

### 1884. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

**a) Freedom of Information (FOI) Reform.** ALIA will be coordinating a submission for the FOI Reform. [http://www.pmc.gov.au/consultation/foi_reform/index.cfm](http://www.pmc.gov.au/consultation/foi_reform/index.cfm) Comments on additional text should be sent to jane.hardy@alia.org.au by 5pm Monday 11th May 2009. It was suggested that this is less appropriate for CAUL than for its individual institutions. Ainslie Dewe will review and confirm. (Action: AD)


Roundtables to discuss draft report March-April 2009 – the Melbourne was attended by Ainslie Dewe and Derek Whitehead.

Supplementary submissions due 10 April 2009

Update 6/5/09: The study has involved consideration of some complex issues, in an area where comprehensive and up-to-date data has been limited. The Commission has received some 550 submissions, more than half since the release of its Discussion Draft on 20 March. The extension will enable the Commission to give more detailed consideration to the available data and to the arguments provided in recent submissions. The final report will be presented to government by 30 June 2009.


**e) Innovation Review.** The deadline for submissions was 30 April 2008. CAUL's response was submitted April 30. The final report was released September 9. Comments on the Review report were accepted up until 30 September 2008. [http://www.innovation.gov.au/innovationreview/Pages/home.aspx](http://www.innovation.gov.au/innovationreview/Pages/home.aspx)

### 1885. Relationships with other organisations.

**a) CONZUL.** Members were reminded that the CONZUL weekly report is sent to the Executive Officer. Items of concern to CAUL will be raised as they occur.

**b) CAUDIT & ACODE.**

i) **EDUCAUSE 2009.** May 2009. Standing Item. Members acknowledged the CAUL members involved in the organisation of the conference. Imogen Garner foreshadowed a debriefing and a written report of the conference. This should be included on the agenda for CCA meeting in July. (Action: DC)
The following CAUL institution personnel were applauded for their contribution to the conference:

Dan Archibald, UL Edith Cowan University
Imogen Garner, UL Curtin University of Technology
David Howard, Manager, Library Collections & Access, Edith Cowan University
Ralph Kiel, Associate Librarian, Information Systems, The University of Western Australia
Linda O’Brien, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Information Services), Griffith University
Liz Burke, Associate Librarian, Reader Services, The University of Western Australia
Peter Green, Associate Director, Resources & Access, Curtin University of Technology
Gaby Haddow, Lecturer, Information Studies, Curtin University of Technology (formerly Library)

ii) EDUCAUSE 2011. Andrew Wells reported that the next conference will be held in Sydney. It is likely that UTS will take the lead and the NSW CAUL members will be involved. EDUCAUSE has traditionally been about the intelligent use of information technology. This is changing and there is more encouragement for academics to be involved. Those who teach should be invited. It is most important that the program committee be experienced and involved, and that particularly keynote speakers be selected based on presentation and performance as much as cv. (Action: AW)

c) Universities Australia. Universities Australia plans to involve CAUL in its preparations for CAL negotiations and negotiations with Thomson Reuters and Elsevier.

d) National Library of Australia.

i) Peak Bodies Forum. Greg Anderson will represent CAUL at the meeting on May 22. The agenda has been circulated.

e) ALIA. In discussion regarding whether ALIA could have a brief session at a CAUL meeting, it was suggested only if they request it directly, and if it is of strategic interest to CAUL rather than a membership pitch. It was noted that CAUL is the largest employer body of their members. It was also noted that AARL is now being indexed by Thomson Reuters, and listed in the ERA list. The editors are seeking more interesting research papers - CAUL members are known for doing interesting work, but do not write it up.

1886. CAUL Meetings.

a) CAUL Meeting 2009/2 - Sydney, 20-22 September, in conjunction with the celebration of the University of Sydney anniversary. The meeting will be held at Waterfront, 27 Circular Quay West, The Rocks. The Executive will meeting on Sunday morning at UNSW, and the University of Sydney event is an afternoon tea. The following items have been held over from previous meeting agendas.

i) AUQA. It was suggested having a ‘hot topic’ on AUQA round 2, for example, the changes in approach as experienced by SCU, Newcastle & Swinburne. suggestion to invite Dr Anne Young, Director of Strategic Planning and Quality to speak at CAUL about AUQA Round 2. Anne managed Newcastle’s audit and would be an interesting speaker. Anne is interested and has offered to provide an overview of how libraries are being assessed as part of the deep audit themes e.g. student experience/Internationalisation. The only hitch is availability - Anne may have to attend the Higher Education Summit which will be held in Melbourne on the 3/4 April. This all depends on whether our DVC(A) wants Anne to go.

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

From Linda Luther: For the next CAUL meeting, I think it would be good to have a focus on Teaching and Learning rather than research. I am interested in hearing more about the work at QUT that Judy Peacock is leading regarding the closer relationship with student learning and academic literacies. I think Cathrine Harboe-Ree also has Learning Skills within the Library. UTAS runs a program UNISTART which incorporates a Library session within a range of learning skills. There are staffing issues - who runs the
program, who do they report to, how do they relate to other library staff - and what do the programs comprise in terms of content, who develops it?

iii) From Linda Luther: Another idea would be to hear more about special collections. Conservation and digitisation are on the agenda here. What are the oldest items in our collection. How are we preserving them for the future. How are we engaging with academic staff and programs to develop and maintain interest in our ancient collections?

iv) Felicity is interested in succession planning, and all other issues associated with staff development and management.

v) From Ainslie: Under the scholarly communication umbrella I think that we need to have the discussion that Andy Powell has started on "Web 2.0 and repositories
- have we got our repository architecture right?"

http://www.slideshare.net/eduservfoundation/repositories-and-web-20-have-we-got-our-repository-architecture-right

"Having the conversation is hard * highly political space * strong "open access" voices who, understandably, don't want their agenda de- railed by discussion about - preservation - search engine optimisation - Web 2.0 - social networks - semantic Web - the future of peer review * it can be hard to get the conversation started"

The current IRs are just a step along the way - we need to talk about what comes next.

vi) RDA. Implications for CAUL institutions.

http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/rda.html

b) CAUL meeting 2010/1 - The current proposed date is April 9/10 (tbc), Canberra. It was noted that Easter is April 4, and suggested looking at dates in late March. (Action: DC)

c) CAUL meeting 2010/2. Members agreed that it not be held alongside IFLA as the combined event would be too much. Sue Roberts has offered to host a CAUL meeting in Wellington. It was noted that a significant number of CAUL members had not personally attended previous meetings in New Zealand. It was agreed to find a local option. (Action: DC)

1887. Forthcoming Executive Meetings.

a) Draft schedule for 2009. Potential clashes:

2009
Leave/absences currently planned:
Greg Anderson, August 10-14;
Ainslie Dewe, IATUL, June 1-4 plus 2 weeks;
Imogen Garner IATUL May 25 – June 19
Heather Gordon, 26-27/11 (JCU planning) + ??
Andrew Wells, May 8-29 inclusive
Diane Costello, May/June (tbc):
2009 June 1-4 Leuven, Belgium, IATUL;
2009 July 9-15 Chicago American Library Association;
2009 August 23-27 Milan, Italy World Library and Information Congress: 75th IFLA;
2009 November 3-6 Denver, Colorado EDUCAUSE.

2010
2010 April 2-5 Easter
2010 April 18-21 ICOLC Chicago, IL
2010 August 15-19 Brisbane IFLA
2010 October 12-15 Anaheim, California EDUCAUSE 2010
i) 2009/4. July 29, Brisbane in conjunction with CCA 2009/1. This meeting will consider the CAUL meeting agenda and the 2010 budget. (Action: DC)

ii) 2009/5. Sunday, September 20, from 10am, in conjunction with CAUL 2009/2, Sydney September 21-22. It was noted that the Sydney marathon is run about this time. Later note: the event is on Sunday September 20 from 7.15am and the route includes the roads towards and close to UNSW.

iii) 2009/6. November 18, Melbourne, in conjunction with CCA 2009/2.

1888. Other business.

The meeting concluded at 2pm
CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/4
29 July 2009
from 8.30am-10am and from 12.30/1pm
alongside CCA meeting from 10am-12 noon
Customs House, Brisbane

Draft Minutes
(Updated 29/8/09)

1889. *Attendance & Apologies.* Andrew Wells (President), Ainslie Dewe (Deputy President),
Greg Anderson, Imogen Garner (Treasurer), Heather Gordon.
In attendance: Diane Costello.

1890. *Minutes of CAUL Executive Meeting 2009/3, Perth, May 2009.* The minutes were
accepted without amendment.

1891. *Minutes of CAUL Meeting 2009/1 – April 2-3 2009.* The draft was held over until this
meeting.

1892. Business Arising, not otherwise included in the agenda.

   a) Item 1873. It was agreed to add CAUL’s risk assessment document to the September
      papers. *(Action: DC)*

   b) Item 1884. The report on the digital economy has now been released and will be linked to
      the CAUL web site. *(Action: DC)*

   c) CAUL 2009/1 Item 907. The BPWG proposed a scoping study to update the materials
      availability survey. It was agreed to seek a progress report. *(Action: DC)*

   d) **Open Access.** The ad hoc working group has not yet met.

STRATEGIC PLAN

1893. **Review of Progress of Strategic Plan (Standing Item).** It was agreed to review the
progress of the strategic plan at the February Executive meeting, and include as a major
agenda for CAUL 2009/2. It was last reviewed thoroughly at CAUL 2006/1.

A skeleton of the 2010-2012 plan has been prepared, separating out the operational (business
as usual) activities from the new activities planned for the next year to three years. Andrew
Wells has drafted changes to the plan as discussed at the last meeting. It is intended to be
used as a trigger for discussion.

The open access working group will be asked to report before the meeting to feed into the
discussion. *(Action: AW)*

Overall structure – does the breakdown work? is the information resources section clear?

JCU’s strategic plan has a 2 page strategic intent, then the University plan for the 5 years – i.e.
how to achieve strategic intent, actions and strategies. It is possible to separate the two
documents to be used in different ways. CAUL’s plan should be designed to be used by people
outside of CAUL.

Also think about what members want CAUL to do, and ensure that there is a wider strategy/goal
which covers this.
The environment. How will universities take advantage of the government’s decision on students, spaces? These themes should be addressed because of the likelihood of additional funds. Social inclusion is a significant part of the government agenda. The Bradley review will result in the biggest change in higher education in decades, mostly because of the student choice issue, the competitive environment, and how universities will market themselves.

Do the current areas of the plan enable these to be considered?

It was suggesting using some of the terminology out of the innovation report, broaden from researchers to “for innovation”. World class research is a goal.

The following were suggested as key target areas:
innovation and discovery;
student experience;
value and impact - without losing the concept of practice;
communication and influence - tied back to the goals.

AUQA has pushed the student experience. Use this terminology rather than learning and teaching. Should it be embedded in everything or included separately up front?

TEQSA is replacing AUQA/ (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) “The Government will redirect funding from the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA)”).

Impact studies should be included in the action list.

Libraries have not been able to demonstrate how they contribute to student learning outcomes. Not all have graduate attributes, and the terminology is dated so can be replaced with “Maximising the student experience.” Add social inclusion, indigenous students, etc. Library space is not captured under teaching and learning. There is a lot of activity around research training but nothing has been done with CAUL.

CAUL members will have a view on turning students into independent learners - are there enough staff to do this; whose responsibility is it; how do we work with other areas in the university? It is also about critical thinking rather than about information literacy. Library management systems are becoming more powerful but with varying levels of integration. Broaden the language about the student learning experience rather than describing how it will be effected e.g. leave out graduate attributes and information literacy.

Open access is not yet included in the values – add something from the CAUL statement. Neither is community, knowledge transfer, knowledge exchange. Do not lose the SPARCAUL direction.

Information resources have been uncomfortably included with research and teaching areas. It should not be necessary to decide whether collections support research or teaching. The term implies what we have rather than where we are heading.

Intellectual property should be included in this area e.g. how information is used.

Institutional repositories have been included with the ERA, but essentially play a utilitarian role.

Communication and Influence.

This section in the previous version contains too many items, and it was suggested highlighting only the main issues and excising the operational sections for the information of members only:
developing relationship with Universities Australia is most important;
with other relationships just need to know how to respond and to identify those which are most important;
identify that CAUL does respond to government papers – this area is less understood by the wider membership because it is done by the Executive, particularly where CAUL has been invited, which is part of the goal. It was agreed to make more of an effort to advise members when these are done rather than just listing on the website and recording in the minutes.

(Action: DC)
From 2007-2009 plan:

22. Develop statements of value for university libraries, both quantitative and qualitative (Ad Hoc Working Group)  The Go8 proposes to pay a consultant to undertake a cost-benefit study for a total of USD 140,000. Seven of the Go8 will share the cost and CAUL will contribute AUD 20,000. CAUL hasn't yet received its invoice though this is likely to be soon. The ANU, UQ and UAdelaide are the selected libraries.

David Powell is currently in Australia interviewing senior academics and other university administrators about the proposed questionnaire. A report is expected by the end of the year.

1894. CAUL Achievement Award. Members reviewed the award in the light of the 2010 budget. It is currently a $5,000 cash award, plus the travel costs of the winner to present at the next appropriate CAUL meeting.

Members discussed the application of the winners' work to CAUL directly, noting that it was reviewed recently and the “nationally significant” element was emphasised. http://www.caul.edu.au/caul-doc/CAUL-MemberAward.doc from CAUL 2002/1. It was noted that CAUL members have not questioned the award to date. Members discussed whether it the right tool to inspire people or to plan succession? It is meant to encourage people to be innovative, but this clearly isn’t the reason for having done the work. It should be noted that this should not devalue the awards to the previous winners. It was agreed that Ainslie Dewe will present this as a hot topic to encourage discussion on the award, and how such awards may be tied back to the strategic plan. (Action: AD)

CAUL Administration

1895. CAUL Finances. The 2009 budget has been updated.

a) *CAUL Budget Planning* Imogen Garner prepared a discussion paper on principles for setting the CAUL budget. A background paper prepared by Diane Costello shows previous budget decisions. Members considered which items are funded from the operating budget (from members' fees) and which from retained earnings. The former is mostly salaries and meeting costs. Members were concerned about reducing retained earnings by too much, in case, say, CAUL needed to move to another premises away from ANU campus.

If membership fees were to be kept steady and CAUL run a deficit budget, it may then necessary to increase the fee by a larger amount when additional funds were required. A more predictable approach could be to increase the fee annually by 2% and use retained earnings for any over-budget costs. An annual 5% increase would be too high, and CPI is not predictable because of fluctuation. An annual fee rise might be considered undesirable, but it would be predictable and therefore can be budgeted for. A prudent annual increase would cover at least the increase in salaries i.e. 2-4%.

CAUL currently collects identifiable fees for CAUL and CEIRC membership, plus the ADT and the ALCC levies. It was suggested that all except CEIRC be incorporated into the main membership fee. CONZUL’s contribution is currently calculated at 25% of CAUL membership fees and may need to be renegotiated. CONZUL also pays its share of the statistics collection and site.

CAUL should draft a clear plan for the use of retained earnings, considering what, if any, major changes need to be made to staffing, CEIRC, etc. It was noted that retained earnings have allowed CAUL to fund the website redevelopment and the CEIRC review, for example. Members were reminded that, when this issue was discussed last year, the CAUL auditors did not offer a benchmark figure, but were happy with CAUL’s level of retained earnings.

It was agreed to draft principles for the CAUL budget for discussion at the CAUL meeting. (Action: IG)


   i) Publications for sale. CAVAL has been selling copies of CAUL Performance Indicators since August 1995. Since mid-2005, only one copy has been sold, so this account with CAVAL has now been closed off and any further inquiries will come directly to CAUL. The final payment of $290.00 will be applied to this year’s invoice for collection of the CAUL statistics.

   ii) CAUL Industry Think Tank. Members discussed whether, if the Think Tank makes a profit, how should that profit be used e.g. to contribute to the costs of David Prosser’s domestic travel; to support staff development travel, etc.

d) *CAUL Budget 2010. A draft budget was prepared for discussion at this meeting, in preparation for the CAUL meeting. A statement from the bank on CAUL’s foreign currency accounts states that gross interest earned in the last financial year is equivalent to AUD 6,316.89. Items for consideration:

   i) SPARC Membership. Members were reminded that SPARC had previously been removed from the budget because it did not fit the CAUL criteria for membership of external organisations. It was agreed to include the USD 5,400 as a contribution to the work they do, even though the output of their work is fully open access. It was suggested that interest earned in CEIRC accounts could be appropriately used for support for open access – it could be paid directly out of the USD account.

   ii) CAIRSS. It was noted that the ADT levy is approved to the end of 2010. It was considered too early to think about what might be needed from 2011. CAUL should consider what it wants to achieve through CAIRSS and how would that achievement be recognised.

   iii) CEIRC. It was noted that there is still disagreement about the way negotiations should be handled e.g. following Go8 deals, using teams of negotiators or professional negotiators. There is still some lack of consensus about what needs doing and how much should members pay for it. Greg Anderson referred to the discussion at the last CAUL meeting re the impact of overdue invoices and whether this should be done by the publishers or by CAUL. He reported that the Datasets Coordinators report invoicing through CAUL rather than the publishers as one of the key advantages of CEIRC. It was suggested raising this issue during the closed session of the Think Tank i.e. does CAUL need to consider where it wants to go with CEIRC, and possible increase the resources to support it. It has been agreed that CEIRC should be more strategic, but not clear how – solutions are needed that work best for both the industry and the libraries.

   iv) CHASS Membership Invoice. A renewal invoice for $1,000.00 (plus GST) has been received, although CAUL has never been a paid-up member. It was agreed to remind CHASS of CAUL’s previous decision not to join. (Action: DC) The decision not to become a member was made at CAUL 2004/2:

   Item 892.  *Relationships with other Organisations.* At the request of members, the Executive reviewed the organisations with whom CAUL might have a formal or an informal relationship. Organisations considered include CHASS, FASTS, SPARC, COUNTER, ICOLC, IFLA, ALCC, ADA, CNI, RLG. Actual decisions will be made in the context of the budget. Madeleine McPherson asked members to consider the proposed guidelines.

   It was noted that the financial contribution is generally a determining factor, and consideration should be guided by the flow-on effect on CAUL membership fees. It was recommended that any commitment include a period of review, rather than being open-ended. Any member may suggest at any meeting that CAUL joins a given organisation, but commitments will only be made in light of the budget. The recommendation
Recommendation to CAUL: that the following guidelines be applied when recommending that CAUL become a member of an organisation:

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


1897. CAUL Web Site.

1898. ACT!, by Sage, database software development. http://www.thecontactgroup.com/ Diane Costello will analyse Alisha's report on the comparison between the two systems, with a particular focus on the whole-of-process efficiencies. (Action: DC)

CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

1899. CAIRSS (CAUL Australasian Institutional Repository Support Services).

The CAIRSS Steering Committee met by teleconference on July 6 and recommended that the mode of governance be the following, which is very close to that originally proposed:

Members agreed that the CEIRC model would be the most appropriate for CAIRSS. The model includes three CAUL members, one of whom is a representative of the CAUL Executive, plus two experienced practitioners. The latter are nominated by their university librarians, and are selected by the CAUL members on the committee, taking into account the nature of their institutions, their experience, possibly what type of software they use, and the overall balance of the committee membership. The nominated repository managers must be reporting through to the university librarian. The two general CAUL member positions are elected from the membership.

It was agreed that the service providers, USQ and Swinburne, attend the Steering Committee as non-voting attendees. It was also agreed that an ANDS representative be invited as appropriate as a “friend of CAIRSS" to keep each apprised of progress in the other.

It should be noted that Helen Livingston is willing to stand for election to the Steering Committee. Selection criteria for the repository manager on the committee were drafted by Kate Watson.

The recommendation was supported.

It was suggested that Helen Livingston and Judy Stokker be invited to remain on the Steering Committee, at least until the future of CAIRSS, post-2010, is determined.

It was noted that the CAIRSS list now appears to be the list of choice for repository managers, superseding both the old ADT list and the more recent ANZ repositories list.

   a) ADT. Kate Watson was due to meet with UNSW’s Tom Ruthven in the week of July 6 to discuss options for handover of appropriate ADT functions to CAIRSS. The CAIRSS Steering Committee also noted that some parts of the ADT website may revert to CAUL’s management. When the decisions are made, the existing ADT reference group will be wound up.

a) **ERA and Copyright.** It was noted that the journals lists do not include the names of the publishers – there is no way of easily identifying whether they are held.

1901. Research Infrastructure.

i) **AeRIC.** Andrew Wells will meet with Claire McLaughlin when he is next in Canberra.  
*(Action: AW)*

1902. CEIRC (CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee).

a) **CAUL Industry Think Tank.** Sydney, 17-18 August 2009. Diane Costello reported on the planning, and Greg Anderson addressed the need to agree on some actions to come from the meeting. It was agreed to follow up with both members and publishers.  
*(Action: DC)*

b) **Licences – confidentiality.** ARL Encourages Members to Refrain from Signing Nondisclosure or Confidentiality Clauses (June 5, 2009) Heather Gordon suggested that CEIRC licences be reviewed for such clauses. Eighteen licences have such clauses, and they vary. Some can be shared with CEIRC colleagues and others cannot. It was agreed that details be shared with Datasets Coordinators. *(Action: DC)* It was noted that the model clause is to have no clause.

c) **Scopus and Web of Science.** The Universities Australia board has approved setting up a panel, which is scheduled to meet by teleconference on August 7.

d) **Wiley-Blackwell 2010-2012 negotiations.** The response to CAUL’s proposal is due at the end of July, and there is a proposed meeting following the Think Tank. Greg Anderson outlined the additional licence terms which are an improvement over the previous terms.

e) **CEIRC survey.** The 2009 survey indicated a preference for multi-year deals as long as there was no price increase. The survey will be available in a public version, with the detail available to CEIRC members. Some respondents are still interested in print for reserve, though it is not clear why the electronic version isn’t used to produce course-packs and reserve copies. The EBL (ebooks.com) model was felt to be unsustainable and needs to be addressed. It was suggested that CEIRC ask for published version in the local repositories. It was noted that a key factor is likely to be whether it is intended to be open access, and which staff would it be e.g. permanent, contract, conjoint, adjunct, etc It was suggested using the ERA definitions. *(Action: DC)*

f) **Australian Financial Review.** CEIRC is still waiting for a response from Rick Bremble with a description of the content i.e. not AFR.com *(Action: DC)*

g) The mentor program up and running with four participating pairs.

**CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING & TEACHING**

1903. Copyright.

a) **Universities Australia negotiations with CAL.** Heather Gordon. A matrix of journal packages facilitated through CAUL was provided to Universities Australia to assist with their analysis of content used in universities. The ERG held a teleconference recently and expect to have the methodology completed soon.

**DELIVERING QUALITY & VALUE**

1904. Staff Development.

a) **UNISON Staff Development Fund.** UNISON has offered to move the remainder of its funds to CAUL for the support of staff development. The accumulated monies are held by the University Library at the University of Technology, Sydney and currently total $46,381.07.

At the last meeting, Diane Costello was asked to consider how the UNISON funds might be used to support a shadow Executive Officer in the CAUL office. She outlined the potential decisions needed:
whether all areas of the CAUL office or CEIRC only;
logistics – the office currently has three desks and four computers;
funding – salary, per diem, travel to CAUL committees, length of “contract;”
HEW level – current staffing is HEW 10 x 1 plus HEW 4 x 1.25 – test for level required for
ongoing professional support e.g. HEW 5/6/7;
timing – busy CEIRC time in September-November or less intense time (note training time
required);
selection mechanism – imaginary pd, nomination by university librarian;
legal – stay on home library staff & reimburse salary costs, workers compensation etc
length of contract – too short means more training and less output, too long means more
expensive and greater impact on home institution – minimum two months.

It was decided not to take this suggestion further.

An alternative suggestion was to support a library staff development program, perhaps at
level 7 as other levels are already covered, to encourage leadership, by seeding the
outlays for a development event and try to keep it topped up. Another option is to fund a
scholarship to another event or the CAUDIT or ACODE institutes.

b) **CAUL Library Staff Development Conference 2010.** June/July 2010 in Melbourne.
In discussion on the composition of the program committee, it was suggested including
new CAUL members such as Liz Burke or Barbara Paton or someone who has attended it
in the past. It will again be targeted at level 8s and up. Andrew Wells will call for
expressions of interest from CAUL members to participate in the program committee,
noting that there are generally four to six teleconferences needed. *(Action: AW)*

**COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE**

1905. Communication. *(Standing item)*

a) **President’s Report.** Ainslie Dewe acted as president while Andrew Wells was on leave
in May. Inter alia, she wrote to the following:

i) **CONZUL.** John Redmayne and Sue Roberts regarding the invitation to hold a CAUL
meeting in Wellington in 2010.

ii) **UNE.** Barbara Paton welcoming her to CAUL on her appointment as University Librarian.

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

c) **CAUL Report 2007-2008.** *(Standing item)* It has been agreed that another biennial
report be produced i.e. for 2007-2008. *(Action: DC)*

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

1906. Submissions to Public Inquiries.

a) **Towards Government 2.0: An Issues Paper.** Government 2.0 Taskforce,
Department of Finance and Deregulation. "Remember we can’t promise to give your
input proper consideration if we receive it after the start of business on 24 August 2009."
The Taskforce will provide a final report on its activities to the Minister for Finance and
Deregulation and the Cabinet Secretary by the end of 2009. The Taskforce will disband
on completion of its final report. [http://gov2.net.au/](http://gov2.net.au/) The paper is divided into two
sections, public sector information and the citizen’s participation in government. CAUL is
interested in the first but not the second. It was agreed to reprise CAUL’s psi submission
and advise that the second is not being addressed. *(Action: DC)*

b) **Freedom of Information (FOI) Reform.** ALIA will be coordinating a submission for
on additional text should be sent to jane.hardy@alia.org.au by 5pm Monday 11th May
2009. It was suggested that this is less appropriate for CAUL than for its individual
institutions. Ainslie Dewe will review and confirm. *(Action: AD)*

c) **Productivity Commission.** Copyright restrictions on the parallel importation of books
into Australia. [http://www.pc.gov.au/projects/study/books](http://www.pc.gov.au/projects/study/books) CAUL’s submission was

d) **Digital Economy Future Directions.**

e) **Review of Australian Higher Education.** (The Bradley Review) Discussion Paper June 2008. Submissions close 31 July 2008. Interim report to government in October (now delayed) with a final report due at the end of the year. The report was released December 17 2008 and the government was expected to respond in March/April.

f) **Innovation Review.** The deadline for submissions was 30 April 2008. CAUL’s response was submitted April 30. The final report was released September 9. Comments on the Review report were accepted up until 30 September 2008.

1907. Relationships with other organisations.

a) **CONZUL.**

b) **CAUDIT & ACODE.** A joint meeting of the Executive committees is scheduled for July 29.

i) **EDUCAUSE 2011.** Andrew Wells has volunteered for the conference committee. Peter James from UTS is the chair and is awaiting the package of information from the Perth conference. He is speaking to conference organisers but a venue has not yet been booked. *(Action: AW)*

c) **Universities Australia.** Universities Australia plans to involve CAUL in its preparations for CAL negotiations and negotiations with Thomson Reuters and Elsevier.

d) **National Library of Australia.**

i) **Peak Bodies Forum.** Greg Anderson represented CAUL at the meeting on May 22. The draft minutes have been circulated.

1908. CAUL Meetings.

a) **CAUL Meeting 2009/2 - Sydney, 20-22 September,** in conjunction with the celebration of the University of Sydney Fisher Library anniversary. The meeting will be held at Waterfront, 27 Circular Quay West, The Rocks. The Executive will meeting on Sunday morning at 11am (at the University of Sydney (tbc), followed by the University of Sydney event, afternoon tea @ 2pm for 2.30pm. Andrew Wells called for suggestions for the agenda and hot topics, and responses have been included below. Some items have been held over from previous meeting agendas. In general, hot topics should include some sessions from each section of the strategic plan.

i) **Strategic Plan review.** It was agreed to structure the groups then select the chair of each. *(Action: DC)* Each member of the Executive will participate in one group. Allow 30 minutes for discussion before coming back together, leading into afternoon tea.

ii) **IATUL.** From Judy Stokker: .... if the folk who attended IATUL and SCONUL would be willing to do a report back with a view to what are the issues for University Libraries - anything to inform our future directions or other issues, new ideas, their take-aways. It was agreed to invite Helen Livingston and Ainslie Dewe to report. *(Action: DC)*

iii) **Open Access.** From Judy Stokker: .... an update on the open access work that Cathrine and Maxine volunteered to do. It was agreed to include this item in the business meeting alongside the report from the Think Tank. *(Action: DC)*
iv) **CAIRSS.** An update from Helen Livingston will be included in the business meeting.  
**Action:** DC  

1) **OAKList.** Judy Stokker will demonstrate OAKLaw as part of the CAIRSS update.  

v) **Student engagement.** From Anne Horn: Dr Hamish Coates (Principal Research Fellow, ACER) was recently a keynote at our Deakin Teaching and Learning Conference. I had a chat to him regarding the AUSSE survey on student engagement and a forthcoming survey addressing student support services within the context of how university libraries can best use and provide input into these instruments. Given the recognition the AUSSE survey is receiving by AUQA, it is critical we have good relationships with ACER. He indicated he would be pleased to address CAUL. It was agreed to invite him for the Tuesday morning.  
**Action:** DC  

vi) **Academic standards.** From Anne Horn: As an accompanying speaker, it would be good to also have Dr David Woodhouse, Executive Director AUQA to discuss AUQA's recent paper on Academic Standards. (He recently addressed our Academic Board on this issue.) A key issue for libraries in this paper is around generic skills and standards, and advice CAUL may be able to provide regarding standards for information literacy generic skills. It was agreed to hold this over for consideration for another meeting.  
**Action:** DC  

vii) **Leadership development.** From Felicity McGregor: …. leadership development - our latest attempts. It was agreed to include this in the business meeting.  
**Action:** DC  

viii) **Staff Development, Achievement Award.** Ainslie Dewe will lead discussion in the business meeting.  
**Action:** AD  

ix) **Distributed National Collection.** From Craig Anderson: ….have Janette speak at the next CAUL meeting with an update on several CAVAL, and more general issues - especially CARM 2, and looking for possible sectoral direction and support for an investigation into a shared, and/or distributed national collection. It was agreed that this has been covered a number of times before. On the other hand, it is possibly premature, considering alternative storage models. It was agreed not to include it at this meeting, but perhaps invite Janette Wright to attend the CAUL Executive meeting in November.  
**Action:** AW  

x) **AUQA.** It was suggested having a 'hot topic' on AUQA round 2, for example, the changes in approach as experienced by SCU, Newcastle & Swinburne, and to invite Dr Anne Young, Director of Strategic Planning and Quality at UNewcastle to speak about AUQA Round 2. Dr Young managed Newcastle's audit and is interested in providing an overview of how libraries are being assessed as part of the deep audit themes e.g. student experience/internationalisation. It was agreed to hold this over for consideration for a later meeting.  
**Action:** DC  

xi) **Learning Skills.** From Linda Luther: ….a focus on Teaching and Learning rather than research. I am interested in hearing more about the work at QUT that Judy Peacock is leading regarding the closer relationship with student learning and academic literacies. I think Cathrine Harboe-Ree also has Learning Skills within the Library. UTAS runs a program UNISTART which incorporates a Library session within a range of learning skills. There are staffing issues - who runs the program, who do they report to, how do they relate to other library staff - and what do the programs comprise in terms of content, who develops it?  

It was agreed to invite Linda Luther and Cathrine Harboe-Ree to reflect on changes in their institutions regarding learning skills and literacies and include in the session on student engagement. It was also agreed to invite Judy Stokker to talk about QUT research support.  
**Action:** DC  

xii) **Special Collections.** From Linda Luther: Another idea would be to hear more about special collections. Conservation and digitisation are on the agenda here. What are the oldest items in our collection. How are we preserving them for the future. How are we
engaging with academic staff and programs to develop and maintain interest in our ancient collections? It was agreed to hold this over for consideration for a later meeting. *(Action: DC)*

xiii) **Scholarly Communication.** From Ainslie Dewe: Under the scholarly communication umbrella I think that we need to have the discussion that Andy Powell has started on "Web 2.0 and repositories - have we got our repository architecture right?" [http://www.slideshare.net/eduservfoundation/repositories-and-web-20-have-we-got-our-repository-architecture-right](http://www.slideshare.net/eduservfoundation/repositories-and-web-20-have-we-got-our-repository-architecture-right)

"Having the conversation is hard * highly political space * strong "open access" voices who, understandably, don't want their agenda de- railed by discussion about - preservation - search engine optimisation - Web 2.0 - social networks - semantic Web - the future of peer review * it can be hard to get the conversation started"

The current institutional repositories are just a step along the way - we need to talk about what comes next. It was suggested that this thread may come up with the Think Tank - new models, not taking advantage of the web, etc.

xiv) **RDA.** Implications for CAUL institutions. [http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/rda.html](http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/jsc/rda.html)

b) **CAUL meeting 2010/1 - March (25-26), Canberra.** (Easter is April 4) Andrew Wells called for expressions of interest in hosting both 2010 meetings.

c) **CAUL meeting 2010/2.** Members agreed that it not be held alongside IFLA as the combined event would be too much. Responses were received from:

**QUT:** This offer was accepted for the 2nd or 3rd week in September, and Diane Costello will check whether the IFLA programs have all collapsed. *(Action: DC)*

### 1909. Fortcoming Executive Meetings.

a) **Draft schedule for 2009.** Potential clashes:

**2009**

- Leave/absences currently planned:
  - Greg Anderson, August 10-14;
  - Heather Gordon, 26-27/11 (JCU planning)
  - Diane Costello, July (tbc)

- 2009 August 23-27 Milan, Italy World Library and Information Congress: 75th IFLA;
- 2009 November 3-6 Denver, Colorado EDUCAUSE.

**2010**

- 2010 April 2-5 Easter
- 2010 April 18-21 ICOLC Chicago, IL
- 2010 June 20-24 Chicago, IL IATUL
- 2010 August 15-19 *Brisbane* IFLA
- 2010 October 12-15 *Anaheim, California* EDUCAUSE 2010

i) **2009/5.** Sunday, September 20, from 10am, in conjunction with CAUL 2009/2, Sydney September 21-22. Diane Costello will organise meeting space at University of Sydney. It was noted that the Sydney marathon is run about this time. Later note: the event is on Sunday September 20 from 7.15am and the route includes the roads towards and close to UNSW. [http://www.sydneyrunningfestival.com.au/default.asp?PageID=15125](http://www.sydneyrunningfestival.com.au/default.asp?PageID=15125) Include this URL in the organisation papers. *(Action: DC)*

ii) **2009/6.** November 18, Melbourne, in conjunction with CCA 2009/2.

### 1910. Other business.
a) **HES and academic libraries in Australia** - a proposal from Di Worth and Anthony Hornby was forwarded to the Executive by Linda Luther and Ruth Quinn. Members were unable to see any reason behind the proposal, and no further information was provided when requested. Members noted the CEIRC review in 2007, the CAIRSS tender in 2008, and agreed that there was no need for further consideration of CAUL’s processes at this stage. Andrew Wells will respond, querying which CAUL services are “arguably unsustainable.” *(Action: AW)*

b) **CAUL Elections.** Positions up for election for 2010-2011 are:

- President - vice Andrew Wells, eligible for re-election
- Member – vice Imogen Garner, eligible for re-election
- Member – vice Greg Anderson, eligible for re-election

and for the CEIRC committee:

- CAUL member representative - vice Anne Horn, eligible for re-election
- Alison Neil (single terms only for Datasets Coordinators)

*(Action: DC)*

c) **Open Access.** It was noted that Tom Cochrane’s paper at SCONUL was provocative, and suggested that he be invited to reprise it at CAUL, and that the ad hoc group on open access report back to CAUL. It was also suggested that CAIRSS investigate the proportion of institutional repositories which are open access, noting that this needs to be defined. CAUL has a statement on open access which is still relevant. *(Action: DC)*

The meeting closed at 4.45pm
CAUL Mission

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

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

Membership

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

Environment

The environment in which CAUL operates is characterised by:

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

- Collaboration within and across sectors
- Commitment to resource sharing;
- Commitment to access to information, ideas, and creative works without censorship;
- Respect for the intellectual and creative endeavours of others;
- Equitable access to services and resources;
- Innovation in the application of new technologies and service models
- Excellence in operational and service delivery;
- Openness, responsiveness and customer focus;

Goals

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

- optimising and maximising the student experience;
- optimising and maximising services and resources available to researchers;
- bringing change and innovation to academic publishing
- supporting universities' wider scholarly communication and information management roles;
- promoting continuous improvement in university libraries, and,
- influencing the development of an appropriate legal, regulatory and funding environment
I. COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

Goal

To seek out and receive opportunities for CAUL to influence developments in higher education and information policy

Rationale

University libraries are well recognised for the value they add to their institutions’ mission, improved levels of service and efficient use of resources. Their continued visibility, relevance and importance to the community-at-large, stakeholders and the Government are vital to CAUL’s ability to support the learning, teaching and research activities of their institutions. CAUL is aware of the tensions that operate within the sector from constrained funding and competing needs.

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

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

Actions (2010)

For discussion:

Collaboration & International Engagement

- CAUL/CAUDIT/ACODE
- EDUCAUSE 2011
- CONZUL
- SCONUL

Policy in Higher Education and Information Infrastructure,

- Building influence through representation, visibility, and being proactive and responsive as required. Develop relationship with Universities Australia

External Communication

- Website

Internal Communication
II. CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Goal
CAUL will facilitate its members' contribution to the student experience.

Rationale
University libraries make a major contribution to the student experience through the provision of facilities, services and resources, both physical and virtual. CAUL members carry out a range of programs to build students' abilities in scholarly methods. Libraries' physical facilities have undergone major transformations in response to changes in pedagogy and technology. Facilities are being reconfigured in response, and online, location-independent, services are emerging as a significant alternative and complementary method of service provision.

Developments in learning management systems are forging stronger collaboration between libraries, learning units and IT departments.

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

Actions (2010)

For discussion:

Learning outcomes
- How do CAUL members contribute? Practice and focus has changed over a decade – more online, self-help, refurbishment of space. Can we evaluate and identify what should be done next? A good one for the small group to discuss.

Learning skills
- A minority of members are responsible for this

Information Literacy
- Suggest it be considered in learning outcomes

Learning spaces
- As a part of learning outcomes. I think the building and design issues have had enough airing for some time

Offshore service delivery
University Library Australia

III. CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

Goal
CAUL will facilitate the members’ role in supporting and maximising research outcomes

Rationale
University libraries are responding to increased focus on research and research training in their institutions. This is leading to new initiatives in research information management, research measurement services, research training and e-research. CAUL will need to develop a strong relationship with the Australian National Data Service (ANDS) and identify emerging opportunities in e-research.

CAUL members are increasingly responsible for delivery and stewardship of information resources generated by their own institutions. These information resources may be research related (e.g.,...
theses, research data) or about teaching and learning (eg, teaching objects, course materials).

Repository development will be assisted through CAIRSS.

**Actions (2010)**

**For discussion:**

* eResearch
  * NRIC, aERIC, ANDS – relationship, service development, capability development

Institutional repositories - Contribute to the development and promotion of institutional digital assets repositories initiatives.

  * CAIRSS
  * Research training

  * Could be a useful one for sharing of practice.

Deleted: NCRIS,
IV. INFORMATION RESOURCES

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

Rationale

University libraries manage substantial budgets for information resource and depend on suppliers of scholarly information to meet the research and teaching needs of their institutions. A steadily increasing proportion of these budgets are used for electronic resources. CEIRC is CAUL’s key program for managing relationships with suppliers of scholarly information. CAUL members have ongoing interests in how information can be used in research, teaching and resource sharing. These interests are addressed through activities in copyright, open access and preservation.

Actions (2010)

For discussion:

Cost-efficient access to resources
- CEIRC – there are still some issues from the Review that need attention. Strategic and operational matters need to be sorted out and resourced appropriately

Scholarly communication
- SPARCAUL
Open access to research
- Include in SPARCAUL(?)
Copyright and intellectual property
- ALCC
- UA and CAL

Preservation

Deleted: CAUL members are increasingly responsible for delivery and stewardship of information resources generated by their own institutions. These information resources may be research related (eg, theses, research data) or about teaching and learning (teaching objects, course materials)
III. HAVING AN IMPACT

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

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

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

Actions (2010)

For discussion:

Benchmarking and statistics

• Ongoing work in data collection

Workforce planning and staff development

• CAUL Staff Development event (2010)

The value proposition

• Response to Go8 Outsell study (underway)
• Response to IRUA

Best Practice

• AUQA and TEQSA -- what to learn, what to take forward
APPENDIX – CAUL OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES, TO WHICH ARE ADDED THE ANNUAL ACTIONS HIGHLIGHTED IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN

Note: This section is lifted from the old strategic plan, as a reminder of previous activities, and a basis for the appendix on operational activities.

I. CONTRIBUTION TO LEARNING AND TEACHING

Actions

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

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

Offshore service delivery

II. CONTRIBUTION TO RESEARCH

Actions

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

4. Continue the development of the Australasian Digital Theses Program. (ADT Policy Reference Group)

5. Review the operational requirements for central administration of the ADT vis a vis the take-up of independent institutional repository solutions by members, and reduced dependence on VT software. (ADT Policy Reference Group)

6. Contribute to the development and promotion of institutional digital assets repositories initiatives, particularly through DEST’s SII-funded FRODO, MERRI and 2006/7 projects. (ALL members)

7. Contribute to relevant groups & activities regarding information infrastructure e.g. National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy, Australian Research Information Infrastructure Committee. (Executive)

8. Draft a framework under which digitisation projects can be identified and supported vis a vis JISC’s Digitisation in the UK: The case for a UK framework. (Executive)

eResearch

9. Contribute to relevant national and international groups and activities regarding eResearch e.g. e-Research Coordinating Committee (Executive)

10. Development of policy and advocacy skills (eResearch Working Group)

11. Data management (eResearch Working Group)

12. Training: a) improve the level of data management knowledge, engagement and capability nationally; and b) ensure that a critical mass of librarians advance to a level of expertise where than can provide training to researchers. (eResearch Working Group)

13. Enabling collaboration (eResearch Working Group)

III. DELIVERING QUALITY AND VALUE

Actions (ongoing)

14. Benchmark performance measures with comparable international organisations and contribute to the development of international performance measures (All Members)

15. Continue to develop, extend, scope and cost a range of agreed performance measures (BPWG)
16. Facilitate the enhancement of knowledge and skills of members and their staff in delivering high quality outcomes through seminars, workshops etc e.g. RQF forum, institutional repositories forum, AVCC library staff development conferences. (Executive)

17. Investigate workforce requirements and skills development to ensure maintenance of quality services in a rapidly changing information environment (BPWG)

18. Collect and publish statistics on Australian university library outputs and activities (CSFG)

19. Facilitate sharing of management and planning information among CAUL members e.g. through one-off seminars, hot topics at CAUL meetings, etc (All Members)

20. Conduct and publish the results of surveys and questionnaires which enable members to share collective knowledge and experience (All Members)

IV. COMMUNICATION & INFLUENCE

Collaboration & International Engagement

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

22. EDUCAUSE 2007 (Linda O'Brien; Executive)

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

24. Publicise the role of CAUL in fostering international collaboration (Executive)

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

Policy in Higher Education and Information Infrastructure

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

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

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

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

30. Promote the development of the national information infrastructure while highlighting the role of university libraries as partners in university learning, teaching, and research. (All Members)

31. When appropriate, and with discretion, commission research into high priority matters affecting information policy in higher education, globally and nationally. (Executive)

32. Identify opportunities and assess collaborative proposals from members aimed at improving the quality of the national information infrastructure, especially in relation to information literacy, graduate qualities, business continuity and risk management. (Executive & All Members)

External Communication

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

34. Promote and market the interests and achievements of CAUL to government, the universities, the AVCC, etc (Executive & All Members)
35. Develop and promote the CAUL web site as a source of information about higher education issues of relevance to university libraries. (Executive Officer & All Members)

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

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

Internal Communication

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

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

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

Planning

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

42. Review the CAUL strategic plan in 2009. (Executive and All Members)
| 40 members |
| 10 per group |
| including 1 Executive member |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sectoral</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Newish</th>
<th>Execu</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Catholic University</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond University</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Queensland University</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin University of Technology</td>
<td>LATN</td>
<td>WAGUL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td>WAGUL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>IRUA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>IRUA</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>IRUA</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>IRUA</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>IRUA</td>
<td>WAGUL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>LATN</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td>LATN</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinburne University of Technology</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Adelaide</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ballarat</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Canberra</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSW @ ADFA</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Newcastle</td>
<td>IRUA</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td>WAGUL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td>LATN</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Queensland</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Technology, Sydney</td>
<td>LATN</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>QULOC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>WAGUL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Sydney</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
<td>UNISON</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>CAVAL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massey University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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 22 members now using their repository to deliver theses to the central ADT service, up from 10 in March.

Swinburne is testing OAI-PMH harvesting from its repository. The other 20 members are using web gathering.

### Achievements since last report

#### Membership
The number of active members has risen by one to 42, 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 37,144 theses that link to a digital version of the thesis, a 50% increase over 1 year. 35,140 have been contributed directly by members. There are 156,320 records for theses on the database altogether representing those without links to digital theses.

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

### Plan for forthcoming activity
CAIRSS
Meetings held with CAIRSS to discuss options for transfer of service.

### CAUL budget implications
Levy transferred to CAIRSS

### Recommendations to CAUL
CAIRSS responsibility for ADT to be agreed by end of 2009
CAUL Strategic Plan

Report to CAUL

Author: Greg Anderson
Date: 16 September 2009
Date of previous report: 26 March 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contribution to Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Improve opportunities for cost-efficient purchasing and licensing of electronic information resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>CEIRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>CEIRC Meetings held on the 24 June 2009 and 31 August 2009. CAUL Industry Think Tank, 17 &amp; 18th August 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td>A. CEIRC Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2010 renewal process

A large number of renewals are being processed for 2010. Any price increase over 4% is being challenged with subsequent price reductions. A significant number of vendors have not increased their subscription prices in response to the GFC.

The Executive Officer will remove low uptake or low value deals from the CEIRC program during the current renewal process in accordance with the Review Recommendation 2.3.1.

### Dataset Coordinators

The Dataset Coordinator Mentoring program is underway with 4
Dataset Coordinators were surveyed for their views on the benefits of CEIRC. Invoicing via the CAUL Office was one of the key benefits including:

- Ability to have an invoices raised quickly when needed
- Ability to have a pro forma invoice raised during the budget year when needed
- Benefit of receiving a significant number of invoices from CAUL rather than chasing individual vendors.

Other benefits of CEIRC include access to central information for vendors, offers and licence agreement wording etc on the CAUL Website. Having a network of dataset coordinators provides opportunity to exchange information and share outcomes of trials etc. It was suggested that evaluation reports on datasets or comparisons of products eg EBL be posted on the CAUL website with password control.

**CEIRC Planning**

CEIRC’s Risk Management and Operational Plans are under review. An extensive re-write is planned in conjunction with the CAUL Strategic Plan 2010-2012.

**B. Product and Vendor Negotiations**

*Wiley-Blackwell*

The CEIRC Negotiation Team forwarded a detailed response to the original Wiley/Blackwell proposal in May. The revised agreement and 2010-12 prices were discussed with Wiley/Blackwell representatives on the 18th August. The revised offer was considered to be reasonable with the inclusion of options for upgrading or downgrading, an opt out clause, price caps and early payment discounts. The prices and options for all participants were circulated to CAUL members. At the last CEIRC meeting, the Executive Officer reported that 29 institutions had already renewed and 4 institutions had upgraded to the full collection.

*Fairfax Business Media.*

CEIRC members will be contacted to see if there is any interest in pursuing a deal for afr.com search. The Fairfax representative who was involved with the protracted negotiations has left the company.

*Springer.*

The CEIRC Negotiation Team will be reconvened to negotiate the Springer 2010-2012 deal which has a large number of CAUL participants.

*EBL.*

Although a large number of libraries have trialled and are using EBL feedback suggests that the pricing model is unsustainable. EBL will be invited to attend the February meeting of CEIRC to discuss options.

**C. CONZUL representative.**

Ross Hallett is the new CONZUL representative on the CEIRC Committee.
| 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 underway for the Dataset Coordinator’s Forum which will be held in conjunction with VALA in February 2010. Topics may include; statistics, outcomes of the Think Tank, e-book models and the value of CEIRC from a Dataset Coordinator and University Librarian perspective.  
The next CEIRC meeting will be held on 17th November. |
| Recommendations to CAUL | Note the report. |

Pro-forma updated 29 July 2008
Report to CAUL

Author: Ruth Quinn
Date: September 2009
Date of previous report: April 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Contribution to Teaching and Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Review global best practice in information literacy and make it available to CAUL members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Information Literacy Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity since last report</td>
<td>F2F meeting held in April alongside CAUL meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of IL Coordinators updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of IL Practitioners finalised and promoted to e-list and IL Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements since last report</td>
<td>Survey of IL Practitioners made available via SurveyMonkey – closes Friday 18th September. As at 16th September, 68 responses received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>Analyse the results of the IL Practitioners survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide report on the results to CAUL with recommendations for future action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL budget implications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
<td>That the report be noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-forma updated 9 September 2009
### 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. ULA content on the CAUL Website being updated to reflect current practice
2. CAVAL Reciprocal borrowing Executive advised that any arrangement made by CAVAL to automate management of defaulting staff and students is covered under existing ULA guidelines and there is no need to change the global system.
3. ULA membership for students enrolled via Open Universities Australia is up to the individual home institution library. There is a reluctance among some libraries to indemnify these students, there is no “whole of Open Universities” consensus; and students who are not indemnified cannot participate in ULA

**Achievements since last report**

As above

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

N/A

**Plan for forthcoming activity**

1. Continue to update web site to reflect current practice.

**CAUL budget implications**

None

**Recommendations to CAUL**

That CAUL note the report

---

Pro-forma updated 9 September 2009
Report to CAUL

Author: John Redmayne
Date: 7/9/09
Date of previous report: 25/3/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>CONZUL Report to CAUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>For information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>John Redmayne, Chair, CONZUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-line</td>
<td>April-September 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activity since last report

1. **Staff movements.** Ross Hallett has been appointed as the new University Librarian at the University of Waikato. Teresa Chitty (Horn) has resigned as University Librarian at Lincoln University (effective Oct 9). Ross has taken over from Teresa as the NZ representative on the CEIRC Committee from CEIRC 2009/4.

2. **Serials Budgets.** There has been a varied response at this stage to the possibility of serials cancellations, with several university libraries receiving additional grants to cover the serial shortfall for 2010. Two universities have had greatly diminished book budgets, as funding was transferred to maintain serial subscriptions.

3. **CONZULAC.** This is CONZUL’s book purchasing consortium. The present contract (held by Blackwell’s) expires 31/12/09. Tender documents were released last week to vendors. Interviews with shortlisted vendors will take place in early November.

4. **CONZUL Sponsored Interest Group Meetings.** Successful meetings for Cataloguers and for Liaison Librarians have been held this year. The meeting for Heritage Special Collections Librarians has been postponed while CONZUL clarifies some issues.

5. **NZ Statistics Consortial Deal.** This had previously been arranged by the Research Committee of NZVCC with several adverse terms. CONZUL was asked to take over the renewal of the deal, and this has resulted in a much more satisfactory outcome, including a halving of the price. The NZ Statistics deal includes access to some Australian statistical datasets.

6. **Leadership Course for middle level library staff.** The MLIS programme at Victoria University of Wellington offered a very successful 6 week extramural course under the WISE consortium. The course was led by Sue Roberts (University Librarian at Victoria University of Wellington) and Kat Cuttriss (Wellington Campus Librarian, Massey University). Feedback from students (mostly practitioners) was very positive and it is hoped the paper can be repeated in the future.

7. **Storage Project.** Helen Renwick (Associate University Librarian, University of Auckland) has been employed as the consultant for the national shared-store scoping project. This has been funded by the TEC (Tertiary Education Commission) with a grant of $319,756. The project is to look at a collaborative approach to storage of low-use print research collections across the NZ university libraries. The final report is due by December 2010.

8. **Digitization of the A-Js.** Initial discussions are taking place with the National Library, the Parliamentary Library, the Law Librarians, and the large public libraries for a collaborative project to digitize the Appendices
9. **Library salaries survey.** A remuneration survey across the whole NZ library sector is currently taking place. Results should be known by late October.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights of meeting</th>
<th>Nil.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan for forthcoming activity</td>
<td>The second CONZUL meeting will be held 15-16 October in Christchurch, immediately after the LIANZA Conference. CAUL colleagues would be very welcome to attend our meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pro-forma updated 26 January 2009
# Advocacy and Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Relationships with other organisations – Libraries Australia Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Linda Luther and Anne Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-line</strong></td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievements since last report</strong></td>
<td>Debbie Campbell reports that she has now just about completed her visits to university libraries to discuss Libraries Australia issues. In addition a roadshow has been presented in more than 20 locations covering all States and Territories between April and September this year. This provided both an overview of the Libraries Australia services as well as discussing the ways in which organisations can more fully utilise the services offered. The presentation for the roadshow is available at <a href="http://www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/events.html#Roadshow">http://www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/events.html#Roadshow</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publicity, reports, publications since last report</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan for forthcoming activity</strong></td>
<td>The next meeting of the Libraries Australia Advisory Committee will be held on 5 November 2009. The Libraries Australia forum will be held in Hobart on 6 November. More details at <a href="http://www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/aum/au09/index.html">http://www.nla.gov.au/librariesaustralia/aum/au09/index.html</a>. Charles Sturt University School of Information Studies will be holding a seminar on 5 November. Its theme is <em>Empowering users – what can we do to facilitate creation, discovery, use and transformation of our collections?</em> Registration is available from the LibrariesAustralia forum page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAUL budget</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implications</td>
<td>Recommendations to CAUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is recommended that CAUL note the report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAUL Budget Principles

Introduction
CAUL has an operational budget referred to as the AUD account and three foreign currency accounts in USD, GBP and EUR. CAUL operating costs are derived from membership fees, interest on cash and publications. Expenditure mainly covers salaries and meeting costs. The three foreign currency accounts are for income and expenditure on subscriptions and are effectively cost-neutral with the exception of bank fees and interest earned which is used to assist cash flow.

CAUL membership fees and levies are raised independently each year for CAUL operations, CAUL Electronic Information Resources Committee (CEIRC), Australian Digital Theses (ADT), (now CAUL Australian Institutional Repository Support Service or CAIRSS) and the Australian Libraries Copyright Committee (ALCC) to support the copyright adviser.

The CAUL budget is drafted for the second CAUL meeting of the year by the Executive Officer and CAUL Executive reviews and adjusts it before the Treasurer presents it to CAUL for ratification or contest at the meeting.

CAUL Budget Principles

1. The budget supports the strategic directions of CAUL.
2. Member fees are charged and may be increased by vote at a meeting of members. (CAUL Constitution)
3. Membership fees for CONZUL are based on a contribution of 25% of the CAUL membership fee.
4. CAUL may raise funds by levies on members’ libraries if endorsed by a two-thirds majority of members. (CAUL Constitution)
5. The CEIRC levy will cover the full operating costs of the program.
6. CAUL will, as a minimum, run a balanced operational budget each year for day to day expenses.
7. Interest earned in the CAUL foreign currency accounts shall be held in those accounts to provide cash flow to meet payments.
8. Funding from the operating budget will be provided to support those undertaking a representative role for CAUL.
9. An audited statement of accounts shall be prepared annually for the year ending 31 December, signed off by Executive and presented for approval to CAUL in the following year.
10. The CAUL budget for the forthcoming year shall be approved by the members at the second meeting for the year.
11. Members shall be responsible for their own expenses in attending CAUL Council meetings.
12. CAUL activities such as professional development, think tanks etc shall be cost recoverable.

Imogen Garner
11 September 2009
CAUL Budget Report
updated 17 September, 2009

Format of this Report
The main budget worksheet is CAUL’s Profit & Loss (P&L) for the year to date, showing:

In AUD:
- Budgeted income
- Budgeted expenditure
- Expected expenditure to date (based on the budgeted amount and the expected expenditure flow, which may be seasonal)
- Actual expenditure to date (from the MYOB AUD P&L report)
The sub-total (CAUL + CEIRC operations) reports CAUL’s operational budget.
Following this sub-total are items for which CAUL collects funds to pay subscriptions of various kinds, effectively cost-neutral: datasets subscriptions, Rodski subscriptions, SPARC membership.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Datasets Subscriptions "Budget" (and the foreign currency accounts EUR, GBP and USD)
As there is no budget for this item, income and expenditure patterns of the previous year have been used. The bulk of the income and expenditure happens during renewals time of November-January. Other than interest earned and bank fees, the income and expenditure should be identical.

Liabilities
Provisions have been made for Annual Leave and Long Service Leave for the Executive Officer, expensed in 2005, retained as liabilities from 2006.

Additional liabilities may be added where CAUL has received income for a specific purpose e.g. the CAIRSS funds are held in a liability account and any expenses are reconciled monthly with that account.
CAUL Budget Report - 2010 Budget - draft
Updated 23 July 2009

Salary Expenditure for 2010
- ANU salary increase of 4.5% was applied from 27/11/08, then on anniversaries from 5/3/09

The Executive Officer salary is $95,837 (ANU Senior Admin Officer - from 2009, a new structure translates this to ANU Senior Manager 2) plus on-costs and salary administration (ANU) of 39%. This is the top of scale, so the only changes are EB increases.

The Finance and Administration Officer (1.0 FTE) is based on a salary of $51,706 plus 41.7% at HEW 4/4 plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7%

The Administration Officer (0.15 FTE) was based on casual rates of $32.68 for HEW 4/1 plus plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7%. HEW 4/1 salary is 47,578 - casual rates is 25% loading on hourly rate. This position is currently used almost entirely for CEIRC purposes, because of the increased demands of the program.

An additional 10 hours per week was approved in 2008 to support the processing of CEIRC renewals in September, October and November. For 2009, this was extended to cover August. Based on an expected 2010 casual hourly rate of $32.68 at HEW4/1. From the beginning of 2009, the same person, Beverley Gaykema, has also worked in the above AO role.

Total Salaries for 2010 $225,465.30

CEIRC Income & Expenditure for 2010
From 2009, the CEIRC fee was changed to reflect the resources currently allocated to the CEIRC program, 60% of the EO, 85% of the FAO, and 130 hours of casual support in Q4. The latter was increased to 170 hours in 2010. Also for 2010, the 0.15 Admin Assistant position has been applied fully against CEIRC, reflecting the actual allocation of time to CEIRC.

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. In the first 6 months of 2009, the total earned was equivalent to AUD 700.00 due to zero interest rates on USD account, and almost zero on the GBP account.

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." In 2009, the rate is $120/hour. From May, 2009, some of this work is being brought back into the office, allowing the savings to be used on additional hours for CEIRC support.

Total budgeted CEIRC expenses for 2010 $199,789.82

There are now 23 external CEIRC participants, 8 CONZUL and 39 CAUL paying members. External fees are 150% of members' CEIRC fees. In order to balance the program income/expenditure, the proposed fees for 2010 will be $2,450 and $3,675. This represents an increase of nearly 9%.

Total proposed CEIRC income for 2010 $199,675.00

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

CAIRSS/ADT 2009-2010

The ARROW funds received for CAIRSS ($580,000 for 2 years) have been placed into a liability account, which is reduced as expenditure is applied to it. ADT fees for 2009 and 2010 ($36,000 per year) are also moved into this liability account. The account is reported in a separate tab in this budget report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted Income</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure</th>
<th>Expected Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>144,000.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.4) 53,285.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>21,000.00</td>
<td>Admin Assistant (0.15) 10,990.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution (membership)</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
<td>Office Expenses 7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting 3,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Rental 8,190.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Meetings 15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Meetings 12,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President's Meetings 2,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representation/Seminars 2,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings 1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications / Web Site 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award 6,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (Operating)</td>
<td>172,200.00</td>
<td>120,865.48</td>
<td>51,334.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALCC Levy 20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALCC Membership 20,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Membership 500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings 2,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (Copyright)</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>23,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution (statistics)</td>
<td>6,140.00</td>
<td>Statistics Publication 50,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics Meetings 1,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COUntER Membership 650.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ILWG 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics Site Enhancement 10,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best Practice Working Group 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (Best Practice)</td>
<td>7,890.00</td>
<td>62,350.00</td>
<td>-54,460.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (ULA)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Research &amp; Development 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (R&amp;D)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL operations)</td>
<td>200,090.00</td>
<td>206,215.48</td>
<td>-6,125.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (internal)</td>
<td>115,150.00</td>
<td>Executive Officer (0.6) 79,928.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (external)</td>
<td>84,525.00</td>
<td>CEIRC Assistant (0.8+) 81,201.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check!</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Meetings 15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting</td>
<td>13,600.00</td>
<td>Audit &amp; Accounting 15,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>Research 5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOLC Meetings</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>ICOLC Meetings 5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL-Industry ThinkTank</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>CAUL-Industry ThinkTank 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (CEIRC)</td>
<td>199,675.00</td>
<td>199,789.82</td>
<td>-114.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)</td>
<td>399,765.00</td>
<td>406,005.30</td>
<td>-6,240.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>($6,240.30)</td>
<td>($6,240.30)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datasets Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subscriptions Income 0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (AUD account)</td>
<td>399,765.00</td>
<td>406,005.30</td>
<td>-6,240.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIRSS/ADT Program (liability account)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAIRSS/ADT Membership Fees 36,000.00</td>
<td>ADT 36,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from ARROW</td>
<td>580,000.00</td>
<td>CAIRSS 290,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total (CAIRSS)</td>
<td>616,000.00</td>
<td>326,000.00</td>
<td>290,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subscriptions Income 0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest 0.00</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL USD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£ ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subscriptions Income 0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest 0.00</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL £</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subscriptions Income 0.00</td>
<td>Subscriptions Payments 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest 0.00</td>
<td>Bank Charges 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EUR</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest earned on Foreign Currency Accounts ($) given exchange rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD account</td>
<td>0.00 @ 0.7996</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBP account</td>
<td>0.00 @ 0.4868</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUR account</td>
<td>0.00 @ 0.5772</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40 CAUL members @ $4,500+1350-2250 (change in CEIRC fee) - caul20082 decision to retain total overall CAUL+ceirc fee

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

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

19,000 in 2003; 22717 in 2004; 14014 to 30/6/06
17,000 to 23/7/07; 21,000 to 7/09

< 15% time allocated to general CAUL activity by FAA HEW incl o/c & salary mgmt plus extra hours 0.15 for admin support

315+GST per fortnight

Estimate for migration of the website to the new platform - 100 hours of HEW 3 PLUS outstanding cost of redeveloping the site - started 10/4/09

$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting

40 CAUL members

updated with information from CAVAL 30/10/08, later updated upon acceptance of a new 5-year proposal from CAVAL.

Library Consortium £365 ($545)

Approved by Executive 4/2/09

40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005 or later years

Income from 2004 recorded in liabilities

39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL

CAUL Executive Officer: External members *23
Wintec withdrew 10/11/08
HortRes merged with CFR

>85% time on CEIRC activity, plus 10h/wk casual staff Aug/Sept/Oct/Nov + 40h project to populate ACT! approved by Executive 4/2/09

1 meeting only in 2009 late April

40 CAUL members but not CONZUL

for 2 year program

16/3/08-16/3/10
Format of this Report
The main budget worksheet is CAUL’s Profit & Loss (P&L) for the year to date, showing:
In AUD:
- Budgeted income
- Budgeted expenditure
- Expected expenditure to date (based on the budgeted amount and the expected expenditure flow, which may be seasonal)
- Actual expenditure to date (from the MYOB AUD P&L report)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Datasets Subscriptions "Budget" (and the foreign currency accounts EUR, GBP and USD)
As there is no budget for this item, income and expenditure patterns of the previous year have been used. The bulk of the income and expenditure happens during renewals time of November-January. Other than interest earned, the income and expenditure should be identical.

Liabilities
Provisions have been made for Annual Leave and Long Service Leave for the Executive Officer, expensed in 2005, retained as liabilities from 2006.
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 salary is 94,461 (ANU Senior Admin Officer) plus on-costs and salary administration (ANU) of 39%.

131,300.79

The Finance and Administration Officer (1.0 FTE) is based on a salary of $50,113 plus 41.7% at HEW 4/3 plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7%.

71,010.12

The Administration Officer (0.15 FTE) was based on casual rates of $33.76 for HEW 4/3 plus plus on-costs and salary administration (The One Umbrella) of 41.7%.

11,481.10

An additional 10 hours per week was approved in 2008 to support the processing of CEIRC renewals in September, October and November. For 2009, this was extended to cover August. Based on an expected 2009 casual hourly rate of $31.60 at HEW4/1.

3,806.06

An additional 40 hours was approved by the Executive 4/2/09 for project support to populate the ACT! database. Based on an expected 2009 casual hourly rate of $31.60 at HEW4/1.

1,791.09

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 participants 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

This proposal was reviewed at CAUL 2008/2 and it was decided to keep the overall CAUL + ceirc contribution the same, so the CAUL fee was increased to 4500-900=3600

Internal External

Total expenses $183,336 $2,170 $3,254

Travel Costs for 2007 onwards

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Category</th>
<th>Budgeted Income</th>
<th>Expected Expenditure to date (30/9/09)</th>
<th>Actual Expenditure to date</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>144,000.00</td>
<td>39,390.24</td>
<td>$36,981.22</td>
<td>-$2,409.02</td>
<td>-6.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Cash</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>9,590.63</td>
<td>-7,098.63</td>
<td>-42.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution (membership)</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
<td>2,930.69</td>
<td>-2,299.90</td>
<td>-44.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>492.92</td>
<td>-$2,057.08</td>
<td>-42.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental</td>
<td>8,190.00</td>
<td>5,866.15</td>
<td>-$274.35</td>
<td>-4.47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>-11.00</td>
<td>-3,011.00</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Meetings</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>12,948.02</td>
<td>$1,698.02</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Meetings</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>7,723.44</td>
<td>-$4,276.56</td>
<td>-35.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Meetings</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>282.45</td>
<td>-$1,717.55</td>
<td>-85.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation/Seminars</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$2,000.00</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint CCA Meetings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>677.27</td>
<td>-$322.73</td>
<td>-9.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications / Web Site</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33,103.18</td>
<td>$33,103.18</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUL Achievement Award</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>4,963.37</td>
<td>-$1,036.63</td>
<td>-17.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Operating)</strong></td>
<td>181,200.00</td>
<td>102,932.20</td>
<td>$78,267.82</td>
<td><strong>118,550.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.61%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAMMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCC Levy</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Membership</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>1,875.00</td>
<td>-$625.00</td>
<td>-25.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Copyright)</strong></td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>-3,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONZUL contribution (statistics)</td>
<td>6,140.00</td>
<td>4,963.37</td>
<td>$1,176.63</td>
<td>-19.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILWG</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Site Enhancement</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$10,500.00</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice Working Group</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (Best Practice)</strong></td>
<td>7,890.00</td>
<td>-5,235.00</td>
<td>$2,655.00</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ULA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (ULA)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (R&amp;D)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL operations)</strong></td>
<td>209,090.00</td>
<td>255,322.00</td>
<td>-$46,232.00</td>
<td><strong>217,550.38</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.80%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEIRC PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (internal)</td>
<td>105,750.00</td>
<td>59,085.36</td>
<td>$46,664.64</td>
<td>-44.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC Levy (external)</td>
<td>77,740.00</td>
<td>55,741.39</td>
<td>$22,027.61</td>
<td>-28.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (CEIRC)</strong></td>
<td>183,490.00</td>
<td>114,806.75</td>
<td>$68,683.25</td>
<td>37.06%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL (CAUL + CEIRC OPERATIONS)</strong></td>
<td>392,580.00</td>
<td>369,128.75</td>
<td>$23,451.25</td>
<td><strong>338,224.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.17%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Deficit)</td>
<td>392,580.00</td>
<td>369,128.75</td>
<td>$23,451.25</td>
<td><strong>338,224.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.17%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS (reported in native currency, not converted to AUD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USD ACCOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Income</td>
<td>45,547.57</td>
<td>97,184.94</td>
<td>$51,637.37</td>
<td>-108.73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (AUD account)</strong></td>
<td>438,127.57</td>
<td>435,408.99</td>
<td>$2,718.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAIRSS/ADT Program (liability account)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAIRSS/ADT Membership Fees</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
<td>30,331.40</td>
<td>$5,668.60</td>
<td>-18.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from ARROW</td>
<td>580,000.00</td>
<td>81,500.00</td>
<td>-$498,500.00</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total (CAIRSS)</strong></td>
<td>616,000.00</td>
<td>329,000.00</td>
<td>$287,000.00</td>
<td>45.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- USD account: 0.00
- GBP account: 0.00 @ 0.8736
- EUR account: 0.00 @ 0.9937

**Total in AUD**: 636.97
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: A5</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 CAUL members @ $4,500 + 1350 - 2250 (change in CEIRC fee) - caul20082 decision to retain total overall CAUL + CEIRC fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: D5</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></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 91k from 11/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: A6</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUD account only, based on the previous year's interest earned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: B6</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19,000 in 2003; 22,177 in 2004; 14,014 to 30/6/06 17,000 to 23/7/07;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: D6</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 15% time allocated to general CAUL activity by FAA HEW4 incl o/c &amp; salary mgmt plus extra hours 0.15 for admin support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: E9</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315+GST per fortnight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: E10</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Office replacement computer - asset rather than expense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: D16</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate for migration of the website to the new platform - 100 hours of HEW 3 PLUS outstanding cost of redeveloping the site - started 10/4/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: D17</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5000 + travel expenses for presentation at CAUL meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: A23</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 CAUL members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: E29</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>updated with information from CAVAL 30/10/08, later updated upon acceptance of a new 5-year proposal from CAVAL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: D30</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Consortium £365 ($545)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: D32</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved by Executive 4/2/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: A40</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 X $500 in 2004; no levy in 2005 or later years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: D40</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income from 2004 recorded in liabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: B45</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 CAUL + 8 CONZUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: B46</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External members '23 Wintec withdrew 10/11/08 HortRes merged with CFR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: D46</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;85% time on CEIRC activity, plus 10h/wk casual staff Aug/Sept/Oct/Nov + 40h project to populate ACT! approved by Executive 4/2/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: E59</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 meeting only in 2009 late April - airfare paid by NPG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: I51</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income minus expenditure (proposed to be cost neutral)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: A64</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 CAUL members but not CONZUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: A65</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for 2 year program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell: H65</th>
<th>Comment: CAUL Executive Officer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program started 20/3/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAUL RISK ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Impact/Consequence</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence rating</th>
<th>Overall risk</th>
<th>Business Continuity Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Unincorporated status                                                           | Liability exposure for Executive    | Unlikely   | Major              | Medium       | Regularly review advantages/disadvantages of s' | **Delete:** Investigate whether professional indemnity insurance is needed **Delete:** 
<p>| | | | | | |
|                                                                                 |                                     |            |                    |              |                                |
| Cannot enter into contracts as 'CAUL'                                           | Likely                              | Minor      | Medium             |              | Legal advice obtained during CEIRC review advises against incorporation |
|                                                                                   |                                     |            |                    |              | <strong>Delete:</strong> Legal advice obtained during CEIRC review advises on amending head contracts etc that invo |
|                                                                                   |                                     |            |                    |              | CEIRC. Contracts are being amended as they a |
|                                                                                   |                                     |            |                    |              | renewed in line with advice |
| Fragmentation of membership as sectors assert stronger identities               | Influence, advocacy suffer          | Possible   | Moderate           | Medium       | Regularly review mission and values and seek endorsement |
|                                                                                   |                                     |            |                    |              | Encourage information exchange between secto |
| Turnover in Executive                                                            | Poor transfer of knowledge and expertise | Unlikely | Minor              | Low          | Devise and regularly review membership terms a |
|                                                                                   |                                     |            |                    |              | conditions to ensure balance of stability and refre |
| Membership not interested in serving on Executive                                | Lack of turnover leading to fatigue in Executive | Unlikely | Moderate           | Medium       | Executive to identify and encourage members |
|                                                                                   |                                     |            |                    |              | Induction of members to encourage participation |
| Viability of CAUL is threatened                                                  | Unlikely                            | Major      | Medium             |              | |
| <strong>Administrative</strong>                                                               |                                     |            |                    |              | <strong>Delete:</strong> |
| Turnover of CAUL admin staff                                                     | Loss of skill base                  | Likely     | Moderate           | High         | Identify suitable temporary staff able to fill in at a |
|                                                                                   | Time to recruit and train           |            |                    |              | level at short notice |
|                                                                                   | Reduced attention to other priorities in the interim | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Impact/Consequence</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence rating</th>
<th>Overall risk</th>
<th>Business Continuity Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single point staffing in CAUL Office</td>
<td>Loss of knowledge and expertise in staff changes and succession</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ensure records, policies and procedures are documented and accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular review of policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL EO office assistant gathers and shares knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review contract of employment with CAUL EO to ensure sufficient notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive must address succession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU Library no longer willing to host CAUL Office</td>
<td>Locating alternative accommodation</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Regular discussion with ANU on level of comfort arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of alternatives including HR issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate minimum period of notice with ANU if current arrangements are terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of CEIRC administration</td>
<td>Use of existing CAUL Office staff has a negative impact on other CAUL priorities</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Review CEIRC administrative requirements on an annual or bi-annual basis when preparing budget operational plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEIRC and CAUL fees increase to meet costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive to consider review of CEIRC including alternative administrative arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL EO and CEIRC Chairperson monitor administrative activities and communicate regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement and evaluate recommendations on CEIRC administration arising from CEIRC review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Description</td>
<td>Impact/Consequence</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence rating</td>
<td>Overall risk</td>
<td>Business Continuity Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of CAUL records</td>
<td>Loss of historical information</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Electronic backup available Review fire or water threat to CAUL office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of current work product</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Protect laptop from loss or damage All FAO work product on ANU network server Email or upload working documents earlier in the development process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss or damage to equipment or other assets</td>
<td>Cost of replacement Disruption during replacement and setup</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Review insurance details – ANU for in-office; travel insurance for travel; home &amp; contents insurance Canberra Review fire or water threats to CAUL office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget planning for surplus each year Regular review of costs Regular communication to membership on financial status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee income does not meet costs</td>
<td>Membership unwilling to pay increased fees Decrease in reserve funds</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Budget planning for surplus each year Regular review of costs Regular communication to membership on financial status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of misuse of funds by Executive or membership</td>
<td>Membership loses confidence in CAUL</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>External audit report each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIRC operations and cash flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Description</td>
<td>Impact/Consequence</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Consequence rating</td>
<td>Overall risk</td>
<td>Business Continuity Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CAUL doesn’t pay bills in a timely fashion           | Publisher or other supplier ceases to deal with CAUL                               | Unlikely   | Major              | Medium       | Payment of bills is the highest priority of the FAO times  
CAUL stipulates upfront that publisher payment to be 60 days  
Statements sent to CAUL and CEIRC members necessary, monthly during “high season”  
Cash reserves sufficient to carry some late paym from CAUL and CEIRC members  
Notify CAUL member for very overdue payments  
Remind CAUL members regularly about role of Datasets Coordinators and need for clarification of responsibilities at each institution |
| Late payment penalty is imposed                       |                                                                                     | Unlikely   | Moderate           | Medium       |                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Members change their minds after committing to a subscription |                                                                                     | Possible   | Minor              | Low          | CAUL accepts only written acceptance from authorised Datasets Coordinators  
Libraries pay in advance for subscriptions, so withdrawing prior to start is possible, and likely to receive refund if already paid;  
If final cost for subscribers is contingent on the number of subscribers, the institution may be held its prior commitment by CAUL rather than the publisher |
| AUD falls against other currencies                    |                                                                                     | Likely     | Insignificant      | Low          | All payments handled in the native currency with conversion to AUD  
Currency risk managed by CAUL & CEIRC mem institutions  
Comment: I still think the rating is correct – the risk to CAUL is low, Risk to CAUL members is a separate issue |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Impact/Consequence</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Consequence rating</th>
<th>Overall risk</th>
<th>Business Continuity Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss or misuse of CAUL monies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Review processes for authorising payments from CAUL accounts regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL Executive supervision of accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities not fully accounted for e.g. GST, long service leave, recreation leave, superannuation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-compliance with legal requirements e.g. GST, salary-related, industrial laws; superannuation</td>
<td>CAUL or EO fined for non-compliance</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Salary-related and working conditions responsibilities outsourced to ANU and The One Umbrella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GST compliance audited annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher sues CAUL for breach of contract</td>
<td>Financial penalty</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>CAUL signs only CEIRC documents which it has some control over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL does not sign documents which include a clause which requires CAUL to accept indemnity the costs of legal action or any other reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal advice from CEIRC review recommended clauses to avoid this – affected contracts being changed on renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation and influence</td>
<td>Membership loses confidence</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>CAUL actively contributes to matters of education and public policy relevant to CAUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL President maintains and builds profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL EO issues media releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUL President discusses relationship with Universities Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification of high and critical risks and how they are managed

Single point of staffing in the CAUL office – addressed by:

- identification of the skills and knowledge required of replacement personnel;
- identification of expectations of time required to get “up to speed” when replacement is required;
- all CAUL’s work is currently housed on ANU servers which are backed up daily – email and archive; CAUL web-site; CAUL office procedures and CEIRC database and subscription requests – the only information which is not on the server are current working documents until they are either emailed to the respective committees or uploaded to the web site.

Volume of CEIRC administration – addressed by:

- annual or bi-annual review of the workload of the CAUL FAO who handles the day-to-day transactions and record-keeping to ensure that there is sufficient capacity at the high-volume times, particularly August to October, and that there is time the rest of the year to complete less vital tasks;
- bi-annual review of the time spent on CEIRC by the EO, at different times of the year;
- assessment of which CEIRC-related activities could be delegated without loss of quality e.g. reviewing documentation from vendors, both proposals and licences;

Loss or misuse of CAUL funds – addressed by:

- annual audit of CAUL accounts;
- supervision of CAUL accounts by CAUL Executive;
- external book-keeper to reconcile monthly accounts, including MasterCard;
- two signatures required on all CAUL payments, except MasterCard which has a limit of $10,000;
- foreign currency account payments processed by bank branch staff using documentation with two original signatures;
- payment documentation prepared by a third party, except for MasterCard;
### Risk Matrix

#### Consequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Catastrophic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low risk (L) – managed by routine activities

Moderate risk (M) – management responsibility should be specified

High risk (H) – senior management notified

Extreme risk (E) – immediate action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th>Operational</th>
<th>Routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>May only occur in exceptional circumstances</td>
<td>Less than once in every 50 years</td>
<td>Less than once every 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>Could occur at some time</td>
<td>At least once in 20 years</td>
<td>At least once in 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Might occur at some time</td>
<td>At least once in 5 years</td>
<td>At least once per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Will probably occur in most circumstances</td>
<td>At least once per year</td>
<td>At least once per quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Certain</td>
<td>Expected to occur in most circumstances</td>
<td>More than once per year</td>
<td>At least once per month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Measures of Consequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Reputation &amp; Image</th>
<th>Financial Loss</th>
<th>Safety &amp; Injury</th>
<th>Operation loss</th>
<th>Legislative compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low impact, no media coverage</td>
<td>&lt;$50k</td>
<td>No injuries</td>
<td>Minor or no damage to assets. Minor or no interruption to daily activities.</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>News item with low impact or is unsubstantiated</td>
<td>$50k-$500k</td>
<td>Minor injuries/first aid required</td>
<td>Minor damage. Loss of operation no more than one day.</td>
<td>Minor breach of statute/regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Substantiated news item, moderate news profile with embarrassment</td>
<td>$500k-$10m</td>
<td>First aid and ongoing medical treatment. Probable lost time.</td>
<td>Significant damage to assets. Loss of operation 1 day to 1 week.</td>
<td>Formal warning from regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Substantiated news item, high impact news profile with embarrassment, possible 2nd or 3rd part involvement</td>
<td>$10m-$100m</td>
<td>Extensive injuries/possible multiple injuries or single fatality</td>
<td>Major damage to assets. Loss of operation 1 week to 1 month</td>
<td>Suspension of activity and prosecution/financial penalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catastrophic</td>
<td>Substantiated widespread news item, significant reputation damage, third party actions, impact on ability to achieve research and education strategic objectives</td>
<td>&gt;$100m</td>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>Significant loss of assets. Loss of operations &gt;1 month</td>
<td>Prosecution, financial penalty, cessation of activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report to CAUL
March 26 to September 17

(parts of this report are extracted from reports to the CAUL Executive during this time)

CAUL Office.

Preparations for the Think Tank were a significant part of CAUL’s activities over the past two months - finding and arranging venues, organising speakers and their travel arrangements and handling registrations. Registrations were received from 37 CAUL representatives (25 members), 5 CONZUL members, 29 industry delegates and representatives from Universities Australia, CAUDIT and academic speakers - a total of 80. Key senior personnel from international divisions of Nature Publishing Group, Wiley-Blackwell, TandF, Elsevier Science, Thomson Reuters, Wolters Kluwer, EBSCO, Emerald and ProQuest attended. The keynote speaker was Dr David Prosser, Director of SPARC Europe. CAUL funded his travel and arranged his domestic itinerary to support presentations at the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne, Deakin, Latrobe and the National Library (in conjunction with the ANU).

Significant editing has been done on the CAUL report 2007-2008, but its priority continues to be overtaken by other matters such as the Think Tank organisation, CAUL meetings, Universities Australia’s Web of Science renegotiation process, Wiley-Blackwell negotiations and management of resultant subscriptions, new web site population and the additional handling of the majority of CEIRC renewals due to the persistence of many publishers in proposal renewals at 5% or above.

Diane Costello took two weeks long service leave from June 8 to 19, and another 7 days following the Executive meeting in Brisbane, July 29-August 7.

CEIRC.

The number of renewals and new offers received is higher than usual for this time of the year. 96 renewals and 50 new offers have been published to members since the beginning of May. All renewals prices and new offer price caps are being checked and anything over 4% is being returned to the publisher or agent for reconsideration. Four publishers have made special discounts available in return for early payment – CSIRO publishing, which all subscribers have taken up; the American Chemical Society, which all but two have taken up and the American Physiological Society, which required commitment by July 31. Reports on all publishers reporting flat pricing or reduced increases are being included in the CEIRC minutes.

The Wiley-Blackwell contract renegotiation came to a successful conclusion in mid-August, with the result that 39 of the 61 CEIRC subscribers have already renewed, all but 3 for the full collection, including 5 upgrades. One external participant has taken the option to downgrade to its core collection.

Assisting Universities Australia with preparations for the Web of Science renegotiations have included arranging and reporting on a teleconference of library “experts” on both Web of Science and Scopus - to provide background on the content and features and comparisons between the two - participating in the teleconference of the Universities Australia “assessment panel” in later August, and surveying and reporting on CAUL’s attitudes towards and expectations of the various databases included in the latest proposals from Elsevier and Thomson Reuters.

Assisting Universities Australia with preparations for the CAL renegotiations have included preparing a report of journal packages facilitated by CAUL since the mid-nineties, the takeup of those packages over time by individual institutions, the number of titles within those packages and, with some assistance from JCU and UTS, details of licence terms regarding classroom use and coursepacks.

Finance.

AUD 150,000 (one hundred and fifty thousand dollars) has been paid into a Term Deposit for a period of seven months, at 3.50% with interest paid six monthly into the term deposit.

The 2008 audit is underway.
CAIRSS.

The establishment of CAIRSS involved the CAUL Office in a number of ways, setting up CAUL domain addresses for the website and emails, financial reporting and supporting the Steering Committee. Six meetings/teleconferences have been held in 2009. The CAIRSS Steering Committee email list was changed from cairss@caul.edu.au to cairss-sc@caul.edu.au, so that the former could be used as an email address for the project manager. The other generic addresses were finalised on 12 March, 2009.

A CAIRSS page on the CAUL web site [http://www.caul.edu.au/cairss/](http://www.caul.edu.au/cairss/), was established 16 March, 2009. This was also the day that the service officially started.

An announcement about the establishment of CAIRSS was circulated to the media and other appropriate bodies on 18 March, 2009. It appeared in Peter Suber’s Open Access Newsletter [http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2009/03/supporting-australian-repositories.html](http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/2009/03/supporting-australian-repositories.html)


The branding for CAIRSS was approved by the Steering Committee on 2 April, 2009.

The domain cairss.caul.edu.au was established 9 April, 2009.

Since the July meeting of the Steering Committee, a list of tasks has been referred to the project manager for reporting and other feedback:

- It was agreed that any substantive information made available to members via CAIRSS lists or blogs would also be made available more permanently on the CAIRSS website. This will include reports of meetings, and any procedural feedback such as that for supporting the ERA.
- Presentations from the institutional repositories sessions at EDUCAUSE will be made available on the CAIRSS web site.
- Kate Watson is to meet with the ARC and the NLA re MACAR, to report back in time for the next meeting.
- Kate Watson is to meet with UNSW’s Tom Ruthven to review the current state of play for both ADT strategy and technology. It was noted that nothing has changed technically for quite some time so there is less technical expertise available. The meeting will also address which elements of the ADT site should go to CAIRSS and which should come back to CAUL, to report back in time for the next meeting.
- AURC - the proposed project does not yet show a clear benefit for repository managers, as opposed to those interested in the progress of institutional repositories developments. It was agreed that Kate Watson would consult selected repository managers and ask them – what they understand from the AURC proposal as it stands; whether they would find a quarterly snapshot of repository setups useful; how would they use the resulting database – then, if repository managers consider it useful, reframe the proposal from a repository manager perspective rather than from the technical perspective. A revised proposal should be ready by the end of August if it is to be considered by the Steering Committee via email prior to the September meeting. The proposal should include a business case, and show what it would do that current sources of information such as the NLA and CAIRSS surveys cannot do.
- Members endorsed holding a face to face event for repository managers. This has been scheduled for November 30 / December 1 at the University of the Sunshine Coast.

The original 100 hours budgeted for website population was consumed by mid-May and has now gone into deficit of 200 hours i.e. an additional cost of $13,800. The CEIRC publishers’ pages are completed, and the old and new pages are being updated in parallel during this renewals season. Other key sections underway are CAUL meetings, Best practice, Information literacy, Statistics, CAUL surveys. There is 14 years of content to be moved, 1700 html pages which require all the internal links to the 6,000 internal documents to be updated. The migration is slower than expected both because of the development server response time, and because of the relatively clunky back-end, which is not designed to cope with large numbers of pages and files. Some of the latter has been addressed with software changes (at additional cost) and some is going to be a continuing feature of the software.

Some of the system limitations include:

- the system does not manage or display large amounts of content well - some is a design issue and some is a Sitedock issue - the former can be addressed to some extent by requesting rewrites, at cost. For example, until the site population began, it was not clear how the page structure would leave a relatively small amount of the page available for content and how much white space would remain; it was not clear how the 400 publishers included in a drop-down menu would take up so much space.

- it was understood that all documents (.doc, .xls, .pdf, .ppt etc) could be mass-transferred to the new server, however it was not understood that each members-only document would have to be individually moved into the “document reservoir” and individually labelled before being linked to the new pages - an enhancement was requested and implemented, at cost.

- 100 hours of casual staff was estimated as a major contribution to the site population, but the cumbersome approach to some of the functions has reduced the expected volume. Christine Henderson is being employed to translate the CEIRC html pages to the new site; Alisha is also working on some where other tasks permit. 374 publisher pages have been set up.

The translation involves copying the text across to the site, then editing every link in the page to point to the moved documents. If the document is members-only, such as offers to CAUL, the aforementioned cumbersome procedure to move the document, mark it up, then link it is time-consuming. We transferred more than 400 this way, pending automation of some of this procedure.

- This is exacerbated by a “flaky” site – there have been days when it has been extremely slow to respond, other days when system errors have occurred and editing has had to be suspended, and for many days could not access the members-only document folder.

- My time on the work has been sporadic – intensive up-front to learn how the system works and to write the procedures; testing and reporting problems (an average of two messages a day); moving non-CEIRC pages across as time permits; converting former html pages to documents to simplify the process.

- Except for some CEIRC pages, we are not double-editing at present – where pages on the old website are being updated, we are not also checking to see whether this page has been created on the new site – it will be simpler to batch this updating on the new site.

Publicity / PR.

The CAUL Statement on the Global Economic Crisis was released to the press, and selected national and international library and other organisations. It was featured in Campus Review and was mooted to appear in Australian Library News and the Australian Law Librarian. Only two publishers, at opposite ends of the spectrum, acknowledged receipt at the time, though later discussions show that many were conscious of it.

There were numerous links to the CAIRRSS press release on international web sites.
Meeting arrangements (travel, agenda, venues, minutes, etc):

CAUL Meeting 2009/1 Newcastle 2-3 April 2009
CAUL Executive 2009/2 Newcastle 1 April 2009
CAIRSS Steering Committee 2009/4 Newcastle 2 April 2009
CAIRSS Steering Committee 2009/5 Perth 6 May 2009
CAUL Executive 2009/3 Perth 7 May 2009
CEIRC Meeting 2009/3 Sydney June 24
CAIRSS Steering Committee 2009/6 teleconference July 6
Universities Australia Web of Science/Scopus expert group teleconference July 16
CAUL Executive 2009/4 Brisbane 29 July
CCA Joint Executive 2009/1 Brisbane 29 July
CAUL Industry Think Tank Sydney 18-19 August 2009
CEIRC Meeting 2009/4 Melbourne August 31
CAUL Executive 2009/5 Sydney September 20
CAUL Meeting 2009/2 Sydney 21-22 September
CAIRSS Steering Committee 2009/7 Sydney September 22
CAIRSS Steering Committee 2009/8 teleconference November 30

Meetings held/ attended:

April 28 Ingrid Wilkins & Claire Tingey, WalterTurnbull for start of 2008 audit.
April 30 Rebecca Harris, Universities Australia
July 8 - Rebecca Harris, Universities Australia re Web of Science/Scopus, etc
July 13 - CAUL-Industry Think Tank program committee & facilitator teleconference
August 10 - Brenda McConchie re Think Tank facilitation
September 4 - Cathrine Harboe-Ree, incoming CAUL president

Meetings held/ attended - CEIRC related:

April 7 Matt Bromhead, OneSource – teleconference
April 15-18 ICOLC meeting, Charlottesville, VA
April 17 Steven Morris, SCELC demonstration of consortium management database
April 20 JSTOR representatives Ken de Fiore, Josh Horowitz, Jason Phillips, New York, NY
April 20-21 Nature Publishing Group Library Committee meeting, New York, NY
April 28 Heather Crosbie & Tina Argyros, RMIT Publishing
May 5 - Ron MacNeill, CCH
May 6 – James Mercer, Springer, Perth
May 6 – Rosalia da Garcia, SAGE and Jay Glaisyer, EBSCO, Perth
May 20 – Tamara Joyner, Palgrave Macmillan, NPG
June 3 – Wiley-Blackwell negotiation group teleconference
July 3 – Patrick Doogue, IOP Publishing
August 11 – James Mercer, Springer, teleconference re 2010-2012 contract
August 13 – Bruce Heterick, JSTOR, teleconference
August 18 – Reed Elfenbein & Ira Tan meeting with Wiley-Blackwell negotiation group, Sydney
August 20 – Chris Edmeades, CABI
August 20 – Lisa McTiernan, Nanda Kumar & Anthony Halstead, Lexis Nexis
August 24 – Marika Whitfield, OUP, Maryce Johnstone, Cengage, & Linda Wright, Britannica
August 26 – Anna Torrance, Emerald, teleconference
August 30 – Jeremy Nielsen, American Medical Association, Canberra
September 3 – Neil Lader, American Psychological Association, teleconference
September 9 – James Mercer & David Elek, Springer

Diane Costello
Executive Officer
17 September 2009